

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

**TUESDAY, 28 OCTOBER 2008
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DAVID AMBURN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

David Amburn, Chair
John Cluver
Suzanne Pentz
Shawn Evans
Rudy D'Alessandro

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician

ALSO PRESENT

Steven Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
George Thomas, Civic Vision
Robert Heubner
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Stephanie Lauren, Grayboyes Commercial Windows
James Templeton, H2L2
Barry Eiswerth, ALA, ANA, H2L2
William Martin, Esq., Fox Rothschild
Marc Stein
Carl Engelke, Eagle Eye Solutions
Paul Boni
Sabra Smith, Preservation Alliance
Harry K. Schwartz
Norma Van Dyke
David Hammond
Terry Champion
Matt McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll
Michael Viscuso, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll
Gary Martinez, Martinez & Johnson Architecture
David Harrower, John Milner Architects
Marianna Thomas, Marianna Thomas Architects
Kathy Dowdell, Blackney Hayes, Architects
Mary Goldman
Maryann Kurmlavage
Sam Olshin, Atkin Olshin Schade Architects
Andrew Curtis, Atkin Olshin Schade Architects
Glenn Moyer
Melani Lamond

Terence O'Leary, Hersha Development
Esaul Sanchez, University of Pennsylvania
Mathew Garbel
Karen Allen
Fran Byers
Pauline Borkon
Wendy Rosen, Friends of Rittenhouse Square
Kiki Bolender, Schade & Bolender Architects
Magali Larson, WTHA
Chares Larson, WTHA
Guy Caron, WTHA
Jean Wolfe, The Woodlands
Bill Barrista, Spruce Hill Community Association
Mark D'Alonzo, D'Alonzo Architects
Martin Rosenblum
Charles Todd
Richard Thom, R.W. Thom, AIA
Kelly Brennan, R.W. Thom, AIA
Paul Thompson, Bluepath Design
Mark Karp, Esq.
Carolina Pena, YCH Architect
John Ciccone, Ciccone Architects
John Torpey, KBA Architects
Newton H. Smith, Newton H. Smith, Architect
Ron Patterson, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Ellers & Branzberg
Casey Lafferty, Monarch Real Estate
Steve Pollack, Esq., Montgomery McCracken
Nicholas Blum
Elisabeth Blum
Charles Peruto, Jr.
Kevin Bone, Bone Levin Architects
Lorna Katz Larson, Society Hill Civic Association

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Amburn called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Ms. Pentz and Messrs. Cluver and Evans joined him. Mr. D'Alessandro joined them during the meeting.

410 S. FRONT STREET

Owner: Bridgeman Development LLC

Applicant: James Templeton, H2L2

History: designated as contributing to Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/99 with c. 1973 building; designation classification amended to non-contributing, 10/13/99
building demolished in 2001 with PHC approval; currently a vacant lot

Project: Construct 15-story hotel and condominium building

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a mixed-use residential and commercial complex on the lot that runs from Front Street to S. 2nd Street between Pine and Lombard Streets. The site was originally classified as contributing to Society Hill Historic District, but was amended to non-contributing seven months after the initial designation in 1999. The site was not

designated individually before the establishment of the historic district. A building, known as New Market and constructed about 1973, stood on the lot at the time of designation. In December 2000, the Commission approved the demolition of the New Market building and the construction of a 10-story hotel. The New Market building was demolished, but the hotel was not built. The remnants of the New Market building, a large concrete slab and foundations at and below grade, currently occupy the site.

The extent of the Commission's jurisdiction at the site, review-and-comment or plenary, is open to discussion. The Commission may consider this site "undeveloped" and assert review-and-comment jurisdiction; or it may consider it "developed" and assert plenary jurisdiction.

Section 14-2007(7)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance defines the Commission's review-and-comment jurisdiction as follows:

The Commission's scope of review of applications for permits for **construction**, as defined herein, shall be limited to a forty-five (45) day period of comment. (emphasis added)

Section 14-2007(2)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance defines "construction" as follows:

Construct or construction. The erection of a new building, structure or object upon an **undeveloped** site. (emphasis added)

"Undeveloped" is not defined in either the historic preservation ordinance or the Rules & Regulations. However, in practice, the Commission has typically considered a vacant lot "developed" if a building stood on the lot at the time of designation, even if that building was subsequently demolished. It has typically considered a vacant lot "undeveloped" if it was vacant at the time of designation. A building stood on this lot at designation.

If the Commission deems the site "undeveloped," then the developer must present the proposal to the Architectural Committee and Commission at public meetings for comment, but the comments are not binding and the Commission has no authority to deny the project. Once the project has been presented or the 45-day clock has run out, the Commission is bound to approve the proposal as submitted.

If the site is deemed "developed," then the proposal would be reviewed according to the Rules & Regulations for non-contributing sites. The Rules & Regulations for non-contributing sites state that the staff may approve the application; if the staff elects not to approve, the application proceeds to the Architectural Committee, which may approve; if the Architectural Committee elects not to approve, the application proceeds to the Commission, which makes the final determination. The staff suggests that the Committee not approve the application outright, even though it is so empowered under the "developed" scenario, but that it instead allow the Commission to first decide the jurisdictional question and then review the proposal.

When the Commission reclassified the site as non-contributing, it proclaimed that there are no historic resources at the site. Therefore, the Commission should not consider the effect of the proposed work on the site itself, but only on the surrounding historic district. Section 14-2007(k)(.4) of the historic preservation ordinance stipulates that the Commission consider "the compatibility of the proposed work with the character of the historic district including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings and the streetscape." Additionally, Section 6.5.h of the Rules & Regulations directs the Commission to place particular emphasis on the compatibility and appropriateness of the scale, rhythm and materials of the new construction during its review. Finally, Rehabilitation Standard 9 is

applicable. It stipulates that: "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 ... environment."

In the spring of 2008, the current applicant and development team submitted a similar application for this site to the Commission. The application was withdrawn after the Architectural Committee meeting; therefore, the Commission did not have any opportunity to review it. The staff recommended denial of that application; the Architectural Committee split, with two recommending approval and two denial. The staff has now reversed its position and recommends approval of the current application, which is similar, but not identical to the spring 2008 proposal. Some parties have asserted that the staff's reversal is evidence that it has been unduly influenced. The staff rejects that assertion and offers two reasons for the reversal of its recommendation. First, the design has improved. The architect has implemented several revisions suggested by the Architectural Committee during its spring review. Second, the staff benefited not only from the Architectural Committee's review of the spring application, but also the City Planning Commission's subsequent review of the project. Learning from these discussions and others as well as additional analysis, the staff now contends that this proposal satisfies the review criteria set forth in the historic preservation ordinance and the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

The Society Hill Historic District is a dynamic area in which old and new, Colonial and Modern, big and small, short and tall stand side by side. It is not a monolithic neighborhood of three-story, brick rowhouses, but instead a diverse built environment with a broad spectrum of compatible structures ranging from eighteenth-century rowhouses to twentieth-century high-rises. The neighborhood derives its much of its beauty and significance from these juxtapositions that highlight very different buildings existing together in harmony. The staff contends that this well-designed development will be compatible with the diverse character of the neighboring structures, the surroundings and the streetscape. It will likewise be compatible with the diverse materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing of the surrounding neighborhood. Note that the ordinance and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards mandate that new construction should be compatible with, not necessarily similar or identical to, the surrounding historic environment. Compatible means capable of existing together in harmony. Most agree that the Society Hill Towers are compatible with the neighborhood, but no one would claim that they are like the historic buildings in the neighborhood.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff forwards the application to the Architectural Committee, not because it recommends denial, but because it believes that it should be reviewed in public before the Committee and Commission and that the Commission should decide the jurisdictional question. The staff makes the following recommendations:

- the site is "developed" and therefore subject to plenary jurisdiction;
- "the proposed work" is compatible "with the character of the historic district ... including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings and the streetscape" (§14-2007(7)(k)(.4);
- the proposed work is "differentiated from the old and [is] compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the ... environment" (Standard 9);
- the Architectural Committee should not approve the application, but should forward it to the Commission to allow for an additional public review; and,
- the Architectural Committee should recommend approval of the application, pursuant to §14-2007(7)(k)(.4) and Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Barry Eiswerth and James Templeton, attorney William Martin, developer Mark Stein, consultant Carl Engelke, and preservation consultant George Thomas represented the application.

Mr. Martin stated the he would reserve his presentation on the Commission's jurisdiction at this site for the Commission meeting. However, he stated for the record that he considers this parcel to be "undeveloped" and therefore subject to review-and-comment jurisdiction only. Mr. Amburn agreed that the jurisdiction question is best held for the Commission. He contended that the Commission has plenary jurisdiction over the site. He polled the Committee members, who concurred with his contention.

Mr. Templeton presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Mr. Templeton summarized the site's history. He explained that it was cleared in anticipation of the South Street Expressway, which was never constructed. The New Market building was constructed in the 1970s, but never succeeded. He described the failed W Hotel proposal for the site, which led to the demolition of the New Market building. He described the current proposal, which would include a hotel, restaurant, and condominiums. The building would cover 51% of the site. The greenway system in Society Hill would be extended through the site. The buildings would have green roofs and other sustainable features. They will seek LEED certification.

In response to questions from the Committee members, Mr. Templeton stated that the facades of the taller portions would have terraces and be faced with copper panels. The north façade would a curtain-wall façade with frosted glass. He stated that the lower portion of the wall facing the south and the neighboring houses would be a green with vegetation growing on it. He recalled the Bacon plan of 1966, which located tall buildings along Walnut Street and the riverfront. He also noted the current Penn Praxis waterfront plan, which calls for very tall buildings between Front Street and the Delaware River. Mr. Cluver asked for assurances that walkway through the site would be open to the public. Mr. Templeton replied that a deed restriction would require the walkway to be open to the public at all times.

Steven Weixler of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that his organization has held several meetings on this project. He reported that the Association neither supports nor opposes the project. He observed that a petition opposing the project has been circulated. He asserted that the petition was not sanctioned by the Association. He also noted that the petition relates to zoning issues, not historic preservation issues. He concluded that the Association will defer to the Architectural Committee on the question of the compatibility of this proposed complex to the historic district.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance acknowledged that the complex has been designed in a thoughtful manner with a great deal of thought and care. He advised the Committee that it must determine whether the complex is compatible with the historic district. He disagreed with the staff and contended that the proposed complex would not be compatible with the district. He remarked that there are tall buildings in the district in two locations, around Washington Square and at Society Hill Towers. He claimed that the remainder of the district has a 45-foot height limit. He claimed that the materials are not compatible with the district. There are no curtain walls in the district. There are no copper panels in the district. He noted that the base would be of a compatible brick, but only the towers would be widely visible. He claimed that it is not compatible in scale. He asserted that the rhythms of the building are random, unlike the regular rhythms of the surrounding rowhouses. He stated that this building is intentionally and radically different from the neighborhood. He asserted that it would be intrusive and detrimental, like 101

Walnut. HE concluded that it would not be compatible in materials, rhythm, or scale. Mr. Templeton disagreed with Mr. Gallery. He stated that the complex would be located in the middle of the block and would therefore not be highly visible in the neighborhood. He claimed that it would only be visible from the river and other distant locations. He asserted that it is compatible and follows the Society Hill plan of locating tall buildings at the perimeter.

Paul Boni introduced himself as a Society Hill resident. He rejected the claim that the tall buildings in Society Hill are at the perimeter. He asserted that they are around Washington Square and at the northeast corner of the district, but not at the south or east borders of the neighborhood. He stated that the perimeter should not be "fair game." He stated the St. James building at 8th and Walnut should be considered a special case that did not set a precedent. He disagreed with the claim that this building would be invisible. He opined that it would be massive and looming. Mr. Boni asked the staff to justify the recommendation of approval in light of the fact that it recommended denial of the spring 2008 application for this project. Mr. Farnham answered that two factors influenced the shift from a recommendation of denial to one of approval. First, the design has improved with the implementation of suggestions offered by the Architectural Committee. Second, the staff has benefited from numerous discussions of the project before the Committee and elsewhere and its thinking had evolved. Mr. Farnham stated that the staff contends that this building satisfies the review criteria set forth in the historic preservation ordinance and the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

Terry Champion, a resident of the 100-block of Pine Street objected to the proposed building. He noted a petition with 500 signatures of immediate neighbors opposing the project. He claimed that Society Hill includes more eighteenth- and nineteenth-century buildings Regency and early Victorian houses than any city in the world except London. He asserted that Society Hill is a tourist destination. Mr. Templeton stated that Society Hill is a mix of old and new. He reported that the construction would not involve the destruction of any historic fabric.

Norma Van Dyke, a resident of Society Hill since 1974, stated that the American Planning Association recently designated Society Hill as one of the 10 Great Places in the United States. She stated that tourists visiting Philadelphia come to see the historic neighborhood. If built, this project will detract from the historic neighborhood. She opined that the proposed architecture is neither historic nor groundbreaking.

David Hammond, the director of the Head House District, stated that the project will have a positive economic impact on the area. He claimed that it would be compatible with the neighborhood. He rejected the claims that the Society Hill Towers are recessive; he asserted that there are very conspicuous, but compatible.

Mr. Evans asserted that he considers the project to be compatible with the neighborhood. Its proportion and scale relate to the neighborhood. He contended that the objections proffered by Messrs. Gallery and Boni and others are predicated on taste, not an assessment of compatibility. He noted that the proposed building shares much with the Mitchell Giurgola insurance building on Independence Square. He cautioned that the detailing of this building will determine whether it is elegant or not. He noted that the site is a very large development parcel. He stated that it would be unrealistic to think that a taller building would not be built on this site. Mr. Amburn praised the massing, stating that it was appropriate to locate the lower sections near Headhouse Square and the taller sections on Front Street. Mr. Evans noted that the excavation work should be conducted very carefully to protect the adjacent buildings. He suggested that the staff should verify that the buildings will be protected during construction.

Mr. Cluver disagreed with his colleagues on the Committee and asserted that the proposed complex was not compatible with the neighborhood. He advised that the restaurant kitchen should be moved away from Front Street. He suggested using another material other than copper. He stated that the rhythm study presented by the architect was “cute” but unconvincing. He advised that the opening at Front Street should be inviting. Mr. Evans disagreed, stating that the most significant feature of the walkways is that they are hidden. He noted that their discovery is important. Mr. Templeton stated that the walkway is intended to feel compressed and then open out onto the outdoor room, like Three Bears Park.

Ms. Pentz opined that the design is sensitive to the historic district. She stated that the height is compatible; the building would not loom over the district. She called it an enhancement to the district. She advocated for its approval.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted 3 to 1 to forward the application to the Commission to allow for an additional public review and to recommend that:

- the site is “developed” and therefore subject to plenary jurisdiction;
- “the proposed work” is compatible “with the character of the historic district ... including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings and the streetscape” (§14-2007(7)(k)(.4);
- the proposed work is “differentiated from the old and [is] compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the ... environment” (Standard 9); and,
- the application should be approved, pursuant to §14-2007(7)(k)(.4) and Standard 9.

1910 CHESTNUT STREET

Boyd Development LP, Live Nation, Owner; ARC/Wheeler, LLC, Equitable Owner

Matt McClure, Applicant

History: 1928, Hoffman & Henon, architects, designated 8/8/08

Project: Rehabilitate theater, construct 28-story hotel addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the rehabilitation of the Boyd Theater and the construction of a 28-story, 320-foot hotel addition at the rear of the theater. The theater space will be rehabilitated for live performances, motion pictures, conferences, and other events.

The parcel is unusually shaped. The front façade of the historic, Art Deco theater faces onto Chestnut Street. A series of lobbies lead south from the main entrance on Chestnut to the auditorium space, which runs east-west along the 1900-block of Sansom Street. The parcel includes vacant land at the west of the auditorium; the land connects to both Sansom and S. 20th Streets. The Boyd Theater parcel including the vacant land is individually designated; it is not located in a historic district.

The interior and exterior of the theater would be rehabilitated. The Commission has jurisdiction over the exterior only. The front façade would be restored. The decrepit 1950s and later marquee would be removed and the horizontal portion of the original marquee would be reconstructed; the vertical portion, which read “BOYD,” would not be reconstructed. Banners would be added above the reconstructed marquee. The art glass windows and doors would be restored and recreated. A retractable screen based on the original entranceway flooring pattern is proposed to allow the open vestibule to be closed off at night. The details for the screen’s

housing are not included. The staff contends that such a housing would be obtrusive and suggests that the architect consider other alternatives.

The hotel tower would be constructed to the west of the auditorium with frontage on Sansom Street and a covered entranceway running west to S. 20th Street. The construction of the tower would require the removal of a small portion of the theater, the stagehouse, which originally accommodated back-of-house facilities. The portion of the theater proposed for removal has no architectural or historical significance; it is not character-defining. A driveway running east from S. 20th Street to the tower and then turning south and connecting with Sansom Street would provide automobile access to the tower. No parking would be included on site; parking would be provided at an off-site facility. The loading dock for the complex would be located on Sansom Street. The lower floors of the tower would house new back-of-house spaces, a restaurant, ballroom, and meeting spaces. The hotel reception would reside on the fifth floor and the guest rooms would occupy the remaining floors. A pool and exercise area would be located at the roof. The hotel tower would be constructed of concrete and polychromatic glass. It would reflect the color, curves, and playfulness of the Art Deco style of the theater, but in a contemporary manner. The tower would cantilever out over the western section of the auditorium volume, but would not rest on the auditorium. The cantilevered section would house an atrium garden. The tower would be taller than the other high-rise buildings on the block, but would be shorter than many nearby buildings on Market, Chestnut, and Walnut Streets. A swooping, colored glass canopy would dramatically link the tower to 20th Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends:

1. Approval of the removal of the stagehouse, provided the remainder of the theater is restored as proposed, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 9. The stagehouse does not “characterize the property.” Because it is not a “character-defining feature,” its removal is not a “razing or destruction ... in significant part.” Therefore, the removal of the stagehouse is an “alteration,” not a “demolition,” in the eyes of the historic preservation ordinance [§14-2007(2)(a, f)].
2. Approval of the hotel tower, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the New Additions Guidelines.
 - a. The tower “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 tower will be constructed “so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that the character-defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed.”
 - b. The “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.”
 - c. The tower will be designed “in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new.” The tower will not imitate “a historic style or period of architecture.”
 - d. The “new addition to the historic building” is “required by the new use.”
 - e. The “new building” is not “out of character or otherwise inappropriate to the setting’s historic character.”
3. Approval of the restoration of the exterior of the theater building including the removal of the non-historic marquee and the reconstruction of the historic marquee, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7.

4. Approval of the banners and vestibule screen, provided the screen housing is inconspicuous and does not obstruct views of historic features, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorneys Matt McClure and Michael Viscuso, architects Gary and Jose Martinez, and developer Hal Wheeler represented the application.

Mr. McClure introduced the project and noted that the last movie he saw at the Boyd, then called the SamEric, was Rocky III. He remarked that it is the last surviving movie palace in the city. He explained that his client, ARC/Wheeler, is considering purchasing the property from Live Nation, the current owner. His client has a very short due diligence period and would like to obtain the necessary municipal approvals before it ends. He introduced the architect, Gary Martinez, who specializes in restoring theaters. He also introduced his client, Hal Wheeler, who has had significant experience with complex adaptive reuse projects.

Mr. Martinez provided an overview of the project. He noted that this is his third attempt to restore the Boyd. He explained that he has undertaken historical research, exploratory demolition, paint analyses, and other preparatory work. He explained that he would restore the front façade including repairing the limestone, replicating the historic doors, reconstructing the original ticket booth, and rehabilitating the shop windows. The theater has two, original, long, narrow storefronts that run along the open vestibule. Mr. Amburn noted that the Commission has no jurisdiction over the interior, but does have jurisdiction over the open vestibule. Mr. Martinez explained that a security gate or screen is needed; it would close off the vestibule late at night. He has revised the design depicted in the drawings. It will now be relocated to a point behind the ticket booth. Mr. Martinez pledged that it would be transparent, not solid, and it would swing and/or fold. Mr. Martinez provided an overview of the interior restoration, which will be extensive. He noted that the theme of the original interior ornamentation is a celebration of the modern woman.

Mr. Martinez showed photographs of the rear elevation and explained the section of the building, the stagehouse, to be removed for the construction of the tower. Mr. Martinez displayed renderings and plans for the tower. He stated that its massing relates to the historic building and the city. He noted that the tower will be set back from Chestnut Street. The façade will have texture. It will not be flat glass.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance spoke not as a preservation advocate, but as a member of the development team. He stated that the project needs a non-profit partner and the Alliance will be that partner. He conceded that this is an unusual role for the Alliance. He remarked that it will be an “exceptional project” and the restoration will be “exceptional.” He reported that the developer has made an “exceptional commitment” to the restoration.

Howard Haas of the Friends of the Boyd read a statement of support for the project. He asked that the Commission prohibit the removal of the stagehouse until the construction is ready to commence. Mr. McClure stated that his client is willing to accept the condition and not undertake any demolition until the project is ready to proceed.

Adrian Fine, the director of the National Trust for Historic Preservation field office in Philadelphia, noted that the Trust has identified the Boyd as one of the 11 most endangered historic sites in the entire country. He stated that his organization strongly supports the project.

Mr. Cluver stated that he agrees with the staff that the removal of the stagehouse is not a demolition in the legal sense and is acceptable. His colleagues on the Committee agreed. He asked the applicants to explain their decision not to reconstruct the vertical portion of the marquee. Mr. Martinez reported that the vertical section may not have been original, but may have been added soon after the building opened. He stated that he would reinforce the structure to allow for the vertical marquee to be added later, but was not proposing it as part of this package. He pointed out the proposed banners, which would allow the theater to change advertising with the changing performances. Mr. McClure assured the Committee that his team would work with the staff to guarantee that the banners were installed appropriately. Mr. Martinez added that the banners would allow for more flexible graphics than the restored marquee.

Mr. Cluver asked about the proposed screen at the front vestibule. Mr. Martinez assured him that it would be open and transparent, allowing views into the vestibule. Mr. Cluver suggested adding a new set of doors at the opening of the vestibule. Mr. Amburn objected to that suggestion, asserting that the open, exterior vestibule is an important aspect of the front façade. He also noted that the Commission would lose its jurisdiction over the vestibule if it allowed it to be enclosed. Mr. Baron asked the applicants why they had not adopted his suggestion to hide the retractable screen in the new marquee. Mr. Martinez explained that the screen would not be in the appropriate plane if installed in the marquee. He is proposing to install the screen behind the reconstructed ticket booth. The Committee members rejected the suggestion as well. They opined that a screen in the marquee would be too far forward, blocking views of the ticket booth and vestibule. Mr. Cluver asked how the reconstructed ticket booth would be used. Mr. Martinez stated that it would not be used to sell tickets, but may be used as a will-call station. Ms. Pentz asked how the original vertical marquee was supported. Mr. Cluver replied "With optimism." Mr. Martinez explained that it was held by brackets in the façade and on the marquee. Ms. Pentz asked about the roof of the auditorium. Mr. Martinez stated that it will be restored; a mechanical room will be removed. Ms. Pentz, the Committee's engineer, asked the architect if he studied the new loads on the auditorium roof that would result from the tower. Mr. Martinez stated that he would study the new wind and snow loads and would also enhance the roof drainage system, which may be taxed by rain sheeting off the tower. Mr. Cluver asked about the colored materials on the tower. Mr. Martinez explained that some of the glass will be colored; also, the tower will have some texture, which will derive from a louver system that will be colored. Mr. Cluver suggested that the underside of the cantilevered portion of the tower should be well designed because it will be visible from Sansom Street. Mr. Martinez promised to devote attention to that portion of the design. The Committee members agreed that the new tower would be well integrated into its context.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend:

1. Approval of the removal of the stagehouse, provided the remainder of the theater is restored as proposed and the removal is not undertaken until a new construction permit is issued, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 9. The stagehouse does not "characterize the property." Because it is not a "character-defining feature," its removal is not a "razing or destruction ... in significant part." Therefore, the removal of the stagehouse is an "alteration," not a "demolition," in the eyes of the historic preservation ordinance [§14-2007(2)(a, f)].
2. Approval of the hotel tower, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the New Additions Guidelines.
 - a. The tower "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 tower will be constructed "so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that the character-defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed."

- b. The "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."
 - c. The tower will be designed "in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new." The tower will not imitate "a historic style or period of architecture."
 - d. The "new addition to the historic building" is "required by the new use."
 - e. The "new building" is not "out of character or otherwise inappropriate to the setting's historic character."
3. Approval of the restoration of the exterior of the theater building including the removal of the non-historic marquee and the reconstruction of the historic marquee, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7.
 4. Approval of the vestibule screen, provided the screen is transparent and is inconspicuous when closed, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.
 5. Denial of the banners. If a vertical marquee is added, it should replicate the historic marquee.

400 S. 40TH STREET

Owner: Campus Inn Associates

Applicant: Sam Olshin, AIA

History: 1856, Colonial Revival alterations and additions, c. 1900, additions 1964, 1973

Project: Restore house, construct 10-story addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore an Italianate house and construct a 10-story hotel addition. The house is encapsulated in mid twentieth-century additions, which would be demolished. The house would be connected to the hotel by a three-story link. The Commission approved an in-concept application for this project in November 2007. The current project is almost identical to that approved in the in-concept application. However, the height of the hotel building has been reduced from 11 to 10 stories.

The house at 400 S. 40th Street was designated individually. It is not located within a local historic district. A Spruce Hill Historic District has been proposed, but has not been created. Several individually designated properties stand in the vicinity, directly to the west and at greater distances to the southwest and northwest. The properties immediately adjacent to the north, south and east of 400 S. 40th Street including the twins along Baltimore Avenue are not individually designated to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

The historic house would be rehabilitated as the hotel's reception area, offices, the breakfast room, and several guest rooms. The house would be restored to its c. 1900 condition; it was significantly altered at that time, when a Colonial Revival front porch replaced the Italianate porch; a grand Palladian window was added to the south façade; and a large addition was added at the rear. The Colonial Revival alterations and additions have achieved their own historic significance and should be preserved. In the 1960s and 1970s, the house was encapsulated in a series of unsympathetic additions. The applicant proposes to demolish these additions and restore or reconstruct the historic elements of the house. The appearance of the

house is known from period photographs. If the project is approved, the staff would work with the applicant to finalize and review the restoration details. The applicant proposes to deviate from a full restoration on one element. The front porch would be reconstructed as an enclosed space, rather than the open-air porch it was in 1900. This change stems from the redevelopment program, which requires an enclosed dining area for the hotel guests.

The majority of the guest rooms as well as some retail space would be located in a 10-story building to be constructed at the southern edge of the property. The height of the 10-story building is mitigated by shorter, transitioning wings at the front and rear. The hotel would be clad in fiber cement panels, Roman brick, and have a fenestration system that incorporates through-wall vertical air control system. The new building would link to the old with a narrow connector. The proposed three-story link would require some demolition of a three-story bay on the house. However, this area of the house is not visible to the public and it would remain invisible once the 10-story addition is constructed.

The application also proposes some site improvements; these include the creation of a paved outdoor dining space to the east and the modification of a surface parking lot to the west. The site will be enhanced with a perimeter planter; the historic iron and granite fence does not exist, but should be replicated. The application proposes signage for the hotel, but no details have been provided.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of all aspects of the proposal except the signage at the corner of 40th and Pine Streets, provided the house is accurately restored as proposed and a replica of the curb with hair-pin fence at the sidewalk line known from historic photographs is installed in place of the proposed planter; denial of the signage at the corner of 40th and Pine Streets owing to incompleteness; pursuant to Standards 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10, and the New Additions Guidelines.

The hotel building “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 hotel building will be constructed “so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that the character-defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed.”

The “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.”

The hotel building will be designed “in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new.” The hotel will not imitate “a historic style or period of architecture.”

The “new addition to the historic building” is “required by the new use.”

The “new building” is not “out of character or otherwise inappropriate to the setting’s historic character.”

DISCUSSION: Mr. Evans recused owing to his firm’s involvement in the project. Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Carl Primavera and architects Sam Olshin and Andrew Curtis attended the meeting.

Mr. Olshin described the proposed interior and exterior restoration of the historic house. He noted that they intend to restore all missing elements based on archival photographs and surviving architectural fragments. He stated that he would need to undertake the demolition of the non-historic mid twentieth-century additions prior to the start of the construction to better understand the historic building and the extent of alteration. Mr. Olshin assured the Committee

that all restoration details would be finalized with the PHC staff's guidance and review. He stated that the University of Pennsylvania Design Review Committee and its Cultural Resources Subcommittee reviewed and approved the project.

Mr. Olshin commented on the design changes since the approval in concept. Most importantly, an entire story was eliminated from the hotel, making it a 10-story building. The mechanical equipment that was at the upper story has been relocated. Dark gray and Roman iron-spotted brick has been substituted for the originally proposed terra cotta panels. He contended that the design, although clearly contemporary, follows the traditional organizational model of base, shaft and capitol. He also noted that the link between the house and the new building has been minimized, allowing the retention of the flanking walls of an original bay on the south side of the house. He also noted that the proposed parking lot would require relocating existing curb cuts to align them with the driveway. Valet parking and car share service will reduce parking and traffic pressures.

Mr. Olshin addressed the staff's recommendation that a replica of the original curb and fence be substituted for the proposed wall at the sidewalk line. He explained that the low wall was proposed to allow the front yard, which slopes down toward the streets, to be leveled to promote ADA access and allow for a terrace. He agreed to reconsider the design of the garden retaining wall to determine if both the ADA and preservation goals could be accommodated. Mr. Cluver suggested that the stairs at the sidewalk should align with the entrance steps at the front porch.

Mr. Olshin explained that the proposed signage is currently being reviewed by zoning. He added that the amount of signage proposed is intended to attract visitors without being overwhelming. Mr. Olshin also noted that they intend to seek LEED certification and that the new construction would have green roofs.

Mr. Amburn opened the floor to comments from the public.

Marianna Thomas spoke on behalf of the community in opposition to the project. She claimed that some of the proposed changes along the rear of the house would be visible from 40th Street. She claimed that this elevation is the most intact portion of the house. She acknowledged that the Historical Commission only has jurisdiction over the site and not the neighborhood because the site is not within a historic district. She opined that the proposed development is out of scale with the surrounding neighborhood. She also added that the University of Pennsylvania had been a bad steward of the property and that currently many windows were open allowing the water into the building.

Matt Grubel provided a summary of the suburban development of West Philadelphia. He opined the setting is more important than the individual structure in this case. He noted that the developers of the garden suburb had a comprehensive vision that dictated not only the architecture but also the setting. The gardens, set backs, and green spaces are important factors in the unity of the neighborhood.

Jean Wolf, the executive director of the Woodlands Cemetery, opined that the proposed development is not in character with the Italianate garden suburb that surrounds it.

Glenn Moyer claimed that the developer had presented false testimony to the Philadelphia Historical Commission during the 2007 review. He claimed that the developer had asserted that the community supported the project during the earlier review. He asserted that the community had, in fact, rejected this proposal and that the developer had not subsequently retracted his

false testimony. He promised to provide a transcript of the earlier reviews at a later date, verifying his allegations. He also noted that the Architectural Committee had rejected the proposal in concept and that the Historical Commission had improperly ignored the Architectural Committee's recommendation. He insisted that the Committee throw out the application because the community's due process rights had been violated during the earlier review. Mr. Farnham explained to the audience that the Commission's approvals in concept are advisory and non-binding. The earlier approval in concept was not an action on a permit application. Likewise, the Architectural Committee's recommendations are advisory and non-binding. The Commission may accept or reject its Committee's recommendations. Also, the Committee has no authority to reject applications outright.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance recognized the proposal to restore the house, but suggested that some aspects of the new construction were not appropriate. He opined that the three-story café annex is glaringly out of character with the house. He called it a "glass box" that has no relation to the historic house. He asserted that it fails to act as a transition element. He urged the architect to reconsider the design.

Guy Laren, who owns several properties in the neighborhood, opposed the project. He claimed that alternative uses for the site have not been explored. He asserted that the property owner has an affirmative obligation under the Secretary of the Interior's Standards to prove that there are no other possible uses for this site. He claimed that the University of Pennsylvania has never issued a Request for Proposals for this site. He suggested that the site would be suitable for a destination restaurant or a bed & breakfast. He asked the Committee to withhold judgment on this application until the applicant has demonstrated that there are no alternative uses for this property. Mr. Primavera contended that these issues had been discussed during public reviews before the Planning Commission, Historical Commission, and neighborhood associations. He claimed that the developer had reached out to the community and had addressed its concerns. He asked the Committee to concentrate its review on the aspects of the design that have changed since the in concept approval. He suggested that the Committee not review the project anew, but that it accept the project as a given and limit its review to the revisions to the design. David Fineman, an attorney representing some people opposed to the project, stated that he disagrees with Mr. Primavera's understanding of the procedure. He stated that an in-concept review is advisory and the approval is non-binding. He asserted that the final review should be conducted as a de novo hearing. The Committee should consider the entirety of the project again and not limit its review to the details or revisions. He asserted that a de novo hearing is necessary to ensure due process. He noted that once the full Commission rules on the proposal, then the developer and opposition have a right to appeal. Mr. Amburn reminded the audience that the Committee is solely a recommending body; its recommendation is not binding.

Melonie Lamond, a resident of the area, spoke in support of the project. She noted that the community has reacted negatively to the project because of the developer's association with the University of Pennsylvania; the community has not judged the project on its merits. She stated that the restoration of the historic building will be very expensive. The development of the hotel will offset the high restoration costs. Ms. Lamond felt this was a worthwhile trade-off.

Karen Allen, a resident of the neighborhood, stated that the identity of the owner had been mischaracterized. She stated that the University of Pennsylvania owns this site, not the developer or the hotel chain. She stated that the university with has an enormous endowment and the capacity to raise large amounts of money. She asserted that the record does not indicate that the University made any attempt to raise the funds to restore the building without erecting the hotel building. She stated that the claim that this is the only means to restore the

building is fallacious. Mr. Cluver cautioned that this is not a hardship case. One question is before the Architectural Committee: Does the proposal meet the standards and guidelines. He suggested that the Committee consider the merits of the architectural design. He contended that the scale of the proposed hotel is not compatible with historic building. He also stated that the rhythm of the hotel is incompatible. He advised the architect to reconsider the proposal.

Ms. Pentz contended that the comments related to process, ownership, use, and other issues were not relevant to the Committee's review. She suggested that the opponents present their comments to the Commission. In terms of the merits, she opined that the three-story portion competes with the house. She suggested that the three-story portion be reduced to a height less than that of the house. She suggested that the applicant should have provided a clear demolition plan. She contended that the line between reconstruction and restoration was very unclear. Mr. Olshin stated it would be undesirable to reduce the height of the three-story wing because its floors should align with those of the hotel. A misalignment would create an ADA, circulation, and construction problems. Responding to Ms. Pentz's claim that the application did not provide adequate restoration details, Mr. Danta stated that the staff is authorized to review restoration details and the applicant has pledged to restore the house. If the applicant does not propose a true restoration to the staff, the staff will not approve the work, but will forward it to the Committee and Commission for review.

Ms. Pentz stated that site is individually designated. The Commission is charged with protecting the building on the site, not the surrounding neighborhood. Therefore, owing to the restoration of the building, she supports the application. The restoration is an acceptable trade-off for the new construction.

Mr. Amburn suggested that the architect should continue to study the design of the three-story wing that fronts on S. 40th Street. He stated that he supports the project.

Mr. Cluver stated that he would recommend denial. He opined that the architect should work to restore the porch and move the front stairs to align with the entrance way. He also opined that the proposed signage was excessive and that the pane configuration at the hotel needed to be revised.

Mr. Gallery suggested tabling the application until the Architectural Committee has an opportunity to review revisions. Mr. Primavera noted that the Committee is not authorized to table applications. The Commission can table if it so chooses, but the Committee cannot. He also stated that the signage would not be presented today. He would submit a separate application for the signage.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of all aspects of the proposal except the signage at the corner of 40th and Pine Streets, provided:

1. the house is accurately restored as proposed;
2. a replica of the curb with hair-pin fence at the sidewalk line known from historic photographs is installed in place of the proposed planter;
3. the stairs in the garden wall along S. 40th Street are aligned on axis with the front porch;
4. the design of three-story wing along S. 40th Street is revised, making it more compatible; and,
5. the rhythm of the fenestration on the hotel is revised to be more regular.

The Committee makes this recommendation with the Architectural Committee and staff to review the details, pursuant to Standards 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10, and the New Additions Guidelines.

1. The hotel building “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 hotel building will be constructed “so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that the character-defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed.”
2. The “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.”
3. The hotel building will be designed “in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new.” The tower will not imitate “a historic style or period of architecture.”
4. The “new addition to the historic building” is “required by the new use.”
5. The “new building” is not “out of character or otherwise inappropriate to the setting’s historic character.”

RITTENHOUSE SQUARE

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Kiki Bolender, AIA, LEED AP

History: 1683, original city square, Thomas Holmes, surveyor; 1913, redesigned by Paul Cret

Project: Renovate gardener’s shed and install parking

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore the early twentieth-century gardener’s cottage in Rittenhouse Square. The cottage would be removed from its foundations and placed back on new foundations in the same location. The application also proposes to enlarge the service area around the cottage to include a new parking area for maintenance vehicles and storage of irrigation materials. The service area would be enclosed by a green fence and metal gates. The fence would have live vegetation on them that would minimize their impact on the landscape of the park. The cottage and its service area are currently surrounded by landscaped shrubbery.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Building Site Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Kiki Bolender and Wendy Rosen represented the application.

Ms. Bolender stated that the Friends of the Square is raising the funds to restore the cottage. She stated that the roof structure is in good condition, but that the lower portion of the cottage has suffered from extensive wood rot. The proposed fence would be a green screen with a three-inch-thick latticework for plants. She added that, if the proposed fence is not economically feasible, they would instead install a basic mesh fence for plants. She claimed that the end result once the plants had matured would be the same.

Mr. Evans asked Ms. Bolender to enumerate the sections of the old building the would be retained during the rehabilitation. Ms. Bolender replied that most of the structure would be preserved. The wood clapboard, asphalt roofing, and most of the windows, which are not original, would be replaced. She noted that only two original windows survive; they propose to salvage and restore them if possible.

Mr. Evans asked if an existing site plan is available and if the site is gated. Ms. Bolender stated that the proposed site plan is very similar to the existing site plan. She stated that the new and old plans would encompass roughly the same square footage. She noted that the fence would straighten the corners and create a more defined and organized appearance. Ms. Bolender mentioned that a black cloth would be installed on the fence to obscure visibility until the plantings have matured.

Ms. Pentz asked if any archeology was proposed for the site. Ms. Bolender stated that none was proposed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Building Site Guidelines.

339 S. 21ST STREET

Owner: Martin McNamara

Applicant: Tim Peters

History: C. 1870, contributing to Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District, February 1995

Project: Add signage

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a nine-foot, internally-illuminated sign on the Pine Street facade of this corner building. The sign would be made of aluminum plates with opaque vinyl lettering. The sign would be backlit with LED lights.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the sign is reduced in height to a maximum of seven feet, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Patricia Doniewski and Tim Peters represented the application.

Ms. Doniewski described the proposed sign. She noted the sign would align with the existing windows and would correspond to the prevailing scale on the façade. She also noted that the proposed size would not interfere with the clearly demarcated commercial ground floor.

Mr. Danta explained the staff's position and the reasoning behind the staff's recommendation. He stated that a nine-foot sign was not compatible with the scale of the surrounding residential area and that a seven-foot sign would be more in keeping with the fenestration and pattern of the buildings in this residential neighborhood, which has few commercial spaces.

Ms. Doniewski provided photographs of a mock up. She stated that she was concerned about the alignment and scale of a seven-foot sign and its relation to the fenestration and wall. She also noted that the logo is already delicate; if the sign were made smaller, it would become illegible.

Mr. Cluver contended that the difference in size between the proposed and staff-suggested signs were not significant. He stated that he deemed the larger sign acceptable. Mr. Evans agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

219-229 S. 18TH STREET

Owner: Rittenhouse Regency Affiliates

Applicant: Greg Mastalerz

History: 1929, Zantzinger, Borie & Medary, architects, altered c. 1940.

Project: Alter window openings at penthouse.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to enlarge four windows at the penthouse level. The penthouse design was approved by the Historical Commission on April 2006 and was recently completed. The approval from the Historical Commission included a restoration package. The design of the penthouse incorporates decorative panels that are a subdued representation of the original parapet that was lost when an addition was constructed in the 1940s. The expansion of the windows would eliminate the decorative panels that currently mediate the connection between the historic building and the new penthouse. The proposed extension also disrupts the strong horizontal nature of the penthouse addition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9, and the Philadelphia Historical Commission approval of the penthouse in April 2006.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Sarena Rose and David Marshall represented the application.

Ms. Rose gave an overview of the recent rehabilitation work to the building. She stated that the developer is having difficulty selling this particular penthouse floor owing to the current market conditions. She presented the Architectural Committee with three more options at the meeting. Mr. Marshall gave stated that they have a prospect buyer willing to purchase the entire floor if the windows can be lowered. He noted that it would be devastating for the project to lose this buyer in this financial market.

Mr. Evans asked if the penthouse was constructed as approved. Mr. Danta stated that the location and massing of the penthouse is exactly as approved but minor revisions were made to cladding and some window sizes.

Mr. Amburn inquired if the panels that would be lost with the alterations to the windows replicate original features. Mr. Danta answered that the parapet was lost in the 1940s; the panels in question do not recreate historic features, but instead replicate details found on the building below. Mr. Cluver opined that he deemed the loss of the baluster acceptable. He preferred this option over the other three. He objected to the introduction of metal railings that are not found anywhere else on the building. Mr. Amburn agreed.

Mr. Gallery stated that he had taken a tour of the interior and that the as built conditions justify the proposed alteration. He opined that the inappropriate height of the sill as constructed must have been a design mistake.

Mr. Evans noted that the drawing was not clear enough to understand the different plans on which the window sits. He noted that the window seems to sit deeper into the masonry than the panel below. He stated that there was not a good enough sense of this set back and that he was concerned by the proposal to cut down a window on two different planes. Ms. Rose stated that the cut down would just deepen the new sill; making the window sit deeper in the masonry opening, thus eliminating the current plane of the decorative panel below the window. Mr. Amburn accepted this detail.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend Scheme D.

1636 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: George Bochetto Esq.

Applicant: Mark D'Alonzo, architect

History: constructed c.1868, contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District 1995

Project: Roof deck, stair house, reflecting pool

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to add a roof deck on this corner house, which has a mansard. The current proposal represents a scaled-back version of earlier iterations of this design, which were reviewed by the Committee and Commission in September 2006, December 2007, and March 2008. The Commission denied the March 2008 application. The applicant appealed the denial to the Board of License & Inspection Review; the Board affirmed the Commission's denial.

The new design has a stair house leading to a deck and reflecting pool, but does not have the interior living space included in the earlier plans. This deck will be visible because of the corner location and the nature of a mansard roof.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Carl Primavera and architect Mark D'Alonzo represented the application.

Mr. Baron reminded the Committee that the full Commission has often denied roof decks on the main sections of buildings and in particular on mansard roofs. Mr. Cluver asked about the visibility from the public right-of-way. Mr. Baron noted that the sight-line studies indicate that there are particular locations on the public right-of-way from which the deck is not visible. He asserted, however, that the deck will be visible from most locations on the adjacent public rights-of-way.

Mr. Evans stated that he was concerned about the pool, which would be cut into the roof. A large amount of water sitting in the roof structure would pose a conservation risk. Mr. D'Alonzo concurred that the proposed pool would necessitate cutting into the roof.

Mr. Primavera asserted that during its appeal hearing the Board of License & Inspection Review had suggested that both parties endeavor to reach a compromise.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance informed the Committee that he agreed with the Commission policy of rejecting proposals for mansards on decks. He explained that decks were usually placed on rear ells, not mansards, originally. Mr. Primavera asserted that decks should not be universally prohibited on particular building types. Mr. Cluver countered that property owners do not have a right to a roof deck. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed that this particular location on this mansard is not appropriate for a deck.

Mr. Primavera recalled Robert Thomas, the architectural historian on the Historical Commission, had suggested during the review of an earlier iteration of this application that a simple, pared-down stair house and deck would be appropriate. Mr. Primavera also contended that a Commission refusal to approve any deck for this building would not be deemed legal by the

courts. Mr. Baron rebutted the statements that the building has no open space. He stated that the lot includes a rear yard, where a car is parked. The Commission might approve a proposal for a deck over the parking area. Mr. Primavera asserted that a member of the Board of License & Inspection Review had opined that the Commission was doing a disservice to the property owner with its uncompromising position. Mr. Baron responded that that was the opinion of one Board member, not the Board itself. Other Board members expressed different opinions.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guidelines.

1508 PINE STREET

Owner: 1508 Pine Street Associates, Martin Rosenblum

Applicant: Jennifer Arnoldi, Martin Rosenblum Architects

History: Lewis's Row, built 1849, T.U. Walter architect, Individually designated 1971, Significant to Rittenhouse Fitter Residential Historic District 1995

Project: Legalize gas meters on front façade and roll up garage gate on rear.

OVERVIEW: This proposal calls for legalizing the installation of gas meters on the front façade of the building. The developer, who was also the architect for the project, worked closely with the staff on the façade renovations to the building. He disagreed with the gas company over the placement of meters in the basement. He has converted the basement to a condominium unit and does not wish to install the meters along the inside of the front wall of the basement where the gas company had wanted to install them. He offered a space for installation under the front stair, but the gas company rejected that location for safety and access reasons. The developer therefore installed on the front façade and attempted to hide them with a planter. The staff is working with another homeowner on the block to have them installed in the interior.

The second portion of the application proposes installing a metal roll-up garage type gate along the back of the house. Several houses face the street which runs along the back of this building. The staff recommends a gate with a more appropriate paneled-wood design.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect and developer Martin Rosenblum represented the application.

Mr. Baron stated that he, several neighborhood representatives, and City Council members have worked with the utility companies to prevent the installation of meters on the front facades of historical buildings. Mr. Baron reported that he is currently working with a nearby homeowner to relocate his meters to the interior. The gas company is willing to relocate them in cooperation with the property owner.

Mr. Rosenblum stated that he wanted to have the gas company install the meters in a location under his entry vestibule, but that that location was rejected as unsatisfactory. The gas company insisted on installing the meters on the exterior when no interior locations were available. Mr. Rosenblum was not willing to allow them to install the meters on the front interior basement wall between the windows for two reasons. He objected to the effect on the room, which is occupied, and the impact of the meter readers entering the basement apartment to access the meters. The gas company was concerned that about the opportunity to illegally tap into the gas lines as well.

Mr. Baron asked whether it would be possible to create a closet area in the building for the meters. Mr. Rosenblum objected to the cost of moving the meters and explained that he had attempted to hide the meters with a planter. The Committee members stated that allowing utilities on front facades would set a bad precedent.

The Committee turned its attention to the garage door. Mr. Baron explained that the street at the rear of this property is not a service alley, but has houses facing it. He added that the back of this building can be seen from Lombard Street. He suggested a wood roll-up gate like the one recently approved by the Commission for a property at 19th and Delancey Streets. Mr. Rosenblum rejected the suggestion for cost reasons and noted his financial setbacks from the development of the property. Mr. Amburn suggested an open grill roll-up door. Some Committee members suggested that Mr. Rosenblum should submit an application to the Committee on Financial Hardship if he could not afford the appropriate gate.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the legalization of the gas meters and approval of the rear gate, pursuant to Standard 9.

129-131 N. 10TH STREET

Owner: Kwai Shing Wong

Applicant: Yao Chang-Huang, architect

History: c. 1825; individually designated, 1974

Project: Demolish front façade, rear ell, construct new faced and rear addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert this building for first-floor office use and upper-floor residential use. It proposes to demolish the rear ell and extend the rear of the building to cover the entire lot. The rear is visible to the public from a service alley. The front façade of this building was reconstructed with an inappropriate glazed brick without a permit at some point after its designation in 1974. This application proposes to replace the illegal front façade using a more appropriate brick. However, the front door and first-floor windows would not be located in their historic positions; the first floor would be lowered to grade and the windows and door would be located to correspond to it.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the first floor windows and door are rebuilt to their original designs at their original locations, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Architect Carolina Pena represented the application.

Mr. Baron reported that a similar proposal for this property had been submitted to the Commission in the past. The earlier submission lacked the requisite details. This application includes the requisite details. Mr. Baron stated that the proposed front façade would not be a restoration because the first-floor openings would not be located in their historic positions. Mr. Baron explained that the property owner, a benevolent association, is seeking to provide elderly housing. However, the lowered door would not provide access to the housing, but to the office space instead. He noted that the owner also owns the building to the north, which has an at-grade entrance. He suggested that installing an elevator in that building and a connection to this building could provide ADA access for the elderly residents.

The Committee members asked about the relationships and connections to the adjoining building. The applicant stated that as of this date the properties are legally one; they have not been subdivided. Mr. Amburn suggested that the Committee should be reviewing plans for the entire property.

Mr. Cluver stated that this design, which proposes removing the stairs and watertable, lowering the door, and recreating the windows in the wrong location, would significantly change the character the building and create a false sense of history. The Committee strongly urged the applicant to revise the plans to propose a restoration of the front façade.

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

200 MARKET STREET

Owner: Andrew M. Ullman & Sandra Schwalb, Trustees

Applicant: Richard Thom, architect

History: c.1860, floor removed mid twentieth century, stuccoed. c. 2003

Non-contributing to the Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Reface one-story diner, add floor and roof deck

OVERVIEW: The building in question is classified as non-contributing to the Old City Historic District. The application to convert this building from a diner to a full-service restaurant proposes adding a second floor and facing the building with wood siding. The addition would cantilever beyond the first-floor and over the sidewalk. The second-floor addition would include a roof deck with plantings. The design is not compatible with the district in materials, rhythm, or massing. The wood siding and the horizontal windows in particular are incompatible with the surrounding district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and Setting Guidelines

Not Recommended: Introducing new construction into historic districts that is visually incompatible or that destroys historic relationships within the setting.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Richard Thom and assistant Kelly Brennan represented the application.

Mr. Baron stated that, although the building is non-contributing, the Commission is still charged with protecting the integrity of the district. He explained that the area around 2nd and Market Street was the Colonial center of the city with the Market, City Hall, and Quaker Meeting house on this corner.

Mr. Thom described the property. He noted that the billboards that once stood atop the restaurant had been removed. During the removal, the need for a new roof was discovered. He explained that wood, and brick and copper accept panels would be used for cladding. The restaurant would provide outdoor dining on a deck at the second-floor level. An additional door is required. Mr. Thom explained the compositional effect, calling it cubist, with a projecting overhang of approximately six inches. He reported that the Streets Department has already approved the overhang. The restaurant would serve approximately 150 patrons. Mr. Thom acknowledged that the neighbors have concerns about the second-floor deck. They fear that objects may be thrown from the deck. He assured the Committee that his client is an

experienced restaurateur and a respected property owner, who would not tolerate this behavior. He stated that the Board of the Old City Civic Association split on the proposal.

Mr. Baron noted the faux-Colonial pink and white brick as well as the rough plank wood covering are entirely inappropriate for the district. They are not compatible. Mr. Evans liked the materials and saw the humor proposing an Old West style building for Old City. He acknowledged, however, that the materials are not compatible with the district. Mr. D'Alessandro had concerns about the wood material as well. He said building's appearance would change significantly with weathering. Mr. Evans and Mr. Amburn agreed that the materials were inappropriate.

Mr. Thom suggested that he convert the application to an application in concept. The Committee members encouraged him to do so to allow him to revise the materials and other details of the application. Mr. Thom stated that he would like the application to be considered as an in concept application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend an approval in-concept of adding a second floor with deck to this building.

332-334 SOUTH 4TH STREET

Owner: Charles and Margo Todd

Applicant: Paul Thompson, AIA

History: 1811, altered c. 1880, rehabilitated 1960 individually designated, 4/30/1957; contributing to Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Legalize exterior alterations and install solar panels

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize a series of alterations to the rear ell and to install windows, doors, and solar panels on the roof.

In July 2008, the Department of Licenses & Inspections issued violations and a stop work order for major work without permits or approvals.

There is little documentation regarding the condition of the two-story portion of the rear ell prior to the alterations. According to historic atlases, the two-story and part of the three-story rear ell were added between 1860 and 1875. Based on photographs taken by the applicant in May 2008, the first story had two large openings supported by timber lintels and a six-over-six, double-hung window and the second story had two six-over-six, double-hung windows. Without a permit, the applicant demolished the facade of the this section, rebuilt it using some original brick, recreated the large openings on the first story, but added two larger window openings on the second story. The applicant proposes to legalize these alterations and install two sets of French doors in the openings on the first story and two sets of paired double-hung windows at the second story.

In the rear elevation, the applicant proposes to infill two existing openings on the first and third stories and cut two window openings on the third story.

The applicant proposes to install six-over-six, true-divided-light, double-hung windows throughout the remainder of the building. Window shop drawings for the first, second, and third stories alterations were reviewed and approved by the staff in June 2008 prior to the illegal

alterations. In addition, this application proposes to install a dormer window and front door; however no shop drawings have been submitted for review.

This application proposes to install a Timberline Weathered Wood shingle roof and legalize the installation of a wooden gate along 4th Street.

This application proposes to install solar panels on the rear roof of the main block and solar panels, a condenser, and a skylight on the roof of the rear ell. The rear roof of the main block is visible from Green's Court and a public greenway walk. The roofs of the rear ell have a very low pitch. A mockup should be installed to determine visibility from Green's Court and the greenway walk.

This application also proposes to legalize the installation of stucco on the side wall of the rear ell. Since the Architectural Committee meeting, the staff conducted a site visit to examine the method of stucco installation. The building had an existing layer of stucco. The applicant nailed a wire mesh subsurface over the existing stucco, driving the nails into the original brick to anchor the mesh. The applicant then applied another layer of smooth stucco over the mesh. The new layer of mesh and stucco added one inch to the original surface causing the original lintels, sills, and shutter dogs to recede further into the stucco. To remove the nails, mesh, and stucco may cause additional damage to the brick.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of first-story alterations, skylight, and gate, pursuant to Standard 9. Approval of double windows on the rear provided the stucco is removed, pursuant to Standard 9. Approval of the solar panels, provided a mockup proves they are inconspicuous from public rights of way, pursuant to Standard 9. Approval of the condenser, provided it is mounted at grade level in the side yard, not on the roof, pursuant to Standard 9. Denial of solar panel installation on the main block and stucco installation, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Charles Todd and architect Paul Thompson represented the application.

Ms. Sell conducted a site visit and concluded that there was no public visibility of the first story from Green's Court, the greenway walk, or South 4th Street. She confirmed that there is public visibility of the rear roof of the main block and limited public visibility of the roofs of the rear ell.

She explained the additional layer of stucco had caused the lintels and brick molds to recede into the stucco as it added a thick additional layer to the façade.

Mr. Thompson described the history of the building. He stated that the proposed windows on the façade had been approved by the Historical Commission staff. He displayed photographs of the rear ell showing the elevation covered by ivy. He explained that upon removing the ivy, he discovered the stucco had failed. He also confirmed that the rear ell of the building had been stuccoed when it was purchased by his client.

Mr. Thompson stated that a structural engineer determined that the two-story portion of the rear ell had no structural integrity, citing the deteriorated condition of the bricks and rotted wood beams. He stated that he demolished and rebuilt the two-story section of the ell in the same footprint as the original two-story section with a slight difference in second-floor fenestration. He conceded that the work was done without any permits or approvals. He proposes to install paired, double-hung windows in the enlarged second-story openings.

Mr. Baron stated that a row house historically stood to the south. That building was demolished during the Redevelopment period and a greenway was created. The greenways are a significant characteristic of Society Hill. Mr. Baron stated that he had approved true-divided-light windows for the side elevation windows during his staff review of the window application in June 2008 because of their visibility from the greenway. He asserted that the staff and the window applicant representing the owner were aware Commission's jurisdiction. He claimed that the applicant assumed full risk when he undertook the major demolition and alteration without any permits or approvals.

Mr. Amburn inquired why the staff is recommending approval of the illegal double openings on the second-story of the rear ell. Ms. Sell replied the staff proposed the legalization of the window openings in exchange for removing the illegal stucco. She explained that the original rear two-story piece is the latest addition to the building and a window alteration of this type would not negatively impact the building.

Steven Weixler, who represents the Society Hill Civic Association, stated that the Association did not have the opportunity to review this application. He expressed the importance, prominence, and age of this building in Society Hill. He stated that it is the position of the Association to encourage property owners to either restore stuccoed elevations to their original brick or maintain the original stucco where possible. He noted that there is a problem with adding an additional layer of stucco. He stated that, with the necessary permits, the Association is amenable to non-historic window openings in rear ells as there is a tradition of modifying these buildings to accommodate modern uses. He expressed concern over the location of the mechanical equipment proposed for the roofs. He petitioned the staff and the Committee to begin a dialogue about energy-efficient windows and solar panels and preservation in Society Hill. He stated that, although he agrees that energy efficient systems are important and worthy of installation, this proposal is not planned sensitively. He requested alternative placement for the solar panels. He stated that he did not favor the application of stucco, but accepted the proposal for window alteration in the rear.

Mr. Thompson responded that he is agreeable to install the condenser unit in the side yard. However, he stated that relocating the solar panels would require exploration. Mr. Weixler opined that the preservation of the district as a whole takes precedence over a single property.

Mr. Evans applauded the use of solar panels and opined that there is not a negative impact on the district. He asserted that the Commission should approve highly visible green technologies to encourage others to install systems on their buildings. He contended that the Commission must find ways to accommodate alternative energy technologies on historic buildings. Mr. Weixler agreed that the Commission must accommodate green technologies, but contended that the placement of the equipment must be considered for its visibility and impact on the streetscape. Ms. Sell reiterated that the staff is opposed to solar panels on the main block, but does support of their installation on the rear ell, provided a mockup installation shows they are inconspicuous. Mr. Weixler stated that he was also concerned about the placement of the solar panels on the main blocks of houses.

Mr. Evans addressed the issue of stucco. He noted that stucco is installed routinely on houses at Elfreth's Alley when it is difficult to match brick with new additions. Ms. Sell reminded Mr. Evans that staff objected to the additional layer of stucco because it projects beyond the historic window lintels and brick molds. She recommended the removal of all of the stucco and installation of a new layer. Mr. Thompson informed the Committee that they installed a metal mesh with fasteners nailed into the brick to anchor the mesh followed by and application of

stucco. To remove this system would damage the brick. Ms. Sell agreed to perform another site visit to examine the stucco issue. Mr. Baron remarked that the Department of Licenses & Inspections requires inspections of walls prior to applications of stucco to verify structural stability. Stucco can be used to hide structural flaws. Mr. Baron also noted that stuccoing requires a building permit regardless of a building's historic designation status. No permit was obtained in this case.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

1933-1935 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: George Karivalis

Applicant: John Ciccone

History: c. 1875, contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Renovate storefront

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate an existing storefront using historic openings and cues from a historic photograph from 1950. On the façade, the applicant proposes to remove the faux shingled pent to expose a band of historic transoms. On the west side elevation, the applicant proposes to reopen historic window and door openings and install accordion café windows with transoms and two wood paneled doors. The applicant also proposes to install a wood cornice, gilded flat wood signage, and roll-up awnings based on the historic condition shown in the 1950 photograph.

The staff suggests the awnings on the west elevation be installed over the transoms rather than between the transoms and café windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Architect John Ciccone represented the application.

Ms. Sell clarified the staff's suggestion to install the awnings over the transoms on the west elevation. She explained that the awnings as drawn in the elevation are bisecting the café windows and transoms. Mr. Ciccone stated that it was his intent to continue the line of the awnings proposed for the south elevation. He described the awnings as spanning the entire width of the south elevation and set about six inches away from the façade. Mr. Baron added that the staff also suggested the awnings be narrowed to span only the width of each window opening on the west elevation.

Mr. Amburn suggested the installation of flashing between the stucco and the brick, adding that he accepted the applicant's proposal for the awnings on the west elevation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application, provided the awnings are narrowed to span only the width of each window opening on the west elevation, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

107 COTTON STREET

Owner: 526 South Third Street, LLC

Applicant: Glen Falso

History: designated within the Manayunk National Historic District 12/14/1983; vacant lot

Project: Construct four-story building

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a four-story commercial building in a vacant lot. The first three stories would be constructed of brick with brick pilasters, soldier-course brick lintels and sills, a cornice, and six-light aluminum windows in a modern style reminiscent of a historic factory building. The fourth story would be set back eight feet from the façade and five feet from the Station Street elevation. It would be clad with an aluminum panel system and have six-light aluminum windows and double door to provide access to a roof deck.

A similar application was proposed in-concept by a different architect to the Commission in March 2008. The proposed commercial building was designed as a full four-story brick building with cornice. The Commission approved the application in-concept, noting that the height of the building was consistent with other commercial buildings in the area. However, the neighborhood opposed the construction of a four-story building and preferred a three-story building. To accommodate the interests of the neighborhood and the owner's program, this applicant has presented a redesigned version of the building with a setback and change in material at the fourth-story level to give the illusion of a three-story industrial building with a modern rooftop addition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Manayunk Ordinance Section PM-704.2.7.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Ron Patterson, John Torpe, and property owner Glen Falso represented the application.

Mr. Patterson stated that they were granted a variance for a fourth floor and larger footprint.

Mr. Amburn recalled that the former applicant presented two options to the Historical Commission in March 2008. The Commission chose the factory-style building design.

Ms. Pentz requested the applicant to explain the purpose and function of the two-inch recycled brick proposed for the exterior elevations. Mr. Torpe explained they are using a historic brick, cutting it in half, and installing it as a panelized veneer to obtain LEED certification. Mr. D'Alessandro found the recycled brick problematic and expressed concerns about the porous surface of the soft brick that may react like a sponge and potentially degrade. Mr. Evans also expressed concerns about the quality of this material and its ability to sustain itself in the long term. Ms. Pentz added that there is no history of performance with this type of recycled brick. She stated, however, that the durability of a cladding material for new construction was outside the purview of the Architectural Committee.

Mr. Evans also found the design for the returns at the corners to be problematic. He suggested that the applicant use a solid, true brick. He opined that the door was not appropriate and he did not favor the cornice.

Mr. Falso stated that the recycled brick would be dipped in a chemical to strengthen it. He stated that, if the Committee preferred full brick, he would agree to use that material. He stated that he was getting mixed signals, citing that the Commission had previously approved a cornice

like the one he is now proposing. Mr. Amburn stated that the cornice design was inappropriate for this time period. He explained that a corbelled brick treatment would be more suitable.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the cladding is four-inch true brick, a corbelled brick cornice is used in place of the proposed cornice, and the watertable line is continued throughout the base, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Manayunk Ordinance Section PM-704.2.7.

4633 HAZEL AVENUE

Owner: Monarch Real Estate

Applicant: Eugene O'Brien

History: Built 1910-1915, individually designated, 12/2/1976

Project: Legalize pointing and installation of glass block in basement windows

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of destructive pointing on the west wall and installation of glass block in the basement windows. The correct basement windows should be six-light, wood, true-divided-light windows.

In August 2008, the project manager indicated to the staff that pointing work had begun on the side wall without a permit. Staff approved an application for brick pointing with the caveats that the mortar mix be six parts sand, two to two-and-a-half parts lime, and one part Portland cement with staff to review samples of the mortar cut-out and pointing in the field for final approval.

Upon the site visit to check the samples, staff observed a small sample in the rear with the approved mortar mix. The staff performed a "key test" and determined that the sample was appropriate in texture and consistency, however, the color was too white as the mason used a white bar sand. The staff suggested using a brown sand and installing another sample for review.

At the site visit, the staff also observed that the entire side wall up to the second story had been pointed with a very hard mortar applied thickly in the joint causing it to cover the faces of the bricks. Staff conducted a "key test" on the cured mortar and no residue was produced, a typical characteristic of cement. A conversation with the mason on site revealed that he used a high level of cement in the mix. Staff explained to the mason that the hard pointing will not expand and contract at the same rate as the softer historic brick, resulting in spalling.

At the site visit, staff also observed that glass block had been installed within all of the basement openings. To correct a previous window violation, an application to remove illegal vinyl windows and install the correct historic windows in the façade and side elevation up to the middle of the first bay was approved in February 2008. The application omitted a proposal for basement windows. The staff explained to the owner on site that the windows are an illegal condition as they were not approved in the February 2008 application. The owner must replace the glass block with the correct windows or she must apply for legalization.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 6, 7, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Casey Lafferty represented the application.

Mr. Casey stated that the contractor hired to perform the work had assured him that he had obtained the requisite permits and approvals. They have fired this contractor and are in the process of suing him.

The property has been sold and the new owners are refusing to change the windows, citing energy efficiency and safety. The seller has taken \$15,000 off of settlement charges in exchange for the illegal alterations.

Mr. Amburn stated that the pointing needs to be removed. The Committee agreed that the windows are inappropriate.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6, 7, and 9.

708 S. WASHINGTON SQUARE

Owner: Nick Blum

Applicant: Maggie Persofsky

History: c. 1819, Designated individually 11/28/1961; 3/10/1999 as contributing to the SHHD

Project: Construct addition, cut garage

OVERVIEW: The Committee reviewed a similar application last month. Like the previous application, the current application proposes alterations at the front of the building and an addition at the rear.

At the front, it proposes changes at the basement windows and at the planters at the sidewalk. Currently, the basement windows have non-historic horizontal metal grates at grade over window wells and non-historic vertical metal grates in front of the windows. The horizontal grates would be upgraded and the vertical grates would be removed and replaced with "bulletproof glass." The current basement windows are one-over-one double-hung sash. The basement windows in the designation photograph were six-over-six. The Commission did not approve their replacement. This application proposes to construct 8-inch-tall stone planting walls in front of the building and the neighboring building to the west. The wall at the west appears to be on the neighboring property; however, the application provides no indication that the neighbor has approved of the construction.

The application proposes an addition at the rear. The piazza area would be enclosed for an elevator. A second-floor window opening would be enlarged to install a Juliet balcony with French doors and transom. In addition, this application proposes cutting a garage door and cutting down the second floor windows in the rear ell, and adding gate at the side yard. Please note that the designation photograph shows six-over-six windows in the rear ell; the current photographs show one-over-one windows. The Commission did not approve the window change. However, the applicant is now proposing to install the appropriate windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the horizontal grate replacement and approval of the vertical grate removal, provided the marble is patched; denial of the bulletproof glass windows; approval of the planting wall on this property, provided it is brick or marble and no additional dirt will be placed against the building; denial of any alterations to neighboring properties without the property owner's written consent; approval of the elevator addition and French door and Juliet balcony; denial of the garage door and window cut, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Steve Pollack, architect Newton Smith, and property owners Nicholas and Elisabeth Blum represented the application.

Mr. Pollock stated that his clients have met with the Society Hill Civic Association. He explained that the architect has significantly revised the plans since the last presentation before the Architectural Committee. Mr. Blum noted that some of the alterations are to accommodate his 92-year-old father, who is moving into the house. Also, he and his wife are expecting a child. The application is time sensitive.

Mr. Newton provided an overview of the proposal and told the Committee the previously proposed bay is now gone. He stated that they were going to cut-down two openings, but keep the existing head and install true-divided-light windows. He noted that the existing window trim is not historic and asked the Committee and staff for guidance on the appropriate trim. Mr. Baron asked if the existing stucco would be removed before the new stucco is applied. Mr. Smith stated that the brick could not be exposed.

Mr. Weixler, of the Society Hill Civic Association, believes that, since there is currently a parking place at the rear of the property, it would be appropriate to retain the space and bring it up to code, and since the owner has offered to eliminate a steel roll down gate and replace it with a garage door, it would not markedly affect the character. He stated that the Association was pleased to see the window openings proposed for the rear more consistent with the building and neighborhood. The Association is not opposed to the French doors, since they are not visible from public right-of-way as well as the piazza enclosure for the elevator. He stated that the Association supports the replacement of the basement windows on the front elevation with six-over-six windows. He stated that the brick planter is suppositional as it is more in keeping with the design of the house, and the neighboring owner agreed to the work. Mr. Pollock supplied a letter from the neighbor giving consent for the planter work.

Mr. Evans expressed great reservations on the garage issue, and stated that this was originally a two family home with a back dwelling. He opined that removing the back door would result in the loss of the back dwelling being detectable. Mr. Pollock stated that the property was zoned as single family residential. He told the Committee that the width of the opening of the existing parking space does not provide for the car doors to open far enough to secure a two year old in the back seat or to allow an elderly parent to get safely in or out of the car. Mr. Evans stated that the Commission routinely denies garages being cut into houses.

Mr. Amburn observed that it is not possible to make the property accessible without moving the floor heights. He suggested that the applicant rework the proposal.

Mr. Weixler stated that the Association was still in support of the application even though this back dwelling may be a survivor. He opined that there are numerous back dwelling survivors throughout the City. He stated that the house has been extensively modified.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the horizontal grate replacement and approval of the vertical grate removal, provided the marble is patched; denial of the bulletproof glass windows; approval of the planting wall on this property, provided it is brick or marble and no additional dirt will be placed against the building approval of the elevator addition and French door and Juliet balcony;

denial of the garage door and window cut, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

2000-2002 DELANCEY PLACE

Owner/ Applicant: A. Charles Peruto, Jr.

History: c. 1865, Designated individually 1/6/1972; 2/8/1995 as contributing to the RFRHD

Project: Construct rear garages and decks

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct three rear garages with a “living roof,” two balconies at the rear, and one roof deck. The garages and balconies will be constructed in brick with a decorative railing. The application proposes cutting down two rear windows for French doors to access the balconies.

This application also proposes to wash the historic brick with a diluted acid solution and then re-point it. No specifications on the cleaning solution or pointing were submitted. The letter from the contractor mentions installing star bolts and leveling the window lintels, but no details are provided.

The staff suggests that the balconies should be lighter in design without the brick piers; that the French doors and transoms should have fewer divisions to look more like six-over-six windows, and the garage walls should look more like the historic wall that enclosed the rear yard. Please note that the roof of this building is flat and has a gambrel shaped parapet, which is not depicted in the drawings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer, Charles Peruto, Jr. represented the application.

Mr. Peruto summarized the project to rehabilitate the 7-unit apartment building into four high-end condominiums. He noted that he has reduced the size of the proposed rooftop deck. He displayed a catalog showing what he considered to be the three best choices for the garage doors. He explained that the project would not be feasible and the units unmarketable without the garages. He observed that he will replace the windows with historically appropriate windows. He noted that he does not yet own the building, but is prepared to pay \$2.6 million for it. He added that he plans to reside on the third floor. The rooftop deck would be part of his unit.

Mr. Baron reported that some windows were replaced and a garden wall demolished by a former owner without a permit. He noted that violations were issued several years ago for the non-compliant work. Mr. Baron suggested that the garages could be constructed such that they would resemble the lost historic wall. He opposed the open courtyard facing 20th Street and suggested a solid brick wall with a garage door.

Mr. Amburn asked the staff to explain its opposition to the brick piers at the balconies. Ms. Cote and Mr. Baron explained that the piers for the balconies should not mimic the historic building, but should be clearly identifiable as later additions. They suggested a lighter, metal structure. Mr. Evans stated that he is opposed to the rear balconies entirely. He displayed an historic photograph of the rear façade of this corner building and contended that it was a finely designed and detailed façade. He asserted that it was not merely a rear façade, but one with an architectural significance that should be restored. Mr. Amburn agreed that the rear façade is

very significant. He too opposed the balconies. Mr. D'Alessandro disagreed, asserting that the balconies would have a minimal effect on the façade. Mr. Amburn observed that the rooftop deck may be conspicuous as well. He stated that little information had been provided to evaluate the impact of the rooftop deck. He suggested sight-line studies to determine if it would be conspicuous from the public right-of-way. Mr. Evans agreed. Mr. Peruto offered to delete the balconies from the design and relocate that outdoor space to the tops of the garages. He reiterated his desire for the rooftop deck, which would be connected to his unit.

Ms. Pentz objected to the method of removing paint prescribed on the architectural drawings. She stated that it was inappropriate and would damage the brick and suggested that the restoration, star bolts and lintel work should be annotated in the drawings. Mr. Baron remarked that he could advise the applicant on an appropriate method for removing paint from historic brick.

The Committee suggested that the applicant revise and resubmit the plans for the project.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and 10.

1216-1220 ARCH STREET

Owner: Young Smith Field Condo Association

Applicant: Mike Ring

History: 1901, Field & Medary, architects; individually designated, 6/13/1990

Project: Install antennas and accessory cabinets

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove two cellular antennas and install four cellular antennas and one GPS antenna on the penthouse of the Young, Smyth, & Field Company building. The associated equipment cabinet would be housed within the building and not visible.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application.

Mr. Evans asked the staff to reiterate the Commission's policy on antennas. Mr. Farnham explained that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards are applied. Installations that are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way are acceptable. Mr. Baron noted that the Commission has already approved a series of antennas for this building. The Committee members agreed that the proposed antennas would be no more conspicuous than the existing antennas.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval provided the antennas are removed when taken out of service, pursuant to Standard 9.

315 N. BROAD STREET

Owner: JAR Packard Property

Applicant: Mike Ring

History: 1910, Albert Kahn, architect; individually designated, 5/7/1981

Project: Install antennas and accessory cabinets

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install three cellular antennas and one GPS antenna on the upper penthouse of the Packard Motor Corporation building. The associated equipment cabinet would be housed within the lower penthouse and not visible.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application.

The staff explained that the Commission recently approved an equipment penthouse and antennas for this building. The Committee members agreed that the proposed antennas would be no more conspicuous than the existing antennas.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the antennas are removed when taken out of service, pursuant to Standard 9.

510 WALNUT STREET

Owner: Gary L. Naughton, Owner

Applicant: Joseph Levine, Applicant

History: Egyptian Revival façade, c. 1839, John Haviland, architect

office tower, 1971, Mitchell/Giurgola Associates, architects

individually designated, 9/25/1962; significant to Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Restore façade, repair masonry, install concrete stucco

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore and repair North and partial west facade of the office tower by patching concrete spalls and cracks with a polymer-modified Portland cement, coating the concrete surface with reinforced mesh and a built-up coating, and re-caulking the joints with an elastomeric sealant. This application also proposes to repoint joints and pin face stones on the Egyptian Revival façade. The staff has some concerns that the coating will not match the existing concrete in color or texture.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Given the safety concerns and the staff's limited experience with the proposed material, the staff is deferring to the Committee's expertise.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Kevin Bone represented the application.

Mr. Bone explained that the Modern office tower is aging and is in poor condition. He explained that there are two primary problems with the building. First, the concrete exterior of the building is actively spalling. Second, the original design for the concrete exterior is fundamentally flawed. The concrete is highly absorbent and large amounts of water are infiltrating the building. The reinforcing steel is very near the outer surface and is quickly disintegrating. The problems are more extreme on the north and west facades, which this application addresses. Mr. Bone

discussed the system that he is proposing to address the problems. It is a new coating technology that has the capacity to bridge cracks and hold the outer surface of the concrete including small spalls in place. He asserted that the exterior surface of the concrete is in very poor condition and will completely fail if not treated soon.

Mr. Baron asked if the coating is available in a range of colors. Mr. Bone replied that it can be manufactured in almost any color. It can be mixed like paint. He stated that he prefers a lighter to medium gray on the warm side. Mr. Evans asked how it is applied. Mr. Bone explained that a coat is applied like paint, the reinforcing mesh is bonded to the building with it, and then several additional coats are applied over the mesh like paint.

Ms. Pentz opined that the method is too experimental. She asserted that it is not appropriate for this important Modern building. She stated that she considers the patching acceptable, but not the coating. Mr. Bone responded that the building is in very poor condition and must be treated soon. He contended that the original design of the building was technically flawed; the reinforcing bar is too close to the surface and extreme spalling has occurred. He informed the Committee that the owner is reluctant to invest the money necessary to salvage the building. He claimed that the owner may refuse to undertake any remedial work if he senses that the approval process will be difficult. Mr. Bone explained that his firm, which is located in New York City, has been involved with many concrete preservation projects. He explained that he is also a professor of historic preservation. He contended that he is aware of the preservation issues and has a respect for the beauty of exposed concrete, but warned that this building requires a major and immediate intervention to save it and to protect the public. He reported that large pieces of concrete fall to the sidewalk regularly. Ms. Pentz and Mr. Evans both stated that they have had no experience with this coating product. They cannot predict its effects on this building. Mr. Bone observed that this building requires a long-term solution, not a simple patching. Mr. Evans asked him if he had conferred directly with the manufacturer of the coating product. Mr. Bone stated that he had met with the manufacturer at the building to discuss the application of the coating. Mr. Evans stated that, after reviewing the documentation and discussing the matter with Mr. Bone, he was convinced that a significant intervention was necessary to save the building.

Mr. Bone suggested that, perhaps, he could develop a different plan for the lowest 30 feet of the building, restricting the coating to the upper reaches of the building, out of plain sight. He also offered to install a test sample of the coating in an area that is not visible from the street. He reported that there are balcony areas that are easily accessible, but not visible to the public that might serve as test areas.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application, provided a test sample, reviewed by Architectural Committee members and staff to confirm that the coating, if used, will approximate the appearance of the concrete.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 5:20 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 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

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.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.

Building Site Guidelines: Recommended: Designing new onsite parking, loading docks, or ramps when required by the new use so that they are as unobtrusive as possible and assure the preservation of the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape.

Setting Guidelines: Not Recommended: Introducing new construction into historic districts that is visually incompatible or that destroys historic relationships within the setting.

Windows Guideline: Not Recommended: Changing the historic appearance of windows through the use of inappropriate designs, materials, finishes, or colors which noticeably change the sash, depth of reveal, and muntin configuration; the reflectivity and color of glazing; or the appearance of the frame.