

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

**28 NOVEMBER 2006
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
VINCENT RIVERA, CHAIR**

PRESENT

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

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

ALSO PRESENT

Elizabeth Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
Len Nardone, Lichtenstein Consulting Engineers
Laura Siena, West Mt. Airy Neighbors
Karen Anne Riley, Paradigm Realty
Tony Forte, Esq., Saul Ewing
Tom Barton, Barton Partners
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Joe Schiavo, Old City Civic Association
Janet Kalter, Old City Civic Association
Gil Rosenthal, Wallace Roberts & Todd
Era Kiseleu, Wallace Roberts & Todd
Steve Patron, Paradigm
Joe Graci, Franklin Engineering
Fred Maurer
Robert Powers, Powers Group
Ken Smuts, Brown Hill Developers
Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Richard DeMarco, Esq., Klehr Harrison
R. Volpe, Lily Properties
Edward Bell, EBA
Luigi Adamo
Scott Craven, Scott Craven Studio
Norman Gutman
Doug Grainge, Architect
Monike Klatte
Stephen Maffei, Landmark Design

Tom Witt, Esq., Wolf Block
David Robb
Allen Weinberg
Geoff Dennis
Stuart Goodman, Esq., Dilworth Paxson
Graham Laub, Esq., Dilworth Paxson
Lucinda Blank
Steven Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
Richard Thom, Architect
Leo Addimando, 806 Capital

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Rivera called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Messrs. D'Alessandro, McCoubrey and Thomas attended the meeting.

ALLEN LANE STATION

Owner: SEPTA

Applicant: Michael J. Cuddy

History: Built 1885, W. Bleddyn Powell & William H. Brown, architects, designated 8/6/1981

Project: Construct ADA ramp and raise platforms for ADA access, demolish and rebuild shelters and canopies with salvaged, new and replicated materials, restore bridge.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct ADA ramps and to demolish the existing low-level platforms and replace them with pre-cast high-level platforms for ADA access. The existing pedestrian bridge will remain in place and will be rehabilitated with salvaged materials or new, replicated materials. The existing stairs will be demolished and replaced with pre-cast concrete sections. The existing shelters and canopies will be reconstructed on the new elevated platforms with salvaged or new materials to match the existing. New roofing is proposed for the canopies, shelters, and a portion of the station building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. Len Nardone of Lichtenstein Consulting Engineers represented the application.

Mr. Thomas applauded the introduction of ADA access to the station. He asked the applicant to explain the proposed rehabilitation of the bridge. Mr. Nardone responded that the primary parts of the structure would be retained, but some interior structural members would be replaced. He assured Mr. Thomas that the appearance would not change. Mr. Thomas asked about the decking. Mr. Nardone explained that the wood decking and treads on the stairs would be replaced with concrete for safety and maintenance reasons. Mr. Nardone stated that a survey of all the existing wood trim had been conducted. The trim in good condition would be retained; the rest would be replaced in kind. Mr. Thomas asked about changes to the roof over the stairs running from the outbound platform to the station building. Mr. Nardone stated that the roof would be altered to accommodate the raising of the platform and the shelter on it. Mr. Thomas asked whether the windows and doors would be replaced in the inbound platform. Mr. Nardone replied that the windows would be replaced without glazing; the frames would be installed. Mr. Nardone stated that the doors would not be replaced. He explained that neither the doors nor

the glass are extant. Mr. Thomas opined that the doors and windows should be replaced, even if plexiglass is used instead of glass.

Ms. Voith arrived and joined the Committee.

The discussion turned to the safety alterations proposed for the bridge. Mr. Thomas recalled a bridge at the University of Pennsylvania over the SEPTA tracks, which utilized plexiglass barriers near the electrical wires for safety reasons. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he preferred the screening material that is now in place rather than plexiglass. Ms. Voith concurred. Ms. Voith suggested that the applicant replicate the original side walls on the bridge. She suggested that the proposed change reducing the height was inappropriate. Mr. Nardone explained that the side walls would be reduced in height to increase visibility and improve security. Mr. Thomas responded that the side walls should be reconstructed in an historically accurate manner. He noted that the wall was originally very tall to protect users from inclement weather. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the original height of the side walls could be indicated even if the new screening extends below the line of the original wall; he posited that supports for the screening could indicate the height of the original wall. Mr. Nardone noted again that SEPTA sought to increase safety, security, and visibility. Ms. Voith suggested that the applicant rethink the rehabilitation plan for the bridge.

Ms. Voith claimed that the application lacked detailed documentation on the existing conditions. Mr. Nardone stated that the project architect, Mariana Thomas, has undertaken the necessary surveying. Mr. Farnham stated that he had met with SEPTA and the engineering and architectural consultants on two occasions. He reported that the applicants have prepared very detailed documentation on the existing conditions, but they were not included in the application package. Ms. Voith also noted that the designs for the new gutters were not included. The project includes the replacement of pole gutters, which have caused maintenance problems, with hanging gutters.

Laura Sienna of West Mt. Airy Neighbors requested that SEPTA convene a community meeting before the construction begins.

Ms. Voith recommended that the applicant withdraw the application and submit a revised version with additional information in the future. Mr. Nardone stated that he sought the Committee's recommendation of approval for the notion of adding the ADA access with ramps and raised platforms. He suggested that the restoration details could be worked out with the staff. Mr. Farnham asked the Committee to clarify its objections to the proposal. He suggested that the Committee could recommend approval, with the Committee to review details, if its concerns were limited to the rehabilitation details. Committee members noted several irregularities and mistakes in the engineering drawings and suggested that a revised application should be submitted. For example, the revised roof over the stairs from the newly-raised outbound platform canopy to the station building was not depicted accurately. Rather than showing the alterations to the linking roof resulting from the raising of the platform, the drawing depicted the roof as unchanged. To achieve the new platform height, the drawing implied that the tracks themselves had been lowered four feet. Mr. Thomas asked rhetorically if the tracks would be lowered. Mr. Nardone stated that they would not and conceded that the drawing was inaccurate. Mr. Farnham explained that he had been shown accurate drawings prepared by the architect. Committee members asserted that those drawings should have been submitted.

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

109-131 N. 2ND STREET, 117-125 ARCH STREET

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

Applicant: Anthony Forte, Esq., Saul Ewing LLP

History: various nineteenth and twentieth-century buildings; tile façade c.1955-1965

Project: In concept - Construct 3-story townhouses and 6- and 10-story multi-unit residential buildings

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes refinements to the designs for the new buildings at the National Products site on N. 2nd Street between Arch Street and Elfreth's Alley. The former wholesale and retail complex is being converted to for residential use. The Commission approved in-concept proposals in March 2003, August 2004, and November 2006. At the most recent review, the Commission approved in concept the demolition of all buildings on the site except 128 Elfreth's Alley, including the orange tile façades along N. 2nd Street and Flagpole Park; the reconstruction of the tile façades with new tiles and salvaged doors, windows, signage, and other pieces including the granite channels; the construction of a 6-story commercial and residential building behind the reconstructed tile façade at 109-125 N. 2nd Street with the front façade of the new building in the same plane as the rebuilt tile façade below; the construction of a 10-story commercial and residential building on the Arch Street portion of the site; and the construction of ten 3-story townhouses around an open courtyard at the northeastern corner of the site.

The current in-concept application proposes refinements to the designs of the new buildings. The N. 2nd Street building has been simplified and the horizontal lines of the tile façade are now mirrored in the building above. The new building above the tile facades no longer competes with, but instead complements, the historic building.

The building on Arch Street has been improved as well. Most important, fenestration and articulation have been added to the east and west party walls, greatly improving the proposal. The brick appears to be an orange color; perhaps a red color, which would relate better to the surrounding buildings, would be more appropriate.

The designs for the townhouses appear to be unchanged. The townhouses will be minimally visible from the public right-of-way, therefore, they will impact the historic neighborhood little, if at all.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in concept, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Committee. Attorney Anthony Forte, architects Tom Barton and Gil Rosenthal, and developer Steve Patron represented the application.

Mr. Forte explained that he hoped the Committee would provide comments on the recently-revised designs for the new buildings, the 6- and 10-story mixed-used buildings and the 4-story townhouses. He reported that the architects will revise their designs based on the Committee's comments and then return for a final review.

Mr. Rosenthal introduced the Committee to the latest design for the 6-story building. He explained that the neighborhood groups had required the setbacks or steps at the north. He stated that the selection of an appropriate cladding material for the upper stories was critical and difficult. He noted that the Zoning Board of Adjustment had limited his palette to brick, cast stone, and glass with its approval. He explained that it was proving difficult to find an appropriate brick. The Committee suggested that a broader palette than that approved by the Board should be considered. Committee members stated that the designer should not be restricted in such an arbitrary manner. Mr. Rosenthal also noted that he may have to remove the proposed sunscreen because the zoning examiners had signaled that they may include the balconies, which they consider covered, within the FAR. The Committee again objected and stated that the sunscreen or some other terminating element was important to the architectural composition.

Mr. McCoubrey asked Mr. Rosenthal to comment on the window design. Mr. Rosenthal explained that the window locations and sizes of the windows had been determined by the locations of the units and the structural columns. He added that Mr. Barton, the other architect, is still defining the interior layout. Mr. McCoubrey asserted that the windows should be larger. Mr. Rosenthal responded that they are very large, 3'-4" by 7'-0". Mr. McCoubrey commented that they should be more like the loft windows in the neighborhood.

Mr. McCoubrey suggested that terra cotta, rather than brick, might be an appropriate material for the cladding on the upper floors. Mr. Rosenthal agreed and noted that he could carry terra cotta on pre-cast panels. Ms. Voith commented that the cladding on the upper floors should have a similar sheen to the historic terra cotta, which is very shiny. Mr. Rosenthal agreed.

Mr. McCoubrey commended the architect on the setback above the historic tile facades. He asserted that "floating" the upper floors was "absolutely right." Mr. Thomas wholeheartedly agreed. Mr. McCoubrey suggested exploring the use of more masonry on the north, stepped façade. He asserted that this façade was the least resolved of the building. Mr. Rosenthal agreed and offered to explore revisions to the design.

Ms. Voith asked if the park landscaping was part of the current application. Mr. Patron, the developer, stated that the park landscaping is not part of the application. He explained that the park would be donated to the Elfreth's Alley Association and the Old City District. He would provide pro-bono design services to the Association, but the Association would present a landscaping application to the Commission.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance offered his strong support for the project. He stated that red brick would not be appropriate for the cladding. He offered to support a request to the Zoning Board to broaden the palette of materials for the new building. He also offered to support the retention of the sunscreen. He observed that the windows are "great." He too expressed reservations about the north wall. He acknowledged that he was not involved in the negotiations between the developer and the Elfreth's Alley Association, but asserted that the agreement stipulated a sight-line along the north façade, not a stair-step as some had contended. Mr. Barton reported that he had conducted the negotiations for the developer; he noted that Mr. Gallery was incorrect and testified that the agreement specified a stair-step. Mr. Gallery opined that, regardless of the agreement, a sight-line was better than a stair-step. He concluded with a statement of strong support for the project.

Joseph Schiavo of the Old City Civic Association stated that his group supported the project. However, he rejected pre-cast panels as a cladding and suggested brick or terra cotta instead.

Mr. Forte turned the discussion to the building proposed for Arch Street. He noted that the Department of Licenses & Inspections is sending mixed signals on the acceptability of windows on party walls. He stated that his team would pursue approvals for windows in the party walls of the Arch Street building, but, ultimately, the Department would make the decision.

Mr. Rosenthal introduced the design. He observed that he is still adjusting the sizes of the balconies and terrace based on FAR calculations.

Mr. McCoubrey applauded the design of the front façade, especially the way in which the brick irregularly fades into the glass. He noted, however, that the side facades contradict the elegant design for the front façade. He asked Mr. Rosenthal to explain why the side facades are brick to the roofline even though the front façade dissolves elegantly from brick to glass. Mr. Rosenthal stated that he is still revising the party wall elevations.

Ms. Voith asked about the principle guiding the design of the balconies. Mr. Rosenthal explained that they are used to break the mass of the façade and define a thin tower-like section at the west of the front façade. He also noted that they correspond to the fire escapes in the area. Ms. Voith objected to the balconies and asserted that compatibility with the historic streetscape was more important than the establishment of the tower element. Mr. Rivera asked if the developer had received a zoning approval for the balconies. Mr. Rosenthal explained that they had received an approval for the balconies, but not for this exact configuration. Ms. Voith stated that the balconies would be appropriate for Vancouver, but not Old City. Mr. Gallery agreed, stating that they are out of character for Old City. He conceded that they do give the façade "interest." He noted that the metal is the appropriate material for balconies in Old City. He contended that the smaller balconies were "too fussy."

Mr. Gallery asked the Committee to make a strong statement about the importance of fenestration in party walls. He stated that the Board of Building Standards should grant variances for windows in party walls. Ms. Voith agreed. Mr. Gallery also noted the conflicting zoning and building requirements for party wall windows.

Ms. Voith stressed that the materials for the Arch and 2nd Street buildings should be compatible. Mr. Rosenthal agreed, but noted that their front facades have no relationships with one another. He explained that they are adjacent at the rears. Mr. Schiavo stated that his organization wants variety across the buildings.

Mr. Barton introduced the revised townhouse designs. Mr. McCoubrey compared the latest design to the earlier one and agreed that it had been improved. Ms. Voith commented on the differences between the townhouses and the two larger buildings. Mr. Barton responded that Old City is eclectic; the complex would complement that eclecticism. Mr. Barton also offered to reconsider the relationships between the many buildings and provide full materials samples to the Committee during the final review. Ms. Voith suggested that the architects design buildings that are "unified," but not "uniform." Mr. Thomas complimented the applicants on their successful revisions.

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

48 AND 50 S. FRONT STREET, 103, 107, AND 111 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: Centra Associates

Applicant: Richard DeMarco, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzberg & Ellers

History: 48 & 50 S. Front, 103 and 107 Chestnut Street built separately c.1835

All individually designated and contributing to Old City Historic District

111 Chestnut Street, built 1951, non-contributing to district

Project: Complete demolition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the complete demolition of the buildings at 48 and 50 S. Front Street and 103 and 107 Chestnut Street owing to financial hardship. It also proposes the complete demolition of the building at 111 Chestnut Street, but does not provide a rationale. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a violation for an Unsafe Condition at the building at 48 S. Front; the violation specifies a problem in the northeast corner of the building. The applicant has submitted several reports on the condition of three of the structures, 103 Chestnut and 48 and 50 S. Front Street. Engineer Joseph Graci of Franklin Engineering authored two of the reports; engineer Albert Tantala authored one; and historic preservationist Robert Powers authored one. The reports assert that the buildings are in poor but repairable condition. Mr. Graci's reports assert that it would be expensive and potentially dangerous to repair the buildings; he recommends the demolitions of the buildings. The Commission hired an independent engineering firm, Keast & Hood, to assess conditions and comment on repair. The Keast & Hood report suggests that not only are the properties repairable but also that most of the repairs were recently completed.

In addition, the applicant has submitted financial information for several of the properties. In the Property Statement for November 2004 through July 2006, the costs have exceeded revenues in a number of months; however, this would be true of any vacant properties awaiting redevelopment. The properties may make money if wisely developed. The applicants have not attempted to rent or sell the properties. Moreover, many of the cited costs appear to be professional fees associated with abandoned redevelopment proposal unrelated to the demolition proposal.

The applicants have presented a rehabilitation cost study by Jeffrey Brown Associates. However, it appears that this estimate is based on abandoned development project and includes numerous expenses unrelated to the repair or rehabilitation of these buildings. For example, the cost study shows a cost of \$584,311 for underpinning. This number, which makes up more than a quarter of the total, is related to the construction of new building on the adjacent parking, not the rehabilitation of an of the buildings in question. The study estimates \$207,742 for gut demolition and shoring, much of which seems to have already been done by the previous owner. The cost study is both inconsistent and incomplete.

Financial projections for the buildings if rehabilitated are also inconsistent and incomplete. They show no income from the residential section of the buildings even though the assumptions section of the rental analysis lists gross residential square footage as 13,892 and a monthly apartment rent of \$1.33 per square foot. This rental income would add considerably to the cash flow. The study also shows no benefit from the historic tax credits, which would be available to these properties and which have been used successfully in the renovation of many properties in Old City.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

48 S. Front Street, 50 S. Front Street, 103 Chestnut Street: Denial, pursuant to 14-2007 (7)(j) and Standards 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10. These buildings are vacant, but they were vacant at the time the current owner purchased them. According to the independent engineering report, the buildings are repairable. No cogent evidence has been presented to prove that they are not potentially economically viable, particularly as part of a larger development. No attempt has been made to sell the properties.

107 Chestnut Street: Denial, pursuant to 14-2007 (7)(j) and Standards 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10. The building is occupied and in good condition. No information is provided suggesting that it is either in poor condition or operating at a loss. No attempt has been made to sell the property.

111 Chestnut Street: Denial, pursuant to 14-2007(7)(k)(.4). The building is occupied. No information has been presented to suggest that it is either in poor condition or operating at a loss. Although the building is non-contributing to the district, its demolition for an open lot would negatively impact the district. No attempt has been made to sell the property.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Attorneys Carl Primavera and Richard DeMarco, developers Robert and Harvey Spear, engineer Joseph Graci, historic preservation consultant Robert Powers, real estate agent Alan Dinenberg of Legend Properties, and Ken Smuts of Brown Hill Developers represented the application.

Mr. DeMarco informed the Committee that Tantala Associates had issued a revised engineering report that contradicted the Keast & Hood report. He also noted that the Unsafe violation for 48 S. Front Street contradicted the Keast & Hood report. Mr. DeMarco stated that he does not dispute that the properties can be repaired; however, he does dispute the claim that they can be repaired economically. Mr. Primavera interrupted Mr. DeMarco and took over the opening statement. He stated that he would step back and look at the bigger picture. Mr. Primavera noted that the buildings had housed Crab Corners. He also remembered fondly Winston's, which occupied the buildings in the 1970s. He stated that these properties are vacant, vandalized, and blighted. The former owner, who attempted to develop them, purchased them for \$1.6 million. The recent structural work was undertaken during his ownership. He had been unable to devise a profitable development plan for the site. The current owners had engaged Cecil Baker and had endeavored to formulate a profitable development plan. They sought to spread the "penalties" of the historic buildings across the entire development. The 200-unit project would have covered the cost of the rehabilitation of the historic buildings. However, the current owner abandoned the project when the real estate market collapsed earlier this year. The engineers "think the buildings are a significant concern." He stated that the owner is now attempting to limit his liability. He noted the recent case of Michael Asbell, the pier owner. The current owner has attempted to rehabilitate the buildings as a stand-alone project, but has been unable to develop a profitable plan. He asserted that the rehabilitation would cost \$2 million and the rehabilitated buildings would not attract a "credit-rated" tenant. Mr. Primavera stated that these buildings could house "Indian restaurants and apartments," but those uses would not generate the necessary income to support the project. He stated that the best-case income would be \$65,000. He concluded, saying that "if at the end of the day you can put a man on the

moon, they can certainly fix these buildings, but we can't do it in a way that would justify the investment."

Ms. Voith stated that the financial information submitted to the Commission includes the development costs for the abandoned mid-rise project. She asserted that the applicants should not charge the costs of that much larger project to these small historic buildings; it is a pure loss. Mr. Primavera agreed with Ms. Voith that the costs for the abandoned development should not be charged to these buildings. Mr. Primavera stated that he would take them off this spreadsheet. He introduced Mr. Smuts, who summarized his cost estimate. Mr. Smuts conceded that the cost estimate numbers were for the other, larger development project and not valid in this case. He offered to provide new cost estimates. Responding to Mr. Baron's earlier statement that the cost estimates for rehabilitating these properties also include costs unrelated to the historic buildings, for example more than \$0.5 million for underpinning related to new construction on the adjacent surface parking lot, he noted that although this is true the rehabilitation of the historic buildings would be costly. For example, floor levels would need to be changed. He offered to provide a new spreadsheet that detailed the development costs of these buildings by Friday, 1 December 2006.

Mr. Graci explained the structural deficiencies of the buildings. He also claimed that he would need to build a building inside the historic building to salvage the historic facades. He stated that the north wall is deteriorating. He stated that the front and side walls at 48 and 50 S. Front Street are not connected to one another. He also stated that the walls are "S-curving." Mr. Primavera pointed out that 48 and 50 S. Front and 103 Chestnut are interconnected and should be viewed as one building. Mr. Thomas asked for clarifications on the addresses. The applicants displayed aerial photographs and pointed out the different buildings.

Mr. Dinenberg, the realtor, reported on chain tenants who may seek this type of space. He stated that he endeavored to project the incomes the buildings might produce. He stated that the properties could not be profitable if rehabilitated for use as a "Mom and Pop" restaurant like the others in the area. He stated that the first floor could produce \$20 per square foot, the second \$16. Ms. Voith asked if he was familiar with the Old City area. He stated that he was familiar with the area and added that "whether it be in Philly or in the suburbs a vanilla box costs what it costs, but when you have other impending problems, it's just easier to demolish it and build from scratch." Ms. Voith asked if he was "kidding." He stated that he was not. Mr. Primavera injected that Mr. Dinenberg is "the commercial reality." Mr. Primavera asked Mr. Dinenberg to summarize his financial analysis. Mr. Thomas suggested instead that the application team address the issues within the purview of the Committee.

Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee must evaluate the proposal using the Standards. It must determine the impact of the demolition and new construction on the district. Mr. Primavera stated that his client was not proposing any new construction. Mr. Thomas reminded his fellow Committee members of the series of conditions placed on the approval of the demolition of the fire station for the convention center expansion. He asserted that the Committee must look very seriously at this proposal and weigh its impact. Mr. Thomas acknowledged that some buildings cannot be repaired in a feasible manner. He suggested that the Committee leave the economic issues to the Committee on Financial Hardship and consider the architectural and preservation issues. He reminded the Committee of the Keast & Hood report, which asserts that the buildings are not beyond repair.

Joseph Schiavo of the Old City Civic Association noted his letter for the record and contended that the buildings are in "typical poor condition for Old City." He stated that he owns a couple of buildings like them. He remarked that the Keast & Hood report concludes that the buildings can be restored. He contended that the buildings "do not fit the program of the current owner." He concluded that the buildings are "entirely restorable" in a financially feasible manner. He opposed their demolition.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance claimed that there is no hardship, but he would reserve his detailed comments on the economics for the appropriate committee. He highlighted the fact that both Mr. Smuts and Mr. Dinenberg conceded that they had not submitted the appropriate analyses of the costs and benefits of rehabilitation of the buildings. He concluded that the Preservation Alliance opposes the demolition.

Owner Harry Spear stated that they purchased the buildings in their current state; they did not cause the deterioration. He remarked that, "in light of what happened on the pier, we are very concerned about the dangerous condition here and we have two engineer's reports stating that these buildings are, the four of them, could fall at any time." He said that the crowds in the area on weekend nights are at risk. Mr. McCoubrey interjected that these buildings should be stabilized immediately if they are a great safety hazard to the public. Mr. Thomas asked about the scheduling of the Committee on Financial Hardship meeting. Mr. Baron replied that it would occur within the week and the recommendation would be forwarded to the Commission at its 8 December 2006 meeting.

Ms. Voith stated that she could not assess the request without actual estimates for the necessary repairs to the buildings. She asserted that old numbers from an abandoned development project are not enough to render an informed decision. Mr. Rivera agreed and stated that significant information is missing. Mr. Thomas agreed and stated that he would recommend denial. He added that this case is very different from the Asbell pier case. Mr. Baron reminded the applicants that the staff has the authority to approve permit applications for repairs to these buildings and would do so without hesitation. Mr. Primavera stated that "if it collapses before we go to the full Commission, people may say, well, you did it intentionally." Ms. Voith noted that the Keast & Hood report offers no support for the claim that these buildings are in imminent danger of collapse. The report states that they can be repaired in a manner that is not financially onerous.

Mr. Primavera contended that "recently that in a couple of situations, the City of Philadelphia has trumped Keast & Hood and said that we are not going to allow Keast & Hood to soft-sell the public interest and basically L&I has trumped them and said, if you are talking about the Academy of Music or the Betsy Ross House, an unlimited budget, and the whole magnitude, I mean, we are having work, we can raise taxes, and we can save these buildings, to put the public at risk on a marginal building when two engineers in the city have said there is a problem. We are not dismissing them. I am afraid that they are dismissful of us. But, we will get there; we will bridge the gap. We are not ignoring what they have to say, but they will be our first witness if there is a criminal trial to say Keast & Hood, the gold standard, told us not to worry." Mr. McCoubrey rejected Mr. Primavera argument and stated that it is the owner's responsibility to protect the public. He added that he would cordon the area off and install protective scaffolding if he owned the buildings. Mr. Primavera responded that his client installed a fence and signs. Mr. McCoubrey insisted that Mr. Primavera stop attempting to transfer responsibility for these buildings to the Committee. He again declared that the owners, not the Committee, are responsible for the public's safety. He suggested that the owners make the necessary repairs

immediately. Mr. Primavera stated that they would like to demolish, rather than repair, the buildings.

Mr. Graci stated that he has significant experience with historic buildings. He reported that, in his 35 years as an engineer, this is the first time he has ever recommended “massive” work or demolition.

Ms. Voith stated that the owners are responsible for the buildings. She noted that it is a very important corner and asserted that the owners should stabilize the buildings immediately. She wondered about the fate of the building at 105 Chestnut Street.

Mr. Gallery asked for time to review any new hardship information. He noted that the application has “deficiencies.” Mr. Smuts stated that he would provide an estimate for a stand-alone project with commercial on the first floor and residential above. Ms. Voith suggested that they factor in preservation incentives such as tax credits. Mr. Gallery stated that the buildings should be stabilized for later use. Mr. Rivera advised the owners to stabilize the buildings immediately.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the demolition of the buildings at 48 and 50 S. Front Street and 103 and 107 Chestnut Street, pursuant to 14-2007 (7)(j) and Standards 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10; and denial of the demolition of 111 Chestnut Street, pursuant to 14-2007(7)(k)(.4). The Committee suggested that the applicant stabilize the buildings immediately.

417 S. 20TH STREET

Owner: Richard Sparks

Applicant: David S. Traub, architect

History: built c. 1840, mansard c. 1860, contributing to Rittenhouse Fitler District

Project: Add storefront cornice; stucco or rebuild storefront; add roof deck, metal railing, and balcony to rear

OVERVIEW: This application calls for modifications to the former storefront section of this corner building. The storefront which had once been glazed, was infilled with mismatched brick in the twentieth-century. The applicant has proposed two alternatives. The preferred alternative would entail removing the mismatched infill brick and replacing it with a better-matching brick. The second alternative would entail applying stucco to the mismatched infill brick. The applicant also proposes a storefront cornice to match the one at the roofline. He would also add a rear deck and new railing at the rear ell.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the proposal with the stucco alternative, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Architect David Traub and owner Richard Sparks represented the application.

Mr. Traub provided an overview for the project. He displayed a photograph of the row and explained that only one building, the adjacent building to the south, retained its original storefront. He remarked that improving the former storefront area at his site was a challenge. The original storefront had been removed and infilled with mismatched brick and poorly proportioned windows. Mr. Traub stated that his client did not want to reconstruct the storefront

because the building is now entirely residential, but he did want to improve its appearance. Mr. Traub proposed to add better proportioned windows and a storefront cornice. He had originally proposed rebuilding the storefront-area façade in matching brick, but now understands that the staff opposes that approach because it would constitute false historicism. He is willing to stucco the storefront area to improve its appearance while indicating that it is non-historic. Mr. Thomas agreed with the staff's recommendation and stated that the applicant should either faithfully restore the storefront or rehabilitate it in a way that is compatible, but not falsely historic.

Mr. Sparks, the owner, stated that his realtor had not informed him that the building was historic when he considered purchasing it. He is concerned that the designation will add to his rehabilitation costs. He noted that applying the recommended stucco instead of rebuilding in brick would, in fact, save him a substantial sum of money. Mr. Thomas informed the applicant that the color of the stucco will be important.

Ms. Voith questioned the size and proportion of the proposed cornice. She noted that it is not identical to the neighboring storefront cornice and asked the applicant how it would join with its neighbor. Mr. Traub replied that it would butt up against the neighboring cornice. He conceded that he had not resolved all of the details; he was awaiting an approval before investing the time in the design. Ms. Voith suggested that the applicant had not studied this point adequately but should copy the details of the adjacent cornice. Mr. Traub then stated that he would resolve the details with the staff. Mr. Rivera questioned the replication of the pilaster, which is a detail from the neighboring building. Mr. Traub explained that the pilaster would be used to cover a messy junction between the stucco and old brick. Mr. Baron suggested that the staff could review the details and assist the applicant in resolving the open issues.

Mr. Traub requested comments on his proposal for the rear of the building. The Committee members agreed that the proposal was appropriate.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, provided stucco, not brick, is used at the storefront and the new storefront cornice matches the historic storefront cornice on the adjacent building, with the staff to review details.

328-330 S. 21ST STREET, A.K.A. 2100 DELANCEY PLACE

Owner: Lily Properties, Robert Volpe

Applicant: Edward Bell, architect

History: built 1905, Okie Duhring & Ziegler architects; Contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler District

Project: Architectural Committee review of details, construct penthouse

OVERVIEW: A proposal to demolish and add a penthouse on the roof of this corner mansion was approved by the Historical Commission at its April 2006 with details to be reviewed by the Architecture Committee at a regularly scheduled public meeting. Following the Historical Commission's approval, the Zoning Board denied the large penthouse, but approved a much smaller penthouse with larger setbacks. The applicant now seeks the approval of the Architecture Committee for the details of his project already approved by the Commission. The details include the significant reduction in the size and the larger setbacks.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Architect Edward Bell and developer Robert Volpe represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the Commission had already approved this application, but, as part of its approval, had required that the Architectural Committee review the details of the project. This application requests a review of those details. If the Committee approves the proposed details, the application will not be forwarded to the Commission.

Mr. Bell explained that he had significantly reduced the size of the penthouse to comply with his zoning approval. He also noted that the shape of the roof had been altered and that a window had been added to the south wall.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE ACTION: The Architectural Committee voted to approve the proposal.

114 S. 20TH STREET

Owner/Applicant: Luigi Adamo

History: built c. 1860, storefront c. 1905, Contributing to Rittenhouse Fittler District

Project: Legalize café window, shutters, and brick sidewalk; add signage and railing

OVERVIEW: This application proposes legalizing work completed without a permit. After speaking with staff regarding other work, the applicant installed wood shutters on a building that did not originally have shutters. Not only are the shutters too small for the window openings, but they are square head even though the windows are arched. The original, ornate window hoods do not allow for the installation of appropriate shutters. The applicant replaced a concrete sidewalk with brick. The sidewalk may have originally been bluestone. The applicant removed the single-pane glass storefront window and installed a four-part café window below the existing tripartite transom. The applicant installed inappropriate basement windows. All of this work was done without approvals from the Commission or the Department of Licenses & Inspections. The applicant also seeks approval for the addition of a railing at the storefront and two metal signs, one projecting and one above the doorway.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the sign over the doorway, provided it is attached to the wood frame, not masonry; denial of the remainder of the proposal, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 4, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Owner Luigi Adamo represented the application.

Mr. Baron asserted that the dense, grid railing would negatively impact the character of the storefront.

Mr. Adamo explained that the café windows would be operable. Ms. Voith suggested that the Committee recommend approval of the café windows, provided the inappropriate shutters are removed. She suggested that the Committee recommend legalizing the brick sidewalk because the concrete sidewalk was non-historic. She suggested that the applicant propose a more appropriate railing. Mr. Adamo stated that the rendering did not provide an accurate depiction of the railing. Mr. Thomas concurred with Ms. Voith.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the shutters, proposed railing, and projecting sign; legalization of the storefront and basement windows and brick sidewalk, provided the illegal shutters are removed; and approval of the doorway sign, a 42"-tall railing at the storefront window, and the menu box, with the staff to review details.

316 S. 21ST STREET (A.K.A. 2100 CYPRESS STREET)

Owner: William Hozack

Applicant: Alvin Holm AIA

History: Built c. 1860, main block refaced in 1949

Project: Construct two-story rear addition, alter side façade, enlarge garage.

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

The applicant now returns with the revised application informally presented at the Committee meeting. The current proposal retains the north wall of the rear ell with the addition of a new register of French doors and balconies, a non-historic bay would be removed and replaced with a multi-lite double hung window and decorative balcony. An Ionic colonnade would accentuate the ground floor. A service door would be relocated further west on that plane. The applicant also proposes a two-story addition at the rear of the ell. This addition would be constructed of wood with multi-lite wood windows and balcony. A wood decorative parapet would be place atop the ell and rear addition connecting the two. The existing garage facing Cypress Street would be enlarged and refaced with brick and wood doors and roof deck. Lastly, a new dormer is proposed for the mansard over the main block. This dormer would not align with the historic dormers and would be located along the western end of the mansard.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect Alvin Holm represented the application.

Ms. Voith commented that the current proposal was far superior to the four previously submitted.

Mr. Thomas asked if the rear ell was original. Mr. Danta responded that it is. In fact, it is the only original portion of the building; the main block was refaced in the 1940s.

Peter Shaw introduced himself as a neighbor who owns an adjacent property. He opposed the proposal. He described it as "messy" and stated that the French doors and balconies were out

of character for the building. He asserted that it “lacked composition” and “was too jumbled.” Mr. Shaw stated that this design was not appropriate for the house or the neighborhood. Mr. Thomas acknowledged Mr. Shaw’s concerns and noted that the alterations to the front of the house were undertaken more than sixty years ago. Mr. Thomas explained that, owing to the altered state of the building, he can accept the proposal. Mr. Rivera concurred with Mr. Thomas and also stated he considers design to be appropriate in this specific instance. Mr. Holm offered to meet with Mr. Shaw and resolve their differences. Mr. Thomas explained to Mr. Shaw that the Committee is obliged to review proposals based on the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. He remarked that the Committee shall be guided by the Standards. Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Mr. Shaw that the design should be simplified. Mr. Shaw described the design as “busy” and opined that it would not be approved if he had submitted it. Mr. Shaw asserted that he would be held to a higher standard. Mr. Rivera disagreed with Mr. Shaw and contended that the design was not “too busy.” However, he did suggest that the balconies and columns could be simplified. Ms. Voith stated her preference for a wood railing at the garage aligning with the colonnade.

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

241-245 MARKET STREET

Owner: 241-45 LLC

Applicant: Stephen Maffei

History: 241 built c. 1840, demolished in 1987

243 built c. 1840, demolished in 1988

245 built c. 1925, demolished in 1987

Project: Façade alterations to previously approved six-story building.

OVERVIEW: The applicant submitted an application to the Historical Commission in May 2004. At that time, the applicant proposed to construct a six-story building. The Historical Commission voted to approve the proposal with the staff to review details and the Architectural Committee to review details of the Church Street garden wall and trellis.

The applicant now returns with a revised proposal owing to comments received from the Old City Civic Association. The new proposal retains a six-story building on the same location as the previous. However, the sixth floor has been recessed on both elevations and a terrace is proposed. The building still retains a commercial ground floor with residential units above. The treatment of the facades has changed to a more Post-Modern language accentuated by strong fenestrated registers with recessed and projecting balconies. Brick pilasters and stone beltcourses frame these registers, eliminating the vertical thrust of the facades as previously proposed. This treatment is repeated on the Church Street elevation once again. The street plane along Church Street has been simplified with the elimination of the trellis, presenting a simple masonry garden wall and parking gate.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, provided that the Church Street garden wall and gate are redesigned to be more in keeping with the street wall along the south side of Church Street, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. At first, no one represented the application. About 10 minutes into the review, architect Stephen Maffei arrived to represent the application.

Mr. Rivera commented that the current proposal is very different from the proposal that was approved by the Commission. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he did not understand the logic with which the front façade was composed. He questioned the proportioning and scale.

After his arrival, Mr. Maffei explained that the building would be six stories in height. The first floor would be devoted to commercial use; the upper floors to residential. The building would house nine residential units. Floors four and five would have terraces. At the sixth floor, the penthouse would be set back. Mr. Maffei explained that he had changed the design because the neighborhood opposed the original, approved design.

Mr. McCoubrey objected to the system of windows and opined that the wide white bands are poorly proportioned. Mr. Rivera objected to the building, which he described as “massive,” “pretentious,” and “heroic.” Several Committee members asserted that the building was not compatible with the streetscape and historic district. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the applicant simplify the design and remove the unnecessary banding and shaped parapet. Mr. Maffei explained that he had executed the design because the neighbors wanted and demanded it. He concluded that, essentially, the neighbors had designed the building.

Mr. Gallery asked if the Commission’s jurisdiction should be limited to 45 days of comment over this undeveloped lot. Mr. Farnham replied that the property is designated individually. Individually designated properties are never subject to review-and-comment jurisdiction. He noted that the applicant could request that the Commission rescind the individual designation; he opined that this case appeared to meet the requirements for rescission of the individual designation; the historic building has been lost. He stated that the applicant had been or should have been advised of his right to request the rescission. He concluded that, with the individual designation standing, the Commission’s jurisdiction is, unquestionably, plenary.

Mr. Gallery stated that this proposal should be denied because the design is inconsistent with the historic streetscape.

Mr. Rivera stated that he preferred the first design. Mr. McCoubrey agreed and added that he liked the regularity of the first design. Ms. Pentz agreed as well. Mr. Maffei stated that he could address the Committee’s concerns with the neighborhood. He added that it took one year for the neighborhood to grant its approval. Mr. Gallery suggested that an intermediate design, between the approved and current designs, might be the most appropriate. He added that the details need refining.

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

2001 LOCUST STREET (AKA 238 S. 20TH STREET)

Owner/ Applicant: Phyllis G. Gutman

History: Built c. 1860, shop front added c. 1960.

Project: legalize windows

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the inappropriate windows installed by Lowe’s Home Centers, Inc. The building had six-over-six windows at the time of designation. The owner installed eight-over-one and nine-over-one vinyl windows with simulated muntins throughout.

Some of the windows present at the time of designation remain. The owner submitted a cover letter in which he states that the building was constructed by his wife's parents in the 1950s. However, fire-insurance atlases and stylistic characteristics demonstrate that this building was constructed in the mid- nineteenth century. In addition, the owner claims that he has not been informed of the buildings designation or its inclusion on a historic district. The file for this property contains the notice letters addressed to the applicant for the proposed district in December 1994 and the designation of the district in August 1995.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Owner Norman Gutman represented the application.

Mr. Rivera explained to Mr. Gutman that the replacement windows are inappropriate. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the recently installed windows do not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Ms. Pentz concurred. Mr. Gutman stated that he should have sought and received the necessary approvals before replacing the windows. He noted that he endeavored to alter the appearance of the building as little as possible. He purchased the best windows he could afford. He explained that the windows were severely deteriorated. Ms. Pentz stated that the windows are very prominent because this is a corner property. Mr. Farnham displayed an addressed and dated photograph of the building he had taken in 2003 after speaking on the telephone several times to a person associated with the property. He reported that he had explained the application and review process as well as the Commission's jurisdiction to the caller.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

2202 BRANDYWINE STREET

Owner: Kevin and Monika Klatte

Applicant: Douglas Grainge

History: Built c. 1859, altered in 1924, contributing within the Spring Garden Historic District.

Project: Construct third-story addition with rear and side alterations.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a third-story addition on this house. The property, originally built c. 1859, matched the rest of the row and had three stories. According to the cover letter submitted by the applicant, the property suffered a fire and was rebuilt in the 1920s as a two-story residence with a textured-brick façade. The new addition would necessitate demolition of the parapet wall. The new third-story would be clad in textured brick to match the 1920s facade and capped with a cornice reminiscent of the nineteenth century original. Star bolts and a Thorolastic coating in brick red color are proposed along the party wall. The third-floor addition would occupy the front half of the rear ell; a roof deck would occupy the back half of the ell. The portion of the addition over the rear ell would be finished in smooth stucco.

The application also proposes to address an outstanding violation for vinyl siding on a second-story masonry section of the rear ell. An application to legalize this vinyl siding was submitted in August 2004. The Historical Commission denied the legalization at that time. The applicant now proposes to replace the vinyl siding with smooth stucco. In addition, the applicant proposes to

replace the entrance door with a six-panel door with glazing in the upper two panels and replace the triple-window sash with on-over-one sash.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the proposed cornice and Thorolastic coating; approval of the remainder of the application, provided the cornice is either contemporary in style or compatible with the 1920s façade, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Owner Monika Klatte and architect Douglas Grainge represented the application.

Mr. Grange asked why the staff recommended denial of the Thorolastic coating. Mr. Danta replied that the staff felt that it would be detrimental to the brick. He remarked that the staff believes that the unorthodox roof with parapet, not the brick side wall, is the source of the water infiltration. Mr. Grange stated that he believes that the water infiltrates the wall every time it rains. Ms. Pentz rejected that theory. Mr. Grange noted that they had considered applying stucco to the wall, but the contractor indicated that the Thorolastic coating would be a better solution because it fills voids. Ms. Pentz asked to review the Thorolastic product information, but the applicant could not provide it.

Mr. Rivera asked why the staff had recommended denial of the cornice. Mr. Danta replied that the Italianate cornice would not be appropriate for what is, essentially, a 1920s building. All traces of the Italianate style were lost with the reconstruction in the 1920s. Installing the Italianate cornice would create a false sense of historical development.

Attorney Thomas Witt introduced himself and stated that he represents David Robb, the adjacent neighbor at 2204 Brandywine. He reported that the proposed third-floor addition would obstruct the view of the skyline from his client's house. He recommended a reduction in the size of the addition to preserve his client's view and maintain consistency in the neighborhood. Mr. Robb added that his third-floor extends 27 feet back from the front of his house. The proposed addition would extend another 15 feet beyond his addition, blocking his view of the city. Ms. Klatte stated that the new tower proposed for 22nd Street south of Spring Garden will soon block the views of the city for the entire neighborhood.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that he would like the third-floor addition limited to the main block, in keeping with the pattern of the neighborhood. Ms. Pentz agreed.

Mr. Grange asked the Committee what they recommended for the windows and doors of the front façade. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the shutters should be real and operable. Mr. Rivera concurred.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposed cornice and Thorolastic coating; approval of a cornice that is either contemporary in style or compatible with the 1920s façade, stucco on the entire side wall; and the third-floor addition, provided it is confined to the main block, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

303 SPRUCE STREET

History: Built c. 1965; contributing in Society Hill Historic District

Owner: David and Sarah Rosenberg

Applicant: Scott Craven

Project: Construct roof deck on garage, alter rear addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to add a roof deck over a one-story garage at the rear of the property. The deck would measure approximately 13 by 15 feet and cover majority of the roof of the garage. A new wood garage door and trim are proposed. This application also proposes to alter the rear shed addition to the building by replacing the windows with two new wood operable low awning windows, centering the full glazed door, and placing copper sheet in the former location of the door. On the roof of the rear shed addition, the removal of one skylight and new simulated slate shingles are proposed. The original roof was standing-seam metal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the simulated slate shingles, pursuant to Standard 6; approval of a new standing- or flat-seam metal roof, the roof deck, and other proposed alterations, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect Scott Craven represented the application.

Mr. Craven described the existing garage, which he considers an outdoor space. He is proposing to add deck over this existing outdoor space. In an effort to create privacy, he is proposing planters on the north and south sides. He noted the relocation of the doors for access to the deck and garage.

Ms. Pentz asked for clarification about the existing garage and outdoor space. Mr. Craven responded the extant garage is open to the sky; it does not have a roof. He would like to add a roof and roof deck above. Ms. Pentz asked when the garage was constructed. Geoff Dennis, a neighbor, stated that the garage was extant when he moved into his residence in 1998. Another neighbor, Allen Weinberg, who has resided in the area since the 1970s, stated that it had been an open lot. Lucinda Blank, another neighbor from the 300 block of Spruce Street, stated that the garage was erected in the 1980s.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the zoning. Mr. Craven stated that his preliminary information indicated that it would receive zoning approval.

Mr. Weixler of the Society Hill Civic Association noted that issues outside of the Committee's purview that may impact the project's realization. He asked the Committee to consider Standards 2 and 9 as they relate to spatial relationships. He noted that this house is on a corner and reminded the Committee of the historic precedent of rear open spaces visible behind row houses. He also noted a tall structure like this one would impact the experience of neighboring gardens at grade. In addition, the adjacent house has several windows that would open directly onto this space. Mr. Weixler stated that colonial era out buildings were detached from the main building and were frequently short and utilitarian. They had some proportional relationship to the main house, but this deck structure would not. It was noted that this house was erected in 1965. He also opined that the deck would negatively impact 3rd Street. The Society Hill Civic Association opposes this application.

Mr. McCoubrey cited previous approvals for decks over garages at the rears of buildings. He stated that this particular design appears to be taller than necessary and should be reduced in height. The deck enclosure should look like a garden fence. Mr. Craven responded that the mechanism for the garage door precludes a height reduction.

Mr. Rivera commented that the proposed deck is incompatible. He suggested retaining the open space. Ms. Pentz agreed with Mr. Rivera and opposed the deck. She also rejected the artificial slate proposed for the rear addition on the house. She stated that it would not have had a slate roof originally and suggested a metal roof instead.

Graham Laub, the attorney for Mr. Dennis, a neighbor, stated that his client's primary concern was the loss of light and air in his backyard. He contended that this design was not in character with the neighborhood and would diminish the value of the surrounding properties. Mr. Dennis presented a petition from the neighbors opposing this proposal.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial the roof deck, pursuant to Standard 9; denial of the simulated slate shingles, pursuant to Standard 6; approval of a new standing- or flat-seam metal roof and all other proposed alterations, pursuant to Standard 9.

313 ARCH STREET

History: Built c. 1895, Designated 12 April 1979 and as a significant property within the Old City Historic District 12/12/2003

Owner: Normandy/806 S.A.R.

Applicant: Richard W. Thom

Project: Install Concrete sidewalk vault cover, replace remaining stone slabs with concrete

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a new concrete sidewalk vault cover slab in the place of a bluestone slate sidewalk slab that was recently destroyed by a truck delivering drywall to the property. This application also proposes to demolish the remaining bluestone slate sidewalk slabs and replace them with new concrete slabs. This bluestone and cast-iron with bullet glass sidewalk is one of the preeminent examples of historic sidewalk in the entire city.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial as proposed, but approval of the replacement of the missing bluestone slab with bluestone, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect Richard Thom and developer Leo Adamando represented the application.

Mr. Thom described the deteriorating conditions of the vault covers. One collapsed when a delivery truck placed a stabilizing leg on it; the vault below houses the building's utilities. He claimed that the others would crack or break when they are moved to repair the structure below them. He reported that the City's Streets Department, Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, and Federal Highway Administration refused to reinstall the historic vault covers when they reconstructed Market Street in 1995. Mr. Thom asserted again that the bluestone is in poor condition; it is deflected. Ms. Pentz stated that the deflection is normal in large stone slabs like this; it is not evidence of a failure. In addition to the collapsed bluestone, there are least two others cracks; the Parking Authority damaged one slab during installation of a meter.

Mr. Thom again reported that he must remove the slabs to repair and replace the vault structure beneath them. He asserted that the slabs would be severely damaged if not destroyed when they are lifted. Mr. Thom stated that he has been unable to find a source for new bluestone in these dimensions. He stated that he would not be facing these problems if the slabs were granite instead of bluestone. He claimed that the slabs presented a safety hazard. He again stated that removing and then reinstalling the slabs would certainly damage them. To avoid damaging them, he proposed to remove and discard them instead. Mr. Thom noted that they planned to restore the cast iron and glass sections of the vaults. Mr. Thom explained that he would replace the bluestone with concrete. Mr. Adamando reiterated that the sidewalk poses a severe safety hazard and new bluestone is not available in these sizes.

Mr. Baron emphasized that only one panel was broken during the delivery; the others appear to be in good condition and should not be removed and discarded. He stated that these vault covers are historically significant and are, in fact, parts of the building because the vaults were used as rooms of the buildings in Old City. He asserted that their removal would constitute a significant demolition and therefore should not be approved without a finding of financial hardship or necessity in the public interest. Mr. Baron stated that the slabs should be left in place and the structure repaired from below if the removal and reinstallation would damage them. He noted that he had seen no other case of the removal of a sidewalk as part of the rehabilitation of any other building in Old City.

Mr. Adamando stated that it would be unsafe and hazardous for workers to repair the underlying structure with the slabs in place. He also asserted that vehicles driving onto the sidewalk posed a significant hazard. Mr. Adamando remarked that the broken slab must be replaced. If the broken slab were replaced in concrete as he proposes, it would not be consistent with the adjacent historic bluestone. He would like to replace all slabs now for consistency. Mr. Rivera strenuously objected to removing all the slabs because one is damaged. Ms. Pentz concurred. Mr. Adamando responded that the lifting, framing and repositioning of the slabs poses a risk; some would not survive. Ms. Pentz countered that a sandwich-type cribbing could be devised that would prevent damage to the slabs during movement. Mr. Thom acknowledged that a rigging company like George Young could move the slabs. Mr. Baron suggested that several smaller pieces of bluestone could be employed to replace the missing piece. He also noted that missing stone was recently successfully replaced on Strawberry Street with stamped concrete. Mr. Thom stated he would investigate that system. Ms. Pentz stated she would like to see the existing bluestone retained. She suggested using new smaller bluestone or the stamped concrete for the one damaged slab only.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposal, but approval of the broken slab with smaller pieces of bluestone or the stamped concrete, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

1319-25 MARKET STREET, A.K.A. 21 N. JUNIPER STREET, 1 EAST PENN SQUARE

Owner: Granite Penn Square LLC Holding Corporation

Applicant: William G. Schwartz Esq.

History: Built 1930, Ritter & Shay, architects, designated 12/18/1985

Project: Install vent stack to east elevation

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a vent stack for a new boiler system. The vent stack would run from below grade to the roof along the east elevation of this twenty-six-story

building. The vent stack would be anchored to the wall and held in place by a series of guides. The large vent would be highly visible from 13th, Market, and Commerce Streets.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. Attorney William Schwartz and property manager William Walther represented the application.

Mr. Schwartz explained that the hotel would like to install a boiler system to allow it to disconnect from the Trigen steam grid. He reported that a 26-story vent stack would need to be installed to vent the exhaust from the boiler. He noted that a 7-story vent stack might suffice, but that only a \$20,000 study would confirm that it would. He stated that the hotel had decided that it did not want spend the money testing a system that might not work. He offered to paint the 26-story stack to match the adjacent brick façade.

Mr. Baron contended that the building, the former Market Street National Bank, is the best example of an Art Deco building in the city. He also noted that the Commission required extraordinary measures to protect and preserve the building when it reviewed the proposal to convert the former bank to a hotel. For example, the roof was lowered to ensure that the rooftop mechanical equipment was not visible. He also explained that the Commission has required numerous other applicants, particularly restaurants, to install such stacks in the interiors of buildings.

Mr. Rivera asked if the stack would be installed on the exterior of the elevator core. Mr. Walther stated that the elevator core is behind this section of the façade. He reported that he has studied the problem in depth and has determined that there is no appropriate place for it in the interior. He noted that the adjacent lot will be developed at some point, obscuring the façade. He asserted that the hotel must find a solution to the problem. The stack could be painted and the brackets could be redesigned to be more compatible. He also noted that no fan or other mechanical equipment would be needed. He reported that the stack had been reduced to the minimum size, 26" in diameter.

Ms. Pentz stated that the proposed stack does not comply with the Standards. Mr. McCoubrey agreed and indicated that he could not recommend approval. Mr. Schwartz responded that the steam grid has become too expensive. The new boiler system would pay for itself over a short period of time. Mr. Walther again claimed that it would be impossible to locate the stack inside the building. He asserted that it would not fit into the elevator shaft. He also asserted that mechanical equipment and fire stairs occupy other potential locations. He explained that it could not be relocated to other sections of the building outside the mechanical core because the outer sections of the stepped building are shorter. The vent stack cannot exit the building in these shorter sections; it must extend above the tallest part of the building.

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

ADJOURNMENT: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 14-2007(7)(j): No permit shall be issued for the demolition ... of a building ... within an historic district which contributes, in the Commission's opinion, unless the Commission finds that issuance of the permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Commission finds that the building ... cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.