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Chapter 1

The relationship between old and new architecture is a delicate one that must be examined carefully in order to manage the character of a neighborhood while also allowing it to grow. One such neighborhood, with numerous approaches to this issue that represent the work of many architects over several decades, is Society Hill, in Philadelphia.

This case study is intended to examine the relationship between modern and historic architecture in a historic neighborhood that has gone through cycles of prosperity and decline and which is now at a new height in its life cycle. To understand the management approaches that have been utilized in this neighborhood to introduce new architecture into historic traditions and streetscapes and to determine their effects, while providing an outline of the
Chapter 1

historic context of the place, is the main goal of this thesis.

To begin this study, Chapter 2 presents a broad overview of the history of modern infill in historic neighborhoods. This topic has been greatly discussed over the past 30 years, being the focus of many design conferences and journal articles, with many architects, historians and critics analyzing the ways in which modern buildings are and ought to be designed in historic contexts. This chapter also contains an overview of the various renewal plans and reports about Society Hill written and commissioned by the Redevelopment Authority of Philadelphia, which, to a large degree, oversaw the areas redeveloped in the 1950s and 1960s, including the guidelines they produced to regulate the design of modern infill. Comparable modern guidelines are also discussed along with their relationship to the ones produced in the 1950s and 1960s.

With these essays as a background, the focus narrows in Chapter 3 to a broad overview of the history of the chosen study area: Society Hill, Philadelphia, with the intent of giving a context to the analysis. The main concern is the pattern of building construction, why and how it occurred, and
who was involved. The focus of this overview history is a summary of the legislative, policy, and planning initiatives that enabled the neighborhood’s transformation.

At the beginning of Philadelphia’s history, what is now known as Society Hill (Map 1) was the most affluent and bustling neighborhood in the city. But the area slowly but steadily deteriorated throughout the nineteenth century due to a range of factors.

A major factor that contributed to this decline was the presence of the Dock Street Food Distribution Center, located at Second and Walnut Streets in proximity to the Delaware River and its docks. As this Distribution Center grew, the area became more industrial and less hospitable as a residential neighborhood. This, along with the new availability of public transportation, motivated many residents to move farther out of the city, contributing to Society Hill becoming a low-income neighborhood of tenement houses populated by recent immigrants who could not afford better housing.

In the middle of the 20th century, there was a rekindling of interest in
Map 1
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Philadelphia, coinciding with the development of Independence National Historical Park. This urban project brought attention to the area and the desire to bring it back to what it had once been. Once the city was able to move the Dock Street Food Distribution Center to a location in South Philadelphia, the area opened up to redevelopment and it progressed quickly. The city made a major effort to revitalize Society Hill by creating amenities to attract upscale residents, such as restoration of the Head House area, introduction of new commercial nodes such as “New Market” designed by Louis Sauer on Front Street, and construction of the Society Hill Towers and adjacent town houses designed by I.M. Pei and Associates.

During the 1960s and 1970s, the entire area was documented through photographs and a series of government initiatives, and plans were created to aid in the process. (See Chapter 3 for a more detailed history.) Almost all of the historic houses were rehabilitated, restored, or demolished to be replaced with new buildings. It is this new development within the setting of older buildings that is the focus of this thesis.
Chapter 4 analyzes selected examples of this new construction. The analysis relies for identification of examples on the inventory\(^1\) compiled in 1999 in order to list the neighborhood on the National Register of Historic Places and the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. In this thesis, this Inventory and the accompanying Register Nominations were used to select specific streets by first coding buildings based on date of construction. Thus buildings constructed after 1900 were mapped out on Sanborn maps of the area (see Map 7, page 50). From this, a few blocks, the 100 and 200 blocks of Delancey Street and the 600 block of Pine Street, stood out as having close to 50% of their buildings constructed in the last 100 years. These blocks are of interest because they display the most change and possess the greatest mix of architecture from the last 300 years.

Chapter 4 includes descriptions of these buildings, and an analysis of the overall streetscape of the block. The row houses can be divided into three major categories: original historic, restored historic, and modern. Original historic are buildings that have retained their original form and features. Many of these have

---

\(^1\) This document contains descriptions of every building in the historic district along with approximate dates of construction. Some of the descriptions include architect, original owner, contractor, developer, and history of construction. Excerpts pertaining to the specific study area can be found in Appendix E.
been restored in a way that is reflective of the time at which they were constructed. Restored historic refers to buildings in which, while the majority of the built form is original, the façade has been changed or there have been additions made that affect the streetwall, such as removal of a shopfront, the addition of a bay window, or resurfacing the façade with stucco. Many of these changes are now considered historic in their own right, but they can often have the same impact as a completely new building. While these two categories are important, they are not the focus of this thesis. Rather they are the context and setting for the modern infill buildings which are analyzed in this thesis.

For the purposes of this thesis, these modern buildings have been further divided into three broad categories:

**Imitator**: Buildings that closely imitate historic buildings.

**Contextual**: Buildings that are modern interpretations of historic traditions and features.

**Contrastor**: Buildings that seem to ignore the context completely.
The study areas have been chosen to insure that examples of all three categories are included. How building façades reflective of these three broad approaches interact with each other and the street environment is the focus, along with how they were affected by guidelines developed by the Redevelopment Authority of Philadelphia.

This thesis is intentionally limited to that which is typically controlled by the usual preservation processes, mainly primary facades and overall streetscape conditions. Elements not included are interiors, in depth analysis of plans and plan typologies, detailed information about specific architects, and other exterior conditions that do not affect the front streetwall façade.
Chapter 2

“To successfully build the new in the context of the old, we must recognize not only the heritage of the past but also the need for architecture to serve well in today’s framework. We need not only to relate to the proportions of the old but also to allow for the occasional necessary contrast. The new must be designed to fit into its historic neighborhood and also to fit the fabric of the city as a whole. We must design the cityscape to enhance the preserved old and the proposed new. We must be imaginative and creative within our own time and place, solve our own needs and leave behind us a heritage that in time will be worthy of our children’s preservation efforts.”

By definition, infill does not occur in a bubble, and in order to understand how it has evolved to how it is practiced today, a brief overview follows so as to set the context for the idea of modern buildings in historic areas. This is not meant to be a comprehensive history but a short summary to introduce the reader to the ideas of infill and its roots in the past.

---

Only in the last 200 years has architecture evolved so quickly. Before this
time, due to limited methods and materials, it often took decades or centuries for
architectural styles to develop, and even as they did, the material, forms and
volumes remained the same – wood frame or bearing wall masonry.\(^3\) With the
advent of different technology and new materials, architectural styles have
evolved more quickly, and the time to think on behalf of the maturation of
designs and style has decreased.\(^4\) Because of this quicker turn-around time of
architecture, it is even more important to consider the relationship between old
structures and new ones. Without knowing where design stands now, it is
impossible to control where it is going unless the environment in which it exists
is thoroughly studied.\(^5\)

**Preservation and Place-making**

Many historic neighborhoods derive their interest and vibrancy from a
mixture of architectural styles. In such neighborhoods, the intersection of


different eras of history in close proximity, gives depth and meaning that can
turn a space into a place, which is what gives the neighborhood its value.
Meaning is also created by the memories associated with a place that can only
occur when it has a history, both tangible and intangible. These memories create
an attachment that makes it difficult for large amounts of change to occur quickly
because people like to remember how a place is and want it to stay that way.
Managing change within a historic neighborhood must be done in a way that is
conscious of the existing sense of place; because each neighborhood is unique,
and there is no universal formula that can be applied to every case.⁶

To be able to successfully design a structure that is sympathetic to what
exists while also having its own identity is one of the most complex architectural
problems faced by the profession⁷ and must be done with the utmost care.
Because new urban architecture has almost always been built in the context of
old buildings, there is plenty of material available to showcase how architects

have responded to the existing fabric.8 “...A key issue is how to respond to the past without vitiating the authenticity of current architecture, how to make a new architecture out of the past which progresses in a creative way (Richard McCormac).”9

New infill buildings should be sympathetic to the existing fabric. This can be done in a couple of different ways. The first is to recreate what was previously there or imitate the surrounding fabric. The second is to design in a way that is different enough so as to not be mistaken for original while at the same time does not stick out like a sore thumb.10 There is a “rationale in selecting an architectural vocabulary to create a sense of place that responds to geographic settings and community values.”11 Well done infill should respond to its surroundings while at the same time blending in with the overall scheme and atmosphere.

---

9 Ibid, 32.
Addressing Modern Infill in Historic Neighborhoods

Since the late 1970s, there have been a number of conferences held and articles written addressing the idea of modern infill. They all come up with similar broad conclusions – in order to build successful new architecture in a historic context, you must consider the history and traditions of the place, and the visual and social impact of the new designs, creating new architecture that responds to these inherent features, while also contributing to them and the field of architecture.12

One of the first large-scale conferences to be held on this issue was in December of 1977 in Washington, DC. It was organized by the National Trust for Historic Preservation and entitled, “Old and New Architecture: Design Relationship.” This conference had four main goals, which were “To provide a forum for discussion of old and new architecture in the United States; to encourage a dialogue on the theoretical and practical aspects of designing buildings in existing settings; to gain a greater understanding of design methodology for relating new to old; and to produce a publication that

12 Stevens, 27.
contributes to the limited literature on the subject.” 13 This conference, in fact, did produce a book of the same title that is a first major essay of its kind. It provided a foundation for the thought surrounding this issue and opened a dialogue that continues to expand.

The National Trust did not address this issue again at such a level until another conference over a decade later in 1988 in Philadelphia, which took on the topic of new buildings for historic neighborhoods and which was followed by a student design competition in 1989 of proposals for infill solutions. 14

English Heritage, the United Kingdom’s equivalent of the National Trust, followed with a seminar on December 2, 1992 at the Royal Institute for British Architects (RIBA) entitled “Architecture and the City: New Buildings in Historic Contexts.” The introduction given by Jocelyn Stevens, then Chairman of English Heritage, edited versions of the six key papers, and the discussion that followed the lectures were included in the February 1993 edition of the RIBA Journal,

---

14 Young, 12.
giving the British perspective on the issue.\textsuperscript{15}

There also exists a scattering of articles written over the last forty years that address specific issues and case studies, showing examples of how the ideas put forth in such conferences are being implemented or how they could be carried out better. One of the more recent articles is by Diane R. Suchman and Laura Cole titled “Infill Housing,” published in 2001. Their ideas go well beyond physical design, addressing the importance of the social and economic conditions of the neighborhood, community amenities, public services, and the neighborhood’s image.\textsuperscript{16} Their article also addresses the influence of political will, vision, and policy on infill development and the important role that it plays in any change to historic fabric.\textsuperscript{17} All of these factors are important to consider when thinking about adding to existing fabric.

\textbf{Regulations in Society Hill During the Redevelopment}

For the modern redevelopment of Society Hill, which is the subject of this thesis, there are a series of key documents produced during and after the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{15} Stevens, 24.
\item \textsuperscript{16} Suchman, Diane R. and Laura Cole. “Infill Housing,” \textit{Urban Land}. 22
\item \textsuperscript{17} ibid, 23
\end{itemize}
redevelopment. The two main documents that were the overall guidelines for the redevelopment are the urban renewal plans for Washington Square East Unit 1, published in 1958,\textsuperscript{18} and Washington Square East Unit 2, published in 1960.\textsuperscript{19} Along with these plans are two technical reports prepared for the Redevelopment Authority that are also important documents because they aid in understanding what was going on at the time. The first is the \textit{Washington Square East Urban Renewal Area Technical Report} published in 1959\textsuperscript{20} and the second is \textit{A Technical Report on Neighborhood Conservation}\textsuperscript{21} published in 1964. The last redevelopment era document is the \textit{Washington Square Redevelopment Area Plan}\textsuperscript{22} produced by the Philadelphia City Planning Commission in 1957.

Because the focus of this thesis is on residential neighborhoods with a general maximum height of three to three and one-half stories, the description of these plans will focus on the sections of these documents related primarily to this use. Note that these plans also address multi-family mid- and high-rise along

\textsuperscript{18} Redevelopment Authority of Philadelphia. Washington Square East Unit No.1 Urban Renewal Area. 1958.
\textsuperscript{19} Redevelopment Authority of Philadelphia. Washington Square East Unit No.2 Urban Renewal Area. 1960.
\textsuperscript{22} Philadelphia City Planning Commission. Washington Square Redevelopment Area Plan, 1957
with commercial uses in great depth but those sections will not be included in the following synopses.

**Washington Square East Urban Renewal Plans Unit 1 and Unit 2**

The framework of the renewal of this area is in these two plans. Excerpts from them can be found in Appendix A and B. Map 2 shows the Unit boundaries of each of these plans. Both plans are similar and begin with a description of the area covered by the plan with reference maps that outline the boundaries of the unit, an acquisition plan, clearance and rehabilitation plan, and a proposed land use plan. The regulations for specific uses of the land – residential, commercial, mixed-use, etc. – make up the next section, including guidelines for rehabilitation. The third section of each plan addresses land acquisition for development and the conditions and regulations governing new construction and demolition of existing fabric. The last two sections outline all of the miscellaneous provisions and provide the rules for changing the plan.

In terms of building design, height is restricted in Unit 1 to less than three stories in all areas designated Mixed Residential Districts. Both units stipulate
Map 2

Washington Square East - Unit 1 & Unit 2 Boundaries

UD 716, The Urban Design Program Graduate School of Fine Arts, University of Pennsylvania, 1978, fig.12.
that where less than four new residential structures are to be built in a row, that
the height of these buildings should be the same as either of the adjacent
structures. They include guidelines for projecting building elements, such as fire
escapes, which are not permitted on the front facades of buildings, television
aerials, equipment such as air conditioners, and projecting roof elements. They
also address common streetscape elements: sidewalks are all to be paved in
brick, Belgian blocks, or similar paving material, and all yard and garden walls
are to be enclosed with masonry similar to building facades or durable metal
fences that are approved by the Redevelopment Authority.

Both of these documents include guidelines for rehabilitation standards.
The method for acquisition of buildings is outlined along with specific standards
pertaining to quality of construction, rainwater management and basement
conditions. In the Unit 2 plan, there is a specific reference to restoration of
historically certified structures, stating that specific requirements will be made at
the time of acquisition based on their historic and architectural value. There are
sections in each that mention specific properties and areas, much of which was
added in later amendments to the plans.
The Unit 1 plan was ratified in June of 1958 and is valid for fifty years, until 2008. It has been amended five times with a number of modifications in each amendment. The Unit 2 plan has had six amendments with modifications. It was ratified in 1960 and was only valid for twenty-five years.

There are more guidelines that govern the interiors of the buildings than the exteriors in these plans, but because only the exteriors of the building are investigated in this thesis, the explanation is limited to those sections pertaining to building facades and conditions.

**Technical Reports**

The two technical reports contain more specific guidelines for design than the urban renewal plans. Both of these plans were prepared for the Redevelopment Authority.

The first, *Washington Square East Urban Renewal Area Technical Report May 1959*, prepared by Wright, Andrade and Amenta Architects in 1959, is the report created from the cataloguing and surveying of both Units 1 and 2. It is an expansion of the guidelines set forth in the Renewal Plans, going into more
specific detail. There are sections outlining rehabilitation and reuse guidelines, with a greater emphasis on conserving and retaining as much of the historic fabric as possible. A block by block assessment of the area is included in this report, indicating the conditions of the buildings and what is to be retained, and what is to be demolished or replaced. Appendix C gives a comparison in the study area of what was originally planned for the reuse of the building and what was actually done. It shows how plans evolve over time, and the result is that more historic buildings were retained than originally planned.

The most important elements of this report are the map outlining the proposed adjustments to the street layout (Map 3) and an appendix, which lists all of the structures under the jurisdiction of the renewal plans, if they were acquired, their historic certification status, information on date of construction, and their proposed re-use. This document is useful because it is a proposal that can be compared to what was actually done and shows the changes in the plan from initial inception to final implementation. The main difference is the proposed placement of I-95. When the report was written, many of the buildings along Front Street and halfway to Second Street were going to be demolished
Map 3
Proposed Change to Street Grid

UD 716, The Urban Design Program Graduate School of Fine Arts, University of Pennsylvania, 1978, fig.12.
and replaced with the highway, moving Front Street a half of a block to the west. This plan was changed and many of the buildings were saved.

The second technical report, *A Technical Report on Neighborhood Conservation*, was prepared by Albert M. Greenfield & Co., Inc. and The Institute for Architectural Research of the University of Pennsylvania. It begins with addressing the issues of the various real estate markets in the 1950s and 1960s and the sources of funding for rehabilitation and new construction. The chapter on architectural problems is of the most pertinence to this thesis. It addresses the similar issues related to infill housing that have already been mentioned, and also outlines the specific architectural characteristics of Society Hill that are described in greater detail in Chapter Four of this thesis. A large portion of this report presents design solutions to various site conditions, using specific lots in Washington Square East as examples. This portion was prepared under the direction of C. Preston Andrade, Jr. of Wright, Andrade and Amenta Architects, the firm that prepared the previous report. He was the then director of the Institute for Architectural Research of the University of Pennsylvania, the co-
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23 Ibid, Chapter Four, pp 54-68.
Washington Square Redevelopment Area Plan

This plan was prepared in 1957 by the Philadelphia City Planning Commission. It outlines the existing and proposed land uses, zoning changes, plans for greenways and parks, and proposed changes to the street layout. This document provides a good overview of the area and the initial plans of the city concerning Washington Square East. It does not go into great depth but does provide useful information about overall planning issues relating to the entire area. From a comparison of the proposed zoning changes and the current zoning of the area, it is apparent that many of the changes were made that were suggested in this plan.

From a regulatory standpoint, this document was a broader approach that addressed managing the overall character of the area through regulations in land use. It was a more holistic approach to regulation that laid the foundation for the later, more specific plans mentioned above, enabling them to address the issues

---

of architectural design and the specific guidelines to create a vibrant and revitalized neighborhood.

**Current Trends**

Historic district guidelines are a relatively new phenomena. They only came about after other regulations in the form of urban renewal plans set the standard for them.

Many Historic Districts all over the country (although by no means all) have developed guidelines to aid residents and developers in the care, restoration, and rehabilitation of these districts. In order to get a sense of what these guidelines contain, a random sampling was taken from those included in an electronic format on the website of the National Alliance for Preservation Commissions (NAPC). The guidelines referenced are from various parts of the United States and include those for: Louisville, KY (2003); Fredericksburg, VA (1997); Chapel Hill, NC (1998); Boston’s Back Bay (1990); Pasadena, CA (2002); Salt Lake City, UT (1997); and Washington, DC (1995). Each of these selected

---

25 NAPC - National Alliance for Preservation Commissions.
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guidelines contains sections aimed at regulating new construction or changes to historic buildings. They have many of the same components and differ mainly in their varying emphasis on the details that make each place unique. Thus all of them mention height, scale, color, materials, orientation, fenestration, solid to void relationships, architectural details, continuity, massing, rhythm, setbacks, and roof form as essential elements to consider when designing infill in historic neighborhoods. Some guidelines also contain drawings and photographs used to illustrate acceptable and unacceptable solutions.26 This helps to limit the amount of misinterpretation and make the design review process as clear as possible.

The current document for the Society Hill Historic District was created as a pamphlet for homeowners27 in the late 1990s by the Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia, a non-profit organization. This pamphlet is not a set of guidelines but is instead an overview of the considerations the Historical Commission uses when reviewing alterations to historic fabric or new infill. The section pertaining to new construction can be found in Appendix D. In these

26 All of the above mentioned guidelines use visual aids except for the one for Boston’s Back Bay area.
guidelines, it is stated that new construction “should not obscure, damage, or
destroy the character-defining features of the existing historic buildings,” and
that it should not duplicate the existing design but instead create a clear
definition between new and historic materials, reflecting our own time. The main
goal is consistency along the street façade. This idea of consistency along with
continuity emerges as a primary theme of this thesis.

It is important to note that while alterations and additions to historic
structures are regulated by law in Philadelphia and must be approved by the
Historical Commission,28 the design of new construction is not.

“New construction on vacant lots in the district is subject to the
review and comment of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, whose
advice, while not binding, will help insure the integrity of the historic
district.”29

This is an atypical approach to new construction. Many historic districts
have guidelines that are legally binding and must be followed in the case of new
construction as well as in the alteration of historic structures.

It must be understood that this pamphlet is just a set of suggestions not intended as a set of guidelines, but rather to demystify the processes and considerations made by the Philadelphia Historical Commission to administer this local historic district. It is not a replacement for good design sense and judgment. Many of these documents mention that a design professional should be consulted before any major architectural undertaking is begun. Though there is no guarantee, this is the most prudent way to ensure that any new design is compatible with its neighborhood.

**Relationship of Old to New**

From the analysis of these various design guidelines, it is apparent that the specific guidelines are the modern evolution of the original renewal plans.

The renewal plans were a more holistic approach, with their main goal being overall revitalization. They created guidelines that dealt with issues that went well beyond architectural features of the buildings. These plans also set regulations for living conditions and safety, standards for maintenance, construction quality and sanitation. They were aimed at improving the overall
quality and condition of the area and the quality of life of the residents.

The Historic District plans, on the other hand, are aimed at the preservation of what already exists and management of change within that context. They set guidelines for what changes can be made to the district once it has finished the revitalization process. They could not exist without the initial work done in the renewal plans and are a way of maintaining and implementing those plans. They are a maintenance plan for these areas.
Chapter 3

This chapter serves as an overview of Society Hill’s architectural and urban history as a context for the architectural analysis of the modern architecture in the historic context. Society Hill has a complex and intricate history that cannot be addressed fully in a single chapter. A detailed history can be found in such publications as *Philadelphia: A 300 Year History* edited by Russell F. Weigley and *Philadelphia: A Brief History* by Roger D. Simon.

**Early Settlement**

The area known as Society Hill in Philadelphia is one of the oldest areas of the city. Its boundaries are roughly from Front Street to Eighth Street and from Walnut Street to Lombard Street. It was settled shortly after the founding of Pennsylvania by William Penn in 1682. The name “Society Hill” comes from the
original owner, the Free Society of Traders, which was deeded the land on the hill south of Dock Creek by William Penn. The first set of row houses were built along Front Street between Walnut and Dock Streets circa 1690. The earliest building style was in the tradition of England, half-timbered construction typical of architecture prior to London’s Great Fire of 1666. The area began to build up in the first half of the eighteenth century, expanding westward from the Delaware River, but remained relatively compact because of the lack of good transportation and roads.

To serve the increasing population, a market was constructed at the intersection of Second and Lombard Streets, called New Market. The market continued to expand and by the beginning of the nineteenth century, the Head House was constructed on Pine and Second Street, at the northernmost end of the New Market.

In 1800, fire safety legislation was passed by the city that required all new

---

construction to be of brick. Because of this, throughout the century, the older wooden houses were replaced with new masonry buildings. Commercial development also increased, and the food market grew. The food distribution center that was originally located on Dock Street expanded south, eventually reaching the Head House, displacing the retail shops in New Market.\footnote{Sauer, Louis A. “Reinforcing A Sense of Place,” Old and New Architecture (Washington D.C.: The Preservation Press) 116-18.}

Decline

By the middle to end of the nineteenth century, manufacturing facilities and warehouses had taken over the banks of the Delaware River where the first settlement had occurred. Many of the residents of Society Hill moved out to the more fashionable “suburbs” at the growing western and northern ends of the city like Rittenhouse Square to escape the dirt and congestion and also because they no longer needed to live within walking distance of their place of work due to the new electric trolley lines installed in the 1890s. Map 4 shows the Society Hill Area in 1895. It is almost completely built out, and along the water is the evidence of manufacturing and warehouse uses. Map 5 is of the Rittenhouse
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Map 4
Society Hill Area in 1895

Map 5
Rittenhouse Square Area in 1895

Square area at the same time. It has become quite developed, with lots and buildings of a larger size than those in the Society Hill Area. As the area lost its original inhabitants and property values fell, new immigrants took advantage of the now vacant homes and moved in with such rapidity that there was no time to replace the existing single-family homes, resulting in many of them being converted into multiple-family residences. In particular, the areas around Second and Front Streets were almost completely taken over by manufacturing facilities, warehouses, and tenements. Much of the existing fabric was significantly altered and lost.33

Redevelopment

Key milestones in the redevelopment of Society Hill are chronologically summarized as follows:34

1944

- Designation of Independence Square as a national shrine.

33 Ibid.
34 All information in the redevelopment section is from Society Hill, Philadelphia: A Report of the Presentation to the Seminar on Case Studies in Urban Design. UD 716 The Urban Design Program Graduate School of Fine Arts University of Pennsylvania, 1978 and Society Hill, Philadelphia: Historic Preservation and Urban Renewal in Washington Square East, a Master’s Thesis by Valerie Sue Halverson Pace, University of Minnesota, Ph.D., 1976 Urban and Regional Planning.

1945

- The Pennsylvania Housing and Renewal Act was adopted by the state legislature, laying the legal framework necessary to accomplish renewal in Society Hill and other areas of the city.

1947

- The Better Philadelphia Exhibition, organized by Edmund Bacon and Oskar Stonorov, displayed a new vision for the city and its future. The earliest plans for the renewal of Society Hill were part of this exhibit.
- The Redevelopment Authority of the City of Philadelphia was formed and given the power to borrow money, which would be important for later redevelopment programs.

1948

- Greater Philadelphia Movement was established. It proved instrumental in relocating the Dock Street Food Distribution Center (DSFDC), one of the pivotal events in the redevelopment of Society Hill.
1949

- National Housing Act Passed. This provided 1.5 billion federal dollars throughout the country in loans and grants over a five-year period. This would allow the purchase of highly valued urban land that could be resold at a reasonable price for redevelopment of housing.

- Edmund Bacon became director of the City Planning Commission. The Commission conducted a housing survey throughout Philadelphia, designating nine renewals areas including Society Hill.

1952

- The National Park Service adopted a plan for Independence Mall and acquired the first part of the greenway system.

- Philadelphia Home Rule Charter passed. This greatly expanded the powers of the City Planning Commission and established a five-year capital budgeting program.

- “The Chinese Wall,” a railroad bridge that had divided Philadelphia in half running up Broad Street, was completely demolished, which reconnected the city and added to the redevelopment momentum.
1954

- Housing Act of 1954 passed. This guaranteed money to complete any renewal projects that had already begun. For Society Hill, it showed the private investors that investment here was safe.

- The redevelopment plan for Washington Square East was divided into three units. (Units 1 and 2 are the focus of this thesis.)

1955

- The Food Distribution Corporation was founded to organize and oversee the construction and relocation of the DSFDC.

1956

- Richardson Dilworth became the mayor of Philadelphia in 1956 and appointed Albert Greenfield Chairman of the City Planning Commission. Greenfield pushed the creation of the Old Philadelphia Development Corporation (OPDC). This agency served as an intermediary between city agencies and private developers and was responsible for finding investors, identifying sources of funding, and ensuring quality and consistent design.

- The city began its acquisition of the DSFDC property.
Old Philadelphia Development Corporation founded. It contracted with the Redevelopment Authority to act as the redeveloper for the historic buildings and some vacant lots in Society Hill.

1957

The second plan for Society Hill, after the Greater Philadelphia Exhibition in 1947, was completed by Vincent Kling, Roy Larson, and Oskar Stonorov. This plan was submitted to the Federal Urban Renewal Administration as an application for a survey and planning grant. Once the grant was given through the Redevelopment Authority, its staff was absorbed into the Planning Commission. With this grant, the Redevelopment Authority was able to condemn the entire area of Society Hill. A plan was created to promote rehabilitation.

At the same time, Section 220 of the Housing Assistance Act provided tax incentives for housing construction, and the Federal Urban Renewal Administration committed $11.1 million for acquisition and demolition of properties.

Mayor Dilworth builds a Georgian style house overlooking Washington
Square Park.

1958

- G. Holmes Perkins was appointed Chairman of the City Planning Commission, and William Rafsky became head of the Redevelopment Authority. Wright, Andrade and Amenta was commissioned by the Redevelopment Authority to study the area and outline the specification for a competition for development.

- A competition was held to select architect-developer teams to develop one or both parcels of Washington Square East (Society Hill). The winning teams were I.M. Pei with developers Webb and Knapp for the eastern half, and Harrison Abramovitz with developers Jefferson Square Corporation for the western half.

- By the end of this year, the entire property of the DSFDC was acquired by the city.

- Redevelopment Authority ratifies Washington Square East Unit 1 Urban Renewal Plan.
1959

- The DSFDC closed and was relocated to South Philadelphia.
- The Technical Report written by Wright, Andrade and Amenta Architects is published.
- Washington Square East Unit 1 is acquired through eminent domain by the Redevelopment Authority.

1960

- Commencement of the construction of the Society Hill Towers was delayed, partially due to the status and scale of another housing project on Washington Square, the Hopkinson House. The FHA was concerned that the area’s overall housing need would be met by Hopkinson House alone, project and refused to guarantee a loan. There was also concern about construction and expenses of the towers that caused further delays. As a result, due to financial hardship, Webb and Knapp had to sell the development to Alcoa, who became the final developers of the towers.
- Redevelopment Authority ratifies Washington Square East Unit 2 Urban Renewal Plan.
1961

- Implementation of the plan for Washington Square East Unit 2 was begun but approached differently than Unit 1. Certain parcels were excluded from acquisition but were still under the regulation of the plan.

1962

- Construction began on the Society Hill Towers, which took two years to complete.

1964-1967

- A turning point in the redevelopment process. During this time a majority of the properties in Society Hill were sold.

1970

- By this time, public expenditure for Society Hill was $10 million and total expenditures were estimated at $75 million.

This brief history of Society Hill serves to give the backdrop for the analysis of the architecture that came out of the final redevelopment stage.
There was much attention paid to Philadelphia’s redevelopment initiatives in Society Hill. Many architectural writers were concerned about how the balance between old and new architecture would emerge. Many commented on the fact that the city should be moving forward architecturally, and that to simply copy a previous style would not be in the spirit of redevelopment and growth. As Lewis Mumford put it, “Since so much that is historically genuine remains, why should anyone debase its value by minting and scattering about false coin that the innocent will take as real money?”\(^{35}\) The history of architecture is about change and progress, and to attempt to halt this change is in direct opposition to the very nature of the discipline.

When looking at the architecture within a historic district, there are a few important questions to consider. Many of them involve determining what exactly is meant by “historic,” and how those meanings are manifested. Such questions are inextricably interwoven with the individual building analyses and overall streetscape evaluations that are the subject of this chapter.

When we walk down the brick-paved, tree-lined sidewalks of Society Hill, a certain atmosphere is experienced. This feeling is unique to the current time and not a recreation of a previous era. What we call “historic” often is the sense of place created by the layers of architectural history working together to invoke emotion and memory. The redevelopment of Society Hill was not trying to recreate the past but to make us aware of the history embodied in these
buildings. It is this history that the modern architecture will be analyzed against, the history re-recognized in the 1950s by the Redevelopment Authority and the citizens of Philadelphia.

**Analysis Methods**

For this thesis, there are two general categories of buildings in Society Hill. The first is structures built prior to 1950 and have been restored or rehabilitated. The second category, and the primary subject of this thesis, is those built between 1950 and 1975 during what is known as the redevelopment period and also those built after 1975. These modern buildings fit into three stylistic categories.

The first category is the “Imitator.” These are buildings that use historic elements and motifs directly without modern interpretation. They continue the visual continuity of the older buildings and are meant to blend seamlessly into the streetwall and general architecture of the neighborhood and not pose as an architectural or visual distraction to the casual pedestrian. A good example of this type of building is the row of five two and one-half story dwellings, #201-
209, designed by architect Joshua Fish on the north side at the east end of the 200 block of Delancey Street (Image 1). These buildings have used elements typical of architecture in the area from the mid to late-eighteenth century to cause little stylistic disruption. Another two buildings that have used a later style are #218 and #220, across the street from the previous example (Image 18). These are three story buildings that use elements more typical of early nineteenth century architecture of this area. This type of building pays respect to a time-tested design, but it says nothing about the styles of the time in which it was built.

The second category is the “Contextual.” These buildings have taken historic themes, materials and proportions, but treated them in a way that conveys the time in which they were built, while continuing the scale and lines of the existing structures. From first glance, these are not always the easiest to pick out from the original buildings because in color and texture they blend with their neighboring buildings, but on second glance by their distinctly modern elements and lack of (or reinterpreted) historic detailing, they show themselves as a response to the historic context while continuing to move forward. An example of this type is the row of five dwellings on the south side of Pine Street, #618-626
(Images 63 and 64). These five units form a continuous structure that is divided into bays, each unit consisting of two bays. Their height is not an issue because there are moderate variations along the block and the color is a dark brown brick, which adds to the variations in color along the block. Another good example is 633 Pine Street (Image 53). It carries the same lines as the adjacent building, with three horizontal bands of windows, and also matches the cornice closely. It is a lighter color, but in this case that is what sets it apart.

The final category is the “Contrastor;” those buildings that stand out because they are of a completely different material, style or scale from the surrounding buildings. While they are often of a similar height and/or setback, in response to zoning regulations, these buildings contain details that do not respond to the existing fabric and in fact, disregard it. Because of these elements, they create a disruption in the streetwall and vista, clearly showing that they are “modern.” There are fewer of this type than of the other two, and some historic buildings have become type three buildings by work done to them during the restoration period. An example of this is the structure on the west end of the 600 block of Pine Street, #637-43 (Image 54). The large geometric shapes, chamfered
corners, and recessed central portion, along with the bright white of the stucco make it stand out from the other buildings on the block and in the neighborhood. It is instantly noticeable as different and modern.

The blocks chosen for the study area are all within the Society Hill Historic District (Map 6) and were initially picked based on mapping the modern properties on Sanborn maps to determine their distribution (Map 7). From this initial analysis, a few blocks stood out as having at least fifty percent of their properties built in the last fifty years. Because so much is new on these blocks, they are ideal candidates to analyze how the new and old architecture interact with each other in the street façade.

Many of the buildings throughout Society Hill were also restored and rehabilitated during the redevelopment boom. These terms\textsuperscript{36} must be further

\textsuperscript{36}“Restoration is defined as the act or process of accurately depicting the form, features, and character of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of the removal of features from other periods in its history and reconstruction of missing features from the restoration period. The limited and sensitive upgrading of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems and other code-required work to make properties functional is appropriate within a restoration project.” p 61.

“Rehabilitation is defined as the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.” p 117.

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring & Reconstructing Historic Buildings
Map 6
Society Hill Historic District


9th Street
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Map 7
Modern Buildings Overview Map

Composite of a map from National Register Nomination for the Society Hill Historic District, Philadelphia Historical Commission, and Fire insurance maps from the Sanborn Map Company archives, late 19th century to 1990, Pennsylvania, University of Pennsylvania Library.
explained here. Both of these words have taken on a number of connotations. The terms are also used in the Historic District Inventory without an explanation, so often the word used here is a reflection of the one used to describe the building in this document. Without knowing the exact, detailed history of each building, it is very difficult to distinguish those that have been repaired and stabilized (rehabilitated) from those that have been truly returned to their appearance at a specific moment in time (restored).

In fact, the appearance of many of these buildings is an interpretation of the original style or a speculative restoration. Many of the changes made to these buildings over their life cycle have been removed in order to make them in harmony with the surrounding stylistic conditions. In some cases, even if the original use was a storefront, due to the change in use of the neighborhood, it was “restored” to a residential dwelling. Generally, in the case of these alterations, the buildings are brought to a style that is in concord with the rest of the block and that appears as if it could have been original.
The three blocks chosen for this thesis – the 100 and 200 blocks of Delancey Street, and the 600 Block of Pine Street – mostly include Imitators and Contextuals. In order to include some of the third type, a few other block segments have also been chosen that are within the Society Hill district (Map 8).

In order to provide a context for the modern buildings, a brief building chronology is given that outlines the entire block, followed by an analysis of the modern buildings as they interact with the existing fabric, also looking at their adherence to design guidelines as laid out in the Washington Square East Unit 1 and Unit 2 Renewal Plans, approved in December 1958 and June 1962, respectively.37 The 100 block of Delancey Street falls in Unit 1 while all of the other properties of the study area fall in Unit 2 (See Map 2 from Chapter 2). The guidelines for Unit 1 are still in effect because they must be followed for no less than fifty years,38 but those for Unit 2 were only in effect for 25 years.39 Following the text for each block is a section of images of that block.

37 Excerpts from these documents pertaining to design guidelines can be found in Appendices 1 and 2.
Map 8
Study Area Overview Map

Impervious Surface Layer, City of Philadelphia, referenced from Pennsylvania Spatial Data Access (PASDA) with author’s alterations
North Side - 200 block of Delancey Street

Figure 8
Photomontage of Streetscape

Figure 9
Outline Drawing of Streetscape

Figure 10
Streetscape with Foliage and Street Furniture
200 Block Delancey Street

Map 9 is an overview map of the distribution of historic to modern buildings. Along with Table 1, it provides a brief glimpse of the construction history of the block.

North Side – Construction History

Nine of the twenty buildings were built during the redevelopment. An overview of the block is illustrated in Figure 1.

- #201-213: (Images 1 and 2) The first seven buildings, from east to west, were designed by architect Joshua Fish, and built in 1964. Six of them are similar, two and one-half stories with a raised entrance, while one is three and one-half stories, with taller windows on the second story and a balcony.
- #215: (Images 2 and 9) Built in 1999 and designed by architect Hugh Newell Jacobsen.
- #217: (Image 3) Known as the Rhodes-Barclay House and built in 1750-58 by Samuel Rhodes, a master builder and a Mayor of Philadelphia, it was restored in 1960 by architect W. Nelson Anderson and altered in 1964 by Robert T.
Map 9
200 Block Delancey Street

Impervious Surface Layer, City of Philadelphia, referenced from Pennsylvania Spatial Data Access (PASDA) with author’s alterations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bldg #</th>
<th>Built</th>
<th>OrigArchitect</th>
<th>Bldg #</th>
<th>Built</th>
<th>OrigArchitect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Joshua Fish</td>
<td>200-04</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Joshua Fish</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Hassinger &amp; Schwam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Joshua Fish</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Hassinger &amp; Schwam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Joshua Fish</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>John Goodwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Joshua Fish</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>John Goodwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Joshua Fish</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>John H. Burris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Joshua Fish</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Hugh Newell Jacobsen</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>1843</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>1750-58</td>
<td>Samuel Rhodes</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>1843</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Harrington &amp; Yu Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221-23</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>228-30</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Mitchell/Giurgola Associates &amp; Roy Vollmer Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Decendants of Richard Brockden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Decendants of Richard Brockden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>John Drinker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>John Drinker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Joseph Praissman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235-37</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>James N. Kise &amp; Roland Davies</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>Joseph Wetherill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>John Warner</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>1764-71</td>
<td>James Cresson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245-51</td>
<td>1783-99</td>
<td>John Hall</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trump, builder.

- #219: (Image 3) Next is a narrow street named Philip Street, across which, where #219 once stood, is now an empty lot.

- #221 and #223: (Image 3) Built as a set and the date is unknown, but it is likely, from the size and scale, that they were built around the same time as #217. Both these structures were given new facades 1962.

- #225 and #227: (Image 4) Built in 1846 as tenant houses for the merchant tailors William and Francis Carpenter. Restored in 1960 by architect Herbert Winokur.

- #229 and #231: (Image 4) built in 1846 as tenant houses for the merchant tailors William and Francis Carpenter. W. Nelson Anderson restored #229 in 1961, and #231 was restored in 1973.

- #233-241: (Image 5) were built as a row of five in 1811, and the first is known as the Joseph Wetherill House, named after the original owner and rehabilitated in 1959.

- #235 and #237: (Image 5) Replaced by modern buildings in 1970.

- #239 and #241: (Image 5) The last two of the five, their facades were rebuilt in
1962.


- #245 and #247; (Image 6) A garden has replaced these buildings that were removed in the 1965 renovation (Also see Image 15).

- #251: (Image 6) Known as the John Hall House and built in 1783 by John Hall, a house carpenter. Restored in 1965 by Adolf DeRoy Mark, who gave it a new first ground floor residential façade and moved the entrance to Delancey Street.

**North Side – The Modern Buildings**

A few of the modern buildings on this block are a mixture of Imitators and Contextuals. The first seven buildings (#201-213), although designed and built at the same time by architect Joshua Fish, all have different features. #201 (Image 1) borrows elements from the older two and one-half story structures down the block (#217-223) (Image 3) with its pent roof, while also adopting the raised entrance from the three and one-half story structures at the other end of the block (#225-233) (Image 4) and across the street (#222-224) (Image 18). #203 is painted
brick, making it a lighter color than the rest of the block. It, along with #205, #207, #209, and #213, (Images 1 and 2) imitates the three and one-half story structures down the block, but at a two and one-half story scale. #205 and #207 have a marble water table, and the scale of the first floor of #207 is elongated with painted shutters and wood paneling that make the windows appear taller. Marble belt courses link #209, #211, and #213. The three and one-half stories of #211 (Image 2) set it apart from its immediate neighbors, along with taller second floor windows and a wrought iron balcony, a feature not found on many of the historic buildings in this area. There is also a tunnel-like garage opening that leads behind the property, another unique feature.

#215 (Image 2) is built in a historic style not typical of Philadelphia. Its dormer windows are reminiscent of New England style architecture. The scale matches that of the buildings further down the block but is larger than the adjacent buildings. This is the newest building on the block, constructed in 1999, after the designation of the historic district. By the time this building was constructed, the jurisdiction of the Washington Square East Renewal Plan Unit 2
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Figure 15
Photomontage of Streetscape

Figure 16
Outline Drawing of Streetscape

Figure 17
Streetscape with Foliage and Street Furniture
had expired and the architect was not bound by any local guidelines, but this building still fits within the zoning requirements set forth for height and general layout.

#235-37 (Image 5) is a double lot width house. It was built in 1970 in a post-modern style. The horizontal lines of the adjacent buildings are roughly maintained, including the cornice line, but the scale of the fenestration is greatly altered. The entrance is also recessed back from the street façade. Unlike in the surrounding buildings, the windows are of varying shapes and sizes. They form a different bay rhythm, of wide alternating with narrow. The façade of this building is also set back a few inches from the adjoining structures.

**South Side – Construction History**

Six of the twenty buildings on this side of the block were built during the redevelopment period. An overview of the block is illustrated in Figure 8.

- #200-04: (also known as 334 Third Street) (Images 16 and 23) Constructed in 1780 and the first floor masonry was reconstructed in 1967 by architect Joseph P. Golden.
The next lot is a garden for #200-04.

#208-212: (Image 17) Two attached dwellings built in 1970.

#214 and #216: (Image 17) The oldest on the block and were built in 1756 by John Goodwin, a carpenter. The front façade of #214 was restored in 1957, and John H. Burris restored #216 in 1973.

#218: (Image 18) Built in 1974 by John H. Burris.

#220: (Image 18) Built in 1970.

#222 and #224: (Image 18) Both were built in 1843. Van Arkel and Moss, architects, altered #222 in 1962 by removing the original fourth floor and adding a gable roof, dormer and new cornice. The façade of #224 was restored by architect Allen A. Berkowitz in 1971.


#232 and #234: (Images 19 and 20) Built in 1810 by the descendants of Richard Brockden. Both had their front facades restored by W. Nelson Anderson in 1962 and 1966, respectively.
• #236 and #238: (Image 20) Built in 1765 by John Drinker, bricklayer. This pair is known as Drinker’s Court and between them is an alley that leads to more dwellings on the backlots. #236 was rehabilitated in 1965-66 by architect Edward J. Parnum and #238 was rehabilitated in 1958-59.

• #240: (Image 20) A single modern building constructed in 1961 by architect Joseph Praissman.

• #242 and #244: (Image 21) These two are three and one-half stories tall, were built in 1780 and have an alley passageway between them. They were restored in 1960 by architect Frijof Tobiessen.

• #246 and #248: (Image 21) This set of twins is similar to the previous one, but one story shorter. #246 was built in 1767 by Joseph Wetherill, a house carpenter and #248 in 1964-71 by James Cresson, carpenter. Architect Samuel F. Betts worked on both of these in 1959, rehabilitating #246 and restoring the façade of #248.

• #250: (Image 22) This is the last building on the block and was built in 1826 and originally known as 329 S. Third Street, with the entrance on Third Street. In the restoration done in 1969 by Joshua Fish, the entrance was moved to
Delancey Street.

**South Side – The Modern Buildings**

There are six modern buildings on this side of the block: three Imitators and three Contextuals. #218 (Image 18) is the first of the Imitators. It is three stories tall and has a pedimented entrance, similar to that on #234 (Image 20) down the block. The fenestration does not align horizontally with the adjacent structures, and the entrance condition is in between in height from the two adjacent buildings. The layout of façade elements is taken from #220 while the proportions of the windows are taken from #216 (Image 18). The roof is also flat, which is uncommon in the historic buildings of this area, but because of the tall height of the building, this is not obvious. #220 is also a product of the redevelopment and was built a few years before #218. It has a smaller scale of fenestration than its historic neighbor, #222 (Image 18), and the entrance is flush with the sidewalk, an unusual condition. The last imitator is #240 (Image 20). It is slightly larger in proportion than its neighbors of Drinker’s Court, but follows a similar layout of two and one-half stories with two bays. Some simple historic detailing in the cornice and at the second floor line adds a bit of character.
The Contextual buildings on this side of the block are #208-12, #226, and #228-30 (Images 17 and 19). The first is a set of two houses. It disrupts the streetwall by recessing the central portion where the entrances are located. The edges are also disrupted by diagonal cuts that contain windows. These serve to focus attention on the central recessed portion. The windows do not have divided panes, like the rest of the buildings on the block. It does retain the regular rhythm of the bays as in the historic houses, which the other modern style building, #228-30, does not.

#226 (Image 19) is a Contextual building. It has a raised entrance and three distinct bays, but the detailing and the proportions are different from the historic buildings. The fanlight above the door is reminiscent of others on the block, but the arch detailing in the brick makes it subtly different. The variation in window size also adds to the modern feel. The last historic element is the alley entrance at the west side of the façade, which is similar to those between twin houses along this side of the block.
The most disruptive building on the block is #228-30 (Image 19). The entrance is deeply recessed and the fenestration is not balanced along the façade. It also creates a gap on the west side where the edge of the façade does not meet the adjoining building. The roof is also metal, very different from the shingles on the rest of the block. The breaks in the façade for the recessed entrance and a recessed window also break the plane of the streetwall.

**Overall Block Conditions**

Delancey Street is a vehicular thoroughfare. It runs east to west and it is located parallel to and between Spruce and Pine Streets, creating a secondary division in the block pattern of Philadelphia (Map 10). The north side of the street is divided by two narrower streets that are both vehicular passages, Philip Street and American Street. The south side of the block has one small alley but no secondary streets. The sidewalks of both sides of the street are paved in brick, as in the rest of the district.

There are trees placed in stone-lined beds at regular intervals on the street side of the sidewalk (Image 8). The trees are middle-aged, many of which were
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most likely planted during the redevelopment period when the entire district was made greener. There are some potted plants and window boxes that add more variety to the facades. Streetlamps are also placed at regular intervals down the street as illustrated in Figures 3 and 10. This results in an approximately two-foot-wide unobstructed corridor for pedestrians.

The modern buildings contribute to the historic scale of the street. None of the buildings is much larger or smaller than others, and they all carry the original feel of the historic neighborhood, in materials, features and building elements. When the buildings are reduced to their most basic elements, the patterns are easier to discover. The first in a series of rhythmic layers is shown in Figure 2, where the overall layout of the north side block is distilled from the image in Figure 1. The same is illustrated for the south side in Figure 9 as a condensation of Figure 8. The second layer is the rhythm of the entrances; the third is the bays created by the windows; and the fourth is the street furniture and streets.

One distinct pattern is a clear dividing line mid-block on the north side of the street. East of this line, the buildings are predominantly two and one-half
stories, and west of it, they are three and one-half stories (Figure 2). This division is not mirrored on the south side, which has much more variation along the block (Figure 9). Three of the modern buildings on the north side depart slightly from the overall scale (#211, 215, and 235-37), but because there are variations in the historic structures, the heterogeneous character is maintained.

Another important aspect is the continuity of the streetwall plane. Figure 5 illustrates the breaks in the wall surface on the north side of the block created by recessed areas or projecting elements. The streetwall has some continuous element along the street, broken completely only at the junctions of other streets. Even the garden of #251 (Image 6) has a wall that links the two buildings on either side. Breaks in the streetwall are more frequent on the south side of the block, as shown in Figure 12. The areas where the most breaks occur are at the junctions of historic to modern, such as the recessed central portion of #208-12 (Figure 17 and Image 26) and where #228-30 meets #232 (Image 19). This is one way that the modern buildings distinguish themselves and new. Some of the breaks are subtle, being a slight recession from the façade plane of the adjacent historic structures, while others create deep recesses that, from the point of view
of a pedestrian, can appear as gaps in the streetwall.

The pattern created by the entrances is another layer of the streetscape. Most of the entrances are at the sidewalk edge, which is the custom in Philadelphia. In Figures 4 and 11 (north and south) the pattern of entrances is laid out, and it is apparent that they all open directly onto the street. The entrances on the south side are closer together and create a more regular pattern than on the north side, where the heights are more irregular. There are no yards or space between the sidewalk and the building façade. Most of the entrances are through stairs perpendicular to the façade. There are only a few cases where the staircase is parallel to the building plane. There is variation in the height of entrances to the ground, some being up only one or two steps while others almost half a story (Images 7 and 8). The stairs project perpendicular to the building facades into the sidewalk, along with basement bulkheads for some of the buildings (Images 10 and 24).

With the overlay of the foliage in Figures 3 and 10, the pattern created by the trees also becomes apparent. Another important pattern is that of the vertical
bays created by fenestration, illustrated in Figures 6 and 13. Here, once the
details disappear, the general pattern is revealed, showing general evenness of
bays on the north side, with a few sections wider apart than others but an overall
consistent rhythm. The south side has more irregularity because in many
instances the windows from one floor to the next do not line up vertically,
creating a more staccato pattern.

When walking down the street, the variation in building height is masked
by the trees or by the pedestrian’s proximity to the building facades. When the
trees are in full leaf, the top of the dwellings disappear (Figures 3 and 10). The
part of the facades that affect perception the most is the bottom two stories.
Unless the viewer is specifically looking up, there is a homogeneous feel to the
facades that are only broken slightly by the modern architecture.

The facades are not entirely flat. The main projecting element in addition
to the stairs is pent roofs on a few of the buildings (Images 7, 8 and 24). These
add a secondary sight line down the length of the street and also add to the
horizontal rhythms across the streetwall. In Figures 7 and 14, these patterns are
simplified into bands of lines that carry across dwelling units. They highlight continuity but also make the subtle shifts and breaks more apparent.

To give an idea of how greatly the blocks were changed during the redevelopment period, a few historic photographs have been included. The images of the north side of the street (Images 12-15) are records of the changes that were made to these buildings since their initial construction. In Image 12, tallest building is where #215 now stands. The facades of #221-227 have been drastically changed, as seen in Image 13. The two structures in the center of Image 14 are #239-41. The most telling photograph is Image 15, showing structures where a garden now exists in the lot next to #251. For the south side of the street, the building in the center of Image 27 is #216. It, along with its twin #214, were stripped of the alterations seen in this picture. Image 28 shows the entrance to Drinker’s Court. Similar alterations were made to these structures. In the center of Image 29 are #218 and 220. In this image, they have a fourth story, which was removed during the redevelopment period.

The overall effect of these modern buildings on the streetscape of this
block is moderate, because the buildings are all Imitators and Contextuals. They are not overly disruptive with vast differences in height, scale, materials, or color, and because the historic architecture is varied along the street, these modern buildings add to the heterogeneous character of the block. The overall sense of place remains intact because the various layers of history add to the character of the block and all of the dwellings enhance the original pedestrian scale and orientation. Here, a healthy evolution of architectural styles is apparent.
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Image 7
North side of the 200 block of Delancey street looking northwest from Second Street.

Image 8
North side of the 200 block of Delancey street looking west from Second Street.
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Image 9
North side of the 200 block of Delancey street looking northwest midblock with #215 in the foreground.

Image 10
North side of the 200 block of Delancey street looking east from Third Street.
Nort side of the 200 block of Delancey Street looking west from #207.
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Image 12
North side of the 200 block of Delancey street in 1957 looking northwest from Second Street at #213-219. (Philadelphia Historical Commission)

Image 13
North side of the 200 block of Delancey Street in 1957 looking northwest at #221-227. (Philadelphia Historical Commission)
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Image 14
North side of the 200 block of Delancey street in 1957 looking northwest at #239-241. (Philadelphia Historical Commission)

Image 15
North side of the 200 block of Delancey street in 1944 looking east from Third Street at #241-251. (Philadelphia Historical Commission)
200-04
1780 for William Morell
1967 restored by Joseph F. Golden

208-12
1970 Hassinger & Schwam

214
1756 John Goodwin, carpenter
1957 restored

216
1756 John Goodwin, carpenter
1973 restored by John H. Burris
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Image 20

234
1810 Descendants of Richard Brockden
1966 restored by W. Nelson Anderson

236
1765 John Drinker
1965-66 restored by Edward J. Parnum

238
1765 John Drinker
1958-59 restored
HABS (PA-1326)

240
1961 Joseph Praissman

Image 21

242
1780 for Pryor family
1875 altered
1960 restored by Frijoj Tobbisessen

244
1787 Joseph Wetherill
mid-19th century 3rd floor added
1958 restored by Samuel F. Betts

246
1767 Joseph Wetherill
1900 first floor converted to commercial use
1959 restored by Samuel F. Betts

248
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Image 23
South side of the 200 block of Delancey Street looking southwest from Second Street.

Image 24
South side of the 200 block of Delancey Street looking west from #250.
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Image 25
South side of the 200 block of Delancey Street looking southwest with #200 in the foreground.

Image 26
South side of the 200 block of Delancey Street looking west with #208-12 in the foreground.
South side of the 200 block of Delancey Street in 1931 - #214-216. (Philadelphia Historical Commission)

South side of the 200 block of Delancey Street in 1957 - Drinker’s Court - #236-238. (Philadelphia Historical Commission)
South side of the 200 block of Delancey Street in 1931 looking southeast from Third Street. (Philadelphia Historical Commission)
100 Block Delancey Street

Map 11 is an overview map of the distribution of historic to modern buildings. Along with Table 2, it provides a brief glimpse of the construction history of the block.

**North Side**

All of the dwellings on this side of the block were designed by Louis Sauer and constructed in 1970 as part of Penn’s Landing Square, a courtyard development that encompasses the block between Front and Second Streets, and Spruce and Delancey Streets (Images 30-34). The facades that face Delancey Street are the backyards of the condominiums built around the perimeter of the lot. It is a continuous brick wall interrupted by a rhythm of metal entrance gates and fences. Because they were built simultaneously, they form a cohesive façade along the block, with variations in height that add a rhythm not unlike that of the buildings across the street.

**South Side – Construction History**

Five of the sixteen buildings on this side of the block were built during the
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Impervious Surface Layer, City of Philadelphia, referenced from Pennsylvania Spatial Data Access (PASDA) with author’s alterations
### Table 2
100 Block of Delancy Street Construction Dates and Architects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bldg #</th>
<th>Built</th>
<th>Orig Architect</th>
<th>Bldg #</th>
<th>Built</th>
<th>Orig Architect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Louis Sauer</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Louis Sauer</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Louis Sauer</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Louis Sauer</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Thomas Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Louis Sauer</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Louis Sauer</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>Joseph L. Dutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Louis Sauer</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>William Meguire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Louis Sauer</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>William Meguire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Louis Sauer</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>John Goodwin, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 2
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redevelopment period, and there are also two lots converted to gardens. An overview of this block is illustrated in Figure 15.

- #100: (Image 35) Built at the same time as Penn’s Landing Square, also by Louis Sauer. It is also known as 328 S. Front Street, with the entrance on that side.
- #104 and #106: (Image 36) Two narrow three and one-half story dwellings from 1796. These two buildings had been altered in the late 1800s, and in 1967 were completely restored to a residential façade by architect Curtis Seibert.
- #108: (Image 36) A four bay structure built in 1765 with the ground floor façade rebuilt in 1963 by architect John D. Sacksteder.
- #114: (Image 37) Built in 1775 by Thomas Morris and the front façade was repaired in 1966 by architect A. Harold Gregory.
- #116-18 (Image 37) A garden wall partially obscures the façade of the next building, built in 1960.

#122 and #124: (Image 37 and 38) Built by William Meguire, a cabinetmaker in 1810. B.V. Schlein repaired and restored the façade in 1965.

#126 (Image 38) Built in 1810 and altered in 1965 by John H. Burris, who replaced all of the façade elements except the brick.

#128-30: (Images 38 and 46) Built by John Goodwin, a carpenter, in 1760. #128 was restored by Curtis Seibert in 1963 and #130 was altered in 1975 by W. Gray Smith.

#134-36: (Image 39) This building is a modern house built in 1965, is also part of Penn’s Landing Square and has its entrance on Second Street.

**South Side – Modern Buildings**

Building lots #100 through #112 (Images 35 and 36) were originally slated to be demolished for I-95, the Delaware Expressway, but the plans later changed. Of the six buildings, three were restored and the other three were replaced with modern structures. The first, #100, is a clear Contrastor. It is made

---

of brick, like the historic buildings, but it has an irregular roof profile that is a truncated gable end. There is also a projecting bay window made mostly of glass that changes the flat surface of the streetwall, and a portion is faced in white siding, a material not consistent with the historic fabric. The scale of this building is also larger than that of any of the historic buildings on the block.

A brick garden wall continues the façade of #100 to that of #102, which also has a projecting bay window of glass. This window alters the edge of the building and adds depth to the façade. The entrance is recessed back, unlike the historic buildings, which typically had their door aligned with their façade. This building has two bays created by a large area of glass next to one of brick, creating a modern symmetry that is much different than that of the historic fabric.

The next modern building is #110-12 (Images 36 and 44). It is a Contextual. The layout is that of a traditional twin building, with the entrances adjacent in the center, and windows flanking the sides. The fenestration varies in size but has a clear rhythm and pattern. The building’s three bays are easily discernable
and the building is clearly influenced by the surrounding historic architecture in its façade layout while also expressing its modern elements.

# 116-18 (Images 37, 41 and 45) is set back from the street behind a brick wall. The building is immediately recognized as different because of the front garden. The architectural elements are very different from the surrounding architecture, with the band of windows just beneath the roofline and the arched colonnade on the ground floor. Because it is back from the street and hidden by a wall and foliage, it is difficult to see its interaction with the streetwall and in fact it does not interact but instead recedes and withdraws.

The last modern building is #134-36 (Image 39). Its entrance is on Second Street and it is obvious that the façade on Delancey Street is secondary. There are only two windows and the rest is a blank brick wall with no articulation. It does not engage the historic facades or this block in any way and seems merely functional, making it a Contrastor building like those on the other end of the block. There is no pattern or distinguishable layout to the sparse elements on the façade.
Overall Block Conditions

This block is shorter than the 200 block and more irregular because of its proximity to the old warehouses that used to be along the water, making it subject to more changes and uses. There are no secondary alleys or streets that connect to this streetwall (Map 12). The sidewalks are similar to those in the previous block because of the design regulations, creating a similar pedestrian corridor down the middle of the sidewalk (Images 34 and 42). On the north side of the street, because of the lack of stairs and main entrances, this corridor is wider and unobstructed on the building side (Image 34). The same stone-edged planting beds exist for the trees, which are regularly spaced down the block on both sides.

Because of the fewer number of building units, this block does not have the cohesive feel of the 200 Block. It appears more disjointed and irregular because the space is compacted, making the irregularity more apparent. The historic buildings are surrounded on three sides by modern ones, across the street and at the two ends of the block. This cuts them off from the surrounding historic fabric of the neighborhood. Of the sixteen dwelling units, six are modern,
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but the modern buildings are larger, therefore taking more space on the block. In Figure 16, an outline drawing of the south side of the block, the three largest masses of modern buildings are easy to pick out because of the larger ratio of wall-to-window than in a historic building. The large areas of brick are easily discernable in the photomontage in Figure 15. These three buildings also have squatter proportions. The three voids formed by the two gardens (Image 40), on either end, and the recessed construction of #116-18 (Image 41) mid-block create breaks in the streetwall that cause a greater disruption than on other blocks because of the truncated length of this block. The three and one-half story buildings are roughly the same height, but the abrupt change in height of the few shorter buildings and the garden lots causes a loss of continuity.

In Figure 19, this discontinuity is more apparent. Even though there is a continuous streetwall surface of some kind along both sides of the street, either building façade or garden wall, the modern buildings cause breaks and disruptions in the streetwall with projecting and recessed elements (Image 43). The three gaps in the block are made more apparent here when only the continuity of the streetwall is shown.
Another important aspect is the rhythm of the entrances and the connection of them to the street. In Figure 18, the irregular rhythm of doorways is highly visible, along with the uneven distribution along the block. This is countered by the very regular rhythm of the modern complex on the north side of the block (Image 33). The entrances to the modern buildings at either end of the block are not on this street, causing these buildings to turn their back on this block. The entrances of the other three modern buildings, #202, #210-12, and #116-18, are recessed back from the street. Many of the Contextuals and Contrastors have entrances that are disconnected from the street and sidewalk.

A third layer that exists is the pattern of foliage and street furniture. Figure 17 overlays the trees and streetlamps onto the drawing of the building façades. The pattern of trees is more irregular than on the 200 block, but the streetlamps are still evenly spaced. These trees do not mask the rooflines of the buildings as much as on the previous block. Because of their irregular spaces and variation in size, there are gaps in the green that allow the pedestrian to see more clearly the full facades of some of the dwellings.
The last two rhythmic aspects are the vertical rhythm created by the fenestration, and the horizontal rhythm created by cornice lines, shed roofs and patterns in the facades. The vertical rhythm, illustrated in Figure 20, has a lot of irregularity. Many of the windows on the historic buildings do not line up vertically from the top level to the ground level, creating an offset pattern, and the modern buildings have a different rhythm that is wider and more irregular. Figure 21 abstracts the horizontal rhythm. This is a bit more regular than the vertical rhythm, but at the ends of the block there is more oscillation in the pattern because the windows are placed further apart and more irregularly.

On this block, the buildings on the north side of the street were completely demolished and in a historic image taken in 1968 (Image 47), the modern buildings of Penn’s Landing Square have not begun construction yet and the entire length of the south side of the block is visible. By the time this image was taken, most of the other work had already been done on the block, and #110-12 can be seen still in construction. The modern streetlamp seen in Image 48 has been replaced by the historic Franklin gas-lamp type seen in the foreground of the previous image. Image 48 contains #122-130 and it can be seen that the
changes were not overly drastic. The main change is an addition of the pent roof onto #128-30 and the addition of shutters.

This block possesses more disruption of historic fabric than the other two blocks in the study area. The large gaps that create holes in the façade along with the bay windows of #200 and #202 draw attention away from the streetwall. The continuity of the historic structures is disrupted by the modern buildings.
North side of the 100 block of Delancey Street looking northeast, from Second Street.

Image 30

North side of the 100 block of Delancey Street looking northeast, midblock.

Image 31
North side of the 100 block of Delancey Street looking northeast, midblock.

North side of the 100 block of Delancey Street looking northwest midblock.
North side of the 100 block of Delancey Street looking west from Front Street.
South side of the 100 block of Delancey Street looking east from Second Street.
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Image 41
South side of the 100 block of Delancey Street looking southeast with #116-18.

Image 42
South side of the 100 block of Delancey Street looking west from Front Street.
South side of the 100 block of Delancey Street looking southwest at #102 in the center of the image.

South side of the 100 block of Delancey Street looking southwest at #110-12 in center of the image.
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Image 45
South side of the 100 block of Delancey Street looking southwest at #116-18 in center of picture.

Image 46
South side of the 100 block of Delancey Street looking southwest at #128-30.
South side of the 100 block of Delancey Street in 1968 (note the empty lot on the north side). (Philadelphia Historical Commission)

South side of the 100 block of Delancey Street in 1959 at #124-130. (Philadelphia Historical Commission)
600 Block Pine Street

Map 13 is an overview of the distribution of historic to modern buildings. Along with Table 3, it provides a brief glimpse of the construction history of the block.

North Side – Construction History

An overview of this block is illustrated in Figure 22.

- #601-605: (Image 49) The first three lots on the block belong to the property that has its front on Sixth Street.
- #605: (Image 49) Contained a building in 1999, but it has since been demolished.
- #607: (Image 49) Constructed in 1990.
- #609-11: (Image 49) Built in 1990 and is attached to #613.
- $613: (Image 50) Built in 1983 by architect David Porter.
- #615: (Image 50) Built in 1813 and its Colonial Revival façade was constructed in 1913 by architects Magaziner and Potter.
- The next four buildings were constructed in the first third of the twentieth
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Impervious Surface Layer, City of Philadelphia, referenced from Pennsylvania Spatial Data Access (PASDA) with author’s alterations
### Table 3
600 Block of Pine Street Construction Dates and Architects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bldg #</th>
<th>Built</th>
<th>OrigArchitect</th>
<th>Bldg #</th>
<th>Built</th>
<th>OrigArchitect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>601-03</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609-11</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>David Porter</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>1816</td>
<td>Benjamin Esler Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>George Terrell, nailer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Hassinger &amp; Schwam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Hassinger &amp; Schwam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627</td>
<td>1807</td>
<td>John Warner</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Hassinger &amp; Schwam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Hassinger &amp; Schwam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635</td>
<td>1808</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Benjamin Martin &amp; Assoc.</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>639</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Benjamin Martin &amp; Assoc.</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>634</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>636</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>638</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>640</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>642</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>644</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• century. #617 was built in 1920, #619 in 1930, #621 in 1910, and # 623 in 1925 (Images 50 and 51).

• #625; (Image 52) Façade was rebuilt in 1930, and it seems to have been influenced by #623, being an almost mirror image.

• #627: (Image 52) Built by John Warner, a carpenter, in 1807 and restored in 1961 by Joseph Praissman.

• #629: (Image 52) A storefront built in 1895 existed on this building before the redevelopment period but in 1950 was removed and replaced with a residential façade.

• #631 and #633: (Image 53) Rehabilitated and rebuilt in 1974 by John Lloyd and Associates, architects. From historic photographs taken in 1963, the original buildings were still standing, and the replacements are significantly different.41

• #635: (Image 53) Built in 1808 and rehabilitated in 1971 by W. Nelson Anderson.

• #637-43: (Image 54) The last building on the block is a set of dwelling units

---

constructed in 1975 and designed by architects Benjamin Martin & Associates.

_North Side – Modern Buildings_  

Six of the fifteen buildings on this side of the block were built during the redevelopment period and all but one are Contextuals. The cluster at the east end of the block, #607-613, were built after the jurisdiction of the renewal plans ended, so they are not bound by the same restrictions as the other modern buildings on the block. This does not seem to have affected their design, which still adheres to the guidelines set forth during the redevelopment.

The first one, #607 (Image 49), is very plain compared to its neighbors. It does not have any distinguishing characteristics and is as unimposing as a building can be. While the overall motifs are historic in nature, because of the oversimplification, the building looks modern. The cornice is very simple, as is the three-light transom. The only variation in the brick is the soldier courses above the windows.

The next two structures, #609-11 and #613 (Images 49, 50 and 57), have some more detail, but it is still simplified into marble watertable and belt
courses. The double casement windows instead of the traditional double-hung are an obvious difference, along with the pane division. The single story height of #609-11 is also unusual, since almost all of the dwellings in this area are at least two stories, and it also seems like a side façade in the center of a block. There is a larger wall-to-window ratio due to the wide space between the windows. The window proportions in #613 are also different. The square windows at the third level along with the French windows on the second level compress and then elongate the window openings. The door is also extra-wide and placed centered between two bays. It is made more prominent by the fanned stair and railing. The stone accents beneath the third floor windows and the alignment of the beltcourse with the bottom of the window are unusual and create a non-symmetrical balance. The small round windows flanking the entrance change the condition of the wall meeting the window. This building has taken a few historic elements and, by changing their proportions and layout, has made it distinctly modern.

The next set of modern buildings is #631 and #633 (Image 53). #631 immediately stands out because it is recessed away from the streetwall behind a
brick wall. The wall continues the façade line horizontally, but creates a void vertically. The building is also much shorter than the adjacent structures. There is a clear two-bay division, but the bays are not equal, and the amount of glass is greater than that of wall surface. The entrance is also recessed into the façade, something not done historically in this part of Philadelphia. #633 has the traditional three bay layout, but there is no entrance. The tile along the wall and the bottom of #633, while reminiscent of brick, is a more modern surface. The stuccoed surface is not in keeping with the historic materials. Because of this, these two structures are Contextuals.

The last building on the block, #637-43 (Image 54), is a true Contrastor. The forms are at a larger scale than the rest of the block and all of the elements are very simple geometric patterns. It does not have the delicate details of the historic buildings and instead reflects modernist influences. This building does not attempt to fit in, and in fact, it stands out as different because of the bright white surfaces, beveled corners and larger scale (Image 55). It does not engage the sidewalk and instead turns inward behind the brick wall.
South Side - 600 block of Pine Street

Figure 29 Photomontage of Streetscape

Figure 30 Outline Drawing of Streetscape

Figure 31 Streetscape with Foliage and Street Furniture
South Side – Construction History

All but one of the buildings on this side of the street were constructed after 1800, with a similar layout of three to three and one-half stories tall with two to three bays (Figures 29 and 30).

- #600, #602, and #604: (Image 61), Built in 1823 for the same proprietor, William Seal, a gentleman. Each was worked on separately, the first rehabilitated in 1962 by architect Lenord Solomon and then restored in 1987, the second restored in 1965, and the third restored in 1981 by architect Martin Rosenblum.

- #606: (Image 62) Built between 1816 and 1823 by Benjamin Esler Turner and renovated in 1975 by Robert L. Decker.

- #608: (Images 62 and 67) The only two-story dwelling on this side of the block and built between 1791 and 1794 by George Terrell. There is no date listed in the Inventory for alterations, but by the good condition of the façade, some must have been done during the redevelopment period.

- #610 and #612: (Image 62) These two narrow two-bay houses were built in 1830. Both received new facades, #610 in 1960 and #612 in 1930.
• #614: (Image 63) Built in 1925 and is one of the newer historic buildings on the block.

• #618 through #626: (Images 63 and 64) These next five units were constructed together in 1969 and designed by architects Hassinger & Schwam.

• #628: (Image 64) The construction date is unknown, but the façade was rebuilt in 1930.

• #630: (Image 65) Built in 1840 and in 1910 given a new façade.

• #632: (Image 65) Built in 1805 and altered in 1925.

• #634: (Image 65) Construction date unknown. Façade alterations in 1920.

• #636: (Image 65) Construction date unknown. Façade alterations in 1890.

• #638: (Image 66) Construction date unknown. Altered once in 1890 and then rehabilitated in 1973 by architect Nick Chimes.

• #640 (Image 66) New façade in 1950, at the beginning of the redevelopment.

• #642 and #644: (Image 66) The last two dwellings were built in 1960 as a symmetrical pair.
South Side – Modern Buildings

Of the twenty-two dwelling units on this side of the block, seven were built during the redevelopment period. They were built in two blocks. The first is a block of five, #618-26 (Images 63 and 64), and the second is a twin set, #642-44 (Image 66). The first set is a Contextual. The single building formed is shorter than its immediate neighbors and creates a narrower rhythm with two bays per dwelling unit. An alternating surface of solid and void is produced with near symmetry around a central shorter portion. The entrances are placed perpendicular to the street and are not visible at first glance. There is also a separation due to the metal gates that disengage the entrances from the street. The window proportions go to both extremes from the historic: there are long, thin windows that extend the height of the building and then more square windows that are on the recessed portions of the building. This creates a mostly brick surface that is flush with the streetwall broken by intermittent long lines of glass. The streetwall is also broken by balconies that divide the recessed bays into two horizontal sections. The buildings meet the ground in an abrupt fashion, with no transitional element between where the building ends and the sidewalk.
begins. These buildings do not engage the street and instead seem to withdraw inward.

The second set of modern buildings are Imitators. They imitate the traditional three and one-half story historic form found on this block and throughout Society Hill. The entrance is raised up four steps from the street creating a higher basement below, and the openings are placed in two bays with a dormer window centered on the roof. The cornice is a bit simpler than the other historic ones on the street, but overall these buildings blend into the historic fabric and do not stand out as new or modern.

**Overall Conditions**

The 600 block of Pine Street is not broken on either side by secondary streets. There is one small alley on the south side, but it is very narrow and there is not a break in the curb where it occurs (Map 14). The sidewalks on this street are also paved in brick.

The trees are sparser on the north side of the block (Figure 24, Image 57 and 69) than on Delancey Street and the spaces between vary greatly, but they
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provide adequate greenery. The south side is also irregular but the trees are more frequent (Figure 31). The same condition exists down the sidewalk, with a two-foot pedestrian way down the center (Images 56, 58, 68 and 70). The same streetlamps exist in this part of Society Hill and are a connecting and identifying element of the district.

Most of the buildings on this block are three to three and one-half stories tall, which was not the case on the Delancey Street blocks (Figures 23 and 30). The younger age of these buildings lends to a taller structure, as most of the three-story buildings in the district were built after 1800. Flat roofs are more prevalent on this block, which shows a change in style. For the most part, because the buildings are so tall and the streets so narrow, to the pedestrian the roofs disappear and it is the cornice line that defines the top edge of the structure. Many of the cornices are heavily articulated and add detail to the facades.

The general cornice line on this block is fairly even with only a few significant changes in height of building. This is seen in Figures 26 and 33. Here,
the discontinuity is made obvious when the details of the façade are stripped away. On the south side of the block, the main disruption is caused by the group of five modern units in the center of the block (Figure 33).

For most of the modern buildings on this block, the articulation found in historic buildings is maintained, as is the scale. Some of the historic elements, such as orientation, are altered and this changes the feel of the block. For example, in the central portion of the south side at #618-26 (Images 63 and 64), the lack of staircases that engage the sidewalk in combination with metal fences separating the residents from the street, isolating the buildings from the pedestrian. They do not engage the casual observer in the same way that the neighborhood’s typical stair stoops do, nor as would even a door opening directly onto the sidewalk. The brick walls in front of # 637-43 (Image 54) and #631 (Image 53) on the north side of the street also create a barrier between the pedestrian and inhabitant. In the historic architecture of this time, there was a connection between the inhabitants and the outside world which does not exist in much of the modern architecture, as these buildings turn away from the street to create a more private space.
There is less overall articulation in the facades but also moments of high detail. This block has simpler elements but also some very different ones, such as the two structures with bay windows, #640 (Image 66) on the south side and #621 (Image 51) on the north. The window shapes vary more greatly; some are arched with decorative stone surrounds.

Many of the entrances add high articulation to the facades, both in their individual design and in the rhythm they create across the block streetwall. This rhythm is illustrated in Figures 25 and 32. On the north side (Figure 25), there is a fairly even distribution, with gaps where the facades seem to be turning a secondary façade to Pine Street. There is a greater break on the south side (Figure 32) due to the nature of the entrances on the block of modern buildings in the center. Because these entrances have been turned, they are not apparent from the sidewalk and break the rhythm that is even on either side.

Another important aspect of this block is the rhythm of vertical elements. Figures 27 and 34 illustrate the vertical rhythm created by the fenestration along the streetwall. On the north side of the street (Figure 27) the rhythm is very
regular throughout the central portion of the block and then becomes more spread out at the ends, on the modern buildings. On the south side, the rhythm is broken in the center by the modern buildings. The overall rhythm has variations in width because some buildings have two bays while others have three, but the overall rhythm is fairly even.

The last overall pattern is the horizontal rhythm created by fenestration, detailing in the facades, and the cornice/rooflines of the buildings. This is illustrated in Figures 28 and 35. When the facades are reduced to horizontal lines, the disruption either disappears or becomes more apparent. In the case of the north side of the block (Figure 28), all of the modern buildings except the one on the west end blend into the other buildings’ horizontal patterns. On the south side (Figure 35), the rhythm would be continuous but the horizontal elements of solid brick surface on the modern buildings in the center of the block break up the continuity of the rhythm.

A few photos from the early 1960s illustrate the impact of the redevelopment period on this block. Image 59 is a view looking northwest at
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#609-615. The first three buildings from the right no longer exist. They were replaced in the 1980s and 1990s by modern structures. In Image 60, many buildings have changed. The partial building on the far left is now #637-43, the modern Contrastors on the west end of the north side of the block. The building with the arched third-story windows has been replaced by #631, a two-story modern building recessed from the streetwall. On the south side of the block, Image 71 shows #632-40 and while some changes have been made the majority of these buildings have remained almost the same.
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Image 53

635
1808 for Samuel & Alexander Jarden, plasterers
1971 restored by W. Nelson Anderson
1993 roof deck added

633
1974 John Lloyd & Associates

631

Image 54

637-43
1975 Benjamin Martin & Associates

141
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Image 55
North side of the 600 block of Pine Street looking northeast at #639-641.

Image 56
North side of the 600 block of Pine Street looking west from Sixth Street.
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Image 57
North side of the 600 block of Pine Street looking northwest with #609-11 in the foreground.

Image 58
North side of the 600 block of Pine Street looking west from #607.
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Image 59
North side of the 600 block of Pine Street in 1961 looking northwest at #609-615. (Philadelphia Historical Commission)

Image 60
North side of the 600 block of Pine Street in 1963 looking northeast with #633 in the center. (Philadelphia Historical Commission)
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South Side

600 Block Pine Street

Image 61

600
1823 for William Seal, gentleman
1960 converted to shopfront
1962 rehabilitated by Lenord Solomon
1987 restored

602
1823 for William Seal, gentleman
1850 cornice replaced
1960 rehabilitated

604
1823 for William Seal, gentleman
1895 metal cornice
1981 restored by Martin Rosenblum

Image 62

606
1816-23 Benjamin Estler Turner
1975 restored by Robert L. Decker

608
1791-94 George Terrell, tailor

610
1830
1960 facade restored

612
1830
1960 facade altered
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Image 65

630
1840
1910 new facade

632
1805
1925 alterations

634
1920 facade altered

636
1890 facade altered

Image 66

638
1890 facade altered
1973 restored by Nick Chimes

640
1950 new facade

642
1960

644
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Image 67
South side of the 600 block of Pine Street looking southwest at #608 in foreground.

Image 68
South side of the 600 block of Pine Street looking west from #604.
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Image 69
South side of the 600 block of Pine Street looking southeast midblock.

Image 70
South side of the 600 block of Pine Street looking west from Seventh Street.
South side of the 600 block of Pine Street in 1962 looking southeast at # 638 in the center. (Philadelphia Historical Commission)
Other Properties

To show more examples of Contrastors, isolated conditions were sought out that often existed as a single condition along a block. In some cases, the rest of the block was not varied enough to warrant in-depth analysis but a few units had a strong enough presence to warrant review. Map 15 locates these properties, and Table 4 provides a brief construction history.

417 and 419 Pine Street (a.k.a. 339-45 and 342-50 Lawrence Street)

#417 (Images 72 and 73) was designed by architect Giovanni Cosco in 1973, and #419 (Image 74) was designed by architect George B. Roberts in 1970. These two properties are interesting to compare to each other because they are both modern buildings. #417 is a Contextual and #419 is an Imitator. These two buildings complement each other because they are two appropriate solutions to the same design problem: a corner lot in a historic district. Both have their entrances on Lawrence Street, along the long side of their plan, which is also the gable end of the building. #417 is much narrower and the roof slope is much less than on #419, which has a traditional two-bay width on the Pine Street side and the same roof slope as the historic buildings on the block. The symmetry of the
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Impervious Surface Layer, City of Philadelphia, referenced from Pennsylvania Spatial Data Access (PASDA) with author’s alterations
### Table 4
Other Properties Construction Dates and Architects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bldg #</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Built</th>
<th>OrigArchitect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Giovanni Cosco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>George B. Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Wright Andrade Ament &amp; Gane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Wright Andrade Ament &amp; Gane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Wright Andrade Ament &amp; Gane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Wright Andrade Ament &amp; Gane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Wright Andrade Ament &amp; Gane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Wright Andrade Ament &amp; Gane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Wright Andrade Ament &amp; Gane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Wright Andrade Ament &amp; Gane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Wright Andrade Ament &amp; Gane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Wright Andrade Ament &amp; Gane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>Spruce</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-05</td>
<td>Spruce</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525-33</td>
<td>Spruce</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Orianna</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>I.M. Pei &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>Orianna</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>I.M. Pei &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>Orianna</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>I.M. Pei &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>Orianna</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>I.M. Pei &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Orianna</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>I.M. Pei &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Orianna</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>I.M. Pei &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>Orianna</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>I.M. Pei &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Orianna</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>I.M. Pei &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>Orianna</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>I.M. Pei &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Orianna</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>I.M. Pei &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td>Addison</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>Addison</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>Addison</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>Addison</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>Addison</td>
<td>1987-90</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>Addison</td>
<td>1987-90</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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main façade of each is offset by an extra piece at the far end of the facades. The cornice details on both are similar as are the proportions of the windows. The details are what make them different. #417 has a modern entrance detail of a cracked circle that hinges back into the façade to create a recessed entrance (Image 73), while #419 has a traditional three-light transom front door. The windows on #419 are multi-pane and double hung, while those on #417 are single pane and picture windows are sliding-sash. The arrangement of the windows is roughly mirrored between the buildings, with a round window element near the top of the façade, but #417 is not completely symmetrical in itself. The only modern element of #419 is the greenhouse-type window over one of the basement windows, which looks out of place but is not too disruptive.

These two structures complement each other well because they mirror certain key elements while retaining their individuality and unique modernity that makes them fit in the context of the rest of the block.

257-75 South Third Street

This row of modern buildings was designed in 1963 by Wright Andrade Ament and Gane, Architects (Image 75), the firm that wrote the technical report
in 1959. The row is an alternating set of four bays that in all spans ten dwelling units. They were built as one structure, therefore the façade is continuous. This particular row of buildings was chosen because in this context it is a Contextual. The row houses in Philadelphia did not traditionally have balconies nor did they have small front yard areas that divided the structure from the sidewalk,42 so these elements make it a Contextual, along with the fact that it still blends with the historic architecture and does not stand out as being glaringly different. It fits within the guidelines set for the district and is not overtly distracting, but worth noting.

529 Delancey Street

While the basic structure of this building is historic and was erected in 1810, the new stucco façade applied in the mid 1960s and the complete alteration of the façade and streetwall is the reason for its inclusion in this analysis (Image 76). Stucco is not found on many of the front facades of buildings in this district and for this reason this building stands out as being different and is categorized as a Contextual. The solid, lighter color and texture removes the subtle detail

---

inherent in a brick surface and creates a simplified façade, while the traditional
distribution of fenestration and proportions reflects historic characteristics.

406-12 South Seventh Street

This short row of four units is also historic, built in 1910 and altered in
1960 (Image 77). Originally the ground floor contained shopfronts that were
filled in during the alteration. They are categorized as Contextuals. This set
stands out because of the lighter color, the blocky bay windows, and the floor-to-
ceiling windows on the ground floor. The modern style metal seam cornice also
gives a less delicate look than a traditional metal or wood cornice. These
buildings appear more modern than their construction date suggests, making it
possible that they were completely altered in the redevelopment.

433 Spruce Street

This building has an overall geometry that is not found in historic
Philadelphia row houses: a cylinder (Image 78). This dwelling was built in 1960
but is unlike any of the others built during this time. The round wall
immediately adds depth to the streetwall and a different type of variation than
has been seen before. An interesting thing to note is that the cylinder does not
extend past the streetwall but instead is tangent to it. The building looks as if it is being compressed by the two adjacent and that it is bulging out as a result. The fenestration carries similar horizontal lines as the surrounding buildings and the cornice line is almost the same. The recessed entrance and the bubble glass in the first story windows separate the inhabitants from the street in an uncharacteristic way. Because of the similarity in overall color and texture, this building does not disrupt the streetwall but adds an element of interest, making it a Contextual.

**501-05 and 525-33 Spruce Street**

A group of properties on the 500 block of Spruce Street stand out as being Contrasts. They are #501-05 (Image 79) and #525-33 (Image 80) and were built in 1965 and 1960, respectively. The eight properties create four sets of twins that are of the same design. Between the two sections is a row of eight historic houses all built in the first half of the nineteenth century. The first feature that stands out is the large bay window that disrupts the roof line and the streetwall surface. These windows are at a much larger scale than any others on the block and have elongated proportions. The rest of the windows are simple and do not have much articulation except for a narrow sill. The next exaggerated feature is the
stair. It is larger and more monumental than the other staircases on the block and leads to an entrance that is much higher off the street. Also, because it runs perpendicular to the street, the connection to the building is more indirect. The presence of external staircases to the basement is also an atypical feature in this neighborhood. The building does not touch the adjoining property at the streetwall, causing even more separation between modern and historic. The rhythm is much wider than that created by the bays of the historic buildings. The cornice line is simple and there is a highly articulated brick corbel detail that separates each dwelling unit, roughly lining up to that of the adjacent building, in keeping with the regulations set forth by the Redevelopment Authority.\footnote{Washington Square East Unit 2 Urban Renewal Plan – see Appendix B} The other six units do not match their neighbors in height, but this is allowable according to the aforementioned regulations. Overall, these units seem very monumental and removed from the street and the rest of the block. Their larger scale and exaggerated features clearly set them apart from the rest of the block.

332 Delancey Street

This building was constructed in 1987 (Image 81) and is characterized as a Contrastor. This building was constructed after the jurisdiction of the renewal plan...
plan ended, so it is not governed by the plan’s design guidelines. It has the same general proportions as a historic rowhouse and a similar general layout, but the scale of the windows and the color of the façade are completely modern. The beltcourse is exaggerated and the central portion of the façade is recessed. The entrance is almost double the width of traditional doors and the plinths on either side of the stair are not commonly found. These enlarged features make the building have a monumental feel and make it stand out from the others on the block. The cornice has distinctly modern details that alter the roofline, recessing it back rather than projecting forward from the wall surface. The blend of historic and modern elements is not done in a way that makes the building fit in with its surroundings.

248-70 South Orianna Street (St. Joseph’s Way)

This set of buildings was designed and built in 1976 by architects I. M. Pei and Associates (Image 82). It is part of a larger complex called Bingham Court, which is a courtyard development on the block between South Third and Fourth Streets and Walnut and Pine Streets. Orianna Street is a north-south running pedestrian way that is entered from Spruce Street and ends in the courtyard of
Bingham Court. These seven dwelling units are on the west side of the street midway from Spruce to the Court. The scale of these buildings overall is that of the two-story dwellings in the district, but the scale of the fenestration is altered. The top half of the facade has windows of two different sizes. The entrance is also hidden behind a wall that separates the private space concretely from the public space, withdrawing the building, as many of the modern buildings do. A regular rhythm is created that gives the row continuity and cohesion, but it is clearly a different type than in a traditional row house neighborhood, making this group Contextuals.

This development leads into a courtyard development. Many of these were created during the redevelopment but because they are usually in the center of a block and do not address the street or historic streetscapes, their analysis is not included in this thesis. It is important to note that this is a typology that is strongly represented in Society Hill, one that pays careful attention to the existing street grid pattern and its overlay of secondary streets.

604-616 Addison Street

This set of buildings is two different developments. The first is a group of
four post-modern brick units, #604-610, built in 1995 (Image 83). The first element that is out of place is the garage on the first floor directly onto the main street. Also, the gable end of the roof is on the main façade, another unusual feature. The pattern in the brick of the lighter colored shapes between the windows gives the façade variation but does not enhance its appearance.

The second building, #412-14 (Image 83), is a three-bay stuccoed structure with a recessed central bay. It was built in 1987-90. The surface of the façade is light colored and divided into large squares, giving it the pattern of large slabs. There is also a garage in the right-most bay. The windows are in ribbons of four and divide the façade into distinct horizontal bands. The entrance is on the recessed bay and is behind a metal gate, creating a barrier between the front door and the pedestrian.

These two sets of buildings continue the vertical rhythm of the historic district, but it is in their architectural features and details that they are distinctly modern. The use of the materials and the patterns they create are of a style that does not fit in with the surroundings, making them Contrastors.
417 Delancey Street

Detail of the entrance of 417 Delancey Street.
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Image 76
529 Delancey Street

Image 77
406-12 Seventh Street.
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Image 78
433 Spruce Street

Image 79
501-05 Spruce Street
Overreaching Themes and Conditions

In this analysis, several common themes have been found throughout the study area. Because most of the modern buildings were built during the redevelopment period when the design restrictions were heavily enforced, there are very few examples of buildings that are wildly out of place. Even the few Contrastors identified are not outrageously different from their neighbors – they all kept with the same general materials and size – but they are the buildings that stand out the most against their context.

The distribution of the three types of buildings is outlined in Table 5. Initially, the buildings that were selected from throughout Society Hill that were not part of the three initial study area blocks were chosen to be representative of Contrastors because not many examples were on these blocks. As analysis progressed, the ideas of what constituted each category changed, and many of the building that were initially chosen as Contrastors became type two buildings and a few of the Contextuals became Contrastors.

The initial hypothesis was that the modern buildings fit into three distinct categories and it was this division that affected the streetscape and its perception.
### Table 5
Distribution of Building Typologies in the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>Type 2</th>
<th>Type 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201 Delancey</td>
<td>101 to 129 Delancey</td>
<td>100 Delancey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203 Delancey</td>
<td>110-12 Delancey</td>
<td>102 Delancey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205 Delancey</td>
<td>116-18 Delancey</td>
<td>134-36 Delancey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207 Delancey</td>
<td>208-12 Delancey</td>
<td>637-43 Pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209 Delancey</td>
<td>226 Delancey</td>
<td>604 to 10 Addison*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211 Delancey</td>
<td>228-30 Delancey</td>
<td>612-14 Addison*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213 Delancey</td>
<td>235-37 Delancey</td>
<td>332 Delancey*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215 Delancey</td>
<td>607 Pine</td>
<td>501 to 505 Spruce*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218 Delancey</td>
<td>609-11 Pine</td>
<td>525 to 533 Spruce*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 Delancey</td>
<td>613 Pine</td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 Delancey</td>
<td>631 Pine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642 Pine</td>
<td>633 Pine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644 Pine</td>
<td>618 Pine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419 Pine*</td>
<td>620 Pine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td>622 Pine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>624 Pine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>626 Pine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>417 Pine*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>433 Spruce*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>529 Delancey*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>406 to 412 07TH*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250 to 270 Orianna*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>257 to 275 03RD*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the three blocks

| 13 | 30 | 5 |

From the other properties

| 1 | 27 | 16 |

*buildings not on the three complete blocks
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After analysis, it became clear that it was not a specific contextual approach – i.e. Imitator, Contextual or Contrastor – that affected the streetscape, but rather a series of elements common to all. These main elements are: entrance condition, distribution of window-to-wall surface, placement and pattern of fenestration, recesses or protrusions in the streetwall, scale of architectural elements, and color. It is with these elements that the modern buildings set themselves apart from the historic fabric, but it is with these same aspects that they add to the character of the streetscapes and continue the historic variation with modern counterparts and variations.

One of the themes that most of the Contextuals possessed was a change in the entrance condition from the historic tradition. Many of the entrances are recessed or turned away from the street, and many have fences, walls, or gates between them and the sidewalk/street. Across all three blocks, there are multiple examples of this. The entrance of 102 Delancey Street (Image 35) is recessed into the façade behind a cut-out in the façade; 208-12 Delancey Street (Image 17) has a central recessed portion with the entrances in the center; the row of 618-26 Pine Street (Images 63 and 64) has entrances that are turned away from and
perpendicular to the street, with gates separating the sidewalk from the entrance; and 417 Pine Street (Image 73) recesses back in steps, from the cracked brick circle, to the metal gate, ending in the entrance.

Another motif is the overall scale of façade elements, especially as represented by the ratio of window-to-wall surface and the distribution of these two elements. Many of the Contextuals and Contrastors are at either extreme of this ratio. Some have much more window, while others have larger expanses of brick surface, often with the size of the windows varying along the building facades, with some very large windows coupled with much smaller ones. These aspects are apparent is buildings such as 102 Delancey Street (Image 35), 134-36 Delancey Street (Image 39), 228-30 Delancey Street (Image 19), 639-43 Pine Street (Image 54), 501-505 and 525-33 Spruce Street (Images 79 and 80), and 332 Delancey Street (Image 81).

The last major overreaching theme is recesses or protrusions in the streetwall surface. The modern buildings have more variation in their facades than the historic buildings, with greater variations in solid and void relationships. Most of the historic buildings do not have elements that extend
beyond the streetwall surface with the exception of the two on 600 block of Pine Street that were both built around the turn of the twentieth century (#621 and #638, Images 51 and 66). This becomes a focal point in the streetwall because it is on a different plane than the rest of the façade. A few of the modern buildings with this element are 100 Delancey Street (Image 35), 406-12 Seventh Street (Image 77), and the buildings on the 500 Block of Spruce (Images 79 and 80).

Zoning Issues

One last element to note is the issue of zoning and its impact on the design of buildings in Society Hill. Because Society Hill does not fall under the regulation of any historic district guidelines, the only legal restrictions placed on new architecture is through zoning. These zoning laws control elements such as building height, number of stories, width, type (detached, semi-detached, attached), and open space requirements.44 It is these requirements that have kept the modern architecture similar in scale, height and setback to the surrounding

---

44 All of the buildings in the study area fall into either R10 or R10A zoning districts. R10 is Multi-Family Twin/Row and R10A is Single-Family Twin/Row. For the purposes of this thesis, these two zoning categories are similar enough to be considered the same. The regulations that pertain to this thesis are the following: minimum lot width is 16 feet; maximum building height is 35 feet; maximum number of stories is 3; permitted building types are detached, semi-detached or attached; and multiples buildings per lot is not allowed. The Philadelphia Code and Charter, Title 14: Zoning and Planning, Chapter 14-200 Residential Districts, §14-205. (http://municipalcodes.lexisnexis.com/codes/philadelphia/, April 16, 2005)
existing fabric. All new construction must fall within these codes. The reason that the height and general scale of the buildings is similar while there is variation in architectural elements and style is due to the zoning codes. In the case of Society Hill, zoning has provided a consistent level of overall physical protection – at least at the level of overall bulk, height and density. At the same time, the guidelines and their implementation through the three infill categories analyzed herein have resulted in a physically varied but broadly consistent historic district.
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Two vital influences of architecture are change and growth. Without these aspects, architecture as we know it would not exist. But, as architecture evolves, more issues arise, many involving the existing built environment and the context in which new architecture must fit. New and old architecture has co-existed for as long as humans have been constructing buildings, but perhaps only in the last few hundred years has the relationship been so carefully scrutinized. With the growing realization that our past should be preserved, how we build in this context has come under great scrutiny. The process of design has been altered and with that how we perceive modern architecture.

The historic architecture of Society Hill is vibrant and varied in a way that may not be as obvious to us now as it was in the past. The styles of the late
eighteenth century are very different from those in the middle and end of the
nineteenth century, but because they are all considered “historic,” all of these
styles are acceptable in the district. Many of the modern buildings that have
aided in filling in the gaps in the historic fabric are designed in a similar way to
the existing historic fabric, but many others have also taken on the design
challenge to be a record of the time in which they were designed, and have
created their own architectural vocabulary that is influenced by the past while
also displaying elements of the present.

The modern buildings create variation in the blocks and give them a sense
of change and growth. Society Hill has allowed for different types of modern
buildings and is richer for it. These buildings show that Society Hill is a living
place that has not been frozen in time and preserved in a false way. Despite the
fact that some of the design may not be sympathetic to the overall themes of the
district, the overall level of detail and quality of construction contributes to the
heterogeneity of the district.
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Washington Square East Unit 1
Urban Renewal Plan

The following is a condensed version of the renewal plan produced in 1958 by the Redevelopment Authority of Philadelphia. The plan is in outline form and the portions pertaining to new construction, indicated in bold, have been included in full, while the other section headings are provided as a context as to give a general outline of the document.

Table of Contents
A. Description of Project
   1. Boundaries of Urban Renewal Area
   2. Types of Proposed Renewal Actions
B. Land Use Plan
   1. Land Use Map
   2. Land Use Provisions and Building Requirements
      a. Uses to be Permitted
         (1) Residential Districts. All such Districts shall be predominately in
             residential use.
            (a) Exceptions
            (b) Uses in Apartment Districts
         (2) Commercial Districts
         (3) Public and Semi-Public Districts
         (4) Public Recreation Districts
         (5) Right-of-Way Districts
      b. Additional Regulations, Controls, and Restrictions for properties to be
         acquired
         (1) Residential – the following regulations and controls shall apply.
            (a) Floor Area Ratio
            (b) Building Coverage
            (c) New Dwelling Unit Density
            (d) Building Height
               i. Apartment Districts east of Third Street
               ii. Apartment Districts west of Third Street
         iii. Height of new buildings in Mixed Residential Districts
              shall not exceed three stories, exclusive of attics and
              basements or cellars.
         iv. Where less than four new structures are built to occupy
              the frontage between rows of rehabilitated structures, the
              height of the new structures shall be the same as that of
the cornice height, or top of front wall, of either end of the adjacent structures.

(e) Off-Street Parking
(f) Walkways
(g) Easements
(h) Rehabilitation Standards of Structures to be acquired.
   i. Rehabilitation of structures is incidental to slum clearance and redevelopment. Structures to be acquired for rehabilitation are identified on Map Number 3, Acquisition, Clearance and Rehabilitation Plan. A consultant has been engaged by the Authority to survey the structures scheduled for rehabilitation work and to determine for each structure the work needed to satisfy the standards enumerated below. The Authority will attempt to enter into agreements with former owners to complete the required work. Once such an agreement has been completed, title to the property will be returned to the former owner. Properties for which no agreement is completed will be sold by the Authority for restoration.
   ii. Where rehabilitation is being carried out, the following statements describe the proposals of the Redevelopment Authority with respect to structures to be rehabilitated.
   a. For the rehabilitation structure at 130 Delancey Street and the adjacent lot at 132 Delancey Street, the following requirements shall apply:
      (1) The unimproved parcel at 132 Delancey Street shall be developed as landscaped open space at the front portion for a depth of twenty-seven (27) feet from the front property line.
      (2) No separate structure shall be constructed on the balance of the parcel beyond the twenty-seven (27) feet; however an addition to the structure at 130 Delancey Street may be built in this remaining area (18’9” x 53’0”).
      (3) Any extension to 130 & 132 Delancey Street shall be limited to 60% coverage of the combined lots.
      (4) Off-street parking is not permitted.
   b. Structures to be rehabilitated will be subject to the project standards for rehabilitation specified herein, and the regulations and controls herein specified for properties to be acquired by the Redevelopment Authority.
   c. The project Standards to be established as objectives for satisfactory
rehabilitation shall include:
(1) Conformity to the regulations and controls specified in Section “C” of this Urban Renewal Plan
(2) The following standards with respect to rehabilitation
   (a) Building Structure
      i. All foundation walls, exterior walls, roofs and chimneys, flooring and supporting construction, interior partitions, porches, exterior and interior stairways and rails, windows and window frames, door and door frames, and fire escapes are to be safely constructed and in good condition;
      ii. All rainwater is to be drained so that every structure is free of dampness; all gutters and downspouts are to be safely constructed and in good condition;
      iii. All basement or crawl spaces are to be free of dampness, properly drained and ventilated; every basement used as a dwelling unit is to provide adequate window space located entirely above ground.
(b) Rooms
(c) Sanitary Facilities and Equipment
(d) Electrical Outlets ad Wiring
(e) Heating Facilities
(f) Access and Egress
(g) Hazards and Nuisances
(h) Building Codes
(3) Commercial
   (a) FAR
   (b) Building Coverage
   (c) Building Height
   (d) Building Setback
   (e) Parking Space
   (f) Loading Space
(4) Public and Semi-Public
   (a) FAR
   (b) Building Coverage
   (c) Building Height
   (d) Off-Street Parking
(5) Public Recreation
(6) Overall Controls – the following regulations and controls shall apply
   (a) Television Aerials. Exterior television aerials must be
completely concealed by parapet walls, except on buildings more than four stories high.
(b) Fire Escapes. No Exterior fire escapes may be installed on the face of buildings fronting on a street.
(c) All land to be developed for parking, playgrounds, or swimming pools shall be screened from the adjacent uses by masonry walls of similar materials to adjacent structures or by durable metal fences and planting of a design approved by the Redevelopment Authority.
(d) Signs
d. Statement of Duration and Provisions and Requirements
The provisions of this Plan specifying the land uses for the Project Area and the requirements and restrictions with respect thereto shall be in effect for a period of not less than fifty (50) years following the date of approval of the Plan by the City Council on November 29, 1958.
e. Applicability of Provisions and Requirements of Section C 2a and C 2b supra to property not to be acquired.

C. Project Proposals
1. Land Acquisition
   a. Real property proposed to be acquired for clearance and redevelopment including spot clearance and development of vacant land and rehabilitation are as indicated on Urban Renewal Plan, Map No. 3, Land Acquisition Map.
2. Redeveloper’s Obligations

D. Other Provisions Necessary to Meet State and Local Requirements

E. Procedure for Changes in Approved Plan
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Washington Square East Unit 2
Urban Renewal Plan

The following is a condensed version of the renewal plan produced in 1962 by
the Redevelopment Authority of Philadelphia. The plan is in outline form and the
portions pertaining to new construction, indicated in bold, have been included in
full, while the other section headings are provided as a context as to give a general
outline of the document.

A. Table of Contents
B. Description of Project
C. Land Use Plan
   1. Land Use Maps
   2. Land Use Provisions and Building Improvements
      a. Uses Permitted
         1) Residential
         2) Local Commercial
         3) Semi-Public
      b. Regulations, controls and restrictions on land use of properties to be
         acquired by the Authority
         1) FAR, building coverage, density, yards
      2) Building Height
         a) Where less than four new residential structures are built to
            occupy the frontage between rows of rehabilitated structures,
            the height of the new structures should be the same as that of
            the cornice height, or top of the front wall, of either one of the
            adjacent structures
         b) Any new construction in semi-public districts between Spruce
            and Cypress Streets, and between Third and Fourth Streets, may
            not exceed three stories but shall not exceed the cornice height
            of the highest residential building to the west of this block.
   3) Parking
   4) Walkways
      a) Public walkways as designated on the Land Use Plan shall be
         provided by the City of Philadelphia and maintained by the
         Recreation Department connecting Delancey Street between
         Fourth and Lawrence Streets, and connecting the Orianna
         Walkway in Unit 1 with St. Peter's Church; the closed section of
         Lawrence Street shall remain as right-of-way;
      b) Areas to be used as public walkways shall be improved by the
         City only with appropriate landscaping, paving, objets-d’art,
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outdoor furniture, fences or walls;
c) Private walkways and courts shall be provided by the redeveloper with appropriate access to interior dwellings. Treatment of landscaping and paving is to be approved by the Redevelopment Authority

5) Tentative rights-of-way
6) Signs
7) Fire Escapes
   No exterior fire escape may be installed on the face of buildings fronting on streets or walkways
8) Television aerials:
   Exterior television aerials must be completely concealed by parapet walls, except on buildings more than four stories high
9) Sidewalks
   Because of the architectural and historic character of the project area, all new walkways, sidewalks, and sidewalk repairs shall utilize brick, Belgian Blocks, or similar type of paving material.
10) Projecting Equipment:
   No air conditioning, ventilating, or other mechanical or electrical equipment, except lighting fixtures may project more than one inch beyond the street exterior wall of any building.
11) Projecting roofs:
   No marquees, porches, sun-shades, or awnings will be permitted on front building facades unless specific designs have been approved by the Authority.
12) Yards and Gardens:
   When yards and gardens are enclosed, they shall be enclosed by masonry walls of similar material to adjacent structures or by durable metal fences design approved by the Redevelopment Authority
13) Outbuildings
   a) Where permitted, garages and other outbuildings shall be of masonry or the same materials as the primary structure;
   b) Gates or doors opening on public streets and walkways from outbuildings shall not extend beyond property lines when closed or open
14) Single house building parcels
15) Garden and/or Parking Parcels
16) Rehabilitation of properties to be acquired:
   Structures to be acquired and rehabilitated will be required to conform to the following standards:
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a) Building Structures
   1) All foundation walls, exterior walls, roofs and chimneys, flooring and supporting construction, interior partitions, porches, exterior and interior stairways and rails, windows and window frames, door and door frames, and fire escapes are to be safely constructed and in good condition;
   2) All rainwater is to be drained so that every structure is free of dampness; all gutters and downspouts are to be safely constructed and in good condition;
   3) All basement or crawl spaces are to be free of dampness, properly drained and ventilated; every basement used as a dwelling unit is to provide adequate window space located entirely above ground.

b) Rooms (size, light, ventilation and access)
c) Sanitary Facilities and Equipment
d) Electrical Outlets and Wiring
e) Heating Facilities
f) Access and Egress
g) Code application

h) Specific architectural restoration requirements for all historically certified structures to be acquired will be made at the time of acquisition in connection with their historic and architectural value. Particular attention will be given to the Delancey Street blocks and the street frontage opposite St. Peter's Church.

3. Zoning

D. Project Proposals
   1. Land Acquisition
   2. Rehabilitation and Conservation
   3. Public Improvements
      a. Street changes
      b. Park and Playgrounds
      c. Public Utilities
d. Side Improvement
      A comprehensive plan for street lighting and street tree planting will be carried out by the Redevelopment Authority and Streets Department on all public streets and walkways in Unit No. 2 in conjunction with the same improvements for Unit No. 1 of the Urban Renewal Area.

   4. Redeveloper's Obligations

E. Other Provisions Necessary to Meet State and Local Requirements
F. Changes in Approved Plan
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Table A

200 Block of Delancey Street Re-Use Determination in 1959

The information in the following tables is taken from the Wright, Andrade and Amenta Technical Report, which created an extensive catalogue of most of the properties in Unit 1 and Unit 2, recording the intended reuse, actual use (shown here) acquisition information, historical certification, and any historical dates associated with the properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Re-use</th>
<th>Actual Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201-203</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Cleared for Yard 328 S. 2nd St.</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Cleared for Yard 328 S. 2nd St.</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Garden to 316 S. Philip St.</td>
<td>Garden to 316 S. Philip St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235-237</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245-251</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>Clear for Yard - 334 &amp; 336 S. 2nd St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A (Cont.)
200 Block of Delancey Street Re-Use Determination in 1959

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Re-use</th>
<th>Actual Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table B

100 Block of Delancey Street Re-Use Determination in 1959

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Re-use</th>
<th>Actual Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Clear for new construction</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Delaware Expressway</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.5</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Delaware Expressway</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Delaware Expressway</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107-109</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Delaware Expressway</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111-113</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Clear for new construction</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115-117</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Clear for new construction</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Clear for new construction</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Clear for new construction</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Clear for new construction</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Clear for Delaware Expressway</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Clear for Delaware Expressway</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Clear for Delaware Expressway</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Clear for Delaware Expressway</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Clear for Delaware Expressway</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Clear for Delaware Expressway</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
<td>Rehab’d Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Re-use</td>
<td>Actual Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>Clear for Yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>Clear for Yard</td>
<td>Clear for Yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
<td>Clear for Yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611-613</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>Rehab'd Residential</td>
<td>Rehab'd Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>Rehab'd Residential</td>
<td>Rehab'd Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>Rehab'd Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>633</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>Rehab'd Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>Clear for Yards 339 &amp; 341 S. 6th Street</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>639</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>Clear for Yards 339 &amp; 341 S. 6th Street</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>Rehab'd Residential</td>
<td>Rehab'd Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>Rehab'd Residential</td>
<td>Rehab'd Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>Rehab'd Residential</td>
<td>Rehab'd Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616-626</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
<td>Existing Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Re-use</td>
<td>Actual Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255-57</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Dock St. Superblock</td>
<td>Dock St. Superblock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Dock St. Superblock</td>
<td>Dock St. Superblock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261-63</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Dock St. Superblock</td>
<td>Dock St. Superblock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Dock St. Superblock</td>
<td>Dock St. Superblock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Dock St. Superblock</td>
<td>Dock St. Superblock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Dock St. Superblock</td>
<td>Dock St. Superblock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Dock St. Superblock</td>
<td>Dock St. Superblock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Dock St. Superblock</td>
<td>Dock St. Superblock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Dock St. Superblock</td>
<td>Dock St. Superblock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>Rehab'd Residential</td>
<td>Rehab'd Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>Spruce</td>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>New Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>Spruce</td>
<td>New Residential</td>
<td>New Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>Spruce</td>
<td>6 New Buildings</td>
<td>7 New Buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Delancey</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-60</td>
<td>Orianna</td>
<td>New Residential</td>
<td>New Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Orianna</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>Orianna</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Orianna</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>Orianna</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Orianna</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td>Addison</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>Addison</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>Addison</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>Addison</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>Addison</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>Addison</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Construction

Visitors from out of town are wont to sigh with rapture when they see our trim blocks of tall brick buildings — that even cornice running in a smooth line for several hundred yards really is quite a sight — and exclaim, “Oh, I wish we had something like this in New York!” (“Pine Street,” by Christopher Morley, Pipsqueak, 1921).

The Society Hill Historic District contains significant early structures interspersed with contemporary architecture of the 20th century. With its remarkably high number of important buildings, there are relatively few open lots. Opportunities for new construction are limited; most building involves rear additions, the replacement of the few structures that do not contribute to the district, and the building out of the few empty lots. New construction on vacant lots in the district is subject to the review and consent of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, whose advice, while not binding, will help ensure the integrity of the historic district. Other new construction is fully regulated.

Any new construction in the district should not obscure, damage, or destroy the character-defining features of existing historic buildings. Additions to historic buildings, however, should not exactly duplicate the design in an attempt to achieve a seamless effect; instead, the new addition should be designed so that there is clear definition between historic and new materials. Better for new construction to reflect our time rather than to give a false historical impression through exact mimicry.

At the same time, all new construction should be compatible with the size, scale, color, material, and character of the property and neighborhood.

The goal should be to create consistency in the street facade, including setbacks, materials, overall height, and the spacing and scale of window and door openings.

As you think about your new building or addition, take a careful look at the adjacent buildings as well as others throughout the district. Note the materials used, almost always some form of masonry: brick, stucco, brownstone, or limestone. Look at special features, such as bay windows, dormers, the number of windowpanes, and style of windows.

Note how most streets in the district are consistent in scale and materials, whether the buildings were built as a single design, or added gradually over time. This notion of taking design cues from the surroundings is the goal for sensitive new construction in the district.

An experienced design professional can help meet your needs with a design that is compatible with the historic district. And the staff of the Philadelphia Historical Commission is available for advice and consultation.

by Michael Stern, Foundation for Architecture
| **Recommended** |  |
|-----------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Alignment with adjacent building height and cornice line | Alignment with adjacent window sills and heads | Materials similar to adjacent buildings | Similarity in roof profile |
| Doorway design, dormers, and bay windows can differ in design, if not overall scale, from adjacent buildings |  |

| **Not Recommended** |  |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| No alignment with adjacent building height and cornice line; some variety is okay | Window height size and design radically different from adjacent buildings | Use of materials not found in adjacent buildings or neighborhood | Dissimilar roof profile and design |
Appendix E

DELANCEY STREET - 100 Block

Paving: granite block  
Sidewalks: brick  
Curbs: concrete  
Light fixtures: Franklin

101-29  
See 300-16 S. Front Street and 313-23 S. 2nd Street.

300-16 (a.k.a. 101 Delancey Street) "Penns Landing Square" Nine contemporary houses on Front Street, 55 houses in total development. 3-story, 2-bay, pink brick houses. Recessed porch on 1st and 2nd floors with wrought iron railing; single-leaf door with wood surround; casement sash with 6 lights on 1st and 3rd floors, 2 lights on 2nd. In addition, 4-story, 4-bay, pink brick houses; bays 1 and 2: recessed at 1st and 2nd floors; brick wall column; wrought iron gate; bay 1: metal door surround with flush metal door; bay 2: 6-light casement sash on 1st floor; 2-light casement sash on 2nd; bay 3: 6-light casement sash on 1st and 3rd floors, 2-light casement sash on 2nd; bay 4: 6-light casement sash on 1st floor, 2-light on 2nd; cast stone coping; flat roof.

Delancey Street elevation: 3-stories; brick with casement sash; a 7-foot high brick garden wall extends west along Delancey Street.


301-23 (a.k.a. 129 Delancey Street) Eight, 3-story, 3-bay, pink brick, contemporary houses. Bay 1: metal door surround with fluted metal door and sidelight; large hopper window with transom on 2nd floor; 2-light casement sash on 3rd floor; concrete steps with wrought iron railing; brick flower box between 1st and 2nd bays; bay 2: entrance with metal surround and fluted metal door with sidelight at grade; bay 3: 2-light casement sash at 2nd floor; metal coping; flat roof; 309-11 recessed from street creating landscaped seating area at corner; landscaped area.


***************

100  
See 328-38 S. Front Street.

328-36 (a.k.a. 100 Delancey Street) Four, 3 1/2-story, 1-bay, red brick, contemporary houses. Recessed porch with wrought iron gate on 1st floor; single-leaf metal door; casement sash; 2-story triangular bay at 2nd and 3rd floors; brick soldier course at 1st and 2nd floors; metal standing seam gable roof with recessed deck; 334: shed dormers and roof deck with wood railing.

Delancey Street elevation: 3 stories; brick; 2-story hanging bay with casement sash; an 8-foot high brick garden wall extends west along Delancey Street.

102 3-story, 2-bay, red brick, contemporary house. Recessed 1st floor with brick stoop and flower box; rectangular metal door surround; single-leaf flush metal door; sidelights; triple casement 1st floor, projecting metal bay with fixed casement sash 2nd and 3rd; metal cornice; flat roof; roof deck; square-head alleyway entrance with iron gate.


104-06 Two, 3 1/2-story, 2-bay, red brick, Flemish bond, Federal houses. Pedimented wood frontispiece with fluted pilasters; 6-panel door with fanlight; 6/6 double-hung sash; recessed brick panel between 2nd and 3rd floor sash; wood sills; paneled shutters; brick stringcourse at 2nd floor; wood box cornice; gable roof; arch-head dormer.

Built c. 1796 for Francis Gurney, merchant. Alterations: c. 1875, 104 altered to garage, 106 altered to commercial front; 1967, Curtis Seibert, architect, complete restoration, new windows, door and frames, repair cornice and dormers, front restored to residential façade. Significant.

108 3 1/2-story, 4-bay, red brick, Flemish bond, Georgian house. Cellar bulkhead; brick watertable; wood door surround with 4-light rectangular transom; 6-panel door; leaded glass window on the 1st floor, 9/9 double-hung sash on the 2nd, and 6/6 on 3rd; wood sills; double brick stringcourse at the 2nd and 3rd floors; box cornice; pedimented dormer.


110-12 3 1/2-story, 3-bay, orange brick, contemporary house. Wood door surround with large single-light transom; paneled door; casement sash, recessed at 1st floor; slate and glass angled sills at 1st floor, slate at 2nd and 3rd; 4th floor mansard roof recessed behind open deck.


114 3 1/2-story, 2-bay, red brick, Flemish bond, Georgian house. Cellar bulkhead; brick watertable; arch-head wood door surround; fanlight; 6-panel door; double-hung sash, 9/9 on 1st and 2nd floors; 6/6 on 3rd; molded wood cornice; paneled shutters; double brick stringcourse at 2nd and 3rd floors; modillioned wood cornice; gable roof; pedimented dormer with "Gothick" sash.

116-18  2-story, 5-bay, brick, contemporary house. Brick arch-head door surround; double-leaf wood door; ground floor large brick arched openings with single-light sash; paired casement sash on 2nd floor; gable roof; 6-foot garden wall with a wrought iron gate.


120  3-story, 2-bay, red brick, Flemish bond, Greek Revival house. Arch-head wood door surround with leaded fanlight; 4-panel door; 6/6 double-hung sash; marble sills; paneled shutters; wood box cornice; gable roof.


122-24  Two, 3 1/2-story, 2-bay, red brick, Flemish bond, Federal houses. Brick watertable; cellar bulkhead on 124; marble stoop; wrought iron railing; arch-head wood door surround; leaded fanlight; 6-panel door; 6/6 double-hung sash; wood sills; paneled shutters at 2nd and 3rd floors; molded wood box cornice; gable roof; pedimented dormer.


126  3 1/2-story, 2-bay, red brick, Flemish bond, Federal house. Brick watertable; marble stoop; wrought iron railing; excavated basement; door surround with arched brick lintel with keystone; leaded fanlight; single-leaf 8-panel door; 6/6 double-hung sash; paneled shutters at 2nd and 3rd floors; marble beltcourse at 2nd floor; marble stringcourse at 3rd floor; molded brick cornice; gable roof; pedimented dormer.


128-30  Two, 2 1/2-story, 2-bay, red brick, Flemish bond, Georgian houses. Cellar bulkhead on 130; wood door surround; 4-light transom; 6-panel door; pent eave at 1st and 2nd; double-hung sash 8/12 on 1st floor, 6/9 on 2nd; wood sills; paneled shutters on 1st and 2nd floor of 128; wood box cornice; gable roof; pedimented dormer.

Rear elevation: addition built 1988.

134-36 See 325 S. 2nd Street.
325-39 (a.k.a. 136 Delancey Street) “Penn’s Landing Square” Eight, 3-story, 2-bay, pink brick, contemporary houses. Bay 1: recessed 1st floor entryway; wood door surround with paneled wood door; sidelight and large single light transom; tripartite casement sash on 2nd floor; single light casement on 3rd floor; bay 2: 2-light casement sash on 1st floor; metal coping; flat roof.


DELANCEY STREET - 200 Block

Paving: granite block
Sidewalks: brick
Street furniture: granite carriage step;
      wrought iron hitching post
Curbs: granite
Light fixtures: Franklin

201 (a.k.a. 324-28 S. 2nd Street) 2 1/2-story, 3-bay, red brick, Neo-Colonial house. Brick watertable; rectangular wood door surround; single-leaf 8-panel door; double-hung 6/6 sash on all floors; wood sills; pent eave; 4-panel shutters 1st; wood cornice with modillions; gambrel roof; shed dormer.

2nd Street elevation: brick with brick watertable; square gable window with four lights; a brick wall approximately 10 feet in height extends about 9 feet along 2nd Street.

3rd Street elevation: pink brick; garden wall with marble coping; arch-head entrance with marble steps and wood door.

Built c. 1964 by Joshua Fish, architect. RDA. Contributing.

203 2 1/2-story, 2-bay, brick, Neo-Colonial house. Cellar bulkhead; brick arch-head entrance with wood door surround; single-leaf 6-panel door; fanlight; double-hung 6/6 sash on all floors; wood sills; 2-panel shutters 1st and 2nd floors; wood cornice with modillions; gable roof; pedimented dormer with “Gothick” window; granite carriage step in front of house.

Built c. 1964 by Joshua Fish, architect. RDA. Contributing
205  2 1/2-story, 3-bay, red brick, Flemish bond, Neo-Colonial house. Marble watertable; rectangular wood door surround; single-leaf 6-panel door; double-hung 6/6 sash on all floors; 3-panel shutters on 1st floor; wood box cornice with Greek key design; gable roof; pedimented dormer.

Built c. 1964 by Joshua Fish, architect. RDA. Contributing.

207  2 1/2-story, 3-bay, red brick, Neo-Colonial house. Marble watertable; rectangular wood door surround; 3-light transom; single-leaf 6-panel door; double-hung 6/9 sash 1st, 6/6 sash 2nd; wood panels below 1st floor sash; wood sills 2nd; wood box cornice with dentil molding; gable roof; shed dormer.

Built c. 1964 by Joshua Fish, architect. RDA. Contributing.

209  2 1/2-story, 3-bay, red brick, Neo-Colonial house. Rectangular wood door surround; single-leaf 6-panel door; double-hung 6/6 sash on all floors; wood sills; marble beltcourse 1st and 2nd floors; 2-panel shutters 1st floor, louvered 2nd; wood cornice with modillions; gable roof; shed dormer.

Built c. 1964 by Joshua Fish, architect. RDA. Contributing.

211  3 1/2-story, 3-bay, red brick, Neo-Colonial house. Nine-foot arched courtyard entrance; rectangular wood door surround; single-leaf 6-panel door; three single-leaf doors with 15 lights on; 2nd floor with wrought iron balcony; double-hung 6/6 sash 3rd floor; wood sills; marble beltcourse at 2nd floor; 3-panel shutters 2nd floor; wood box cornice with modillions; gable roof; arch-head dormer.

Built c. 1964 by Joshua Fish, architect. RDA. Contributing.

213  2 1/2-story, 3-bay, washed red brick, Neo-Colonial house. Rectangular wood door surround; single-leaf 6-panel door; double-hung 6/6 sash on all floors; wood sills; marble beltcourses 1st and 2nd floor; 3-panel shutters 1st and 2nd floors; wood box cornice with modillions; gable roof; pedimented dormer.

Built c. 1964 by Joshua Fish, architect. RDA. Contributing.

215-17  (a.k.a. 319-21 S. Philip Street) "Rhoads-Barclay House"  2 1/2-story, 3-bay, red brick, Georgian house. Brick watertable; cellar bulkhead; rectangular wood door surround; 4-light transom with bulls eye glass; single-leaf 6-panel door; double-hung 9/9 sash on all floors; wood sills, pent eave; 3-panel shutters on all floors; wood cornice with modillions; gambrel roof; shed dormer. 2 1/2-story, 5-bay, red brick, addition with concrete stoop; rectangular wood door surround with single-leaf door; 10-light transom; 21-light casement sash 1st floor, 18-light 

201
casement sash 2nd and dormer; cast stone lintels; wood box cornice; slate gambrel roof; pedimented dormers.

Philip Street elevation: brick; rubblestone foundation; centered double-hung 9/9 sash 1st and 2nd; 6/6 sash 3rd; wood sills; arched brick lintel 1st; 3-panel shutters; addition under construction.

Rear elevation: brick; 1 double-hung 6/9 sash 1st floor, double-hung 9/9 sash 2nd; shed dormer.


219 (a.k.a. 318-20 S. Philip Street) 3-story, 2-bay, red brick, Neo-Colonial house. Set back from street by a landscaped garden and driveway. Brick watertable; single-leaf 6-panel door, sidelights and fanlight; 9/6 double-hung sash, 3-panel shutters on 1st floor; gambrel roof, gable end faces Delancey Street.

Philip Street elevation: 4-bays; brick ground floor; cellar bulkhead; stone sills; cedar shake gambrel roof, shed dormers 2nd and 3rd floors; brick chimney


221-23 Two, 2 1/2-story, 2-bay, brick, Neo-Colonial rowhouses. Rectangular wood door surround; single-leaf 6-panel door; 3-light transom; wood sills; double row brick stringcourse 2nd floor; molded wood cornice; 1/2 gambrel roof; shed dormer; 221: 4-light transom, 12/12 sash 1st and 2nd floors; 3-paneled shutters 1st and 2nd floors; storm sash; 223: double-hung 6/6 sash on all floors; 3-panel shutters 1st floor.

Philip Street elevation: stucco over brick; various sash types.

Façades c. 1962. RDA. Contributing.

225-27 (a.k.a. 321-23 S. American Street) Two, 3 1/2-story, 2-bay, red brick, Greek Revival houses. Marble watertable; rectangular wood door surround; 3-light transom; double-hung 6/6 sash on all floors; marble sills and lintels; wood box cornice; gable roof; pedimented dormer; 225: single-leaf 6-panel door; 3-paneled shutters 1st floor, louvered 2nd and 3rd; 227: 8-panel paneled door; 4-panel shutters 1st and 2nd floors, louvered, 3rd.

West elevation: brick; stone watertable.
Appendix E

Built c. 1846 for William and Francis Carpenter, merchant tailors, as tenant houses. Alterations: c. 1915, exterior fire escapes added and cornices replaced with brick; restored c. 1960, Herbert Winokur, architect, new doors, shutters and cornices. 227: rear addition, c. 1966, Duncan W. Buell, architect; December 1993, drive paved, addition, deck. Contributing.

229 (a.k.a. 322-24 S. American Street) 3 ½-story, 2-bay red brick, Greek Revival house. Marble watertable, rectangular wood door surround; 8-panel door; 4-panel shutters; 3-light transoms; double-hung 6/6 sash on all floors; marble sills and lintels; storm sash; wood box cornice; gable roof; pedimented dormer.


231 3 ½-story, 2-bay, red brick, Greek Revival house. Marble watertable and stoop; rectangular wood door surround; 4-panel door; 3-light transom; double-hung 6/6 sash on all floors; marble sills and lintels; 2-panel shutters 1st and 2nd floors, louvered 3rd; wood box cornice; gable roof; pedimented dormer.


233 "Joseph Wetherill House" 3 ½-story, 2-bay, red brick, Federal house. Brick watertable; cellar bulkhead; brick arch-head entrance; wood door surround; single-leaf 4-panel door; arched single-light transom; “Gothick” windows; double-hung 6/6 sash on all floors; wood box cornice; gable roof; pedimented dormer.


235-37 3-story, 4-bay, brown brick, contemporary house. Recessed entrance; single-leaf mirrored door; casement sash 1st and 3rd floors; two vertical casement sash and two balconies with sliding glass door 2nd floor; gable roof.

Built 1970 by James N. Kise and Roland Davies, architects. RDA. Contributing.

239-41 Two, 3 ½-story, 2-bay, red brick, Flemish bond, Federal houses. Brick watertables; cellar bulkhead; brick arch-head entrance with paneled reveals; fanlight; single-leaf 6-panel doors; double-hung “Gothick” windows with 6/6 sash on all floors; storm sash; marble sills; wood box cornice; gable roof; pedimented dormer.

243 4-story, 2-bay, red brick, Federal house. Excavated basement entry; brick arch-head entrance with wood surround; single-leaf 8-panel door; fanlight; double-hung 12/12 sash 1st, 6/9 sash 2nd, 6/6 sash 3rd and 4th; wood sills; 4-panel shutters 1st, 2nd, and 3rd floors; double stringcourse 2nd floor; wood and brick cornice; 1/2 gambrel roof of standing seam metal with shed dormer facing west; ornate wrought iron fence and gate. Wetherill Court at rear, three small artisan houses in court configuration.


245-51 (a.k.a. 327 S. 3rd Street) "John Hall House" 3 1/2-story, 3-bay, red brick, Flemish bond with glazed headers, Georgian house. Brick watertable; cellar bulkhead; pedimented wood frontispiece; single-leaf 8-panel door; double-hung 9/9 sash 1st and 2nd floors, 6/6 3rd and 4th; wood sills; double row brick stringcourse at 2nd and 3rd floors; 4-panel shutters 1st and 2nd; pent roof; wood box cornice; gable roof; two chimneys with parapet; brick garden wall, approximately 5 1/2 feet high, extends along Delancey Street.

3rd Street elevation: 3 1/2 stories; 2 bays; brick, without glazed headers; same details as above.


**************

200-04 See 334 S. 2nd Street.

334 (a.k.a. 200-04 Delancey Street) 3 1/2-story, 3-bay, Flemish bond brick house with glazed headers, Georgian house. Marble stoop; brick watertable; rectangular wood door surround; single-leaf 6-panel door; 4-light transom; double-hung 12/12 sash 1st and 2nd floor, 8/8 on 3rd; wood sills; double row brick stringcourse at 2nd and 3rd floors; 3-panel shutters 1st and 2nd floors; modillioned wood box cornice; gable roof; brick chimney.

Delancey Street elevation: 3 stories; brick; 2-story brick addition with watertable; rectangular wood door surround; marble stoop; double-leaf 3-panel door; 5-light transom; double-hung 12/12 sash on 1st and 2nd floors, 8/8 on 3rd; wood sills; stringcourse
at 2nd and 3rd floors; paneled shutters on 1st and 2nd floors; modillioned cornice; flat roof with deck and post and rail balustrade on addition; brick wall, with brick watertable and stone coping 6 feet high, extends along Delancey Street with ornamental wrought iron gate; hexagonal brick outbuilding shared with 336;


206-12 Two, 3-story, brown brick, contemporary houses. Surround a U-shaped courtyard with butterfly sculpture; single-leaf door; casement sash; gable roof; shed dormer.


214 2 ½-story, 2-bay, red brick, Flemish bond with glazed headers, Georgian house. Brick watertable; rectangular wood door surround; single-leaf 4-panel door; 4-light transom with bull’s eye glass; double-hung 8/12 sash 1st floor, 6/6 2nd; wood sills; 3-panel shutters 1st floor; plaster cove cornice; gambrel roof; shed dormer.


216 2 ½-story, 2-bay, red brick, Flemish bond with glazed headers, Georgian house. Brick watertable; cellar bulkhead; rectangular wood door surround; single-leaf 6-panel door; 4-light transom; double-hung 8/12 sash 1st floor, 6/6 2nd; wood sills; pent eave; 3-panel shutters 1st floor; plaster cove cornice; gambrel roof; shed dormer.


218 2-story, 2-bay, brick, contemporary house. Single-leaf 6-panel door; 6/6 double-hung windows; 3-panel shutters 1st floor, louvered 2nd and 3rd; pedimented wood door surround and fanlight; modillioned cornice.

Built c. 1974 by John H. Burris, architect. RDA. Contributing.

220 3-story, 2-bay, red brick, vernacular house. Rectangular wood door surround; single-leaf 1-panel door with transom; double-hung 6/6 sash on all floors; storm sash; marble sills and lintels; 3-panel shutters 1st floor, louvered 2nd and 3rd; wood box cornice.

222 3 1/2-story, 2-bay, red brick, Greek Revival house. Marble watertable; rectangular wood door surround with egg and dart molding; single-leaf 6-panel door; 4-light transom; double-hung 6/6 sash on all floors; marble sills and lintels; 3-panel shutters 1st floor, louvered 2nd and 3rd; molded wood cornice; gable roof; pedimented dormer.


224 4-story, 2-bay, red brick, Greek Revival house. Marble watertable; rectangular wood door surround with egg and dart molding; single-leaf 6-panel door; 4-light transom; double-hung 6/6 sash on all floors; marble sills and lintels; 3-panel shutters 1st floor, louvered 2nd, 3rd, and 4th; wood box cornice; gable roof.


226 3-story, red brick, contemporary house. Arch-head entrance; single-leaf 6-panel door; ; semicircular single-light transom; double window, 1/18 casement sash, 1st; double-leaf french door with wrought iron flower boxes and railing at 2nd floor; three 4/16 double-hung sash with wrought iron flower boxes and railings, 3rd floor; wood box cornice; gable roof; square-head alleyway entrance.


228-30 3-story, brown brick, contemporary houses. Recessed entrance; double-leaf door; asymmetrical casement sash 2nd and 3rd floors; gable roof; standing seam metal roof; two shed dormers;


232-34 Two, 2 1/2-story, 3-bay, red brick, Georgian houses. Brick watertable; pedimented wood frontispiece with fanlight; punch and gauge work detail; single-leaf 6-panel door; panel reveals; double-hung 9/9 sash 1st and 2nd floors; storm sash; wood sills; double row brick stringcourse at 2nd floor; 3-panel shutters 1st and 2nd floors; molded wood cornice; gable roof; pedimented dormer; arch-head alleyway entrance at party wall.

236-38  "Drinker’s Court" A complex of two Georgian front houses and six rear apartments and a rear building, flanking a courtyard; 236: 2 1/2-story, 2-bay brick house, cellar bulkhead; rectangular wood door surround; 4-light transom; single-leaf 6-panel door; double-hung 12/12 sash 1st floor, 9/9 2nd; pent eave; wood cornice; 1/2 gambrel roof; three brick rear apartments, each 2 stories, 2 bays; shed roofs; 238: 2 1/2-story, 2-bay, painted brick house; concrete cellar bulkhead; rectangular wood door surround; single-leaf 6-panel door; double-hung 8/12 sash 1st floor, 6/9 2nd; 3-panel shutters all floors.


240  2 1/2-story, 2-bay, red brick, Georgian Revival house. Brick watertable; cellar bulkhead; rectangular wood door surround; single-leaf 6-panel door; 4-light transom; double-hung 6/9 sash 1st floor, 6/6 2nd; storm sash; wood sills; double row brick stringcourse at 2nd floor; 3-panel shutters 1st floor, louvered 2nd; wood box cornice; gable roof; pedimented dormer.


242-44  Two, 3 1/2-story, 2-bay, Flemish bond brick with glazed headers, Georgian houses. Brick watertable; rectangular wood door surround; single-leaf 6-panel door; 4-light transom; double-hung 9/9 sash, 1st floor; 12/12 2nd; 8/12 3rd; wood sills; pent eave; double row brick stringcourse at 3rd; wood cornices with modillions; gable roof; pedimented dormer; arch-head alleyway entrance at party wall; 244: storm sash.

Built c. 1780 for the Pryor family. Alterations: c. 1875, mansard roof, bracketed wood cornices and dormers; restored c. 1960 by Frijof Tobbiessen, architect, new sash, doors, pent eaves, cornices, and dormers. Significant.

246-48  Two, 2 1/2-story, 2-bay, Flemish bond brick with glazed headers, Georgian houses. Brick watertable; cellar bulkhead; rectangular wood door surround; single-leaf 6-panel door; 4-light transom; double-hung 12/12 sash 1st floor, 9/9 2nd; wood sills; pent eave; 3-panel shutters 1st and 2nd floors; wood cornice with modillions; gable roof; pedimented dormer; arched alleyway entrance at party wall.


250
(a.k.a. 329 S. 3rd Street) 3 1/2-story, 4-bay, red brick, English bond, Greek Revival house. Cellar bulkhead with marble cheeks; brick arch-head entrance; wood door surround; single-leaf 6-panel door; storm door; fanlight; double-hung 6/6 sash on all floors; storm sash; wood sills; 3-panel shutters 1st and 2nd floors; gable roof.

3rd Street elevation: 2 bays; 6/6 double-hung sash all floors; storm sash; wood sills; 3-panel shutters 1st and 2nd floors; wood cornice.

Built c. 1826 for Henry Schively, cutler and surgeon’s (sic) instrument maker. Originally 329 S. 3rd Street. Alterations: to corner commercial use c. 1877; renovated c. 1969 by Joshua Fish, architect, new ground floor residential façade, entrance moved to Delancey Street, new sash and shutters. Contributing.

PINE STREET - 600 Block

Paving: asphalt
Sidewalks: brick
Curbs: granite
Light fixtures:
Franklin

601-03
(a.k.a. 342 S. 6th Street) Brick wall encloses garden of 340-42 S. 6th Street.

338-42
(a.k.a. 601-03 Pine Street) 3 1/2-story, 3-bay, red brick, Flemish bond house. Cellar bulkhead; pedimented wood door surround with pilasters; single-leaf 6-panel door; 6-light transom; double-hung 9/9 sash on 1st floor, 6/6 on 2nd and 3rd; storm sash; wood sills; brick beltcourse 2nd and 3rd; 3-panel shutters 1st floor; modillioned wood cornice; gable roof pedimented dormer with arched window; a brick wall extends to the corner of Pine Street enclosing garden.

South elevation: (description from 1986—façade now completely vine covered) stuccoed; 2- and 3-story additions; wood door surround with double-leaf glass paneled door; bay window 1st floor, double-hung 6/6 sash on 2nd; a brick garden wall extends along Lombard Street.


605
3-story, 2-bay, stucco, Greek Revival house. Wood door surround; 3-light transom; single-leaf 6-panel door; double-hung 6/6 sash 1st floor; 1/1 2nd and 3rd; stone sills; 2-panel shutters 1st floor; louvered 2nd and 3rd; box cornice.
6th Street elevation: stucco.

NB: Too much vegetation to adequately check property.

Built c. 1840. Contributing.

607 3-story, 2-bay, red brick house. Wood door surround; 3-light transom; single-leaf 6-panel door; 6/1 double-hung sash on 1st and 3rd floors, 9/1 on 2nd; marble sills; brick lintels; wood box cornice; gable roof.


609-11 One-story, red brick building connected to 613; cast stone water table and string course; 6 brick piers; 4-light casement windows; gable roof with slate; brick and cast stone chimneys.


613 3-story, 3-bay, red brick, Post-modern house. Cast stone water table; arched recessed entry with cast stone door surround; single-leaf multi-paned door; sidelights and arched single light transom; 4-light casement sash 1st floor; three 6-light French doors at 2nd floor with wrought iron balconettes; 4-light fixed sash at 3rd; brick sills, 2nd and 3rd floors; cast stone string course 1st, 2nd, and 3rd floors; 4-pane oculus windows flanking door; cast stone panels between 2nd and 3rd floors; cast stone entablature and cornice.

Built c. 1983 by David Porter, architect. RDA. Contributing.

615 3 1/2-story, 3-bay, red brick, Flemish bond with glazed headers, Colonial Revival house. Wood frontispiece with fluted pilasters and transom; single-leaf door with 12 glass panels, brick water table; double-hung 6/6 sash all floors; double window ground floor; stone sills 1st floor, brick sills 2nd; marble belt course at 2nd floor; brick lintels with keystone 1st floor, brick lintels 2nd floor; center window on 2nd floor has blind arch; wrought iron balconettes on 2nd floor; at middle of 3rd floor a cast iron plaque with tree motif; molded wood cornice; gable roof; pedimented dormer; arch-head alleyway entrance with wood door.


617 3-story, 3-bay, brown brick, Colonial Revival house. Wood frontispiece with fluted pilasters and transom; single-leaf door, two panels below, 16 lights above; double-hung 6/1...
sash all floors; double window on ground floors with keystone at center of lintel; brick inset panels between 1st and 2nd and 2nd and 3rd floors; metal cornice.


619 3-story, 3-bay, red brick, Colonial Revival house. Pedimented frontispiece; 3-light transom; single-leaf door, one panel below, 12 lights above; double-hung sash all floors; stone sills and jack arches; corbelled brick cornice; stone coping; flat roof.

Built c. 1930. Contributing.

621 3-story, 2-bay, yellow and brown brick, vernacular house. Wooden door surround; 10-light transom; single-leaf door; tripartite window with double-hung 6/1 and 9/1 sash on 1st floor; 2-story metal bay roof, double-hung 1/1 sash; flat roof with parapet; brick coping.


623 3-story, 3-bay, red brick, Colonial Revival house. Pedimented frontispiece; 3-light transom; single-leaf door; double-hung 6/6 sash all floors; brick sills and brick lintels with keystones; parapet with brick coping.

Built c. 1925. Contributing.

625 3-story, 3-bay, red brick, Colonial Revival house. Pedimented frontispiece; 4-light transom; single-leaf door; double-hung 6/6 sash all floors; painted brick sills; stone jack arches with stone keystone; parapet wall with concrete coping; arch-head alleyway with wrought iron gate.

Façade built c. 1930. Contributing.

627 3 1/2-story, 2-bay, red brick, Flemish bond, Federal house. Brick watertable; brick arch-head entrance with paneled wood door reveal and fanlight; single-leaf 6-panel door; double-hung 6/6 sash all floors; wood sills; stone stringcourse at 2nd and 3rd; 3-panel shutters 1st floor, louvered 2nd and 3rd; molded modillioned wood cornice with punch and gouge wok; gable roof; pedimented dormer with arched window.


629 3-story, 2-bay, yellow brick, vernacular house. Wood frontispiece; fluted pilasters and broken pediment; single-leaf 6-panel door; double-hung 6/6 sash all floors; 1/1
replacement sash 2nd; marble sills and marble lintels with keystones; brick soldier course between 1st and 2nd floors; metal cornice.

Façade built c. 1895 with storefront; storefront replaced with residential c. 1950. Contributing.

631-33  2- and 3-story, 5-bay, stucco, contemporary house. Excavated basement entry with contemporary railing at street level; brown tile watertable, window and door surrounds and cornice; entrance set back from street behind a 4-foot high garden wall of brown tile with center gate; arched recessed entry; 2-light transom; multi-pane single-leaf door; 2-story, 2-bay section has tripartite windows; 3-story, 3-bay section has double-hung 1/1 sash with 9/9 snap-ins, 1st and 2nd floors, 6/6 on 3rd.


635  3 1/2-story, 2-bay, red brick, Federal house. Marble watertable; arch-head brick entrance with marble keystone; single-leaf 6-panel door with fanlight; double-hung 6/6 sash all floors; marble sills and lintels with keystones; brick stringcourse at 2nd floor; wood box cornice; gable roof; pedimented dormer with arched window.


637-43  (a.k.a. 339-41 S. 7th Street) Two, 3-story, red brick and stucco, contemporary houses. Beveled 2nd and 3rd story corner windows; slate sills; recessed 3-story entrance; large arched openings 3rd floor; slanted multi-pane casement windows 2nd floor; brick wall with metal gate at street level.

7th Street elevation: 3 stories; 2 bays; bay 1: 1st floor has metal garage door that hides 1st floor; sliding glass doors on 2nd floor; arched parapet wall hiding bank of casement sash; on 3rd floor is one casement sash on center; bay 2: brick.


**********

600  (a.k.a. 400-02 S. 6th Street) 3 1/2-story, 2-bay, Flemish bond brick, Federal house. Wood door surround; single-light transom; single-leaf 6-panel door; double-hung 6/6 sash all floors; wood sills; molded wood cornice; gable roof; pedimented dormer.

6th Street elevation: brick with headers every 7th course; double-hung 6/6 sash 1st, 2nd and 3rd floors; wood sills.
Appendix E


602 3 ½-story, 2-bay, red brick, Flemish bond, Greek Revival house. Arched brick and wood door surround; 3-light semicircular transom; single_leaf 6-panel door; double-hung 6/6 sash all floors; stone sills and lintels; molded wood cornice; gable roof; arch-head dormer.


604 3 ½-story, 2-bay, red brick, Flemish bond, Federal/Victorian house. Arched brick and wood door surround with fanlight; single_leaf 4-panel door; double_hung 1/1 windows with 8/8 snap-in muntins on all floors; wood sills; bracketed metal cornice; gable roof; arch-head dormer.


606 3 ½-story, 2-bay, red brick, Flemish bond, Greek Revival house. Arched brick and wood door surround with fanlight; single_leaf 6-panel door; double_hung 6/6 sash on all floors; storm sash; wood sills; 3-panel shutters 1st floor; gable roof; pedimented dormer; brick chimney.


608 2 ½-story, 2-bay, red brick, Flemish bond, Greek Revival house. Wood door surround; single light transom; single_leaf 6-panel door; double_hung 6/6 sash all floors; storm sash; marble sills; marble lintels 1st floor; aluminum covered cornice; gambrel roof; pedimented dormer with arched sash; stucco and brick chimney.

Built between 1791-94 by George Terrell, nailor. Significant.

610 3-story, 2-bay, red brick, vernacular house. Rectangular wood door surround; single_leaf 6-panel door with decorative wrought iron security door; double_hung 4/4 sash on 1st floor, 6/6 on 2nd; 4-panel casement window on 3rd; stone sills 1st and 2nd; gable roof; pedimented dormer; brick parapet wall.

612 3 1/2-story, 2-bay, tapestry brick and stucco, vernacular house. Brick on the 1st floor, stucco on 2nd and 3rd; cellar bulkhead; wood door surround; arched single light transom; single-leaf paneled door; double-hung 10/10 sash on 1st floor, 6/6 on 2nd and 3rd; gable roof; stucco parapet wall; pedimented dormer.


614 3-story, 3-bay, tapestry brick, Colonial Revival vernacular house. Pedimented frontispiece; single-leaf paneled and glazed door above and transom; double-hung 6/6 sash on all floors; brick sills; brick beltcourse; corbelled brick cornice; gable roof; square-head alleyway entrance with wood gate.

Built c. 1925. Contributing.

618-26 "Lombard Street Homes" Five, 3-story, 2-bay, tan brick, contemporary houses. Recessed entrances set at right angles to street; 3-part casement windows 1st and 3rd floors; balconies with sliding glass patio doors 2nd floor; brick bays extend the vertical height of the buildings with narrow 3-story windows at either side of party wall; gable, standing seam metal roofs; metal security gates; 622: 2 stories.


628 3-story, 3-bay, painted brick house. Rectangular wood door surround with transom; single-leaf paneled and glazed door; double-hung 6/1 sash on all floors; storm sash; brick sills; center door and balcony with wrought iron railing, 2nd floor; brick beltcourse.

Façade built c. 1930. Contributing.

630 3 1/2-story, 2-bay, yellow brick, vernacular house. Brownstone watertable; pedimented frontispiece; 3-light transom; single-leaf 6-panel door; double-hung 1/1 sash; brownstone sills and lintels; wood box cornice; gable roof; pedimented dormer.


632 3-story, 2-bay, tan brick, vernacular house. Excavated basement with metal gate; rectangular wood door surround with transom; single-leaf 9-panel door; double-hung 1/1 sash all floors; stone sills and lintels; brick cornice; flat roof; brick parapet wall.


634 3-story, 3-bay, red brick, Colonial Revival house. Excavated basement entrance; pedimented frontispiece; single-leaf door with 15 glass panes; double-hung 1/1 sash with 6/6
snap-in muntins all floors; brick sills 1st and 2nd floors; recessed panels with wrought iron grills on 2nd floor; brick lintels with keystones; brick stringcourse at 2nd and 3rd floors; pressed metal cornice and brick parapet with metal coping.


636 4-story, 2-bay, pyrated Pompeian brick, Victorian Romanesque house. Brownstone stairs; rusticated brownstone watertable; excavated basement entrance; arched wood and rusticated brownstone door surround; semicircular single-light transom; double-leaf door with glazed panels; tripartite arched windows 1st floor, double-hung 4/1 and 5/1 sash with “Gothick” panes 2nd, double-hung 1/1 arched Queen Anne windows on 3rd; brownstone sills and arched brownstone lintels with keystones; recessed 4th floor; metal cornice.

Façade c. 1890. Contributing.

638 2-story, 2-bay, yellow Pompeian brick, Victorian Romanesque/Colonial Revival house. Brownstone watertable; arched wood and rusticated brownstone door surround; fanlight of leaded stained glass; c. 1920 single-leaf 3-panel door; tripartite arched windows with leaded stained glass transoms 1st floor, metal bay with classical detailing and 9/9 flanked by 18-light fixed sash at 2nd.


640 3-story, 2-bay, red brick, Flemish bond, Neo-Colonial house. Arched brick and wood door surround with fanlight; single-leaf 8-panel door; storm sash; double-hung 6/6 sash all floors; wood sills with wood panels below on 1st floor; brick sills 2nd and 3rd floors; brick lintels all floors; brick stringcourse 2nd floor; 2-panel shutters all floors; molded wood cornice with modillions; gable roof; roof deck.


642 3 1/2-story, 2-bay, red brick, Flemish bond house. Wood frontispiece with fluted pilasters and 3-light transom; single-leaf 6-panel door; double-hung sash all floors; 3-panel shutters all floors; wood sills; molded wood box cornice; gable roof; pedimented dormer.

Built c. 1930. Contributing.

644 (a.k.a. 401-07 S. 7th Street) 3 1/2-story, 2-bay, red brick, Flemish bond, Neo-Colonial house. Wood frontispiece with fluted pilasters and single light transom; single-leaf 6-panel door; double-hung 6/6 sash on all floors; storm sash; wood sills; paneled shutters 1st floor, louvered 2nd and 3rd; wood box cornice; gable roof; pedimented dormer.

**SPRUCE STREET** - 400 Block

**Paving:** asphalt  
**Sidewalks:** brick  
Franklin

433 3-story, 3-bay, red brick, Flemish bond, contemporary house. Bay 1: 3-story turret with paired casement sash and bubble glass on ground floor; bay 2: recessed entryway with wrought iron gates; double-leaf 8-panel wood door, marble lintel; 2nd: floor-single-leaf door with single light arched transom opens to overhanging brick balcony; 3rd floor: recessed with wrought iron railing.


**SPRUCE STREET** - 500 Block

**Paving:** asphalt  
**Sidewalks:** brick  
Franklin

501-05 (a.k.a. 260-70 S. 5th Street). Two, 2-story, 2-bay brown brick contemporary houses. Bay 1: excavated basement window; casement sash on 1st floor; 99-light projecting window; bay 2: coupled brick and concrete stoops; metal door surround with flush metal door; 1/1 single hung window on 2nd floor; globe lanterns; granite house numbers; metal coping; flat roof.

5th Street elevation: 3 stories; 2 bays; brown brick; bay 1: casement sash all floors; bay 2: two stained glass oculus windows on 1st floor, casement sash on 2nd and 3rd; brick chimney; 6-foot high brick wall extending north along 5th Street with iron gates.


525-33 Six, 2-story, 2-bay brown brick contemporary houses. Bay 1: excavated basement window; casement sash on 1st floor; 99-light projecting window; bay 2: coupled brick and concrete stoops; metal door surround with flush metal door; 1/1 single hung window on 2nd floor; globe lanterns; granite house numbers; metal coping; flat roof.


**PINE STREET** - 400 Block

**Paving:** asphalt  
**Curbs:** granite
Sidewalks: brick
Street furniture: wooden benches, south side facing cemetery

417 (a.k.a. 339-45 Lawrence Street) 3 ½-story, 3-bay, red brick, contemporary house. Principal entrance at gable end; unique arched entrance, recessed louvered door with transom and sidelights; single-light casement windows on 1st floor, 2-lights 2nd; brick sills; pressed metal cornice and bargeboard.

Built c. 1973 by Giovanni Cosco, architect. RDA. Contributing.

419 (a.k.a. 342-50 Lawrence Street) 3-story, 2-bay, red brick, Neo-Colonial house. Double-hung 6/6 sash on all floors; wood box frames; wood sills; 3-panel shutters 1st floor, 2-panel on 2nd; gable roof; pedimented dormer and end brick chimney.

Lawrence Street elevation: entrance and garage.
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SOUTH 3RD STREET - 200 Block

Paving: asphalt  Curbs: granite (east) and concrete (west)
Sidewalks: brick  Light fixtures: Franklin

257-75 (a.k.a. 294 Locust Street and 241 Spruce Street) Ten, 3-story, 2-bay, red brick, contemporary houses. Brick and flagstone stoop with wrought iron railing; wood door surround with single light transom; 6-panel door; 1/1 double-hung windows on 1st and 3rd floors, some with 6/6 snap-in muntins; 2nd floor has two double-leaf single light door opening onto balcony with wrought iron railings; cast stone sills and lintels; cast stone cornice; 259: flush door; single door on 2nd floor; 261: single door on 2nd floor with screen doors; paneled shutters; 263: 15-panel door; stained glass transom; storm door on 2nd floor; 265: storm doors on all doors; 8-panel door on 1st floor; 267: flush door; single door on 2nd floor with louvered shutters; 269: 6-panel door on 1st floor and single door on 2nd with louvered shutters; 271: window grates on 1st floor; 6-panel door; storm door; 273: storm door on 2nd floor; 275: single door on 2nd floor with storm door and louvered shutters; 277: single door with storm door on 2nd floor.

Spruce Street elevation: brick; 1/1 sash with security grill at 1st floor; brick garden runs east along Spruce Street.

Built c. 1963 by Wright Andrade Ament and Gane, architects. Contributing.
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**DELANCEY STREET - 300 Block**

**Paving:** granite block

**Sidewalks:** brick

**Curbs:** granite

**Light fixtures:** Franklin

332

3-story, 2-bay, tan brick, contemporary building. Casement sash; double-leaf metal door with transom; deck.


**DELANCEY STREET - 500 Block**

**Paving:** asphalt, granite cartway

**Sidewalks:** brick

**Curbs:** granite

**Light fixtures:** Franklin

529

3 ½-story, 2-bay, brick and gray stucco, Federal house. Marble watertable; rectangular wood door surround; single-leaf 6-panel door; 3-light transom; tripartite double-hung 6/6 sash 1st floor, double-hung 6/6 2nd and 3rd; stucco sills; gambrel roof; pedimented dormer; glass block basement window.

West elevation: stucco; double-hung 6/6 sash all floors.


**ADDISON STREET - 600 Block**

**Paving:** granite block

**Sidewalks:** brick

**Curbs:** concrete

**Light fixtures:** Franklin

604-10

3 ½-story, 2-bay, brick and stucco, Post-modern house. Recessed entrance bay with door and sidelight; single pane arched window at 2nd floor; stucco wall on 3rd floor; 2-car garage on 1st floor; tripartite window on 2nd floor with smaller window; two double-hung windows on 3rd floor; oculus in gable; wrought iron security gate.


612-14

3-story, 3-bay, stucco, contemporary house. Central bay recessed; single-leaf door with sidelights and glass canopy; balcony at 2nd floor; garage at 1st floor; horizontal band with 4-lights on all floors; wrought iron security grate.


616-18

3-story, 2-bay, red brick, contemporary house. Third bay recessed with 2-car garage on 1st floor; four 9-light windows on 2nd floor, three 9-light on 3rd; recessed front door; 6/6 windows on 1st and 2nd floors; French door with balconette on 2nd floor; granite base and
stringcourse on 1<sup>st</sup> floor; brick stringcourse at 2<sup>nd</sup> floor; recessed 3<sup>rd</sup> story hidden by brick parapet with stone coping; iron security gate at front door and at garage with brick parapet wall; gable roof.

West elevation: brick.


**ST. JOSEPH'S WAY** - 200 Block

- Paving: concrete and brick
- Sidewalks: none
- Curbs: none
- Light fixtures: contemporary

258-70 (a.k.a. 258-70 S. Orianna Place) Seven, 2-story, 2-bay, rectangular, contemporary houses. Brown brick walls; 3-part metal sliding windows on front wall; flat roof; small garden enclosed by high brick wall along front of property.


**SOUTH 7TH STREET** - 400 Block

- Paving: asphalt
- Sidewalks: brick on east side, concrete on west side
- Curbs: concrete
- Light fixtures: modern

406-12 (a.k.a. 701 Addison Street) Four, 3-story, 1-bay, yellow tapestry brick, vernacular houses. Wood door surround; single-leaf 6-panel wood door; oversize double-hung 9/9 sash with 6-light sidelights on 1<sup>st</sup> floor; concrete stoop; 2-story overhanging stuccoed bay with tripartite 6/6 double-hung sash; brick sills; wood beltcourse on 2<sup>nd</sup> floor; aluminum standing seam cornice; flat roof with wooden deck; storm sash.

Addison Street elevation: 3-stories; brick; 1-story garage with metal door and wooden deck.

Rear elevation: brick with 1-story additions.

North elevation: stucco.
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