

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

**Robert Thomas, Chair
Commission Offices, One Parkway, 13th Floor, 1515 Arch Street
27 February 2001**

Present

Robert Thomas, Chair
Tony Atkin
Rudolph D'Alessandro
Tony Atkin
Herbert Levy, FAIA
Suzanne Pentz

Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Jeffrey R. Barr, Historical Research Technician
Julianne Brennan, Historic Preservation Planner
Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary

Also

Nicholas J. Aloï Jr., 124 Queen Street, Owner
Douglas Steele, Pennsylvania School for the Deaf, H2L2 Architects
Ed Rahme, Pennsylvania School for the Deaf, H2L2 Architects
James S. Bishop, Penn Knox
Connie Winters, Penn Knox/Historic Germantown Properties
Tina LeCoff, Penn Knox Neighbors, Chair
Carolyn Sprogell, Schoolhouse Lane resident
F. Conlin, 217 Chestnut Street, Owner
Robert J. McCormac
Robert Landsiedel, Schoolhouse Lane resident
Reimel Cooper, 121 West Coulter Street, Owner
J. Randolph Parry, Architect
F. Neale Quenzel, John Milner Associates
Robert Graves, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Michael Koep, Keating Development Company
Robert Powers, Powers and Company
John Gerbner, Ewing Cole Cherry Brott, Franklin Institute
Christopher Beardsley, Architect
Roger Doherty, Owner
Stanley Krakower, Attorney
Arthur K. Smith, Owner/Neighbor
Sally Smith, Owner/Neighbor
Carol Raviola, 103 Pine Street, Owner/Neighbor
Jean Bryan, 316 South Front Street
Carol Dranoff, 105 Pine Street
Gray Smith, 718 Pemberton Street, Architect
Carl K. Zucker, Attorney
Penelope H. Batcheler, 314 South American Street, Concerned neighbor
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance

Rebecca Stoloff, Society Hill Civic Association
Greg Hanson, Owner
Philip Kunz, Architect
Vito Chimenti, Peirce College
Melanie Piltch, Architect
Steven M. Dranoff, 105 Pine Street
Ted Polett, 1721 Addison Street, Owner
Frederick A. Swope, Joseph Dugan Incorporated
Robert Powers, Powers and Company
Gerry Gutierrez, Group G Architects
Brenda Frank, 113 Elfreths Alley, Owner
Jerry Roller, J.K. Roller Architects
Michael J. Stephan, Washington Square East Condo #1

Herbert Levy, Vice-chair, called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m.

124 Queen Street

Nicholas Aloï, Owner/Applicant
DATE: c. 1815
PROPOSAL: Rear addition and alterations

The applicant has worked with the Commission staff on the restoration of the front façade of this rowhouse. He now wishes to remove some aluminum siding and an addition from the rear and expose the original brick wall. He proposes to add a small addition and a two level deck at the rear. This work will have some visibility from a side street through the yards of two neighboring houses. The staff recommended approval per Standards 9 and 10.

Nicholas Aloï, the owner, attended the meeting to explain the proposal, and stated that in addition, he proposes to restore the existing dormer on the fourth floor to its historic appearance and to rebuild the chimney.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with the staff to review details. Ms. Pentz abstained from the vote owing to her late arrival.

143 and 151 West Coulter Street, Pennsylvania School for the Deaf

Philadelphia Housing Development Corporation, Owner
Ira A. Kauderer, Esq., Applicant
DATE: c. 1860 and c. 1870
PROPOSAL: Demolition of two houses

This application requests permission to demolish two houses on Coulter Street to the rear of the Pennsylvania School for the Deaf. The houses, which have remained empty for a number of years, formerly served as a rooming house and attracted drug use and other problems to the neighborhood. After meeting with the neighborhood, Mayor Rendell had PHDC acquire the properties with the idea that the Pennsylvania School for the Deaf could acquire them. One additional property in the row, not listed by the Historical Commission, is also under consideration for demolition as part of this project. The School will add a high school level and needs an additional school building to house their pre-school. They also seek to construct a second building to house an auditorium for use by the school and the community.

The submission shows several options which include the demolition of one, two or three of the existing houses. The School can construct the preschool without demolishing a designated building, but seeks to demolish the two buildings for the auditorium in the second phase of construction if it can raise the funds. It calculates the entire project with demolition of the three houses at 8 million dollars. The premium for keeping the two houses as part of the project would be 3.1 million, three houses, 3.7 million. Retaining one of the houses raises the cost 1.5 million dollars. In addition, a report by Louis Iatarola explains that the cost of rehabilitating the houses substantially exceeds their market value. The School seeks to demolish all of the houses based on the public good as well as based on economic hardship.

As the Commission has no jurisdiction, the staff thought that the school could move ahead and build the preschool on the site of the non-designated building. The staff consensus favors an attempt to raise funds for a version of the project that saves the two historic structures. If it proves impossible to raise the funds for the more expensive option, the school should come back to the Commission with that information. Because the School does not yet own the properties and has none of the money to build even the least expensive option, it is difficult to evaluate the hardship to this non-profit institution. Eventual demolition approvals should be contingent upon securing funding for that portion of the project as well as design review of the new buildings and landscaping. The staff did not object to the immediate removal of the modern additions to the historic houses.

Mr. Baron read Mr. Tyler's statement saying that he thought retaining a portion of the buildings may not constitute preservation.

Ira Kauderer, Joseph Fischgrund, Douglas Steele and Ed Rahme attended the meeting to explain the proposal and answer questions. Mr. Kauderer explained that this proposal is a very important project for the school. The Philadelphia Housing Development Corporation has purchased the property and the school's purchase of the property from them is contingent upon the demolition the houses. Mr. Fischgrund, headmaster for the school, gave a history of the school's growth in the past years. He emphasized the need for additional space for events as well as community usage. He also gave a compelling argument about the need for the high school and that younger deaf children need older deaf children as role models. In addition, he stated that this is the only space available to the school. Mr. Steele and Mr. Rahme gave an extensive presentation which included site plans and aerial photographs of the proposed project to further show that expansion is limited to this area. Mr. Kauderer also stated that preliminary studies show that money can be raised for the first phase, the early childhood center. He even intimated that 151 West Coulter could be cut from the long range planning; however, the Philadelphia Housing Development Corporation has offered the three properties to the school as a package and the school is reluctant to purchase only one property because of its future needs.

The Committee questioned the city's determination of the condition of the buildings. Mr. Thomas recognized the cost premiums for the rehabilitation options. He stated that it would be unfortunate to allow demolition now, only to have a project unrealized owing to the lack of funds. Mr. D'Alessandro questioned if the new design could incorporate the front façade back to 20 feet. Mr. Levy recommended tearing down only the non-historic building and waiting until funding is in place before tearing down the historic buildings.

Tina LeCoff, Penn Knox Association, expressed her concern about the existence of unsafe conditions owing to the boarded up houses, and would like to see a long term solution to this problem.

Connie Winters, a Germantown resident, stated the proposed properties have never been properly marketed and believes rehabilitation is an option. She contends that the previous owner demanded a purchase price

based on previous use, not single-family homes. She also firmly believes that these properties architecturally define the north end of the Germantown/Penn Knox area and their demolition would seriously impact the neighborhood. She said that there are many Germantown neighbors who do not want to see the homes demolished.

Carolyn Sprogell, area resident, stated that there is a big difference between institutional use and residential use and that she would not like to see Germantown/Penn Knox become an institutional ghetto.

Reimel Cooper, the next door neighbor, stated that she is not looking for a partial solution and therefore supports the school's proposal.

James Bishop, Penn Knox Association, stated that a vote taken by the Association supports the school's proposal for expansion.

Robert McCormac attended the meeting to express his interest in purchasing the property at 131 West Coulter Street for rehabilitation. In addition, he said that the Philadelphia Housing Development Corporation will not release them for sale.

David Plant expressed his interest in the purchase of 151 West Coulter Street to be rehabilitated as a single family dwelling.

Some residents believe that a good faith effort should be made to market the properties before demolition is considered; however, many neighbors prefer a single-family use.

Ms. Pentz stated that architecturally the buildings do not seem appropriate for the school's expansion. Some Committee members thought that, absent full plans and financing, it could not recommend demolition of buildings that can be rehabilitated. Mr. Levy stated that the information regarding the design of the new construction was insufficient and until such information was presented, the Committee could not support the demolition. He suggested tabling the submission until that information could be presented. Mr. Fischgrund replied that the school has little interest in investing more money into design work with no guarantees. It also made the applicant aware of the Historical Commission's Committee on Financial Hardship's availability, if so desired. The Committee recognized that the Commission will also consider such factors as:

1. Public good of the project;
2. Whether the Philadelphia Housing Development Corporation can separate the properties to allow the school to take over part and private families to take another, and
3. The portion of the Ordinance that says the applicant must provide proof of marketing and the impracticability of sale.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the demolition based on The Architectural merits and the Secretary of Interior Standards. Mr. Levy said he did not think the information sufficient to make that determination and he abstained.

1900-38 North Park Avenue

1900 Campus walk LP, Owner

J. Randolph Parry, Architect

DATE: c. 1870

PROPOSAL: Renovations to rowhouses and mall

The Temple Park Mall development team has changed, and the new architect now proposes several revisions to the approved plans. This proposal includes:

1. Raising the terrace across the front of 1916 and 1926 and the proposed new glass pavilions to create a continuous platform across both groups of rowhouses. Encapsulation of the two remaining brownstone stoops.
2. Installation of an ATM machine within an approved new window opening on the south façade of 1900.
3. Construction of a new freezer box addition at rear of 1904.
4. Dumpster and transformer locations at various locations at rear.
5. Wall and pole light fixtures for approved locations at front.
6. Reduced awnings over front doors.
7. Sign banners, wall plaques and hanging metal lettering on glass pavilions previously reviewed in concept only. Installation of a light fixture to illuminate the proposed banners.
8. Kitchen exhaust chimney at rear stuccoed infill area between 1926-28.

Staff recommendation:

1. Denial of the raised terrace connection. The Commission's initial conceptual approval of the terrace required retention and encapsulation of all the original brownstone steps. Prior to construction, Temple University removed and disposed of most of the original steps. The Commission required the retention and repair of the remaining original brownstone steps and wrought iron front basement grates at 1916 and 1926 in the 13 December 1999 final approval. In addition, an expanded terrace will cover the original watertables and obscure the two remaining rowhouse facades.
2. Denial of the exterior ATM. The ATM should be located within a vestibule with the building.
3. Denial of the freezer box addition. As these buildings are undergoing a complete rehabilitation and reconfiguration, the freezer boxes should be installed with the building.
4. Approval of the transformer and dumpster locations if equipment can be sufficiently obscured by compatible fencing and landscaping with staff to review details.
5. Approval of the wall and pole light fixtures.
6. Approval of the awnings
7. Approval of the sign banners with light fixtures, wall plaques and hanging metal lettering with staff to review details.
8. The development team should explore locating the kitchen exhaust chimney within the building and consider a solution that can be utilized for future restaurant tenants. Any other item shown in the elevations or rendering is not under review and should not conflict with the final plans as approved by the Commission on 13 December 1999.

J. Randolph Parry, Ahsan Nasratullah, Ed Hillis and Robert Hoe attended the meeting to explain the project changes and refinements. Mr. Parry stated that the new project team now proposes to enlarge and connect the new raised terraces across the glass pavilions and remaining rowhouse facades to eliminate the multiple ramps and circuitous "up and down" route. A continuous terrace will eliminate the need for interior ramps within the new glass end pavilions. Several committee members recognized the convenience and accessibility issues. Mr. Barr reminded the committee that most of the original front steps and wrought iron basement grates were removed and disposed of by Temple without Commission approval and that by allowing the enlargement of the terrace, the last two sets of original steps would be eliminated. The Commission had required restoration of the steps and wrought iron basement grates at these buildings as a condition of its final approval of the project. Mr. Thomas observed that the two remaining exposed facades would be obscured by this revision and they would no longer "read" as rowhouses. He suggested, however, a possible mitigation measure which could include a display of historic photographs depicting earlier views of the Park Mall rowhouses. Mr. Hoe was receptive to this idea and thought that an interpretive display could be installed in a public space within the building.

Mr. Thomas stated that an ATM machine would be better located in a vestibule within the building. Noting that their bank tenant has specific needs, Mr. Hoe stated that they would withdraw that part of the submission and the tenant would resubmit a proposal for an ATM machine at a future meeting.

The Committee discussed the other details and aspects of the submission noting those items that had been previously approved in concept. The Committee thought the new freezer box addition at rear was acceptable in concept but lacked sufficient detail. Lastly, several Committee members objected to the exterior exhaust chimney at rear and suggested incorporating the chimney into the new stucco infill addition. The plans indicate that the rear stucco wall of the approved infill construction could be adjusted to conceal the exhaust chimney without extending beyond the face of the original rear walls of the rowhouses.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the raised terrace provided the development team mount an interpretative display of historic photographs of the Park Mall rowhouses for public view within the building. The Committee voted to recommend approval of the freezer box addition in concept with the final design subject to Committee and Commission approval. The dumpsters, transformers, light fixtures, awnings, banners, plaques and hanging metal lettering were recommended for approval with staff to review details. The Committee voted to recommend denial of the rear exhaust chimney, as proposed, and suggested a re-design subject to Committee and Commission approval.

JRB

1600 Arch Street, SW corner of South 16th Street

SAS-1600 Arch Street, LP, Owner

Robert B. Graves, Architect

DATE: 1925

PROPOSAL: Exterior signage, awnings, marquees, lighting and planters

The proposal involves installation of metal and glass marquees over the 16th Street and Arch Street doorways, canvas awnings in the windows, decorative paving and planters as well as back lit plastic faced signage pylons, uplighting and streetlights. Plans propose the cutting of a new entry on Cuthbert Street to accommodate bicycles.

The staff recommended approval of the marquees, awnings, paving and streetlights. Denial of the bicycle access door, the planters, the plastic backlit aspect of the signage pylons and any holes cut in the top of the granite to attach the uplighting.

Robert Powers, Michael Koep and Robert Graves attended the meeting to explain and answer questions about the project. Mr. Graves stated that adjustments have been made to the marquee because the attachment location as shown in the plans does not work with the 8½ feet width. The revised dimension is 11. Rods and post hold up the marquee; however, the marquee does not touch the building and 16th Street will not have vertical poles. The Cuthbert Street entrance is shifted one bay to the east to alleviate congestion.

Mr. Atkin questioned the need for cutting so many openings in the Cuthbert Street facade and thought the openings should have continuity in appearance. Committee members thought the door should be flush and solid without mullions. However, Mr. Powers stated that the State has approved single doors with sidelights and mullions. The Committee thought the louvers should remain until a need is established for their removal and at such time come back to staff for approval.

Mr. Graves stated that the existing planters have stone meeting concrete and because of the changing use of this building, the owner would like a pedestrian friendlier front to soften the bottom. The proposed materials are granite and wrought iron.

The Committee thought that given the overall scale of the building, the proposed planters are acceptable.

The proposed signage pylons with backlit translucent plastic were found inappropriate by the Committee. It thought the pylons needed more study and therefore recommended against them as proposed.

Mr. Graves stated that the proposed lighting would be attached to the cornice. However, he offered another option of fastening the fixture to the sides of the pedestal, which the Committee thought acceptable.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the following:

1. Two marquees;
 2. Awnings installed at the transom bar;
 3. Paving and streetlights;
 4. Cuthbert Street openings with doors flush and horizontal mullions at bottom, louvers retained until an established need for removal with staff approval;
 5. Planters, and
 6. Lighting fixtures attached to the sides of the pedestal.
- With staff to review all details.*

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the pylons as submitted.

1115-1141 Market Street, NE corner of 12th Street, Reading Terminal Headhouse

Headhouse Retail Associates, LP, Owner

F. Neale Quenzel, Applicant

DATE: 1891-93

PROPOSAL: Move flagpoles

Mr. Baron summarized the proposal which called for lowering flagpoles on the primary facade from the second floor balcony to just above the first floor. He stated that staff recommended denial since moving the flags would overcrowd the building's entryway. Staff suggested that a mechanism be devised to lower and raise the flags from their present location.

The architect, F. Neale Quenzel, informed the Committee that the flags block the loggia in their current location. He also explained the inefficiency and limited access to changing the flags. He stated that the moved flags, mounted on a flat panel below the columns, would draw the eye toward the convention center signage.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal to move the flagpoles from the second floor balcony to just above the first floor.

JLB

1115-1141 Market Street, NE corner of 12th Street, Reading Terminal Headhouse

Headhouse Retail Associates, LP, Owner

F. Neale Quenzel, Applicant

DATE: 1891-93

PROPOSAL: Awnings and signage on Market Street façade

Mr. Baron described the proposal which involves adding awnings and back-lit plastic box signs or individual letters to attach to the transoms of the eastern bays of the Market Street facade. The staff recommended approval of fabric, non-illuminated, open-sided awnings that match the shape of the smaller Hard Rock Café awnings. The staff further recommended denial of the illuminated signage and thought that the signs should be displayed from behind the storefront glass.

Mr. Quenzel concurred with the staff's recommendation and proposed that the awnings match in profile the smaller of those at the Hard Rock Café. Mr. Quenzel then presented the signage proposal to the Committee stating that not enough room exists to display the signage from inside. He argued that the Committee previously approved exterior strip signs for the other Market Street tenants within the arcade and that the proposed sign would provide uniformity to the facade. The Committee debated on the amount of space an exterior sign should be recessed back from the building's facade.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the awnings to match the smaller awnings of the Hard Rock Café in profile with staff to review awning details and color. The Architectural Committee further recommended approval of the exterior signage provided that the face of the plastic box individual letters sits one-foot recessed back from the outside stone facade.

JLB

1115-1141 Market Street, NE corner of 12th Street, Reading Terminal Headhouse

Headhouse Retail Associates, LP, Owner

Brian L. Newswanger, Applicant

DATE: 1891-93

PROPOSAL: Signage on Market Street façade

Mr. Baron presented the proposal which involves installing a sign for the brew pub on the granite Market Street facade with lighting hung from the bottom of the convention center sign. The staff recommended denial and stated that the signage should be held back to the rear of the arcade, perhaps near the central doors.

The architect, Brian L. Newswanger, stated that the brew pub required a presence on Market Street and that the condominium association approved the placement of the signage. The Committee debated the placement of the sign and its visibility. Mr. Baron recommended approval of a long strip sign, consistent with others approved within the Market Street arcade, and placed in one of the empty arches that flank the convention center doors. The Committee concurred with Mr. Baron's recommendation and Mr. Baron stated he would provide the applicant with a drawing of a strip sign that has been previously approved to aid in his design.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of signage placed on the granite Market Street facade with lighting hung from the bottom of the convention center sign. The Architectural Committee recommended approval of a strip sign, placed in an empty arch that flanks the convention center entrance, with staff to review details and placement of the signage.

JLB

2000 Benjamin Franklin Parkway, SE corner of South 20th Street, Franklin Institute

Franklin Institute, Owner

John Gerbner, Applicant

DATE: 1932

PROPOSAL: Fire door revised

This application involves the location for cutting a new fire door approved at a previous Commission meeting. The applicant had agreed to move the new door out of the window area to an adjacent pier. Upon investigation, the architect found that the masonry pier contains the steel support structure and therefore must again propose the window location. This time the window glazing will remain. The staff recommended approval provided that the window glazing remain.

John Gerbner, the architect, attended the meeting and the stated that revised location leaves more of the window open.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the fire door replacement.

100 Delancey Street

Roger and Jeanne Doherty, Owners

Christopher Beardsley, Architect

DATE: c. 1970

PROPOSAL: Rear addition with elevator

This application calls for a rear addition with elevator as well as a new design for the exposed rear wall and the brick fence. The staff recommended denial per Standards 9 and 10. The staff thought that the new materials do not complement the existing architecture of the building and the extension of the building compromises the view into and design of the rear courtyard shared by the row.

This proposal was seen previously by the Commission; however, the addition was much larger in size. At that time, the Commission had concerns about the importance of the architectural space as well as the building itself.

Roger Doherty, Carl Primavera and Christopher Beardsley attended the meeting to explain and answer questions about the proposal. Mr. Beardsley, the architect, stated that the revised plans meet all zoning and building codes. In addition, he stated that the plans show the addition as a stucco box with glass corner windows which reduce the bulk of the addition. Materials consist of stucco, metal and Rheinzink a gray, non-glossy zinc material. Mr. Primavera, counsel for the applicant, stated that the applicant is entitled to reasonable accommodations under the Fair Housing Act, as amended, and Americans with Disabilities Act. Mr. Doherty stated that in the future his wife may be wheelchair bound and that the elevator would be accessible for her from the garage. He also stated that the neighbors at 102 Delancey Street did not oppose the addition.

Mr. Thomas stated that architecturally the rears of the buildings on Front Street were designed as open space and this proposal alters the space. Mr. Thomas added that if the Committee reviewed this proposal as only an addition, it would recommend denial. However, since the elevator and landing provide accessibility under the American Disabilities Act, the Committee must give precedence to this Act over the Philadelphia Code.

Mr. Baron questioned the existence of an elevator shaft in the existing building. Mr. Beardsley responded that accessing the shaft would require complete interior demolition and that the shaft would not be large enough to accommodate a wheelchair lift.

Stanley Krakower, attorney for Sally Smith the neighbor, stated that the ADA issue is currently under appeal and believes that this approval should not motivate the Historical Commission's decision. He also believes that if the addition is shifted and put adjacent to the street, the neighbors would be better satisfied and the applicant will still be able to build his proposed addition.

Carol Raviola, a Pine Street resident, stated the "all around focus" should be considered and that this proposal impacts her totally.

Steve and Carol Dranoff stated that their view would be hindered and that the addition would impact their light and space.

Grey Smith stated that flipping the addition is more in keeping with other additions in the historic district and would have less impact on the neighbors.

The Committee agreed shifting, but not necessarily flipping the addition to be flush with Delancey Street would be more respectful to the neighbors. In addition the Committee thought that the existing brick wall fence should remain and that excavation and construction should be contained within the rear yard. However, if for construction purposes the wall must be removed it must be reconstructed to match original.

Mr. Beardsley noted that the Commission previously approved the materials of the addition in concept.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept the mass of the addition about Delancey Street instead of the party wall side with the retention of the existing rear wall and the staff to review details. However, the applicant should return to the Committee with new elevations and material samples.

308 South Front Street

Robert and Lexis Potamkin, Owners

Dominic Aspite, Applicant

DATE: c. 1970

PROPOSAL: Enclose front porch

Mr. Baron presented the application which involves closing in the open balcony area on the front facade of this modern row house. Several porches in this row received glazing prior to designation. The glazing will not match the design of the adjacent row house. Staff recommended denial of the proposal believing that the chief characteristic of this architectural style is the relationship of solid to void. Closing this opening, therefore, seriously alters the design of the front facade.

Mr. Atkin questioned the applicant, Dominic Aspite, if he knew how many of the second floor balconies on Front Street have been closed in. Mr. Aspite stated that at least three of the nine properties had closed in balconies. Mr. Thomas added that since this balcony does not protrude from the facade of the building, its closure does not alter the building mass.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of glazing the second floor balcony on the building's Front Street facade.

JLB

227-31 South 6th Street, Lippincott Building

Albro Associates LP, Alan Sobel, Gerald Broker, Owners

Charles D. Datner, Applicant

DATE: 1900

PROPOSAL: Conceptual two-story addition

This application involves creating a two-story addition on top of this building. The design involves no setbacks and features horizontal fenestration. The staff recommended denial since the addition has visibility from all four sides and does not respect the design elements of the existing building. Perhaps a single-story penthouse pulled back from all sides could find approval, but would probably not provide a sufficient return on the expenditure.

Alan Sobel, Gerald Broker and Charles Datner attended the meeting to explain and answer questions about the proposal. Mr. Datner gave a presentation with photographs including a computer rendering of the proposed two-story addition to the existing building. He stated that an existing four-foot parapet wall would conceal one story and visibility of the two stories would be minimized by a twelve-foot setback on the front and the rear elevations. The applicant proposes to cap the addition in keeping with the design of the existing and maintain the integrity of the major façade. Mr. Sobel stated that a window easement exists for the windows in the party wall. He argued that the two fire stairs protruding sixteen feet high through the roof, are no more intrusive than the two-story addition.

Mr. Baron thought that in relationship to the scale of the existing building, the addition would significantly alter the character of the building.

Rebecca Stoloff, Society Hill Civic Association, cited a previous project which also included an addition on Washington Square and the Committee and Commission's stand on not setting a precedent and reviewing each building on its own merits.

Carl Zucker, representing the owner of 223 South 6th Street, stated that the building has clear value without the addition and questioned the legality of the windows since they are in a party wall.

Committee members thought the height of the addition should not exceed sixteen feet to match the height of the existing stair towers and have a setback of at least twenty feet. The Committee emphasized the need to see drawings with elevations and dimensions to show a more complete proposal.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the conceptual addition as submitted.

1902 Spring Garden Street

Marc Ginsburg, Owner

Jerry Roller, Applicant

DATE: c. 1886

PROPOSAL: Legalize removal of stone façade and replacement with brown stucco

This proposal involves legalizing the demolition of a marble façade undertaken without a permit. Licenses and Inspections issued a stop work order, and Mr. Tyler explained the Commission's review process to the

applicant and the need for the Commission to review his proposed scope of work. Subsequently the applicant applied for a permit and through error at Licenses and Inspections received a permit. He then rebuilt the wall in cinderblock and brown stucco. The City has revoked the permit. The staff recommended denial. The applicant should remove the cinderblock and rebuild the façade in marble.

Jerry Roller attended the meeting and showed photographs of 1900 Spring Garden Street, the adjoining house which was also painted. He thought that painting to match 1902 is an appropriate solution. He also stated that the owner did the work absent a permit in ignorance of an historic district.

Mr. Tyler stated that during a 25 January site visit, he encountered a contractor damaging the façade with a sledgehammer. On 29 January, a permit issued after the demolition of the façade; this permit, issued in error, has been revoked. He then suggested to the contractor to clean up the site, until such time as heard by Committee and Commission; however, the contractor opted to finish the work which included painting the façade. The stone veneer was removed and cinderblock and stucco installed on top of the brick. The Committee also stated that per the Standards the materials should match. In regards to the owner's knowledge, this is a new district, and substantial notices were sent out.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the legalization of the removal of the stone façade and its replacement with brown stucco.

264 South 20th Street

Greg Hanson, Owner

Melanie B. Piltch, Applicant

DATE: c. 1920

PROPOSAL: Alter storefront and door, exterior awnings and signage

The project involves alterations to a commercial building to install a dress shop. The applicant seeks to cut down the paneled brick base of the store window, install a glass door in front of the recessed vestibule and add awnings above the door and over the upper floor windows. Plans also show a projecting sign. The staff recommended denial of cutting down the storefront and the new glass door. The storefront awning should cover only the area of the window not the door.

Greg and Johanna Hanson and Melanie Piltch attended the meeting to answer questions and explain the proposal. Ms. Piltch described the project and stated that the glass door is needed for practical reasons such as thermal efficiency, leaves and dirt. She also stated that the applicant proposes to restore the windows in the upper floors, matching the bronze frames. The proposed glass door is very transparent without a frame with narrow sidelights. The sign contains metal letters and fluorescent lighting tubes to run along the side, with a protective shield.

The Committee thought the awning should extend the length of the window and the door.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of altering the storefront and door, exterior awnings and signage with the staff to review details.

1412-14 Pine Street, SW corner of Carlisle Street, Peirce College

Peirce College, Owner

James J. Mergiotti, Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Billboard and security cameras

This project involves the installation of a billboard type sign on the side of 1412 Pine Street facing Broad Street advertising Peirce College. The vinyl graphic will change periodically to give a new image for Peirce. Peirce installed the existing billboard as well as the security cameras without Historical Commission review. The staff recommended denial.

Vito Chimenti and Phil Kunz attended the meeting to explain the proposal. The applicant stated that although the cameras are visible they have helped in regards to security.

The Committee thought the proposed sign resembles advertisement billboards. It suggested a mural or rendering that characterizes Peirce College and not read as a billboard.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the cameras but denial of the billboard type sign.

1721 Addison Street

Ted Polett, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Legalize non-historic windows

This project involves legalizing vinyl windows installed on the front façade of this rowhouse. The windows installed by the former owner in 1997 received a violation immediately that year. Mr. Polett purchased the home in 1997 and the violation did not show up on the City certification. He now seeks to sell the property and the violation now appears on the City certification. He wishes to have the Commission legalize the work based on the premise that he did not do the work. The staff recommended denial per Standard 6.

Laurie Phillips, Ted and Kathleen Polett attended the meeting to argue the fact that the work was done by the previous owner and they should not be held liable for this action. The owners presented labels removed from the windows dated January 1996 and said that owing to the violation being sent to the previous owner, they had no knowledge of its existence until they put the house up for sale.

Mr. Baron stated that the important aspect of the issue is the timing which is as follows:

- 1996 designation photographs show wood six-over-six windows;
- 27 July 1997 the staff requested a violation, wood windows replaced with vinyl snap-in muntins and a security door;
- 22 August 1997 a violation issued to Kurt Burgmister the previous owner;
- 20 June 1997 house sold to the Poletts, and
- 12 May 1997 the City Certification did not show the violation.

The Committee thought that, because this not an architectural design issue but a procedural issue, the Commission should make the decision or strike a compromise if it believes the situation warrants such action. Since the City's recordation is a lengthy process, this would account for the violation not appearing on the City Certification.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the legalization of the non-historic windows but strongly recommended that the Commission consider the circumstances.

113 Elfreths Alley

Albert Malmfelt and Brenda Frank

Gerry Gutierrez, Architect

DATE: c. 1811

PROPOSAL: Visible rear addition

This proposal involves supplementing the addition formerly approved by the Commission and covering more of the visible fabric of the original structure. The staff recommended denial per Standard 9 and 10.

Mr. Baron misunderstood the previous submission and thought the approved addition would carry the rear ell straight back; however, the approved addition extends the width. He thought the portion of brickwork on the rear ell which is original fabric should not be built up.

Brenda Frank, the owner, and Gerry Gutierrez, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Gutierrez said that the original design is on the same plane as the lower two floors. The addition by the previous owner is clad in asbestos siding and represents a way for water penetration of the existing envelope. Therefore, in cleaning up the corner and removing the siding, the applicant thought this an appropriate time for revising the approved addition owing to changes in her lifestyles. Mr. Gutierrez stated that in terms of visibility, the addition would be tucked in the corner, and he presented photographs taken standing on a three-foot concrete barricade on the east side of Front Street to show the extent of visibility. Ms. Frank stated that anyone walking on the Front Street sidewalk will not see the addition.

Ms. Pentz questioned the cutting of a window into a door, but the applicant stated that an existing window opening in the brickwork would be covered up. Mr. Thomas stated that although visibility is an issue, in the case of a 200 year old house it is more important historically to preserve original fabric and original openings.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of a revision to an approved addition.

200 South Broad Street, SW corner of Walnut Street, The Bellevue

The Bellevue Associates, Owner

Frederick Swope, Contractor

DATE: 1902-04, 1910-11

PROPOSAL: Masonry repair and replacement

This proposal involves repairing and replacing damaged or missing masonry elements on the Broad Street façade of the Bellevue Stratford Hotel building. The proposal calls for using cast stone, and masonry patching material. The staff recommended approval with the staff to review details.

Robert Powers and Frederick Swope attended the meeting to answer questions and explain the proposal.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with the staff to review details.

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary