

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Commission Offices, Room 578, City Hall
27 April 2004**

Present

Vincent Rivera, Chair
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Herbert Levy, FAIA
Suzanne Pentz

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jonathan Farnham, Historic Preservation Planner
Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner

Also

Carl S. Primavera, Toll Naval Square
James Campbell, Toll Naval Square
Jerry Simon, Toll Naval Square
Mitch Kotler, Toll Brothers
Adam Barzilay, Toll Brothers
Paul Commito, Toll Brothers
Kevin Smith, Toll Brothers
Matt Koenig, AIA, Toll Naval Square
Kevin Smith, Toll Naval Square
Tim Gibbon, Eastern States Engineering
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Barb Failer, neighborhood representative for area north of Naval Home
Ann Hoskins Brown, 905 South 25th Street
Paul Commito, Toll Brothers
Lenore Millhollen, Preservation Alliance/Center City Residents' Association
Kathy Dowdell, AIA
Hyman Myers, Vitetta Group
Nicole Morris, AIA, Vitetta Group
Marvin Gerstein, Temple University
Lew Halas, Tantala Associates, Coles House, LLC
Glen Kimball, Coles House, LLC
Tony Forte, Esq., Saul Ewing, Temple University
Nan Gutterman, Vitetta Group
John Gerbner, Ewing Cole Architects
Holynn Wallace, Ewing Cole Architects
Cathy Harris, Mural Arts
Amy Johnston, Mural Arts
Janet McDaniel, 342 South 15th Street
Joanne Phillips, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews and Ingersoll
Matt McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews and Ingersoll
Jason Schlesinger, Ceebraid-Signal Corporation
James W. Rowe, Agoos/Lovera Architects
Robert Powers, Powers and Company
Adam Laver, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg and Ellers
Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg and Ellers

Davis D'Ambly, St. Mark's Church
 Ashley Peel Pinkham, The Print Center
 Paul Horning, Berkshire Construction Management Incorporated
 Sean Mullen, St. Mark's Church
 Peggy Wachs, Cosmopolitan Club
 Alice Lyman, 1610 Latimer Street
 Jane Unkefer, Cosmopolitan Club
 Elliot Rothchild, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
 James Lee Deddens, 2304 Wallace Street
 Hether Smith, Arden Theatre
 Terry Nolen, Arden Theatre
 Kevin Towey, Cecil Baker and Associates
 Jon Wagner, AIA
 Richard Stokes, Stokes Architects
 Van Strother, New Covenant Church
 Stephen J. Maffei, Landmark Professional Design Incorporated
 Scott Craven, Scott Craven Studio
 Dominic Aspite, DVH Services
 Ross Warne, Monridge Construction, Incorporated
 David Matus, Matus Windows

Vincent Rivera, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

2420 Grays Ferry Avenue, Naval Home

Owner: Toll Naval Associates
 Applicant: Adam Barzilay, Toll Brothers Associates
 History: 1827-1833, William Strickland, architect
 Proposal: Final Site Plan and Landscaping Plan

At the 8 August 2003 meeting, the Commission reviewed and approved a site plan subject to the review of treatments of the historic perimeter walls, fencing and gazebos. In response to comments at that meeting and the preceding Architectural Committee meeting, the applicant has adjusted and refined the site plan. Half of building 12 has been shifted away from the Governor's Residence, which has required minor modifications to the sidewalk and driveway layout. The site plan otherwise remains the same as it relates to the building placement, new driveways, and parking areas. The project has been split into a two phases. Although included on the final site plan for building placement, the design of buildings 18, 19 and 20 are not part of this submission.

The applicant proposes to replace two portions of the Bainbridge Street perimeter wall with simple black metal fencing and brick piers with precast caps. The replacement fencing is proposed at the locations where the wall is missing or has collapsed. The precast caps are designed to replicate the original stone caps at the front gates. The balance of the brick perimeter wall along Bainbridge Street, Schuylkill Avenue and Grays Ferry Avenue will be retained and repaired. The stone and wrought iron fencing at front will be cleaned, repaired and repainted. At the August meeting, the Commission approved the widening of the original front gates in concept. The applicant proposes to relocate an original stone pier, remove a short section of wall and fencing and widen the north entrance by 5 feet, to 19'6". The existing gates will be repaired, re-installed and fixed in an open position. The south entrance will be similarly altered and widened by 9'5" to 23'5". The existing original gatehouses will be repaired and mothballed and a new guardhouse will be constructed inside the north entrance. This small stuccoed guardhouse,

with metal roofing, measures 8' x 17'4" with vinyl windows and sliding glass doors. The gate alterations also include new paving, bollards, fencing and landscaping.

Many of the existing large mature trees in front of the historic buildings will be protected and retained. The applicant proposes to remove all of the other trees that stand outside of the front, or parade ground, zone. The applicant proposes to screen the new front parking lot with a landscaped berm with low shrubbery. Low shrubs will also screen the 16 small HVAC condensers proposed for the front of Biddle Hall. New landscaping is proposed around the base of both dependencies which will screen new condensers proposed at grade between the main block and rear ell of the historic residences.

All of the existing deteriorated light fixtures will be removed and new light fixtures will be installed at driveways and parking areas throughout the site. At its August meeting the Commission asked to review the proposed treatment of the gazebos. The two structures are now referred to as the gazebo and the pavilion. The applicant has submitted a report from their structural engineer and now proposes to demolish the existing gazebo and pavilion.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the site plan for building placement pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Approval of the alterations to the Bainbridge Street perimeter wall where the brick masonry is missing or collapsed only. Where the existing brick wall is intact, it should be retained and repaired, with staff to review details. Approval of the alterations at the front entrances on Grays Ferry Avenue provided the specifications for the repair of the existing gatehouses are submitted for staff review. Approval of the new guardhouse pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, provided the proposed windows have a real muntin profile on the exterior of the glass. Denial of the new interior fencing proposed inside the north entrance and south exit pursuant to Standard 9. The staff thought that the proposed parking, the new guardhouse, landscaping, and widening of the driveways already compromise the open space and the additional fencing and its related landscaping were unnecessary. Denial of the line of shrubs on top of the berm. Approval of the HVAC condenser locations provided a color sample and specification of the proposed unit are submitted for staff review. Approval of the tree removal and tree protection as proposed. Approval of the replacement light fixtures pursuant to Standard 6. Denial of the demolition of the pavilion and gazebo pursuant to Standards 2, 5 and 6. The structures should be restored and relocated on the site.

Mr. Barr presented the application to the Committee. James Campbell of Campbell Thomas Architects displayed the drawings and pointed out key features as Mr. Barr spoke. In addition to Mr. Thomas, Matthew Koenig of J.K. Roller Architects, Jerry Simon of the Lessard Architectural Group, landscape architect Tim Gibbon of Eastern States Engineering, Carl Primavera of Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers, and Adam Barzilay, Paul Commito, Mitch Kotler, and Kevin Smith of Toll Brothers represented the project.

Discussing the new fences at the entrance and exit on Grays Ferry Avenue, Mr. Campbell noted that they are needed for security to control access to the grounds. He stated that they will be simple, black, five-foot-tall, picket fences. Mr. Gibbon, the landscape architect, added that the plantings at the fences will be prunable to any height. Ms. Pentz of the Committee asked why the historic guardhouses were not being reused. Mr. Campbell explained that historic guardhouses stand directly on Grays Ferry Avenue; the developer required a guardhouse set back from the street to provide a staging area for vehicles awaiting entry onto the grounds and prevent traffic backups on the public thoroughfare. Mr. D'Alessandro and Mr. Levy of the Committee expressed their opposition to the addition of the new fences, which would further curtail the openness of the Parade Ground. Mr. Rivera did not share his fellow Committee members' view.

The discussion turned to the plantings along the front parking lot and at the air conditioning equipment on the ground along the front of Biddle Hall. Although some Committee members suggested that the parking area be further recessed below grade, they all agreed that the lot design with plantings was acceptable. They also agreed that the plantings hiding the HVAC equipment were necessary.

The applicants explained to the Committee and audience that the historic guardhouses would be restored, but not used. Committee members asked about the restorations, which they agreed was acceptable. They then turned their attention to the new guardhouse. The applicants confirmed that it would be fenestrated with simulated-divided-light windows with some weight and dimension to the exterior muntin. Mr. Tyler expressed his preference for a more contemporary design for the guardhouse, but Committee members concluded that the submitted design was suitable.

The Committee then deliberated on the historic gazebo and pavilion. Mr. Campbell explained that there is no appropriate place for them on the site plan. He noted that they are too large for the courtyards between Biddle Hall and the Annex. Mr. Tyler contended that they should be restored and relocated somewhere on the site. Mr. Campbell interjected that the state did not require their preservation. Committee members asserted that their role is to protect Philadelphia's historic resources, not simply parrot the state. They concluded that the gazebo and pavilion should be retained, restored, and relocated on the site.

The Committee then shifted to the proposal to replace two portions of the Bainbridge Street perimeter wall with simple black metal fencing and brick piers with precast caps. The replacement fencing is proposed at the locations where the wall is missing or has collapsed. The Committee agreed that this was appropriate as long as the new fencing is limited to areas where the original fence is missing.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend the following, with staff to review details:

1. *Approval of the site plan for building placement pursuant to Standards 9 and 10*
2. *Approval of the alterations to the Bainbridge Street perimeter wall where the brick masonry is missing or collapsed only. Where the existing brick wall is intact, it should be retained and repaired, with staff to review details*
3. *Approval of the historic gate alterations at the entrance and exit on Grays Ferry Avenue*
4. *Approval of the restoration of the existing gatehouses, provided the details are submitted for staff review*
5. *Approval of the new guardhouse, provided the proposed windows have a real muntin profile on the exterior of the glass, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10*
6. *Denial of the new interior fencing proposed inside the north entrance and south exit pursuant to Standard 9*
7. *Approval of the general landscaping*
8. *Approval of the HVAC condenser locations, provided a color sample and specification of the proposed units are submitted for staff review*
9. *Approval of the tree removal and tree protection as proposed*
10. *Approval of the replacement light fixtures pursuant to Standard 6*
11. *Denial of the demolition of the pavilion and gazebo pursuant to Standards 2, 5 and 6; the structures should be restored and relocated on the site*

2420 Grays Ferry Avenue, Naval Home

Owner: Toll Naval Associates

Applicant: Adam Barzilay, Toll Brothers Associates

History: 1827-33, William Strickland, architect

Proposal: Rehabilitation of Biddle Hall, Surgeon General's Residence and Governor's Residence

Biddle Hall

At the 8 August 2003 meeting, the Commission reviewed and approved the new roof, dormers, monitors and skylights on Biddle Hall. The applicant now seeks final approval for the proposed rehabilitation of Biddle Hall and the two dependencies. Biddle Hall will be completely renovated to contain 66 one and two-bedroom residential units. In the north and south wing the units are configured front-to-back with new doors proposed for the front and rear elevations. The concept of cutting down existing window openings for new exterior doors was discussed at the October 1999 and February 2000 Committee meetings. Throughout design development, all parties have acknowledged the practical necessity of converting some windows into doors. The main entrances to the units will be located at the rear of Biddle Hall. The rear doors in the units will open onto the verandahs at the front of Biddle Hall. The verandahs will be divided into individual, private balconies. Two-panel metal or fiberglass doors are proposed for the rear elevation with three-lite transoms on the ground and second floor. Multi-lite metal patio doors are proposed for the front elevation with three-lite transoms on the ground and second floor. As the floor to ceiling height is greater on the first floor, the applicant proposes taller six-lite transoms above the new doors at the front and rear elevations.

The existing multi-lite double hung windows are deteriorated or missing, and the applicant proposes new, simulated-divided-lite, double hung, wood windows to match many of the original muntin patterns. Proposed details show a flat exterior muntin that measures 1" in width. The original muntin was deeper and measured 3/4" in width. At the August meeting, the Commission approved simulated-divided-lite windows for the monitor and dormers, but only after deciding that the simulated-divided-lites would not be detectable at that height above the ground. The original tripartite windows to either side of the front portico and at north and south end walls had a six-over-six, double hung flanked by two-over-two double hung units. At the tripartite window locations the applicant proposes three, one-over-one units. All frames and exterior window trim will be wood to match the existing original dimensions and profiles.

There are original door openings onto the verandahs in the wing walls of Biddle Hall. One original single-leaf door with glazing has survived in one of the openings. The applicant proposes to convert these wing wall door openings into windows, each with a new six-over-six double hung window above a recessed wood panel.

There are wide half-round arch top openings at the side of the C section, or center section at rear. There is an inconsistency between the plans and elevations regarding the treatment of these openings.

The original front door is missing. Historic images indicate that, at one time, there was a double door with a tall glass pane over a small solid recessed panel on each leaf. The applicant proposes a wide fiberglass or metal, single-leaf door with two tall glass panes over two small solid panels. The drawings lack information regarding the treatment of the sidelight openings.

The Commission approved in concept the removal of the stucco and CMU stairtower additions at rear at the August meeting. The new connection for the addition will require the modification of one section of original railing on each floor. The plans for the new annex propose the reinstallation of one section of original railing on the new construction. The proposed areas of connection for the new annex will require the infill of several original window and door openings at the rear. Many of these openings are currently infilled with CMU or brick. The applicant proposes to remove the metal fire stairs that had been inserted at the verandahs at the rear as well

as the metal awning frames flanking the entrance at front.

The entire verandah at the north and west of the center section at the rear was destroyed in the fire. Some columns were salvaged intact but ten fiberglass replica columns were approved for five locations at load bearing points as part of the completed roof framing and sheathing work. No other columns will bear any roofload. The drawings lack information regarding the re-installation of the original cast iron columns at the reconstructed verandah. The applicant proposes new 2"x4" wood decking and new wood fascia trim at veranda floors throughout. The original masonry floor fascia at the first floor front will be retained.

As discussed in concept at previous meetings, the applicant proposes 5' privacy screens on the front verandah to create private balcony space at the rear of each unit. The screens will span the depth of the verandah, perpendicular to the original railing. The new screens will align with and attach to each cast iron column and the marble façade.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the solid two-panel door with a three-lite transom and frame to match the original window, at the rear, with staff to review details. Denial of the six-lite transom at first floor rear. The dimensions of the lites in the transom should match those in the original windows as closely as possible. The new first floor doorways should maintain the same three-lite transom with either a taller door or modified transom bar detail. Denial of the multi-lite patio doors proposed for the verandahs at front. The introduction of the smaller lites detracts from the character of the primary elevation and does not simulate the original windows. Although not original to these locations, if glazing is desired, the applicant should install a door with a panel and glazing pattern based on the one existing original verandah door. Approval of the three-lite transoms and doorframe to match the original window frame, at front, with staff to review details. Denial of the six-lite transom at first floor front. Again, the new first floor doorways should maintain the same three-lite transom with either a taller door or modified transom bar detail.

Denial of the wood simulated-divided-lite windows. New windows should be true-divided-lite with a 3/4" muntin to match the original. Denial of the one-over-one tripartite window configuration as shown. The tripartite windows should have two, two-over-two units flanking a six-over-six unit. Denial of the single-leaf front door. The original front door will no longer function as the primary entrance and will not be handicapped-accessible. As a significant character defining feature of Biddle Hall, the new door should replicate the historic, wood, double-leaf door with a flat-panel pattern, glazing, and sidelites.

Denial of the alteration of the wing wall door openings. The installation of a six-over-six windows above a panel creates a false historic appearance. The original doors at these locations had glazing and this door should be replicated and fixed in place. Approval of the removal of the metal fire stairs at rear and metal awning structure at the front.

Approval of the alterations at the rear to accommodate the new annex connections. Denial of any additional fiberglass replica columns. The drawings are unclear on this issue but our understanding is that there are enough original cast iron columns to complete the rear verandahs. The applicant should reinstall all original cast iron columns at their original locations. Approval of the new wood decking. Denial of the first and second-story verandah floor fascia. The original floor fascia at the rear and on the second floor front was wood with a half-round nosing. The fascia should be reconstructed in wood to replicate the profile and dimensions with staff to review details. Approval of the privacy screens on the verandas at front with staff to review details.

Mr. Barr presented the application to the Committee. James Campbell of Campbell Thomas Architects, Matthew Koenig of J.K. Roller Architects, Jerry Simon of the Lessard Architectural Group, landscape architect Tim Gibbon of Eastern States Engineering, Carl Primavera of Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers, and Adam Barzilay, Paul Commito, Mitch Kotler, and Kevin Smith of Toll Brothers represented the project.

The Committee discussed the Biddle Hall tripartite windows with the applicant first. Mr. Koenig clarified that he had updated the design of the tripartite windows to be six-over-six flanked by two-over-two as recommended by the staff. He stated that he would update the drawings. Regarding the windows in general, the Committee opined that they should all be true-divided-light with appropriate $\frac{3}{4}$ " muntins.

Mr. Barr pointed out a discrepancy on the drawings at the rear center of Biddle Hall. The drawings call for doors in plan, but windows in elevation. Mr. Koenig stated that this problem had not yet been solved.

The Committee turned its attention to the front door. It stated that, because of its significance, the door should be a wood door with sidelights like the original door. Members decided that a simulated double-leaf door was acceptable, provided it mirrored the historic door in every other way.

Addressing the verandah changes, the Committee concluded that the modifications to the railings at the rear at the end pavilions were acceptable. It also determined that the removal of the non-historic verandah firestairs was acceptable. It decided that the original verandah columns must be reused wherever possible. It decided that the proposed decking was appropriate, but that the wood fascia details should be revised to replicate the historic details. Finally, the Committee concluded that the privacy screens at the verandah were acceptable, but that the attachment details should be reviewed. Regarding the verandah doors that the applicant proposes to convert to windows over panels, the Committee opined that the applicant should instead replicate the extant verandah door and fix them in place in the openings. Mr. Tyler suggested that the staff and applicant work out the minor door and window configuration details.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance suggested that, to keep the project moving forward, that the staff and applicants seek a consensus on as many open issues as possible before the Commission meeting. He stated that the proposed units in Biddle Hall will be small and dark and advocated the acceptance of highly glazed doors at the front façade. He also asserted that the main doors to the units should be wood. Referring to the site plan review, he contended that no appropriate place exists at the site for gazebo and pavilion and therefore they should be offered to institutions in the City such as the Fairmount Park Commission for relocation.

Mr. Campbell noted that the state and federal governments have already reviewed and approved plans and any deviation from those plans may introduce difficulties. Mr. Gallery responded that new state and federal approvals could be easily obtained, if the requests were appropriate. Mr. Rivera stated that Mr. Gallery's suggestion of a consensus was a good one.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended the following, with staff to review details:

1. *Approval of the solid two-panel door with three-lite transom and frame to match the original window for the main unit doors at the rear of Biddle Hall*
2. *Denial of the solid two-panel door with six-lite transoms for the main unit doors at the first-floor rear. The new first-floor doorways should include taller doors and the same three-lite transoms used on other floors.*

3. *Denial of the multi-light patio doors for the verandah unit doors at the front of Biddle Hall. The introduction of the smaller lites detracts from the character of the primary elevation and does not simulate the original windows. Although not original to these locations, if glazing is desired, the applicant should install a door with a panel and glazing pattern based on the one surviving original verandah door.*
4. *Approval of the three-lite transoms and doorframe to match the original window frame at the verandah unit doors at the front of Biddle Hall.*
5. *Denial of the six-lite transoms for the verandah unit doors at first-floor front of Biddle Hall. Again, the new first-floor doorways should include taller doors and the same three-lite transoms used on other floors.*
6. *Denial of the simulated-divided-lite windows. The new windows should be wood, true-divided-lite with a ¾" muntin to match the original.*
7. *Denial of the one-over-one tripartite window configuration as shown. The tripartite windows should have two, two-over-two units flanking a six-over-six unit as the architect noted during the Committee meeting.*
8. *Denial of the single-leaf front door. The original front door will no longer function as the primary entrance and will not be handicapped-accessible. As a significant character defining feature of Biddle Hall, the new door should replicate the historic, wood, double-leaf door with a flat-panel pattern, glazing, and sidelites. A single-leaf door that simulates a double-leaf door is acceptable.*
9. *Denial of the alteration of the wing wall door openings. The installation of a six-over-six windows above a panel creates a false historic appearance. The original doors at these locations had glazing and this door type should be replicated and fixed in place.*
10. *Approval of the removal of the metal fire stairs at rear and metal awning structure at the front.*
11. *Approval of the alterations at the rear to accommodate the new annex connections.*
12. *Denial of any additional fiberglass replica columns. The applicant should reinstall all original cast iron columns at their original locations.*
13. *Approval of the new wood decking.*
14. *Denial of the first and second-story verandah floor fascia. The original floor fascia at the rear and on the second floor front was wood with a half-round nosing. The fascia should be reconstructed in wood to replicate the profile and dimensions.*
15. *Approval of the privacy screens on the verandahs.*

Surgeon General's and Governor's Residences

The dependencies will be renovated for 12 residential units. The applicant proposes to retain and repair the existing original windows, porch posts, railings, and stucco on the dependencies. The drawings show one-over-one double hung windows in the small openings on the side elevations. One new window opening is proposed at first-floor rear on each residence on the façade opposite Biddle Hall. The applicant proposes to install a new, six-over-six double hung simulated-divided-lite window unit with a 1" muntin to match the height and fill the width of an existing door opening.

Handicapped accessible ramps are proposed on both residences on the façade opposite Biddle Hall. The installation of the ramps will entail the removal of a set of stone steps. The original front doors are missing. The drawings lack information on the all of the proposed exterior door and doorway details. The drawings are unclear regarding the treatment of the openings on the front façade.

Similar to Biddle Hall, the applicant proposes privacy screens for the front porches on both floors. The screens will span between and attach to the columns and masonry façade. On the second floor, the privacy screen divides the porch equally and appears to attach to center section of original railing and center door opening. Spandrel glass is proposed for this center opening.

Again the drawings are unclear regarding this treatment. New sections of railing are proposed to fill the existing spaces between the paired porch columns. Lastly, the proposed site engineering drawings show a fire department connection on the Governor's Residence on the façade opposite Biddle Hall.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the window repair. Denial of the new simulated-divided-lite windows. New windows should be true-divided-lite with a $\frac{3}{4}$ " muntin to match the original. Denial of the small one-over-one units at side. Historic photos indicate that the windows were three-over-three. Approval of the removal of one set of steps and the addition of the handicapped ramp on each residence. The applicant has located the ramp in the most unobtrusive location.

Denial of the second-floor front openings as drawn. Historic photos suggest that there was a single-leaf door at the center flanked by six-over-six windows. The staff recognizes the need for access to the porch at these locations and the existing openings appear to extend to the floor. The proposed treatment, however, should fit into the existing openings and the staff recommends approval of new single-leaf doors with staff to review details. All exterior doors at the first floor had sidelights and should replicate the original details and dimensions.

Approval of the privacy screens at the first-floor porch with staff to review details. Denial of the privacy screen on second floor. The 5' height and location at the center of the railing and window appears awkward. The screen, or screens, should align with the existing column and attach to the wall similar those proposed for the first floor. Approval of the spandrel glass for the second-floor center window opening provided a sympathetic treatment is proposed. Approval of the infill sections of metal railings provided the "feet" are removed and the bottom and top rail align with the existing original railing.

Mr. Barr presented the application to the Committee. James Campbell of Campbell Thomas Architects, Matthew Koenig of J.K. Roller Architects, Jerry Lessard of the Lessard Architectural Group, landscape architect Tim Gibbon of Eastern States Engineering, Carl Primavera of Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers, and Adam Barzilay, Paul Commito, Jerry Simon, Mitch Kotler, and Kevin Smith of Toll Brothers represented the project.

Mr. Tyler noted that the anchor and other motifs that once decorated the porch railings have been lost and could be replicated. The Committee agreed. The Committee also agreed that the second-floor porches should not be arbitrarily divided in half with the new railings as shown on the drawings, but should be divided to coincide with the porch columns.

The Committee deemed the fire department connection appropriate.

Kathy Dowdell of the AIA asked why the applicant needed to make both dependencies handicapped accessible. Mr. Campbell replied that units of the type in the dependencies were not available elsewhere in the complex and therefore should be accessible to all. Mr. Commito stated that Toll Brothers preferred not to make the buildings handicapped accessible. Mr. Smith of Toll Brothers stated that one unit in one of the dependencies would be used as a sales unit and therefore needed to be accessible. Committee members responded that it could be made temporarily accessible with a temporary ramp.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended the following, with staff to review details:

1. *Approval of the window repair.*
2. *Denial of the new simulated-divided-lite windows. New windows should be true-divided-lite with a $\frac{3}{4}$ " muntin to match the original.*

3. *Denial of the small one-over-one windows on the side facades. Historic photos indicate that the windows were three-over-three.*
4. *Approval of the removal of one set of steps and the addition of the handicapped ramp on each residence, with the provision that the applicants investigate the possibility of not making the buildings accessible.*
5. *Denial of the first-floor front openings as drawn. All exterior doors at the first floor had sidelights. The new doors and sidelights should replicate the original details and dimensions.*
6. *Denial of the second-floor front openings as drawn. Historic photos suggest that there was a single-leaf door at the center flanked by six-over-six windows. The proposed treatment should fit into the existing openings.*
7. *Approval of the privacy screens at the first-floor porch.*
8. *Denial of the privacy screen on second floor. The 5' height and location at the center of the railing and window appears awkward. The screen, or screens, should align with the existing columns.*
9. *Approval of the spandrel glass for the second-floor center window opening.*
10. *Approval of the infill sections of metal railings provided the "feet" are removed and the bottom and top rail align with the existing original railing. The missing railing motifs such as the anchor should be replicated if feasible.*

2420 Grays Ferry Avenue, Naval Home

Owner: Toll Naval Associates

Applicant: Adam Barzilay, Toll Brothers Associates

History: 1827-1833, William Strickland, architect

Proposal: Biddle Hall Annex

At the 8 August 2003 meeting, the Commission reviewed and approved the design of the addition to Biddle Hall in concept. The plans and elevation have now been refined and return for final approval. In response to comments by the staff and Committee, the revised design has less vertical divisions in elevation, the proposed materials are more uniform, and the general character is more contemporary. Although red brick remains as the predominant material on the exterior, the variation of brick colors has been eliminated and the roof has been simplified. On the courtyard elevations the upper floors are clad in a stucco finish that appears compatible with the rear of Biddle Hall. The light colored split face block remains on the ground floor on all the elevations. The proposed connection at the rear of the prow ends is now fully glazed and provides a rooftop location for all of the HVAC condensers for the upper story units in Biddle Hall. The applicant has designed a "well" in the new roof on the courtyard side of the annex to accommodate the condensers for the units in the new building. In the courtyard, the annex connects to the rear center section of Biddle Hall with a simple flat roofed hyphen clad in split face block and stucco. At the landings on the upper floors of the connections, the applicant proposes to incorporate a section of original railing from Biddle Hall on the four courtyard elevations. The railing returns onto the new construction and visually unifies the new with the old. Several original window and door openings, many of which are currently infilled with masonry, will get covered by the new connections and will get infilled as necessary. At the prow ends, there is a discrepancy in the setback of the connection between the J.K. Roller and Lessard drawings which deserves study. All three connections now have an open "pass-thru" at grade level against the rear wall of Biddle Hall.

Staff Recommendation: Approval pursuant to Standard 9 with staff to review details.

Mr. Barr presented the application to the Committee. James Campbell of Campbell Thomas

Architects, Matthew Koenig of J.K. Roller Architects, Jerry Simon of the Lessard Architectural Group, landscape architect Tim Gibbon of Eastern States Engineering, Carl Primavera of Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers, and Adam Barzilay, Paul Commito, Mitch Kotler, and Kevin Smith of Toll Brothers represented the project.

The Committee deemed the new design much improved over the previous design submitted for in concept review. Mr. Gallery judged it a “great improvement.”

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

2420 Grays Ferry Avenue, Naval Home

Owner: Toll Naval Associates

Applicant: Adam Barzilay, Toll Brothers Associates

History: 1827-1833, William Strickland, architect

Proposal: New Construction

At the 8 August 2003 meeting, the Commission approved in concept the front elevations of the new construction with simplification of the brick colors. The elevations have been refined and return for final approval. In response to comments at previous meetings, the brick colors have been simplified. However, the character and features of the new construction still have a pseudo-historic look which neither relates to the character of the Naval Home nor the historic vernacular Philadelphia rowhouse architecture in the surrounding neighborhood. The recessed terrace at the fourth floor of the townhouse design has been eliminated and replaced by a traditional pitched roof with dormers. The front and side elevations are faced in brick while the rears are brick and stucco. Other than the brick color, the façade details return essentially unchanged. The applicant, however, has modified the design in response to the condition of the conceptual approval at the August Commission meeting.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Barr presented the application to the Committee. James Campbell of Campbell Thomas Architects, Matthew Koenig of J.K. Roller Architects, Jerry Simon of the Lessard Architectural Group, landscape architect Tim Gibbon of Eastern States Engineering, Carl Primavera of Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers, and Adam Barzilay, Paul Commito, Mitch Kotler, and Kevin Smith of Toll Brothers represented the project.

Barbara Failer, a neighborhood representative, inquired about the heights of the buildings on Bainbridge Street. The applicants explained that the City View Condominium buildings along Bainbridge are about 50 feet tall, but added that land rises steeply from the street to the building site. Ms. Failer also stated emphatically that the neighbors want the missing sections of the wall along the northern edge of the property replaced in brick not metal. Committee members remarked that they had already rendered a recommendation on this aspect of the proposal during the review of the site plan. Lenore Milholland of the Center City Residents Association also registered her concerns about the wall.

Mr. Campbell presented a sample board showing the colors to be used throughout the project. Kathy Dowdell of the AIA inquired about the stucco color on Biddle Hall. Committee members concluded that the colors were appropriate.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended approval of the new buildings, with

staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

915 Clinton Street

Coles House, LLC, Owner

Albert Tantala, Engineer/Applicant

DATE: 1835-1843

PROPOSAL: Legalize roof deck

Mr. Farnham presented this application, which proposes the legalization of a roof deck constructed without the Commission's approval or a building permit. At its February 2003 meeting, the Commission approved numerous changes to this property for its conversion to condominiums including the addition of nine decks. This deck was not reviewed or approved as part of that application. It was constructed without any approvals during the approved renovation project.

The deck is situated on the main block of the rowhouse, not on the rear ell. It is located on the rear slope of the gable roof, but extends above the peak of the roof, even without a railing. It stands on concrete footings that were cut into the building's side wall, damaging the historic brick. Also, changes including the addition of a window have been made without approvals to a projection on the roof that is labeled "existing stairs" on the plans. The application does not address this change or other contemplated changes necessary to convert the projection to a stair tower. The deck is highly visible from Cypress Street and, with the addition of the requisite railing, may be visible from Clinton and S. 10th Streets.

Inspired by this illegal deck, architect J.K. Roller submitted an application to the Commission in late 2003 for a similar deck and stair tower at 919 Clinton Street, two doors to the west. At its November 2003 meeting, the Commission denied that proposal pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to the Historical Commission's row house deck policy, Standards 6, 9, and 10 and the Roofs Guideline. The deck should be removed and the damaged brick repaired.

Lew Halas and Glen Kimball, counsel for the owner, attended the meeting. He asserted that the stair tower was extant and at one time served a small four-foot by four-foot platform. Mr. Kimball conceded that the plans for the new roof deck were not submitted with the overall renovation plans, but he claimed that the failure to include the deck plan was a mere oversight. He concluded that the deck would have limited visibility, owing to buildings on either side. Mr. Kimball noted that other decks exist on Cypress Street. Mr. Halas commented that the proposed deck would be accessible only from the top unit. Mr. Kimball explained that the deck is an asset to the condominium unit. He said that the vista from the deck is beautiful.

Ms. Pentz reiterated the importance of consistency in the policy about decks on the main roof. She stated that the Committee would not have recommended approval of this deck had it been included in the overall renovation plans in advance of construction and certainly could not recommend legalization of it in retrospect. Her fellow Committee members agreed and suggested that the deck be removed and the building repaired. Mr. Levy lamented the destructive nature of the deck installation. He also stated that the beautiful view from the deck did not justify legalizing it.

The applicants asked if anything could be done to make the deck acceptable. The Committee suggested that a deck on the rear ell might be acceptable. The applicants inquired if it would be

acceptable to build a walkway and stairway from the stair tower on the main roof down to a deck on the rear ell. Committee members replied that they would need to see the details but that such a walkway system would defeat the purpose of moving the deck to the rear ell. They stated that no addition to the main roof would be acceptable. The attorneys asked several other questions about potentially approvable decks; the Committee suggested that they speak with the staff outside the meeting.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended denial pursuant to the Historical Commission's row house deck policy, 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.]; and the 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.]. It recommended that the deck be removed and the damaged brick repaired.

1800-18 Park Mall aka Liacouras Walk

Temple University, Owner

Hyman Myers, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1872, David A. Woelpper, builder

PROPOSAL: Reconstruct mansards in steel, replace slate with substitute material, infill basement windows – in concept

This application seeks final approval of significant demolition at 1802-1818 Park Mall and amendments to the Commission's earlier approval in concept. The overall project includes the rehabilitation of 1800 Park Avenue; substantial demolition at 1802-1818 Park Avenue; the retention of the historic facades of 1802-1818 Park Avenue; and the construction of a 5-story building set back behind front facades of 1802-1818 Park Avenue. At its meeting on 13 February 2004, the Commission found that the adaptive reuse of the historic buildings would constitute a financial hardship and approved in concept the demolition of the rears of 1802-1818 (but not the mansards) and the new construction provided the design was improved.

This application seeks final approval of the demolition of the rears of 1802-1818 Park Mall. It is unclear whether it seeks the final or in-concept approval of the demolition of the mansards with dormers. It also seeks in-concept approval of the following as an amendment to the earlier in-concept approval:

1. the reconstruction of the mansards with dormers in steel to match original and the replacement of the slate with an undefined substitute material
2. the removal of the concrete steps at 1808-1810 and installation of a concrete landing for accessibility
3. the installation of handrails at the historic entrances
4. the installation of new windows at all buildings to match those at 1800 Park Mall
5. the installation of new doors at all buildings

6. the infilling of the basement windows and addition of fiberglass copies of the original ornamental grills

The Commission's earlier finding of financial hardship and in-concept approval of the demolition and new construction did not include the demolition of the mansards with dormers. In fact, the approval was implicitly predicated on the retention of the mansards. The current application presents no justification for the demolition and reconstruction of the mansards. This significant change in the proposal is not consistent with the Commission's earlier rulings and may place them in jeopardy. In addition, the current application consists of photographs and text only; no plans or drawings for the demolition or new construction have been submitted. Likewise, no façade stabilization plan has been submitted. This portion of the application must be considered incomplete.

For the in-concept portion of the application, not enough information has been submitted to evaluate the proposals for the concrete landing and handrails. This portion of the application must also be considered incomplete. Architectural drawings should be submitted for the proposals. For example, the new concrete ramp cannot be evaluated without plans and elevations; there is no way to assess the impact of the addition on the historic fabric without complete information. More research must be conducted to determine if the windows and doors proposed as models for the replications are appropriate. Also, the application states that the basement windows will be infilled to stabilize the front wall. An engineer's report confirming this claim must be submitted before this proposal can be evaluated. Finally, the original ornamental grills for the basement windows may be reproduced in a substitute material, but, given their locations, they should be fabricated in a more durable material than fiberglass such as cast aluminum.

Staff Recommendation: Denial owing to incompleteness and Standards 2, 5, and 6. If additional documentation of the proposal is submitted at the Architectural Committee meeting, the staff recommends that the Committee defer any recommendation until next month's meeting, allowing the staff and, more importantly, the Committee and public opportunities to review the application.

Mr. D'Alessandro recused himself. Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Hyman Myers, the architect, and Tony Forte, counsel for Temple University, attended the meeting. Mr. Myers made a case for final approval of the demolition including the mansards and conceptual approval of the changes to the proposal since the last review. Mr. Forte stated that the demolition and stabilization must occur in July and August to allow the new construction to commence by September 2004 to be completed by September 2005. He added that the university must move offices and facilities into the new building to be built at this site before it can commence with a much larger project on a nearby site. Any delay to this project will delay the other project as well. Mr. Myers distributed new documentation including plans.

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance, noted that this is a very important project and offered strong opposition to the Committee taking any action on this proposal prior to the thorough review of the revised drawings by the staff, public, and Committee. He opined that the review of the demolition plans should not be conducted until the plans for the new construction are complete.

Mr. Forte stated that he offered the new documentation to the Preservation Alliance during the week of 19-23 April, but that Mr. Gallery did not accept his offer. Mr. Gallery denied that anyone on the Temple team had made any new information available to him.

Mr. Levy asserted that the Committee, staff, and public should have an opportunity to review the newly submitted materials carefully. Mr. Tyler stated that the Commission has been very

generous with this project. He recounted that the Commission placed numerous requirements on the University of Pennsylvania before a demolition permit was granted for Smith Hall. He objected to the submission of the documentation at the meeting.

Mr. Forte insisted that Temple must move forward with the project. The university would not abandon the project without completing it, he claimed. Therefore, the Committee should not fear approving the demolition without complete construction plans.

Mr. Myers acknowledged that the marked change in the plan is the demolition of the mansard section of the buildings. He stated that the mansards are in very bad condition and distributed detail photographs to the Committee. He added that he hoped to sister new structural members onto the existing, but it was not possible. He also considered a new structure under the old. It was not feasible. He claimed that it would \$250,000 more to keep the historic mansards in place than to rebuild them in steel. He referred the Committee to the cost breakdown in the new packet, but then realized that it had not been included.

Mr. Rivera and Ms. Pentz suggested that the applicants might need to return to the Hardship Committee to plead their case because the scope and cost of the work have been adjusted. Ms. Pentz and Mr. Levy stated that they cannot approve a complex project that they have not had an opportunity to review completely. Mr. Rivera stated that he needed time to review the drawings. Mr. Forte asked if there was any way for the Committee to recommend approval. Mr. Levy stated that he would like to see the demolition and new construction drawings together before rendering a decision. He said that he saw no commitment in the documentation to rebuild the mansards faithfully. Mr. Myers replied that they would rebuild the historic mansards exactly; he added that they would save original pieces of the buildings to use as models for the new construction.

Ms. Pentz asked about the proposal to replace the slate with a substitute material. Mr. Myers replied that most of the original slate has been lost. Mr. Forte noted that the Commission had recently approved slate substitutes for another Temple building. Mr. Myers stated that he had not yet selected a slate substitute. Mr. Levy contended that the applicants had placed the Committee in a difficult position; for example, they appeared to be requesting approval of a replacement slate, but had not offered a specific alternative. Mr. Myers explained that the project faces severe time constraints and added that he would work with the staff on the approval of the details. Mr. Rivera avowed that the Committee must be respectful of the process.

Mr. Forte stated that his application team is before the Committee for two matters, the final approval of the demolition and the conceptual approval of the numerous restoration details. Mr. Levy remarked that the application is essentially for the stabilization of a three-story brick wall; he asserted that he could not approve such an application without further information and a commitment to a new design. Mr. Rivera commented that the Committee should not recommend approval of the application owing to the lack of plans and commitment to the new construction. Mr. Tyler agreed. Mr. Rivera added that the Commission had approved in concept one plan, but was now asked to give final approval for a different plan. Ms. Pentz concurred with her fellow Committee members. Mr. Levy again asserted that he would not recommend approval owing to the incompleteness of the application. He asserted that the details needed to be worked out and presented to the Committee.

Mr. Myers asked the Committee what documentation it would like to see if they presented a new application for next month's meeting. Mr. Levy and Mr. Rivera stated that they would like to see commitments to the restoration of those sections of the historic buildings that will be retained.

Mr. Gallery urged the staff to poll the Hardship Committee to see if it would accept the additional demolition would in any way invalidate its original finding of hardship.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended denial of the application owing to the incompleteness of the application and 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 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.]; and 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.].

1228 Pine Street

David Callan, Owner

Charles McGloughlin, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1832

PROPOSAL: Alter 1st floor window to new bay window, add 3-story rear addition

Mr. Farnham presented the application, which proposes the replacement of a Colonial Revival storefront window with a bay window at the first story front façade and the construction of a large addition at the rear.

The Colonial Revival storefront window, which was installed in the early twentieth century, replaced an earlier storefront window. Ghostings on the brick as well as replacement brick below the window provide clues to the earlier window. The design for the proposed front bay window derives from a bay window across the street at the northeast corner of Camac and Pine Streets. It is not based on the current or previous window at 1228 Pine Street. Further research should be undertaken to determine the historic storefront window configuration or the original residential window configuration.

A large rear addition is also proposed. The rear of the property is highly visible from Waverly Street. The cornice design should be revised; it should not replicate the front cornice, as is currently shown on the plans.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the front bay, pursuant to Standard 3. Approval of rear addition, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Alan Metcalfe and Charles McGloughlin, architects, attended the meeting. Mr. Metcalfe stated that his search of historical records did not reveal any new information about the historic bay that was removed from this building in the middle of the twentieth century. He noted the ghosting of original bay, but concluded that it did not provide enough information for a restoration. He also noted the heterogeneous nature of the buildings on this block of Pine Street. He added that the building owner desires a new bay window like the window on the building diagonally across the street. Committee members decided that, although not a documented restoration, the bay window was acceptable. They also concluded that the rear addition proposal with the corrections was acceptable.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended approval of the revised proposal, with the staff to review details.

222 North 20th Street, Franklin Institute

Franklin Institute, Owner

Debbie Terrell, Applicant

DATE: 1929-1931, John Windrim, architect; addition, 1988, Geddes Brecher Qualls
Cunningham

PROPOSAL: Cooling tower on roof, windows

Mr. Farnham presented the application, which proposes the addition of a large cooling tower to the roof and new windows on rear facades of the Franklin Institute. The tower would be added to the Mandell Center, an addition at the southwest corner of the complex, not the older neo-classical building. The Mandell Center was designed by Geddes Brecher Qualls Cunningham and constructed in 1988. The center's large scale and simple Modern lines can accommodate the addition of the bulky cooling tower. The vast majority of the windows would be replaced at the south façade of the northwest wing and the west façade of the southeast wing of the original building; both facades are visible from the public right-of-way. Two additional windows would be replaced at other locations, neither of which is visible from the public right-of-way. The original windows are steel; the replacements would be aluminum with subframes. The new configurations would match the original configurations. In some cases, existing louvers would be maintained; in others, louvers would be added. In all cases, the daylight openings would be significantly reduced with the addition of the subframes. Also, the position of the glazing plane would be shifted.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the cooling tower, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline. Denial of the windows, pursuant to Standard 6. The replacement windows should replicate the details of the original windows, especially the daylight openings and glass position.

John Gerbner and Holynn Wallace, architects, attended the meeting. Mr. Gerbner displayed large photos and drawings and claimed that the cooling tower would have limited visual impact on the complex. Committee members agreed that the tower would not be visible from the Parkway and Logan Circle and would have little or no negative impact on the addition at the rear.

Mr. Gerbner explained that the Franklin Institute's windows consist of two types: bronze on the primary, limestone facades and steel on the secondary, brick façades. He informed the Committee that the steel windows have failed, but the original bronze windows are in excellent condition. He is therefore proposing to replace only the steel windows. He acknowledged that the proposed windows differ in details, but not configuration, from the original steel windows. Committee members noted that the proposed windows were very poor matches for the historic windows. Mr. Levy asked if better replicas were possible. Mr. Gerbner commented that better matches could be achieved. The Committee signaled that it would like to see the applicant propose windows truer to the originals. Mr. Gerbner discussed several possible window details that would allow him to better replicate the historic windows. He concluded that he would withdraw the window portion of the application and submit a new window application for true replicas of the historic windows. The staff informed him that it could approve at the staff level the replacement in kind of the historic steel windows.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the cooling tower and replacement windows, provided the replacement windows replicate the historic windows in configuration, profile, and dimension, pursuant to 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.]; and the Roofs Guideline [Recommended: Installing mechanical and service equipment on the roof such as air conditioning ... when required for the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

2504 South Cleveland Street

Sara DiNicola, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1909, John Windrim, architect

PROPOSAL: Replace security door

This application proposes the replacement of a non-historic aluminum screen door with a metal security door.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the proposed door, pursuant to Standard 9. A wood, fully-glazed, storm door could be approved at the staff level.

Mr. Farnham presented this application. No one attended the meeting to represent the proposal. Committee members discussed the proposal. They acknowledged that security is an issue; however, it contended that the applicant should seek a more appropriate door.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal as submitted, pursuant to 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.].

1939 West Diamond Street

Margaret Carney, Owner

Cathy Harris, Applicant

DATE: 1889, Willis Hale, architect

PROPOSAL: Mural

This application proposes a mural with a landscape theme by artist Anna Uribe on a stucco party wall at 1935 Diamond Street.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application. Cathy Harris and Amy Johnston, Mural Arts Program, attended the meeting. Ms. Harris explained that the mural was part of a larger effort to improve the vacant lot. Parking and landscaping will also be added, but that segment of the work is not included in this proposal. She showed the Committee examples of the artist's work. Ms. Johnston noted that the architecture of the proposed location will be taken into consideration during the design of the mural. Mr. Farnham advised the applicants that proposals for further alterations to this site must be submitted to the Commission for its review.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, pursuant to 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.].

329 South 17th Street

MFT Holdings, LLC, Owner

Cathy Harris, Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Mural

Mr. Baron explained this proposal, which calls for painting a mural on a stuccoed party wall facing a parking lot on Pine Street. The mural is a rendering of different buildings to the north of this structure including Liberty Place. The mural does not cover any exposed brick surfaces.

Staff recommendation: Approval pursuant to Standard 9 and Standard 10.

Cathy Harris and Amy Johnston, Mural Arts Program, attended the meeting. Ms. Johnston asserted that the neighbors in the 1600 block of Waverly were apprised of the mural and gave their support. Mr. Baron remarked that the mural is appropriate for the neighborhood in terms of color and form and the Committee concurred.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval pursuant to 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 work 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.] and 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 property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

25 South Van Pelt Street

Archdiocese of Philadelphia, Owner

Cathy Harris, Applicant

DATE: 1894, addition 1939 by Louis Magaziner for Big Brothers Association

PROPOSAL: Mural

Mr. Baron explained the proposal, which calls for painting a mural on a brick side wall of the addition building. Unlike other murals applications this is not a stuccoed wall that was formerly covered by another building. The applicant has also provided no information on the size or appearance of the mural.

Staff recommendation: Denial because the application is incomplete and pursuant to Standard 9 and Standard 10.

Committee members expressed concern about the mural's installation on an exposed brick wall and the absence of details with regards to its scale and location on the wall.

Cathy Harris and Amy Johnston, Mural Arts Program, attended the meeting. Ms. Harris stressed that the mural's intent is a city wide awareness of truancy. She believes that this very visible wall would be a prime location for the mural, which would cover the entire wall.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the mural could be painted on another surface and attached at this location so as not to be permanent. He expressed concern with setting a precedent of a mural on a brick wall. Mr. Levy offered that if the vacant lot is sold and developed, then the mural would be covered. He thought that the applicant should acquire more information about the alley way.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal because the application is incomplete and pursuant to 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 work 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.] and 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 property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

342 South 15th Street

Frankie Francis, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1845

PROPOSAL: Reinstall windows, stucco façade

Mr. Baron explained this proposal, which involves work to a Greek Revival rowhouse. The applicant removed the historic windows, closed down the openings on the second floor and installed vinyl windows. The applicant now seeks to reinstall the wood sash that he removed. He also seeks to stucco the building over the existing coat of stucco.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the reinstallation of the sash and approval of the re-stuccoing only if necessary if the old stucco is first removed and the new replicates the original in composition and scoring pursuant to Standard 6.

The Committee members discussed the proposal and expressed concern that the new stucco would extend further outward if the old was not first removed.

Janet McDaniel attended the meeting and informed the Committee that the existing stucco would be repaired and a new coat of stucco would not be installed. She asked if the penetration for the air conditioning units could be infilled with stucco. Committee members recommended that the stucco be patched with the same sand finished stucco.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the installation of the original windows and patching of the stucco, with staff to review a sample and color of the stucco pursuant to 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.]

1612-18 Locust Street

TC & KY Association, Incorporated, Owner

Joanne Phillips, Esq., Applicant

DATE: 1960, architects Supowitz & Demchick Non-contributing

1618, built 1850 attributed to John Notman, altered ground floor 1890, Wilson Eyre Jr.

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation of 1618, demolition of 1612-16, construction of 8-story multi-unit residential building with parking

This proposal is modified since last month. It now includes the demolition of only the Non-contributing structure and a piece of the 1960 Locust Club addition that wraps around the rear of 1618 Locust Street. The brownstone house at 1618 Locust will be retained and restored on the exterior. The plans call for an 8-story residential building to be constructed on the site of the Locust Club. The new building will have multiple set backs from Locust Street as well as from the west side above the 6th Floor to honor the scale of Locust Street and minimize shadows on the St Marks Church site. The building will be clad in yellow and pink Casota stone as found on the Art Museum and will have balconies and an entrance on the right side of the facade. On Latimer Street, the building has a courtyard and the vehicle entrance to parking with a brick fence to run along the property line. We have not received the drawings for the east façade.

Staff recommendation: Approval with staff to review details and pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

The applicant clarified that the proposal is in concept. Robert Powers, Jason Schlesinger, James Rowe, the architect, Joanne Phillips and Matthew McClure, counsel for the applicant, attended the meeting. Ms. Phillips said that the revised proposal will retain and incorporate the brownstone into the development. She noted that she has met with neighbors and the Planning Commission. Mr. Rowe said that the concrete block addition would be removed and the portion which covers the bay. There would be a set back from Locust Street at the 5th to 7th floors and east on the 8th to 9th floors with the cornice line restored at the 4th floor. He pointed out that Locust Street has a mixed context of materials. The proposed stone blends with the rear elevation wall along Latimer Street, which will have a gate and the proposed tower will have balconies.

Carl Primavera, Esq., representing St. Mark's Church, believes that the rhythm and scale of the proposed project will negatively impact the church property.

Cletus Lyman, resident of Latimer Street, expressed concern that wall along Latimer Street would be erected so high that it would hide the planting in the garden. He thought that the proposed iron gate should mimic the gate on his property. Mr. Rowe assured Mr. Lyman that details are forthcoming. Alice Lyman expressed concern that the height of the new construction would obscure her view north.

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance, remarked that the revised proposal which retains the brownstone, addresses the cornice height and the setback from Locust Street is an exceptional effort; therefore the Alliance strongly supports the revised proposal.

Sean Mullin, St Mark's Church, appreciates the revised proposal; however, he believes that St. Mark's Church was not built as an urban property, but should be surrounded by space and light. He said that he has seen shadow studies, but concluded that a building which doubles in height would have an impact on the church. Ms. Phillips addressed the shadow issue by saying that there would be no shadows between March and December. Mr. Schlesinger gave an illustrated demonstration with regards to shadows.

Peggy Wachs, Cosmopolitan Club, is supportive of the project; however, she has concerns about the additional traffic created, possible commercial parking, trash collection and the garden view. She inquired about the number of underground parking spaces. Ms. Phillips said that 17 spaces would be provided only for unit owners.

Ms. Phillips remarked that the alterations to the rear will be an improvement.

Committee members concurred that the proposed Casota stone material will give light and enhance the massing. Mr. Powers commented that the proposed material is very compatible.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept with staff to review details and pursuant to 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 work 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.] and 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 property and its environment would be unimpaired.]

33 South 2nd Street, and 18-22 Letitia Street

EFL Partners V, LP, Owners

Paul Stewart, Applicant

DATE: c. 1905, 18-22 S. Letitia, built c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Roof decks, HVAC

This proposal, seen in the past, involves items that became apparent with the arrival of the full set of drawings. These items include roof top HVAC and deck structures, and cutting several windows on the north wall facing St. James Street. Staff has now worked with the applicant to minimize some of the issues. We still have inadequate drawings to assess the changes to the parapets and front cornice but the applicant proposes to raise the parapets of the Letitia Street property to change the roof slope and drainage to create internal drains in place of the existing downspouts.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the HVAC, deck and roof-top storage shed and new windows on St James Street with staff to review details, and denial of the 8 foot high privacy wall on the roof deck pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Baron presented the application including a storage structure on the roof, HVAC and cutting several windows on the St James Street façade. He noted that the applicant had not submitted information showing the revised cornice and parapets for the Letitia Street building. He was told by the applicant that that issue was being withdrawn from consideration at this time. Mr. Rothchild said that this was correct but that he thinks that the staff already approved the parapet change.

Elliott Rothchild, the architect, said that the storage structure on the roof deck would be pulled back towards the stairtower structure and that the parapet wall on 2nd Street would hide the air conditioning units on that building. He noted that the front of the parapet on Letitia Street was raised to create a valley for water drainage.

Committee members recommended that the height of the privacy fence atop the deck be adjusted. Mr. Rivera inquired if the dunnage would be visible. Mr. Rothchild responded in the negative, since it would be setback 12 feet from Black Horse Alley.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, subject to the height of the privacy fence, not to exceed six feet, and with the staff to review details pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

2304 Wallace Street

William Cromar, Owner

James Lee Deddens, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Replace stucco on façade, new front door

This proposal calls for removing a stuccoed brick face façade and installing a new smooth stucco on the façade. The applicant claims that the brick is in poor condition. He also wishes to change the front door and frame with a design that is not based on the historic doors of this period.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to 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.]

Mr. Atkins inquired about the success rate for the removal of cement. Mr. Baron explained that it is often possible to remove stucco and restore the brickwork below. He recommended a site visit to look at a sample area. Ms. Pentz pointed out that the faux lintels would extend beyond the plane.

James L. Deddens, the architect, said that the brick beneath the existing stucco appears to be in poor condition. Committee members concluded that the stucco should be allowed. Mr. Deddens said that the owner is open to suggestions for the door design.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the stucco with a neutral color sand finish, and denial of the door as submitted, but approval of a four panel door with glazing subject to staff review pursuant to 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.]

210 West Washington Square

210 West Washington Square Association

Jeffrey Wyant, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Committee's review of glass sample

Mr. Farnham introduced the review. He explained that the Commission approved several alterations to the N.W. Ayer Building at 210 W. Washington Square at its 8 April 2004 meeting. A restaurant will be added to the first floor and garden area of this property. As part of its approval, the Commission required that the Architectural Committee review glass samples for the glass garden wall running along the sidewalk from the Ayer Building to the Saunders Building to the south. The Commission gave the Architectural Committee final-approval authority for the glass. The Committee looked at samples and approved the first glass sample, provided the glass is mounted with the matte finish side facing the public sidewalk.

250 Lawrence Street

Arden Theatre Company, Owner

Noele Parris, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1820, significant in district

PROPOSAL: Partial demolition of rear, construction of 3-story rear addition

This proposal includes the removal of two, small rear additions and the construction of a three-

story addition. The original rear ell with the staircase will remain and connect the main section of the house with the addition. The new construction consists of a large section at the same height as the rear ell with a projecting, asymmetrical bay at the rear. The south wall of the addition will be brick and will extend past the plane of the addition's rear wall. The rear wall will be stuccoed and the projecting bay will be clad in metal with a standing-seam metal roof. All windows will be wood and a mix of casements and fixed sash. Although the addition will be highly visible from 5th Street, it will have minimal impact on the building's historic fabric.

Staff recommendation: Approval with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina presented the project. Terry Nolan, Executive Director for the Arden Theatre; Heather Smith, a Board Member of the Arden, and John Wagner, the architect for the project, attended the meeting. Mr. Nolan explained that the building will serve as the residence for visiting artists and actors for the Arden Theatre. Ms. Spina noted that the rear ell is original to the building and houses the staircase for the house, but the additions that design proposes to remove date to the mid-20th century. Mr. Atkin suggested putting a door, leading from the first floor unit to the garden area. The Committee members discussed the best place for the door, considering the grade changes around the addition and the security issues of having a door in the bedroom area. Mr. Wagner and Mr. Nolan said that they would consider the suggestion.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportions, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and 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].

317 and 319-29 Vine Street

Berkshire Vine Street, LP, Owner

Paul Horning, Applicant

DATE: 317- vacant lot; 319- c. 1960, non-contributing, demolition permit approved at staff level

PROPOSAL: Construction of 6-story multi-unit residential building with parking

This application is for a new 6-story, 60-unit residential building with parking. The U-shaped complex faces Vine Street with the open courtyard as the pedestrian entrance. At six stories, the building responds to its neighbors, the Charles E. Brown Factory next door, the Leas & McVitty building down the block and the expansive Thomas Scientific Building across the street. The building will have brick walls, large banks of black-finish, one-over-one windows, and stone coping. The courtyard will be a break in the building that offers a relief to the monolithic nature of the building, like Orianna Street does further down the block.

On the 4th Street façade, the building breaks down to minimize its scale in response to the smaller buildings along York Avenue. Zinc-clad, projecting bays are introduced and the parapet is broken to reduce the sense of the overall height of the building. The brick and windows remain the same. This treatment continues along the Wood Street façade, which houses the vehicular entrance. All parking will be underground.

All mechanical equipment will be on the roof and will be hidden by the zinc-clad or brick parapet. According to the zoning agreement, nothing will be above 75 feet. The brick façade will be a typical red brick, but some details, such as the watertable and some piers, will be done

in a darker red brick for contrast. However, at the north end of the 4th Street façade and along Wood Street, the watertable is at 4 feet above the sidewalk. This makes the pedestrian experience rather bland. Perhaps windows or reveals in the brick could be inserted to break the monotony of the brick façade at this level.

Staff Recommendation: Approval with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina presented the project. She stated that a non-contributing building stood on the site at the time of designation, so the Historical Commission has jurisdiction over the new construction, not just review and comment. Mark Hallowell and Paul Horning noted that the areas that are slated to be clad in zinc may be covered in a different metal, but it will be grey in color. Cost will be the deciding factor. Committee members suggested terne-coated stainless as an alternative.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportions, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and 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.].

241-45 Market Street

The 241-245 LLC, Owner

Stephen Maffei, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 241- c. 1840; demolished 1987; 243- c. 1840; demolished 1988; 245- c. 1925; demolished 1987

PROPOSAL: New construction on vacant lot

This proposal calls for a six-story, multi-unit residential building along Market Street, with commercial on the ground floor. Although the lot goes to Church Street, the building sits at Market Street only. The rear of the development is reserved for parking with only a garden wall and gate at the Church Street street-line.

The building follows the design which became popular in the 1940s with services in a single core, called out in a different material and the actual used space in wings coming off of that core. The service tower will be sheathed in either terra cotta panels or brick veneer. The floors will be articulated with limestone veneer panels. Casement windows with transoms will add a verticality to the building. Each floor will have recessed balconies with a Trespa Meteon (man-made, wood-resin) panel system for the railings. At the penthouse, the balcony will extend the width of the building. The entrance to the upper floors will have a stone canopy and halo-lit stainless-steel numbers over a double-leaf, fully glazed door with transom. The storefront at the first floor will have a symmetrical design of a double-leaf, fully glazed door with transom, flanked by tripartite windows. There is a large entablature at the first floor for signage when there is a tenant.

The rear façade matches the Market Street in design. At the street-line, the plans call for a series of stone columns and concrete canopies with brick bases. This wall will extend to the rear of 239 Market Street, which is owned by the same developer. Metal gates stand at the vehicular and pedestrian entries.

The west elevation, which is visible since the neighboring building is only two stories tall, calls for smooth stucco with scored expansion joints with piers of terra cotta or brick veneer at both ends. The east façade also has a stucco finish, but since the owner also owns 239 Market Street the design can incorporate windows on this façade. At the middle there is a light well with casement windows topped with transoms. At the ends, the floors also have banks of casement windows with transoms.

Staff recommendation: Approval with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9, however, the developer should reconsider the street-line of Church Street. It is a vibrant street that has many buildings facing this property and this is an opportunity to restore the historic street wall on this block.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal. The Committee asked about the Commission's jurisdiction. Ms. Spina said that the Commission individually designated the properties in 1976, but the buildings were demolished in 1987 and 1988.

Stephen Maffei, the architect, presented material samples for the building. He said that the owner had considered splitting the development, with a building on Church Street, but this did not prove economically feasible.

Beth Richards, representing the Old City Civic Association, remarked that Church Street is a very important, noting the Sugar Mill apartments and coffee shop across the street, and inquired if any variances are required. Mr. Maffei replied that the project would require several variances, but the owner wanted to come to the Historical Commission prior to appearing before the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

The Committee members concurred that the garden wall along the Church Street street-line should be made more substantial. They asked that the columns be made of brick and landscaping be added to enhance the pedestrian experience along Church Street. Mr. Maffei suggested installing a trellis system over the parking area. The Committee thought that may be an appropriate way to help minimize the openness of the parking area, but wanted to see details before recommending approval.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, with the staff to review details of the building and Committee to review details of the Church Street garden wall and trellis.

239 Market Street

Loumac, LP, Owner

Stephen Maffei, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1847; storefront and industrial windows installed, c. 1925

PROPOSAL: Cut new windows in rear, roof deck

Ms. Spina presented this proposal, which calls for restoring the front façade to the 1920s alterations. However, the proposed aluminum windows have larger dimensions at the operational sash. For now, these are the best alternative on the market for insulated, aluminum sash for these industrial type of windows.

On the rear, the owner wishes to install two new windows on the rear ell with identical industrial sash and a new door that will be the primary entrance for one of the units. Although this will include the removal of historic fabric, the rear ell has been stuccoed in the past and has seen some deterioration. On the roof of the rear ell, the owner wants to install a roof deck with a horizontal rail; this meets the Secretary's Standards, but may not meet code. To have access to

the roof deck, the application calls for removing the original windows on the third floor of the main portion of the building and installing a large, sliding glass door. The plans call for rebuilding the entire rear wall of the main building, citing deterioration as the factor, but the application does not include a structural engineer's report documenting the need for reconstruction.

Staff recommendation: Approval of restoring the front façade, the aluminum replacement windows, and cutting the windows and door in the rear ell, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 4, 6, and 9. Denial of the rebuilding of the rear wall and the sliding glass door, pursuant to Standard 9. To access the deck, one of the windows should be cut down to a single-leaf door.

Stephen Maffei, the architect, said that the owner met with a structural engineer to determine the stability of the rear wall. He proposes to restore the rear wall in brick. The Committee discussed the proposal and concurred with the staff's recommendation. They noted that although the rear wall may be re-built if a structural engineer deems it imminently dangerous, the historic window configuration should be kept.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of restoring the front façade, the aluminum replacement windows, cutting the windows and door in the rear ell, re-building the rear wall (if substantiated by a structural engineer) and cutting the windows to single-leaf doors, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 4 [Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.], Standard 6 [Deteriorated 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.] and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]. Denial of the sliding glass door, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportions, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

7500 Germantown Avenue, Wingohocking Hall

New Covenant Church, Owner

Van Strother, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1890-1900, Wilson Brothers, Cope and Stewardson, architects

PROPOSAL: HVAC units, fencing, gazebo, landscaping

Ms. Spina explained this proposal, which involves two parts. First, the rehabilitated building will have 56 housing units and each unit plus all of the common areas have their own HVAC condensers. The condensers, themselves, are small, 23-inches by 35-inches, but they are grouped together in places around the building. The rear of the building is actually the most visible from a public right-of-way, Gowan Street. At the front of the building, the plan calls for hiding them with shrubbery.

Second, the applicant wants to create landscaped gardens in the areas between the wings with fencing. The western courtyard will become the entry garden and the eastern courtyard will become the private garden. The proposed fencing is a simple, aluminum picket fencing. The applicant also proposes to have a straight fence at the entry garden with simple, picket columns at the entry path. Along the building façade, by the door, another fence will delineate the garden to create a visual porch. For the eastern, private garden the applicant proposes a curved fence.

For both gardens hardscaping and landscaping are proposed.

Staff recommendation: Approval of HVAC with landscaping as a buffer on all sides, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9, 10, and Mechanical Systems Guideline. Approval of the landscaping, hardscaping and fencing, but without the curve at the private garden, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Van Strother, the architect, attended the meeting. He said each resident will be responsible for the cost of the air-conditioning, so the only way to monitor the use was to have individual units. He explained the difficulty in designing the HVAC system for the project, owing to the technical restraints of the system and the close proximity the units must have to the rooms in order to be most efficient.

The Committee concurred that the units along the rear are most visible from a public right-of-way and additional greenery should be added to the Gowan Street façade for a visual screening. Mr. Strother objected, stating that the driveways are necessary for the maintenance of the building. Ms. Spina said that the driveways do not have to be eliminated, but some of asphalt around the proposed HVAC units could be converted to landscaped edges.

The Committee then discussed the proposed landscaping and fencing in the courtyards of the building. They agreed that the two fences should be straight to reflect the angular forms of the building.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of HVAC with landscaping as a buffer on all sides, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.], 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.] and Mechanical Systems Guideline [Recommended: Installing air conditioning units if required by the new use in such a manner that historic features are not damaged or obscured.]. Approval of the landscaping, hardscaping and fencing, but without the curve at the private garden, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

1420-22 Chestnut Street

Property Management, Owner

Dominic Aspite, Applicant

DATE: 1896-97, Frank Miles Day, architect; 1st floor altered, c. 1960; 1st floor refaced in granite, 1981.

PROPOSAL: Signage

This proposal calls for signage at the first floor for a new commercial tenant. The signage would be placed at the top of the arches and includes brass letters, with a high shine finish, with bands that would span the length of the building. Florescent lights will illuminate the sign.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and Signage Guideline. Halo-lit signage in the band above the transom would be more appropriate for the building.

Ms. Spina explained the application and Ross Warne and Dominic Aspite attended the meeting. Mr. Aspite said 7-Eleven is concerned with the proper lighting of the sign. Committee members agreed with staff that the proposed sign is inappropriate for the building. They noted to the

applicant that if halo-lit letters are used in the sign-band, the mechanicals would be in the back of the sign rather than at the top, allowing for larger letters.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.] and Signage Guideline [Not Recommended: Using inappropriately scaled signs and logos or other types of signs that obscure, damage, or destroy remaining character defining features of the historic building.]. It suggested a halo-lit sign in the band above the transom.

427 Spruce Street

Antonio and Georgine Atacan, Owners

Steven Owens, Contractor

DATE: 1791

first French Consulate General in the United States, 1791-1793

Spanish Legation, 1795-1805

restored, Carl Massara, architect, 1969-1972

PROPOSAL: Roof deck, change dormer window to door

This application proposes the addition of a roof deck to the rear ell. The plans originally submitted to document the proposal were incomplete. On 26 April 2004, 13 days after the application deadline and one day before the Committee meeting, a newly-retained architect submitted revised plans for the deck. To access the deck, an original rear dormer window would be cut into a door and a bridge would be built from the new door across the roof and narrow piazza to the deck on the rear ell. The deck would stand very high owing to the steep pitch of the roof. It would be visible from Manning Street and, perhaps, S. 5th Street.

Staff Recommendation: Denial owing to the incompleteness of the original application, conversion of the dormer window to door, and roof alterations, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Committee. He noted that the Society Hill Civic Association “objects” to the proposal because it has not had an opportunity to review it. Owner Antonio Atacan and architect Scott Craven represented the project. Mr. Atacan ardently beseeched the Committee to recommend approval of his proposal. He stated that he even though the deck itself is on the rear ell, he would like to access the deck from the main block of the rowhouse from the “master level” with the master bedroom and master bath. He added that the deck would enhance his “quality of life” and the building’s “marketability.” He asserted that his \$200,000 investment in alterations to the property evidenced his commitment to the building. Mr. Atkins of the Committee stated that he has “absolutely no problem” with the deck. He cited the views from it as a reason for approving it. He added that the “brilliant young architect” had done a “lovely” design. He urged his fellow Committee members to recommend approval. Ms. Pentz, Mr. Levy, and Mr. D’Alessandro expressed reservations about the deck, especially the alterations to the dormer and roof. Mr. Atkins again asserted that the designer was a “brilliant young architect.” Mr. D’Alessandro posited that the alterations to the roof for the walkway might compromise the roof structure. He asked the architect to explain the changes. Mr. Atkins and the architect explained the details of the project, stating that the walkway would rest on the roof and would not require the cutting of any joists.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal as submitted.

123 League Street

Rostislav Kopylkov, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1793

PROPOSAL: Legalize metal door

This application to cure a violation involves the front door of the house. The applicant replaced his historically accurate wood front door with a metal door with shallow panels on an emergency basis without a permit. The wood front door had been reviewed by the Commission and the house was awarded a plaque for an accurate restoration.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to 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.]

Rostislav Kopylkov, the owner, explained the circumstances where he needed an immediate door replacement. He thought that the acquired door replicated the original door closely enough.

Committee members concurred that it could not justify the legalization of the existing door because it didn't match the material or profile of the historically correct door.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the legalization pursuant to 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.].

237 South 18th Street, Barclay Hotel

Barclay Condominium Association, Owners

David Matus, Applicant

DATE: 1928, J.E.R. Carpenter, architect

PROPOSAL: Replace 20 windows

This application involves installing twenty wood Marvin windows in a second floor condominium unit. The installation would include the windows only on the right half of the front façade. The windows differ from the existing in some dimensions as well as with a visible jamb liner. A similar application for a higher floor was denied by the Commission in the past.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron presented this application and noted that there have been several proposals for window replacement in this building which have been denied by the Committee and Commission. He pointed out that the proposed window's dimensions differ slightly from the original but that the main issue was the visible jamb liner.

David Matus, the window representative, explained the differences in the dimensions, but thought that the slight variation would have minimal impact on the window appearance. The drawings also did not seem entirely accurate.

The Committee concurred that the applicant should submit true shop drawings showing exact window details off existing and proposed for comparison. But they thought that the main

sticking point was the jamb liners.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial pursuant to 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.]

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan Farnham
Diane M. Hughes
Laura M. Spina