

**REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**31 OCTOBER 2006
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
VINCENT RIVERA, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
Herbert Levy, FAIA
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Suzanne Pentz
Robert Thomas, AIA
Daniela Voith, AIA

Jonathan Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician

ALSO PRESENT

Peter Kelson, Esq., Blank Rome
Adam Laver, Esq., Blank Rome
Li Chung Pei, AIA
Robert Downs, Yaron Properties
Timothy Safford, Rector of Christ Church
Joseph Schiavo, Old City Civic Association
Michael Santoro, Merion Builders, LLC
Luigi Corrodo, Merion Builders, LLC
Donato J. Pignetti
Yao Chang Huang
Peter Miller
Kerry Polite
Sonali Polite
Kiki Bollender
Eileen Quigley, Esq.
Stephen Carlino
Craig Sokolow
Craig Deutsch, Harman-Deutsch Architects
Paul Drzal, Harman-Deutsch Architects
Anthony Forte, Esq.
Nan Gutterman, Vitteta
Nicole Dress, Vitteta
Steve Patron
Gil Rosenthal, Wallace Roberts & Todd
Sam Robinson, Wallace Roberts & Todd
Tom Barton

Jessica Senker, S. Harris & Co.
Sam Harris, S. Harris & Co.
Rick Cole, Elfreth's Alley Association
Janet Coulter, Old City Civic Association
Alvin Holm
Thomas Witt, Esq.
Vesna Hess
Frank Rapisardi
Stephen Verner
James Garrison
Mitch Wolfson
George Baker
Joel Schmitt
Ray Brogden
Brett Harman
Peter Adel
Michael Saponaro
Christopher Feranec
Anthony Tartaglia, Landmark Design
Stephen Maffei, Landmark Design

CALL TO ORDER

Robert Thomas, acting chair, called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Ms. Pentz and Voith and Messrs. D'Alessandro and Levy joined Mr. Thomas on the Committee.

218-226 ARCH STREET, LITTLE BOYS' COURT

Owner: 218 Arch Street, L.P., Yaron Properties, Oxford Construction Development, Inc.

Applicant: Adam Laver, Esq., Blank Rome

History: vacant lot, non-contributing in Old City Historic District

218 and 220 Arch Street, individual designations rescinded in 2006

Little Boys Court designated as part of Historic Street Paving Thematic District

Project: In concept, construct 23-story building

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a 272-foot tall residential and commercial tower for 218-226 Arch Street in the Old City Historic District. An historic street and surface parking lot now occupy the site. The parcel has a complicated history of designations.

The Commission individually designated the two historic buildings that stood at 218 and 220 Arch Street in 1977, but recently rescinded those designations. In 1985, the Commission approved the demolitions of the two historic buildings to clear the site for the construction of a hotel, but it was never built. In September 2006, the Commission reviewed and approved a rescission request from the current owner, rescinding the individual designations of 218 and 220 Arch Street.

The Commission designated the parcel at 218-226 Arch Street as part of the Old City Historic District in 2003; it is classified as non-contributing. If this were the only designation, the Commission would certainly review this application with 45-day review-and-comment jurisdiction. However, the Commission also designated Little Boys' Court or Way, which runs

across this parcel, as a significant resource in the Historic Street Paving Thematic District. Little Boys' Court runs across several private parcels; it is not an open, public street. The paving on it may be the oldest in the city. The Commission enjoys plenary jurisdiction over Little Boys' Court.

The preservation ordinance [14-2007(2d) and (7d)] limits the Commission's jurisdiction to 45 days of review-and-comment on "undeveloped" sites. The threshold between review-and-comment and plenary jurisdiction is the "undeveloped/developed" boundary; it is not the "non-contributing/contributing" boundary, as many often assume. The Commission has typically considered surface parking lots as "undeveloped" sites and only asserted review-and-comment jurisdiction over new construction on them. However, the Commission has never encountered a situation in which a designated historic street runs across a private property that includes a surface parking lot and is classified as non-contributing. The application raises a fundamental question: Is a parcel that includes a designated, significant historic street "developed" or "undeveloped" in the eyes of the preservation ordinance? The Commission must map the "undeveloped/developed" boundary to determine whether it has review-and-comment or plenary jurisdiction over this parcel.

The criteria with which the Commission must review this application, regardless of the extent of its jurisdiction are stipulated in the preservation ordinance and *Secretary of the Interior's Standards*. Section 14-2007(7)(k)(.4) of the preservation ordinance stipulates that:

In making its determination as to the appropriateness of the proposed alterations, demolition or construction, the Commission shall consider the following:

... the compatibility of the proposed work with the historic district or with the character of its site, including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings and the streetscape.

Furthermore, the Commission's *Rules & Regulations* stipulates and a recent court ruling has upheld that "The Commission, its Architectural Committee and staff **shall** be guided in their evaluations by *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards*." Rehabilitation Standard 9 requires that:

New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

The proposed development, a glass and steel tower set on a masonry base, would stand 272 feet tall. The surrounding buildings are, for the most part, masonry and only two to five stories. Christ Church, one of the City's most significant historic buildings, stands only 250 feet to the southeast of the site. Its tower, one of the most important features on the Philadelphia skyline for 250 years, is only 196 feet tall. The proposed tower would overwhelm Christ Church and other nearby buildings. It is not compatible in features, materials, size, scale, proportion, or massing with the historic district, the primary resource the Commission is charged with preserving.

The features, scale, proportion, and massing of the base are not compatible with the historic district. The inset corner and entranceway do not respect the historic wall plane at the sidewalk line. Although retail is planned for the ground floor, the neighborhood tradition of storefront windows is not respected. Above, the tall, thin windows do not respect the common window

proportions in the district; the ratio of solid to window is also unlike and incompatible with that of the neighborhood.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Committee formulate a recommendation that will serve for both review-and-comment and full jurisdiction as well as for both in-concept and final review. The staff recommends that the Committee recommend denial owing to incompleteness for the final-review segment of its recommendation. Regarding the merits of the proposed building, the staff recommends denial, pursuant to Section 14-2007(7)(k).4 of the preservation ordinance and Rehabilitation Standard 9 of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards*. The staff contends that the proposed building is not compatible in materials, features, size, scale and proportion, or massing with the site, neighboring structures, adjacent historic street, surroundings, streetscape, or historic district. Its construction would diminish the integrity of the historic district.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorneys Peter Kelson and Adam Laver, architect Li Chung (Sandy) Pei, and developer Robert Downs represented the application.

Mr. Farnham advised the Committee regarding several procedural issues. He explained that the application was submitted as an in-concept application. The application form itself clearly states "In Concept." However, one day prior to the Architectural Committee meeting, the applicant informed the staff that he planned to seek final, not in-concept approval. Mr. Farnham noted that the amendment from in-concept to final at such a late stage raises a legal question regarding public notice. The agenda, which was distributed to the public, mirrors the application form and states that this would be an in-concept review. Mr. Farnham suggested that the Committee neither endeavor to determine whether this application should be considered a request for an in-concept or final approval nor consider whether proper notice was given for a final review, but leave those legal questions to the Commission. He also explained that the potential change from in-concept to final has ramifications for the staff recommendation distributed with the Architectural Committee packets. The staff employed in-concept standards while reviewing this application. If the staff had reviewed this as an application for final approval, then it would have recommended denial to the Committee owing to incompleteness because the application does not provide numerous key details necessary for a final review. For example, no detailed information is presented about the treatment of Little Boys' Court. Perhaps the oldest surviving street in the city, it should be carefully preserved and/or restored. Its historic course, dimensions, materials and other features should not be altered. Likewise, owing to its fragility, it should not be adapted for use as a service driveway. Mr. Farnham suggested that the Committee consider the completeness of the application or lack thereof as part of its review. More generally, he suggested that the Committee formulate a recommendation that can serve for either an in-concept or a final review.

Mr. Farnham also informed the Committee that the Commission's jurisdiction over this site is complicated. The site is designated in two ways. The parcel is designated as part of the Old City Historic District and classified as non-contributing. It is also designated as a resource in the Historic Street Paving Thematic District and classified as significant; Little Boys' Court, a historic street, runs across sections of the parcel at the east. Some contend that the Commission's jurisdiction over this project should be limited to 45 days of review-and-comment; others contend that the Commission should enjoy plenary jurisdiction over the project. Mr. Farnham suggested that the Committee not opine on the jurisdiction question, but formulate a

recommendation to the Commission that could serve for either a review-and-comment or plenary review.

Mr. Farnham explained to the Committee that some community members have reported that the developer plans to incorporate the adjacent parcels to the west at 228 and 230 Arch Street, which he owns and which are designated as historic, into this project. Mr. Farnham assured the community members present that those properties are not included in this project as defined by the architectural plans and drawings submitted with this application. He also assured them that any incorporation of those designated, contributing properties into this project at a later date would fundamentally change the nature of this application and would, perhaps, invalidate any Commission approvals predicated on plans that do not include those two historic buildings. He reported that if the buildings at 228 and 230 Arch are included in this project at a later date he would advise the Commission to conduct an entirely new review of the project.

Mr. Laver introduced the project to the Committee. He explained that the proposal does not include the properties at 228 and 230 Arch Street. He also explained that Little Boys' Court occupies approximately 600 square feet of the site. He stated that no construction "is planned" on Little Boys' Court. He stated that the developer plans to restore the historic street. Turning to the new building, he reported that the parking for 90 automobiles would be below grade, the bottom three floors would be dedicated to retail space, the towers would house 80 dwelling units, and the towers would be 184 feet and 268 feet in height. He claimed that it would be a world-class design that would complement, not denigrate, Old City.

Mr. Pei presented the architectural plans to the Committee. He stated to the Committee that "it rightly belongs in your jurisdiction to review the appropriateness of this project." He remarked that historic areas can benefit from contemporary buildings that bring rejuvenation. He noted that this site is in the heart of Old City, not on the periphery, and declared that this project will bring a sense of drama and enlightened change to the community. He explained that the 21,000 square foot site is a rupture in the fabric of the neighborhood; he is endeavoring to repair the "huge hole" and "significant scar." His proposed building will reinforce rather than detract from the neighborhood. He explained that the base will be traditional and the tower contemporary. He noted that Little Boys' Court is in "derelict condition"; he plans to repair it, light it, and make it walkable. He also noted the open court to the south and the proposed connection to N. 3rd Street. His complex would fit into the network of walkable alleys in Old City. He reported that his designs are "still very preliminary." With his building, "Old City can become renewed." This project will "enliven the heart of Old City." Mr. Pei explained that the tall, narrow windows in the base "reinforce the slender towers." He reported that service vehicles would enter the building through the parking entrance. He referred to the recessed, "glassy" entrance on Arch Street as inviting; it would draw pedestrians into the retail spaces. He noted that the height of the base had been reduced significantly; it is now only 48 feet in height. He stated that the 65-foot height limit in Old City is "for guidance only." He concluded, stating that this is a very special project that should be treated with "special consideration."

Mr. Laver prompted Mr. Pei to speak about the proposal's compliance with *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards*. Mr. Pei explained that the towers "belong to the larger Philadelphia," not only Old City. He noted that the towers are unabashedly forward and modern, while the base is traditional. Mr. Pei claimed that he is a preservationist and noted his involvement with preservation on New York's Upper West Side. He stated that he believes in protecting neighborhoods. He stated that this project would strengthen Old City and make it part of the larger city.

Ms. Voith questioned Mr. Laver about a garbled statement he had made at the beginning of his presentation. She asked if he had said that he considered this a “review-and-comment” or “review-in-concept” application. After consulting with Mr. Kelson, Mr. Laver requested that the Committee treat the application as an “in-concept” application.

Mr. Thomas thanked the applicants for their presentation and expressed his opinions on the proposal. He disagreed with the applicants’ assertion that the 65-foot height limit in Old City is merely a guideline; he contended that it is the law. He also objected to the applicants’ claim that this project would bring life to Old City; he stated that Old City is already thriving and lively. He highlighted the fact that Old City retains its historic scale; it is composed of low and mid-rise buildings. He not only objected to the height of the building, but also to the design of the base of the building, especially the ratio of masonry to window on the top floors of the base. He noted that he wrote a book on Philadelphia’s alleys and suggested that the design of the façade along Little Boys’ Court was not appropriate. Mr. Pei explained that the garage entrance that runs along Little Boys’ Court would be glazed and illuminated. Mr. Thomas also rejected the two large voids in the Arch Street façade for the parking and retail entrances. He suggested that the hard edge at the sidewalk should be maintained for all infill construction in the district. He concluding, stating that the design was inappropriate for the district. Mr. Pei stated that he appreciated the feedback. Mr. Thomas asked if the developer would gate the rear court, making it private. Mr. Pei stated that it would remain open to the public.

Mr. Voith asked Mr. Pei to show the Committee where the 65-foot elevation was on his model of the 268-foot tower. Mr. Pei indicated a point just above the base, near the bottom of the tower. Ms. Voith remarked that the tower would virtually disappear if the proposal was held to the 65-foot height limit. Mr. Thomas reminded the Committee that it should base its review on the preservation ordinance and *Secretary’s Standards*, not the zoning code. Mr. Levy agreed with Ms. Voith and Mr. Thomas, asserting the proposed building is too tall. He asked the Committee to consider the view of Philadelphia from the waterfront, the historic view. He noted that the scale has not changed over the centuries. He asked Mr. Pei why he had not turned the towers 90 degrees to minimize the views from the waterfront. Mr. Pei stated that the design is intended to relate to the tower at Christ Church. He also stated that viewers never observe architecture from one location, but are always moving. He remarked that views are dynamic, always changing. He contended that the tower would “strengthen” the views of Christ Church. He cited Boston, Vancouver, and Seattle as cities in which towers had been integrated into historic areas. Ms. Voith asked if any Committee member would accept a building that exceeded the 65-foot height limit. Mr. D’Alessandro stated that he would not consider a taller building to be appropriate. Ms. Voith complimented Mr. Pei on his design, but claimed that it was not appropriate for Old City. Mr. D’Alessandro agreed and asserted that it should not be built in this area.

Timothy Safford, the Rector of Christ Church, opposed the project on two grounds, the impact on the church’s viewshed and the precedent it would set. He stated that the church’s steeple is precious and important to Philadelphia’s past and future. He remarked that the church is both a religious and a national shrine. He noted that “spire” and “inspire” are etymologically related. He explained that the National Park Service had recognized the importance of the view of Christ Church when it created the park to the south of the church. He emphasized the importance and power of the views of the church, but explained that the church is fragile and requires protection. He noted that it is very easy to take the church for granted. He reported that the church supports the 65-foot height limit and asked the Committee to deny the proposal. He also objected to the

precedent that would be established with an approval of this project. He stated that there is no planning for Old City and no way for his institution to plan for its future if the height limit is simply waived. He asked the Committee to recommend denial to protect the viewsheds of the steeple and to preserve the height limit. Mr. Thomas agreed and stated that height limits are important for the preservation of historic waterfront areas like Old City.

Joseph Schiavo of the Old City Civic Association stated that his organization objects to the scale and massing of the proposed building. He also opposed the size of the building and noted that the zoning regulations for the site limit the street frontage of new structures to 70 feet maximum; this would exceed the 70-foot limit by 18 feet. He also stated that the limit may apply to the Little Boys' Court façade as well. He suggested that a narrower building would be more appropriate and would give Little Boys' Court some "breathing room." Finally, Mr. Schiavo objected to the applicants' repeated assertion that this building would "bring Old City into the future." Countering that claim, he stated that Old City is already a vibrant community. Mr. Schiavo submitted a letter detailing the position of the Old City Civic Association.

Mses. Pentz and Voith and Messrs. D'Alessandro, Levy, and Thomas agreed that they could not support an application that proposed a building of this height and mass in Old City. They praised the quality of the presentation and suggested that this building might be appropriate in a different environment.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to adopt the staff recommendation and recommend denial, pursuant to Section 14-2007(7)(k)(.4) of the preservation ordinance and Standard 9. The proposed building is not compatible in materials, features, size, scale and proportion, or massing with the site, neighboring structures, adjacent historic street, surroundings, streetscape, or historic district. Its construction would diminish the integrity of the historic district.

112 ROXBOROUGH AVENUE

Owner: Merion Builders, LLC; Luigi Corrodo

Applicant: Michael Santoro

History: Designated 12/14/1983

Project: Partial demolition, construct rear addition, alter roofline

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the rear and roofline of the building, construct a new roof with a non-historic roofline, and construct an addition. This application also proposes to alter the front façade of the building by infilling the existing windows and cutting a new fenestration pattern of two windows on each floor. All the facades will be stucco and a stucco band will run between each floor along the front and side of the building. Colonial Revival window surrounds with a keystone motif are also proposed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to the following sections of the special controls for the Main Street Manayunk Historic District:

PM-704.2.3 Repair: Original architectural features such as cornices and bays shall not be removed. Deteriorated features shall be repaired where possible. Replacement material where necessary shall duplicate the original as closely as possible.

PM-704.2.4 Facings: Refacing of facades, bays, cornices with inappropriate materials such as aluminum siding, or brick veneer shall be prohibited. Existing inappropriate facade facings shall be removed at the termination of the useful life of the facing. Any

inappropriate facing material lawfully in existence shall not be repaired or altered in any substantial manner.

PM-704.2.5 Elements: Original window and door openings, sills, lintels, and sashes shall be retained and repaired whenever possible. Replacement elements shall match the original appearance in proportion, form, and materials as closely as possible.

PM-704.2.7 Design: Additions, alterations, and new construction shall be designed so as to be compatible in scale, building materials, and texture, with contributing buildings in the historic district.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Developers Michael Santoro and Luigi Corrodo represented the application.

Ms. Cote noted that this property has been significantly altered without the Commission's review. She suggested that the property owner provide permits documenting the work undertaken since the property was designated in 1983. The siding, for example, would require a building permit regardless of any historic designation. Mr. Santoro stated that he purchased the property approximately one year ago, but only learned of the historic district when applying for permits one month ago. He stated that the siding was already in place at the time of purchase and that he has no record of the date of its installation.

Mr. Santoro stated that 114 Roxborough Avenue, adjacent to his property, is a vacant lot. In response to Ms. Voith's question, he stated that it is his intent to rehabilitate the property and sell it. Mr. Santoro proposed to raise the roof line to create a large area for a master suite and walk-in closet.

Ms. Voith remarked that the original openings may be evident when the siding was removed. Mr. Baron displayed photographs showing the historic window openings on other houses in the row. He noted that the rear ell is exactly in line with the others and is completely intact. Owing to its corner location, the building is highly visible. Ms. Pentz offered that the shape and scale of the building are its key features. Mr. Santoro commented on its proximity to the elevated SEPTA tracks and asserted that its visibility is not important.

Mr. Santoro asked if he would gain approval by retaining the roofline but modifying the second-floor rear to add square footage. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee must be guided by the appropriate standards when evaluating proposals. He stated that the proposed alterations are not compatible with the historic building, the row, and the historic Manayunk neighborhood.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposal.

248 N. LAWRENCE STREET

Owner: Donato J. Pignetti

Applicant: Carolina Pena

History: undeveloped site in Old City Historic District, designated 12/12/2003

Project: Construct four-story residence with garage

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a four-story residence on a vacant lot within the Old City Historic District. The lot sits between a 1960 non-contributing garage building and an 1820 significant Greek Revival Rowhouse. The building would be constructed of red brick.

An open garage with the main entrance would occupy the first floor at the front. The second and third floors would have large openings of similar dimensions as the garage. They would be fenestrated with several panels of glass and separated by aluminum cladding. The fourth floor is set back from the façade and would not be visible from the street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff comments that open parking in the front façade is not appropriate for this location in the Old City Historic District.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Côté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. She explained that Commission's jurisdiction is limited to 45 days of review and comment in this case because the property was designated as an undeveloped site in the Old City Historic District. Donato J. Pignetti and Yao Chang Huang represented the application.

Ms. Voith noted the need for elevation drawings of the streetscape with the new building to evaluate the new construction in relation to the rhythm and scale of the neighborhood and its impact on the neighboring properties.

Mr. Huang stated that he did not know that the property was designated until he submitted the building permit application to the Department of Licenses & Inspections. Mr. Levy asked the applicant if he was willing to withdraw now and submit the necessary elevation drawings at a later date. The applicant stated that he would like to proceed.

The Committee asked about the open parking at the front. Ms. Voith questioned its legality and stated that the open parking was not compatible with the historic neighborhood. She suggested that the applicant withdraw his application and present a revised application at a future date. Ms. Voith voiced her objections to garages at the first-floor fronts of rowhouses. It does not relate to the scale and character of the street. She stated that, at a minimum, the applicant should add pedestrian and garage doors. Mr. Pignetti reported that there are buildings near 20th and Delancey Streets with similar designs.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Committee commented that the application is incomplete and that the large opening at the first-floor front is incompatible with the historic district.

1928 PINE STREET

Owner: Mark Ansley

Applicant: Peter Miller

History: Built 1889, Frank Miles Day, architect; designated 2/8/1995

Project: Replace front façade windows with wood simulated divided light muntin windows

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the second and third-floor windows of this Queen Anne Revival Rowhouse with twelve-over-one wood simulated-divided-light sash. This house originally had twenty-over-one wood true-divided-light windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Peter Miller represented the application.

Mr. Miller corrected Ms. Cote's introduction, asserting that the proposed window not only has muntins applied on the interior and exterior, but also has spacer bars. He also claimed that he had proposed twelve-over-one, not twenty-over-one, windows because he had been advised by the staff that the twelve-over-one configuration was historically appropriate. Ms. Cote showed a photograph of the building with its original twenty-over-one windows to the Committee and stated that the staff's advice had been based on this photograph. Mr. Miller stated that the number of panes in the upper sash was unimportant to him; he offered to install twenty-over-one windows if the Committee agreed that that was the appropriate configuration. Mr. Miller provided the Committee with his reasons for proposing simulated-divided-light windows. The Marvin simulated-divided-light windows have a very good warranty; they are very durable; they will be installed at the second and third floors, high above the sidewalk; and they will not compromise the historic appearance of the building.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked Mr. Miller if the glass area would be reduced with the new sash. Mr. Miller stated that it would not. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the sash replacement kit includes a liner, which would occupy space between the historic frame and new sash. He asked Mr. Miller to provide the width of the liner. Mr. Miller stated that he did not know the width of the liner. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he could not review the application without knowing the width of the liner.

Mr. Thomas noted the many divisions in the upper sash. He stated that it would be difficult to produce an appropriate true-divided-light sash with 20 panes. He suggested that a simulated-divided-light window would be acceptable in this particular instance owing to the numerous divisions. Ms. Voith agreed and agreed, but asserted that this is a special situation; any recommendation for approval should not be perceived as setting a precedent.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of Marvin twenty-over-one simulated-divided-light wood windows for the second and third-floor front façade with the staff to review shop drawings.

2116 LOCUST STREET

Owners/Applicants: Kerry and Sonali Polite

History: c. 1875; designated 2/8/1995

Project: Construct roof top addition, Renovate front façade

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a third-floor addition on this 1870s carriage house. It would be set back approximately four feet from the façade. The front and rear façades of the addition will be what is described in the drawings as an aluminum storefront with alternating panels of stucco and glass and a row of transoms above. The east elevation of the addition will be stucco. A roof deck is proposed at the rear of the addition. This application also proposes renovations to the front façade. New storefront windows and a door as well a new aggregate material at the base of the windows are proposed for the first floor. Replacement two-over-two arched double-hung sash windows are proposed on the second floor. New French doors, which would eliminate the existing arched transom, are proposed for the central opening of the second floor.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owners Kerry and Sonali Polite represented the application.

Mr. Polite explained that their primary objective was to increase the size of their house, which is now 1800 square feet. Adding the penthouse would increase it by 600 square feet. He also noted that their carriage house and the adjacent one had been converted to commercial space in the 1920s. Ms. Pentz asked if they planned to restore the carriage house appearance. Mr. Polite stated that they had considered it, but could not afford to at the moment. Mr. Thomas cautioned that the storefront may have acquired its own historic significance. Mr. Farnham agreed.

Ms. Voith stated that the addition should not be visible from the public right-of-way. She thought that the proposed addition would be highly visible. She suggested that the addition be moved back away from the front façade to reduce its visibility. Mr. Levy agreed. Mr. Polite explained that the lot is very small and the addition could not be pushed back much. Several Committee members noted that the plans include a large roof deck at the rear. They suggested reducing the size of or eliminating the deck altogether to allow the addition to be set back farther.

Ms. Pentz asked the applicants how they planned to build the addition. They stated that they planned to add floor joists above the existing roof, which would be less expensive. Committee members noted that the addition would be taller and therefore more visible with this method.

The discussion turned to the proposal for the front façade. Ms. Voith stated that the applicants should prepare “existing” and “proposed” drawings. The drawings submitted do not indicate clearly the extent of the work proposed. It is impossible to differentiate the proposed alterations from the existing conditions. Mr. Polite explained that they planned to replace the existing storefront windows with windows with transoms to provide air circulation. He also planned to replace the door and transom to the right of the storefront windows. At the second floor, they planned to replace the central arched casement windows and transom with an arched French door. He explained that the transom bar is currently low, making access to the small balcony difficult. He also noted the major segment of the proposal, the penthouse addition. He explained that the location of the addition on the building was based on the interior stairs and other existing conditions. He asked about the Committee’s standards for judging additions. Ms. Voith stated that it should not be visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Farnham noted that Roofs Guideline in the Standards addressed additions. It states that rooftop additions should be “inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.” He contended that the currently proposed addition would be conspicuous, not inconspicuous. He suggested that it be set back farther on the roof to reduce its visibility from the street. He suggested a mock-up of the proposed addition and offered to have the staff evaluate it with the owners. He stated that some of the proposed alterations to the existing building could not be considered restoration, but that the staff could help the owners achieve their goals and restore the building simultaneously. He suggested that the owners work with the staff to better understand the historic aspects of the building and to prepare an application that would achieve their goals and those of the Commission. Mr. Thomas agreed and stated that, for example, a storefront window could be devised that would both restore the historic appearance and provide the needed ventilation.

Kiki Bollender, an architect who owns the neighboring building, stated that the zoning for the site will require an 11-foot setback for the addition at the rear. She asked how the Committee accounted for zoning in its review. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee does not. It reviews proposals using the Secretary’s Standards for guidance. A separate zoning review will take

place. The owners will need both Historical Commission and zoning approvals before a building permit review is conducted.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to incompleteness and pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

321 S. 25TH STREET

Owner: Stephen Carlino

Applicant: Eileen Quigley

History: c. 1830; designated 2/8/1995

Project: Construct brick piers at garden wall, construct conservatory at second floor

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to add a third-story conservatory on top of non-historic rear addition of this 1850s Greek Revival house. The conservatory will attach to the historic rear of the house and will have a cross gable design. It is unclear how the conservatory will meet the historic house. This application also proposes to construct brick piers at the rear garden wall.

The Commission reviewed a similar proposal for a conservatory or sunroom in July 2005. The Commission approved the addition with a simplified design without cresting or a cross gable, with the staff to review details.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the conservatory addition, pursuant to the Commission's July 2005 decision; approval of the brick piers, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Eileen Quigley, architect Peter Miller, and owner Stephen Carlino represented the application.

Ms. Quigley stated that her client needed the extra height provided by the cross-gable. Mr. Miller agreed, stating that he had simplified the design, but needed the cross-gable. He clarified that the conservatory would attach to the historic building above the existing cornice line; he would not remove the cornice, but build on top of it.

Mr. Farnham reminded the Committee that the Commission had reviewed a similar proposal in July 2005 and specifically denied the cresting and cross-gable. The cresting has been removed, but the cross-gable is retained in the current application. He cautioned the applicants that the Commission may refuse to review this application because they had already denied one very much like it. He noted that the Commission has no explicit rule regarding the re-review of denied applications. He stated that it has been more than one year since it was denied, but noted that the Commission may consider it a "second bite at the apple."

Ms. Voith and Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee had rejected the cross-gable before and should reject it again. Mr. Carlino asserted that he needed the cross-gable to provide headroom in the conservatory. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the cross-gable only provides headroom at the center of the sunroom; if the headroom under the shed roof, which covers almost all of the sunroom, is sufficient, then the cross-gable is unnecessary. Ms. Pentz stated that the applicant could increase the headroom by reducing the pitch of the shed roof of the conservatory. She stated that the Committee could not recommend approval for the cross-gable. Mr. Carlino displayed photographs of other sunrooms in the area. The Committee noted that one was illegally constructed and that others faced service alleys. The Committee noted that this

sunroom would be highly visible from the street. Mr. Farnham explained to the applicants that they already have the Commission's approval for a sunroom without cresting and a cross-gable. The staff could place the approval stamp on an application for such a sunroom today.

Mr. Carlino asked for a recommendation on the proposed brick piers. Mr. Farnham stated that the staff could approve the addition of the brick piers to the non-historic rear wall. The application was forwarded to the Commission because of the sunroom, not the piers.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the conservatory addition as submitted, but approval of a conservatory addition without a cross gable, with staff to review details, pursuant to the Commission's July 2005 decision; approval of the brick piers, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Rivera arrived to join the Committee meeting. Mr. D'Alessandro departed.

236 S. 21ST STREET

Owner: Craig Sokolow

Applicant: Harmon Deutsch

History: c. 1870; contributing in district; designated 2/8/1995

Project: Rehabilitation of front façade and construction of roof-top addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reconstruct, but not restore the storefront and upper stories of this contributing building in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District. The storefront reconstruction is loosely based on a historic photograph. Neither the design nor the materials proposed reflect the original. The applicant proposes concrete and aluminum rather than wood. Also, the rebuilding of the dormers in the mansard is conjectural and not justified by either material or photographic evidence.

The application also proposes the addition of a fourth floor with a front deck. The deck would be set back five feet from the edge of the mansard, and the fourth-floor would be set back twenty feet from the edge. The addition would be finished in smooth stucco and accentuated by multi-light windows and doors. A second three-story addition is proposed for the rear of the building, which is not visible from any public right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the inaccurate reconstruction of the storefront and dormers, pursuant to Standard 6; approval of the addition, provided the front parapet on the penthouse is deleted, the penthouse itself is shifted farther back on the building from the front façade to minimize visibility, and simpler, undivided windows and doors are installed in the addition, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Craig Sokolow and architects Craig Deutsch and Paul Drzal represented the application.

Mr. Deutsch presented the proposal. He explained that he would recreate the general sense and proportions of the storefront, but would not reconstruct it precisely. He stated that he was not proposing a wood storefront owing to maintenance concerns. Mr. Danta noted that the application included scant details about the storefront. Mr. Deutsch stated that he would submit the bulk of the details to the staff for its review. Mr. Rivera objected, asserting that he could not

simply imagine the storefront. He stated that the details must be submitted to the Committee. Mr. Thomas agreed and stated that he did not have enough information to evaluate either the storefront or the restoration of the historic dormers. He compared the historic storefront roof to the proposed pent eave. He contended that the proposed was unacceptable. He stated that the storefront need not be a precise replication of the historic storefront, but should be much closer. He stated that he accepted the added door at the north for access to the residences at the upper floors, but could not accept the pent eave. He noted that the historic tin roofing material is still available. He also stated that the historic rooflines of the storefront should be replicated. Ms. Voith remarked that the drawings called for a CMU and concrete storefront. She asserted that this was unacceptable. Mr. Danta noted that the Standards allow for changes in materials when necessary, but opined that the change from wood to concrete was inappropriate. Mr. Sokolow, the owner, stated that he would rebuild the storefront to match the historic. He offered to use the historic materials. He rejected his architects' plan and stated that he would "absolutely do an exact restoration" of the storefront. The Committee noted that the staff could approve a restoration of the storefront.

Mr. Thomas agreed with the staff recommendation regarding the penthouse. He stated that if the unnecessary parapet is removed from penthouse, the penthouse itself is shifted farther back on the building from the front façade, and simpler, undivided windows and doors are installed in the addition, then he would support its approval. His colleagues on the Committee agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the inaccurate reconstruction of the storefront and dormers, pursuant to Standard 6; approval of the addition, provided the front parapet on the penthouse is deleted, the penthouse itself is shifted farther back on the building from the front façade to minimize visibility, and simpler, undivided windows and doors are installed in the addition, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

1328-1332 RACE STREET

Owner: PA Convention Center Authority

Applicant: Anthony, Forte, Esq., Saul Ewing LLP

History: 1925 by architect John Molitor

Project: Demolish building completely, salvage of architectural elements, rescind historic designation

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the demolition of the firehouse at 1328-1332 Race Street to clear the site for the expansion of the Pennsylvania Convention Center. The Commission approved in concept the demolition in the public interest with conditions in October 2002. The current application accepts the conditions imposed in 2002:

1. HABS recordation;
2. Issuance of demolition permit after certification of funding for the expansion;
3. Last property to be demolished on the site; and
4. Salvage and retention of historic artifacts for potential reuse in an exhibition.

The rescission request will be forwarded to the Committee on Historic Designation and the Commission. It is not before the Architectural Committee.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the demolition in the public interest, provided the four conditions outlined in the 17 October 2006 letter by Anthony Forte, Esq. are satisfied, pursuant to the Commission's in-concept approval of October 2002.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Anthony Forte and architects Nan Gutterman and Nicole Dress represented the application.

Mr. Forte explained the proposal to the Committee. He reported that he had met with the Preservation Alliance, which was supporting his claim that this demolition would be in the public interest. He stated that the HABS documentation has been completed. Mr. Levy replied that it could not have been completed because it is not on HABS stationary, but is on Vitetta stationary. Ms. Voith asked if the documentation has been accepted by the National Park Service. Ms. Gutterman answered that the documentation has not been submitted to the federal government. Mr. Forte explained that the earlier approval did not require a submission to and acceptance by HABS, but only that the documentation was to be prepared to HABS standards. He offered to have the documentation submitted for a HABS review. He also noted that several of the properties were on or eligible for the National Register. Therefore, the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission would be establishing its own mitigation requirements including documentation.

Committee members asked about the disposition of the artifacts. Mr. Forte explained that they would be exhibited in the Convention Center or donated to the Fire Museum on N. 2nd Street. He stated that the documentation would be donated to the Athenaeum. Ms. Voith inquired about the salvaged artifacts. She stated that rather than a vague plan to exhibit or donate she wanted to see a detailed, thorough maintenance and management plan with an inventory explaining how the artifacts would be salvaged, stored, conserved, and exhibited.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the demolition in the public interest, provided the following conditions are met:

1. HABS documentation of the building is submitted to and accepted by the National Park Service;
2. The demolition permit is not approved until the funding for the expansion is certified;
3. The building in question is the last property to be demolished on the site; and
4. The identified historic artifacts are salvaged and stored according to an approved artifact management plan.

Mr. McCoubrey joined the meeting.

109-131 N. 2ND STREET, 117-125 ARCH STREET, 128 ELFRETH'S ALLEY

Owner: National East Associates, LP; Steve Patron; Paradigm Realty Alliance; Robertson Douglass Group

Applicant: Anthony Forte, Esq., Saul Ewing LLP

History: various nineteenth and twentieth-century buildings; tile façade c.1950-1960

Project: In concept - Demolish buildings, demolish and reconstruct tile façade, landscape park, construct 3-story townhouses and 6- and 10-story multi-unit residential buildings

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to convert the National Products site of N. 2nd Street between Arch Street and Elfreth's Alley to a residential complex. The Commission approved similar in-concept proposals in March 2003 and August 2004.

The only significant deviation from the in-concept approval of August 2004 is the current request to demolish and rebuild the tile facades. The applicant claims that the rate of failure of the tiles is accelerating and that the entirety of the tiles will need replacement in the near future. The applicant furthermore claims that, if the tile facades are not reconstructed, then the costs of maintaining the facades will exceed the financial capability of the new condominium owners' association.

All of the buildings on the site including the orange tile façades along N. 2nd Street and Flagpole Park would be demolished. The tile façades would be rebuilt to match the original façades with new tiles and salvaged doors, windows, signage, and other pieces including the granite channels. A 6-story commercial and residential building would be constructed behind the reconstructed tile façade at 109-125 N. 2nd Street. It would have balconies and be clad with granite veneer, cast stone, and precast panels. A 10-story commercial and residential building would be constructed on the Arch Street portion of the site. It would also have balconies and would be clad with brick at the lower floors and glass and panels at the upper floors. The entrance to the underground parking garage would be located at the east end of the Arch Street building. Ten 3-story townhouses would be constructed around an open courtyard at the northeastern corner of the site. Flagpole Park, at the intersection of N. 2nd Street and Elfreth's Alley, would be landscaped. The building at 128 Elfreth's Alley would be retained; the opening created at the rear by the demolition of the N. 2nd Street buildings, which would not be visible to the public, would be infilled with CMU and a brick veneer.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial of the demolition and reconstruction of the tile facades; approval of the remainder of the demolition and construction, provided the tile facades are left in place and repaired, pursuant to the Commission's in-concept approvals of March 2003 and August 2004, Standards 2, 5, and 9. The staff concedes, however, that the applicants have presented cogent information regarding the accelerating failures of the tile façade. The staff seeks the expert advice of the Committee on the best remedy, repair or reconstruction.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Steve Patron, attorney Anthony Forte, architects Gil Rosenthal, Sam Robinson, and Tom Barton, and consultants Jessica Senker and Sam Harris represented the application.

Mr. Forte began his presentation with the Elfreth's Alley property. He explained that the building at 128 Elfreth's Alley will be disconnected from the larger complex with the demolition. The rear will be sealed with CMU and a brick veneer. The developer will donate the building to the Elfreth's Alley Association, which will prepare a rehabilitation plan. Ms. Pentz stated that the plan for 128 Elfreth's Alley was acceptable to the Committee.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of the proposal for 128 Elfreth's Alley.

Mr. Forte then explained that he sought to renew the approval in concept for the development. He presented an overview of the proposed buildings. Ms. Voith questioned the proposed the size and scale of the proposed buildings, especially the 10-story building on Arch Street. She

stated that she could not consider recommending approval of a building that exceeded the 65-foot height limit after she had recommended denial of the proposed 23-story building on the 200-block of Arch Street earlier in the meeting. Mr. Forte conceded that this building did exceed the height limit, but that it was 10, not 23 stories. He noted that it would be approximately the same height as the building across the street at 108 Arch. Furthermore, he explained that the site plan had been developed in concert with the Elfreth's Alley and Old City Civic Associations. He explained that the density and height had been reduced to the north and east, near Elfreth's Alley and Appletree Court in exchange for greater heights and densities to the south and west. He reported that the overall density was considerably lower than allowed by zoning. He asserted that this plan has neighborhood support. Ms. Voith asked for evidence of that support. Mr. Patron explained that he had devised the plan after hundreds of hours of consultation with the neighbors at their kitchen tables. Ms. Voith asked if the neighborhood groups had submitted letters of support. Mr. Farnham noted that the only letter received on the project was from the Preservation Alliance, which was generally supportive. Ms. Voith again asked for evidence that the civic associations supported the breaking of the height limit. Mr. Farnham noted that representatives of the two community groups were in attendance. Architect Rick Cole, the vice president of the Elfreth's Alley Association introduced himself and stated that his organization had worked closely with the developer for a long time. He stated that, in general, his group supported the project, but that it still reserved the right to review the details of the proposed buildings. Janet Coulter of the Old City Civic Association echoed Mr. Cole. She stated that her group supported the plan, but also wanted an opportunity to review the details of the proposed buildings. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he had reviewed this project several times as a member of the Committee and thought that the major issues regarding the massing and locations of the buildings had been decided. He suggested that the Committee not reopen the large questions that had already been decided, but concentrate on the details during this review. His colleagues agreed. Ms. Voith noted that she had not been part of the earlier discussions, but would accept her colleagues' earlier decisions.

Mr. Forte explained that the major open question is the treatment of the tile facades. He introduced the preservation consultant, Sam Harris. Mr. Harris first defined his unique vocabulary. He stated that when discussing the tile facades, he used the word "rehabilitation" to mean the retention and repair of the existing tile facades. He used the word "restoration" to mean the demolition and reconstruction of the tile facades. Mr. Harris stated that the tiles were installed in two campaigns, in the late 1950s and early 1960s. They are approximately 2-½ inches thick and adhered directly to the building facades. He stated that the facades are composed of historic brick and infill CMU. The mid twentieth-century storefronts were cut into the facades without any relation to the historic openings. A metal angle supports the tiles along the bottom of the facades, but nowhere else on the facades. There are 1535 tiles in total. Three surveys of the tiles have been conducted, in 2004, 2005, and 2006. In 2004, 220 tiles had deteriorated and required significant intervention; the façade was still repairable. In 2005, more tiles had failed, but it was still repairable. However, in 2006, 800 tiles required significant intervention. The failure rate had accelerated dramatically. Mr. Harris posited that the cause of the accelerating failure rate was environmental; he suggested that it might be due to the construction across the street. He stated that the tile on the façade will continue to fail and it should be entirely rebuilt now as part of the larger development project. He stated that the future condominium association will be unable to bear the cost of the repairs if it is not "restored." He reported that the tile is still being manufactured and can be replicated in kind. He explained that the façade is unique for its appearance, not for its original fabric. Mr. Thomas stated that he would accept the notion of reconstruction if he is convinced that the tile is at the end of its life. He agreed that throwing the current tile façade into the hands of a condominium association

would be “a disaster.” Ms. Voith agreed with Mr. Thomas that rebuilding of the wall would be acceptable if the tile is at the end of its life. Ms. Pentz asked if the developer could better protect the wall. Mr. Harris stated that the problem is not direct impact, but is the growth of micro-cracks in the surface of the tile. Damage occurs with every freeze-thaw cycle. Ms. Pentz asked if the tiles could be repaired. Mr. Harris stated that they could be repaired with silica. He explained that the tiles suffer from a manufacturing defect. The glaze does not wrap around the tiles at the edges, but instead ends at the edges, allowing water to sit at the mortar joints and penetrate down into the tiles. Mr. Harris clarified that painting the tiles with a silicon substance would prevent water from entering the existing system of micro-cracks. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the repair would significantly alter the appearance of the tiles. Mr. Harris agreed. Mr. Harris also stated that the repair would probably only last for five to ten years, not 100 years.

Mr. Baron asserted that this is a very rare façade. It is probably the only one like it in the city. The material itself is important even if it is repaired. He noted that repairs to tile are proving durable at the Reading Terminal Headhouse and the Market Street Bank. He stated that the applicants should provide a sample of the replacement tile to compare with the historic tile. He doubted that the new tile would match the old as well as Mr. Harris claimed. He asked the Committee to recommend denial of the application because key information was missing. Ms. Voith countered that this application requests an in-concept approval only; the details can be reviewed as part of the final application. Ms. Pentz agreed with Mr. Baron and asserted that the Standards require repair. Mr. Harris quoted from Standard 6, noting that it recognizes that the “severity of deterioration” can reach a threshold and “require replacement,” not repair. He asked Mr. Patron to speak about the cost differential between repair and replacement, what he called “rehabilitation” and “restoration.” Mr. Patron stated that he would donate the difference to the Elfreth’s Alley Association if the replacement cost less than the repair. He stated that the difference may be about \$40,000.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On a motion offered by Ms. Voith and seconded by Mr. Levy, the Architectural Committee voted 5 to 1 to recommend approval in concept of the reconstruction of the tile facades. Ms. Pentz dissented.

Mr. Farnham noted that the review had already taken 90 minutes and highlighted the fact that the Committee was behind schedule. He suggested that the Committee review the new construction quickly; the proposal had changed little from the earlier project that the Commission approved in concept. Mr. Rivera disagreed and offered the applicants 30 minutes to present their proposal. Mr. Rosenthal provided an overview of the new construction. He began with the 10-story building on Arch Street. He noted that John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance had objected to the balconies on the building; he explained that they were derived from the many fire escapes in the neighborhood. He stated that the masonry of the façade will be brick. He noted that his firm will continue to develop the design for the building.

Mr. Rosenthal discussed the proposal for the N. 2nd Street building. He explained that he would like to bring the front façade of the new building out to the plane of the tile façade below. He cited Cecil Baker’s addition to the Western Union building on the 1100-block of Locust Street and stated that he would devise a separator like Mr. Baker’s between the historic building and the addition above. He displayed numerous schemes for the building, all of which retained the massing but not the setback already approved in concept. He stated that the design would continue to evolve, but would remain within the envelope already approved. Ms. Voith asked him to respect the horizontality of the tile facades. Mr. Rivera objected to the proposal to push the upper floors forward to the plane of the tile facades.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of the massing and locations of the proposed townhouses and 6- and 10-story buildings with open space, park landscaping, and underground parking accessed from Arch Street, with the understanding that the designs of the new buildings will continue to evolve.

Ms. Voith and Mr. Thomas excused themselves from the meeting.

316 S. 21ST STREET

Owner: William Hozack

Applicant: Alvin Holm

History: c. 1860, main block refaced in 1949

Project: Rear addition, alterations to side wall

OVERVIEW: This is the third permit application submitted for this project. The applicant submitted the first in March 2006. The Historical Commission reviewed that application in April 2006 and tabled it for a period not to exceed six months to allow for the correction of an error in the inventory regarding the classification of this property. In June 2006, the Commission reviewed the inventory classification and classified the property as Contributing in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. The applicant withdrew the permit application tabled by the Commission in April 2006 and submitted an application in July 2006, which was subsequently withdrawn and not reviewed by the Historical Commission.

The current application once again proposes alterations to the rear ell of this property. The applicant now proposes to retain the north facing wall of the rear ell. However, the fenestration would be altered to create aligned registers with six-over-six windows would be installed throughout. A two-bay addition would be added to the rear ell. This addition would be clad in brick and unified to the historic rear ell by the addition of a parapet. Also, the applicant proposes to enlarge the garage, add a deck on top of it, install a colonnade, and replace an existing bay with a balcony and French doors.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal. Architect Alvin Holm, attorney Thomas Witt, and owner Vesna Hess represented the application.

Mr. Danta informed the Committee that the applicant would like to discuss a new design, not the project documented in the Committee's materials. Mr. Danta suggested to Mr. Holm that it would be best to withdraw the current design, which he is no longer proposing, and submit the new design for the next deadline, to give the public and the staff time an opportunity to review it. The staff recommendation does not address the new design. Mr. Danta suggested that the applicant discuss his new proposal with the Committee members, but noted that the Committee would offer a recommendation only on the official submission.

Mr. Holm acknowledged the concerns regarding to the massing, historic fabric, and locations of opening in the rear ell in his initial submission. He stated that his new proposal would address these problems. It would retain the original openings and perceived length of the ell, yet

accommodate the program desired by his client. This would be achieved by an addition at the rear and the opening of two new windows. Mr. Holm noted that the rear addition would be differentiated from the historic rear ell in both material and design. Mr. Danta stated that the rear ell was the only portion of the building that retained its original fabric. Mr. Witt stated the lower part of the wall has structural problems, which the new plan addresses.

Mr. Rivera asked Mr. Holm to identify the materials proposed for the addition. Mr. Holm answered that the rear addition would be wood framed and that the parapet would be masonry. Mr. Rivera opined that the redesigned proposal appeared to be a continuation of the changes started in the mid twentieth century and would be acceptable. The members of the Architectural Committee stated that the applicant should submit his new design for a complete review by the public, staff, Committee, and Commission. They stated that the new design appeared to solve the historic preservation questions posed by the earlier designs. They stated that they would support the approval of the new design when it was submitted for an official review.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the original proposal, pursuant to Standard 9; the Committee did not formulate an official recommendation on the new proposal.

1701 LOCUST STREET

Owner: CDF, Philadelphia Holding, LP

Applicant: Martin Jay Tackett

History: 1923-1925, Frank Hahn and Brian Baylinson; significant in district.

Project: Alter ground floor commercial space.

OVERVIEW: The applicant submitted an application for alterations to this restaurant space in October 2006 and withdrew the proposal at the Commission meeting. The applicant now returns with a modified proposal.

The current application proposes to install windows and doors. The space does not retain its original windows and doors. The windows and door would be aluminum and would be reminiscent of the original units known through photographs. The proposed units would be out-swinging casements with transoms. The applicant also proposes to install awnings. The awnings over the windows would be of the shed type; the door would have a square awning. The Chancellor Street elevation currently has two blocked openings. The applicant proposes to reopen them and install fixed windows. The application also proposes to install halo-lit letters and a projecting double-sided sign. This two signs would be attached directly on to the limestone façade of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the windows, doors, and awnings, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9; denial of the signs, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Frank Rapisardi represented the application.

Mr. Rivera commented that placing the signs on the awnings would simplify the additions to the façade and eliminate the clutter. Mr. Rapisardi stated that he could relocate the larger horizontal sign to the apron portion of the square awning over the door.

Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the design for the doors. Mr. Rapisardi responded that the central door will be the only entrance from the street; the square awning over the door will help to differentiate the door from the adjacent casement windows. Mr. Rapisardi asked for comments on the proposed parking sign on the Chancellor Street façade. Mr. Baron noted that the Art Commission may object to an internally-illuminated awning with an egg-crate soffit.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the windows, doors, and awnings, with the staff to review details, but denial of the signage, pursuant to Standard 9.

1225 PANAMA STREET

Owner: Laura Spear

Applicant: Stephen Verner

History: c. 1830

Project: Reconstruct roof with enlarged front dormer and redesigned rear dormer

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish and reconstruct the roof of this house. The house recently suffered a fire. The applicant would reconstruct the roof with altered dormers. The front dormer would be replaced with a widened two-bay dormer that would be clad with Hardiplank. The dormer would have six-over-six wood windows. At the rear the applicant proposes to reconstruct the widened dormer that already exists, but with French doors and a balconnette rather than the two windows that are currently present. A skylight is proposed at either side of the rear dormer. The roof would be finished with a dark grey asphalt shingle.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the demolition of the historic roof structure, provided a professional engineer certifies that it is necessary; approval of the rear dormer; denial of the front dormer, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Stephen Verner represented the application.

Mr. Verner distributed an engineer's report regarding the condition of the roof structure. Ms. Pentz commented that the roof did not appear to have structural damage. She noted that Mr. Verner intended to change the shape of the roof. Mr. Verner stated that several beams were charred from the fire. He reported that the overall massing of the roof would be maintained, but the new dormers would differ from the historic dormers. Mr. Verner also mentioned that the adjoining properties currently have non-historic dormers. He noted that the Commission has approved similar proposals, for example on Iseminger Street. Ms. Pentz remarked that the rear roof would become nothing more than a vertical surface. Mr. Verner explained that it would be mansard shaped with skylights. Mr. Baron noted that the Iseminger Street project referred to involved alterations to a non-historic dormer; in this case, the alterations would destroy the historic dormer and would alter one of the few original facades remaining on this street. Mr. Baron acknowledged that there were enlarged dormers on neighboring properties, but that they had been altered in the early twentieth century, long before the designations.

Ms. Pentz noted that the engineer's report did not provide convincing evidence that the roof required replacement. She felt that the fire should not be used as an excuse to change the profile of the roof. She suggested retaining the historic dormer on the front. Mr. Verner stated that the insurance agency had requested a complete reconstruction of the roof structural

members. Mr. Levy asserted that, if it is replaced, then it should be replaced in kind. Mr. McCoubrey agreed that the historic configuration should be retained at the front.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposal as submitted, but approval of the reconstruction of the historic roof and dormer at the front and altered roof and enlarged dormer at the rear.

219-229 S. 18TH STREET

Owner: Rittenhouse Regency Affiliates

Applicant: Jim Garrison, Hillier Architecture

History: 1925, Zantzinger, Borie & Medary, architects as Penn Athletic Club
major alterations 1957, Cronheim & Weger, architects

Project: Architectural Committee review of penthouse

OVERVIEW: In April 2006, the Historical Commission approved an application for restoration and additions at this property. The decision, however, required that two aspects be revised and resubmitted to the Architectural Committee for its review; a redesigned Locust Street façade of the penthouse and the details of the non-historic balconies. The applicant returned to the Committee in May 2006 with the balcony restoration details. The Committee approved them at that time. The current review involves the Locust Street façade of the penthouse only; it is the last outstanding item from the April 2006 Commission decision.

The Historical Commission requested that the architect redesign the Locust Street elevation at the penthouse level to better respond to the rhythm and order of the historic building. The new proposal presents a more harmonious pattern of aligned fenestration at the penthouse level that follows the rhythm of the registers below. The revised design also presents undivided fenestration which creates an effective differentiation between the historic building and the new addition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Pentz recused owing to her firm's involvement in the project. Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. He explained that the Commission had already approved the project, but had required that the Committee to review the details. He noted that the Committee had the full authority to approve the application; it would be presented to the Commission only if the Committee denied it. Architect James Garrison represented the application.

Mr. Garrison stated that he had redesigned the Locust Street façade based on the comments received during the previous review. He explained that the Committee had requested that the penthouse be redesigned to be more harmonious with the historic building below. He stated that other details had been finalized, such as the selection of a terracotta cladding system. Mr. Garrison acknowledged that he had previously focused all his energy on the Rittenhouse Square façade and had slightly overlooked the Locust Street façade, but had now fully developed that façade as well.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to approve the application, pursuant to Standard 9.

1731 DIAMOND STREET

Owner: Willington Properties, Mitch Wolfson, principal

Applicant: George Baker, architect

History: 1889, Contributing to Diamond Street Historic District

Project: Renovate exterior

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore portions of the front façade of this rowhouse. It proposes removing a later storefront and installing windows and masonry to match adjacent houses in the row. A portion of later brick at the water table base will remain as will the door. The applicant proposes to build up the missing portion of brownstone above the base in colored stucco.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the new stucco is located in the historic plane as identified by the adjacent building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Mitch Wolfson and architect George Baker represented the application.

Mr. Baker stated he would remove the awnings and shutters. He stated that he had proposed a design that was as close as possible to the original except for the area at the watertable. He explained that he will remove the storefront and reconstruct the first-floor façade with the residential windows. He thought that he need a new front door for fire rating. Committee members did not think it needs to be fire rated. Mr. Baron suggested that a new door could be reviewed at the staff level and Mr. Baker agreed. Mr. Levy asked about the proposed window configuration. Mr. Baron replied that the new windows should be the historically appropriate configuration probably one-over-one. Mr. Wolfson requested an approval of brown vinyl windows. Mr. Levy replied the Committee could not recommend approval of such a window.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the windows are wood, with the staff to review details.

433 N. 39TH STREET

Owner: Joel Schmitt

Applicant: Ray Brogden

History: built 1895 by Wright & Prentzal

Project: Construct ADA ramp and install vinyl windows in front façade

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the addition of a ramp and vinyl windows on the front façade of the building. The application also proposes a new door.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the ramp, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10; approval of the door, provided it is based on the original door, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6; denial of the vinyl windows, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Joel Schmitt and architect Ray Brogden represented the application.

Mr. Brogden asked the Committee to disregard the door section in the proposal; he stated that the proposal included the ramp and second and third-floor windows only. Mr. Brogden explained to the Committee that he was unaware of the historic designation of the property. He requested the approval of the vinyl windows and noted that several surrounding properties already have vinyl windows. Committee members said that the windows should be wood.

Mr. Levy expressed concern about the level of the ramp and the step connection. He suggested that it might need an additional riser. Mr. Brogden stated that he would install an interior ramp to account for the difference.

Mr. Baron noted the tile work at the front entrance. Mr. Schmitt stated that he did not know when it had been added.

Mr. Baron directed the Committee's attention to the proposed transoms for the third floor, which are not the historically appropriate. Mr. Schmitt stated that he was attempting to match windows in the surrounding neighborhood. He noted that he had purchased the vinyl windows. He asked if it would require his neighbors to install wood windows as well. The Committee members stated that they would be consistent and require wood windows of the neighbors as well.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised ramp, but denial of the vinyl windows, pursuant to Standard 6. The Committee noted that one-over-one wood windows would be appropriate.

563 N. 20TH STREET

Owner: Allied Realty, LLC

Applicant: Brett Harman, architect

History: c. 1855, alterations c. 1910, storefront added c.1935

Project: Alter exterior including masonry openings

OVERVIEW: This application proposes rehabilitating this store and apartments for residential use. The former owner replaced several side windows with vinyl units; a violation was requested. The application proposes to restore the front windows with two-over-two sash and remove the capping from the window frames on the side facade. Two window openings will be cut into the side. One door will be reopened and one rear window closed. The other windows, some of which are illegal, will be retained. A skylight monitor would be added to the roof to allow greater headroom at the upper floor. The existing metal panel storefront will be restored and a new door added. Decks will be added to the rear ell.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Brett Harman represented the application.

Mr. Baron stated that the historically appropriate window material is wood. Mr. Harman asked about the new side windows. The Committee stated that one-over-one wood windows would be appropriate.

The Committee and applicant discussed removing the paint and pointing the brick. It was agreed that Mr. Baron would look at brick samples with the applicant.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

2215 MADISON SQUARE

Owner/Applicant: Peter Adels

History: 1870, Charles Leslie, developer

Project: Repair and replace metal garden fence

OVERVIEW: This application proposes repairing and replacing parts of a fence that encloses the shared garden that runs down the center of Madison Square, which is a pedestrian street. Other residents may repair and replace the fences in front of their properties based on the standard set by this application. The application proposes constructing new sections of fence in black painted steel, but without the historic fleur-de-lis finials. The applicant does not wish to replicate the finials for cost, consistency, and safety reasons.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the application, but approval of a fence with finials replicating the historic fence, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Peter Adels represented the application.

Mr. Baron described the uniqueness of the block, which has a center garden with an iron fence that is in disrepair. Mr. Adels has been working with other homeowners to find a solution to restore the garden fencing. Mr. Baron explained that although the Commission had only received an application for 2215 by the application deadline. Mr. Adels subsequently submitted applications for his neighbors at 2217 and 2219 Madison Square. The Commission may review those next month or direct the staff to apply the decision in this matter to those identical applications as well.

Mr. Baron introduced a letter from the Preservation Alliance advocating for the restoration of the fence including the finials. Mr. Adels was adamant that no one including John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance was authorized to speak for him. He reported that one neighbor is opposing his fence plan, but that the other property owners support him. Mr. Adels stated that one neighbor wanted to ship the fence to Boston for restoration. He stated that it is his desire to restore the original fence without replicating the original finials. He cited safety and cost reasons for not replicating the finials. Mr. Adels stated that the one neighbor had relayed false information to Mr. Gallery; the neighbor had claimed that Mr. Adels was planning to remove the historic fence and install a new non-conforming fence. Mr. Adels stated the fencing without the finials would cost approximately \$1,000 per household and that with it may cost \$3,000. He claimed that the garden area is owned by the City; it was formerly known as Webster Street. Mr. Adels stated he is selling his property on the block on November 30; he did not know if anyone would actually implement this fence plan. He conceded that the fence historically had the finials; he is opposed to them for cost and safety reasons. Mr. Adels also stated that he was proposing the replacement of the damaged pieces only, not the entire fence. All extant finials would remain in place. Mr. Rivera asked if it would be a financial hardship to replace the finials. Mr. Levy suggested that the applicant accept Mr. Gallery's offer to help raise funds for the restoration. Mr.

Adels replied that Mr. Gallery had not been consistent; first he stated that he could not help; then he stated he could. Mr. McCoubrey stated that, according to the Standards, the finials should be replaced. Mr. Rivera suggested that the Commission should actively assist the homeowners in the restoration of this fence.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application, but approval of a fence with finials replicating the historic fence, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

309 PINE STREET

Owner/ Applicant: Michael Saponaro, Christopher Feranec

History: Built c. 1809

Project: Construct roof deck on rear ell

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a roof deck on the rear ell of this property. The applicant has submitted photographs showing that the rear dormer has been altered into a door. The proposed deck would be located on the roof of the rear ell, but would have a connecting bridge to the dormer. No details have been provided on this link. In addition, City aerial photographs show that the rear dormer was unaltered until recently; the Commission did not review this change.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9. The illegal alterations to the dormer should be reversed.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owners Michael Saponaro and Christopher Feranec represented the application.

Mr. Saponaro presented photographs of the dormer, which showed the alterations undertaken without a permit. He stated that the dormer was barely visible from the street. Mr. Feranec stated that the lower section of the dormer was rotted and that he had extended the opening create a doorway and remove the deteriorated section. Mr. Feranec stated that he was not aware of the necessity of a permit for this work.

Mr. Rivera cautioned the applicant on the design of the deck's supporting structure. The applicant said he would investigate this structure.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend legalizing the dormer and approving the deck.

2320 MADISON SQUARE

Owner: Danforth Builders & Developers, Inc

Applicant: Stephen Maffei

History: Built c. 1870, demolished 1983

Project: New two-story residence

OVERVIEW: The Historical Commission approved an application in concept for this property in December 2005. The applicant now returns for final approval. Excepting the rooftop features, the current application proposes the exact design that was approved in concept. The Commission's decision specified the elimination of the roof hatch and deck. The applicant has eliminated the deck, but has retained the hatch to access rooftop condensers.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to the Commission's in-concept approval and Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Anthony Tartaglia and Stephen Maffei represented the application.

Mr. Levy inquired whether the condenser would be placed on the roof. Mr. Maffei answered that the mechanical equipment would be installed on the roof because that the rear yard is too small.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to the Commission's in-concept approval and Standards 9 and 10.

ADJOURNMENT: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Section 14-2007(7)(k)(.4): In making its determination as to the appropriateness of the proposed alterations, demolition or construction, the Commission shall consider the following:

... the compatibility of the proposed work with the historic district or with the character of its site, including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings and the streetscape.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jonathan Farnham, Randal Baron, Jorge Danta, Karen Gonski, Erin Coté