

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

**Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Commission Offices, One Parkway, 13th Floor, 1515 Arch Street
29 January 2002**

Present

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Tony Atkin, AIA
Rudolph D'Alessandro
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Suzanne Pentz

Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Jeffrey Barr, Historical Research Technician
Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner

Also

Lenore Millhollen, Preservation Alliance/Center City Residents' Association
Lauren Weinstock, Ithaca Partnership
Judith Eden, Center City Residents' Association
Michael Stern, Community College of Philadelphia
Marc Brookman, Esquire
Michael Schade, Atkin Olshin Lawson-Bell Architects
Frank Glodek
Scott Donahue, Rittenhouse Town Watch
Irma Feldman, Ernesto's 1521 Café
Joel Levinson, AIA, Joel Levinson Associates
Lynn B. Henson, Waverly Street neighbor
Te Chow Lei, T.C. Lei and Associates
Vern Lei, T.C. Lei and Associates
Judith Robinson, Woodstock Street Block Captain
Michael Sher, Pine Realty
V. Kieffer, Philadelphia Sign
Harry J. Sher, Esquire, Attorney for Pine Realty
Timothy Cwiek, Philadelphia Gay News
Anne Fadullon, Dale Corporation
David O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighbor's Association
Jean P. Barr, 608 South Front Street
Beatrice Smith, 2351 St. Albans Street
Frank Reis, 608 South Front Street
Janet and Saul Levy, 228 Monroe Street
Elizabeth Armour, Society Hill Civic Association
Lorna Katz Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association
Christopher Beardsley, 228 Monroe Street
George Tait, Tague Lumber
Don Foster, 314 Catharine Street, Unit 402
Chariss McAfee, Loomis McAfee Architects
Richard E. Tucker, Old City Civic Association

Sandra Lazovitz, S& S Properties
 Mark Wadell, Wade Properties
 Hugh Zimmers, Zimmers Associates
 Scott Craven, 313 North 3rd Street
 Paul Christner
 Bill VanNess, Dale Company
 Penelope A. Batcheler
 Ellen Miller
 Dennis Milstein
 Carlie Seltzer, Office of Councilman Clarke
 Steven Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
 Raymond Rola
 Morris Chomitz, Society Hill Civic Association
 Mark Brodsky, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
 Cirel Magen, Society Hill Civic Association
 James Crowell, Crowell Design/Old Pine Church
 Lorna Katz, Society Hill Civic Association
 Christian Busch, The Sullivan Company
 David Amburn
 John Douthwade, Oasis Company
 Nicholas Aloï, Mainline Construction, 124 Queen Street
 Ed Plocha, 334 South 19th Street
 Dan Banks
 Michael Rigolizzo, 231 North 2nd Street
 Charles Loomis, Loomis McAfee Architects
 Bob Levitt
 Larry Mitchell

Daniel McCoubrey, Acting Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

245 South 17th Street

University City Housing Company, Ithaca Partnership, Owner
 Lauren Weinstock, Applicant
 DATE: 1888, Frank Miles Day, Architect
 PROPOSAL: Install garage door

The Commission approved the cutting of a garage door in the face of this building in 1997. The applicant is returning for approval of the actual garage door design. Committee, at a previous meeting, asked for shop drawings to prove that the approved design can be built. This application has scaled drawings, but they differ from the approved 1997 design and fail to show how the door functions.

The approved garage door design had three multi-light transoms, each with 22 panes. This detail mimicked the leaded transoms in the upper sash of the 3rd floor windows. The proposed door now has only 12 panes in each transom. Also, the drawings now show a paneled reveal of 1 foot-8 inches. The drawings fail to show how the door functions, and do not have hardware information.

Finally, the application does not address details of the garage opening. The approved design had stone quoins along the sides of the opening and a stone lintel above. The drawings do not show

any of these details and the opening as cut does not have the quoins. Staff recommendation: Approval of the door design.

Lauren Weinstock attended the meeting and stated that the entire door including the transoms, operates as a single unit. She noted that the contractor intended to install bricks salvaged from the front wall over the new steel lintel. She had no details of the proposed quoins.

The Committee thought that not having the quoins represents a change from the formerly approved drawings. Ms. Pentz questioned the stone at the base of the jam, which is seen in the photographs. Mr. McCoubrey raised the question of the wood reveal overlapping the masonry and the treatment of the corners. Absent the mechanical and masonry surround details, the Committee concluded that the drawings are incomplete. It believed these to be important aspects of the proposal.

The Architectural asked the applicant to return with mechanical and the masonry surround details.

2102 Mt. Vernon Street

Frank Glodek, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855, Oliver Parry & Nathaniel Randolph, builders; alterations: new façade, 1966;
new cornice, c. 1985

PROPOSAL: Security door

This proposal calls for a security door on the front entrance.

Staff recommendation: Approval of a fully-glazed storm door since it is a non-historic façade, per Standard 9.

Frank Glodek, the owner, attended the meeting and stated that door is needed for security reasons.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval as submitted.

1719-21 Walnut Street

Midwood Management Corporation, Owner

Michael Schade, Architect

DATE: 1719: c. 1850; storefront, c. 1940
1721: c. 1900

PROPOSAL: Façade alterations, substantial demolition

This application involves demolishing two separate buildings and creating a single commercial space. The Commission previously approved the demolition of the neighboring, non-contributing building at 1715-17 Walnut Street and this is part of a related development. The basis of the district's significance is the residential development of the area, and both of these buildings are listed as "contributing" in the district's inventory.

1719 and 1721 Walnut Street were constructed as separate residences in the mid to late-19th century, and stretch back to Moravian Street. As commercial development moved along Walnut Street, they became commercial spaces, with storefronts added to the first floors. However, their massing remains fairly intact with the basic footprint of front building, piazza and rear-ell. 1721's rear has been modified with a three-story ell and the installation of industrial windows, but

1719 retains the c. 1850s footprint. The proposal includes demolishing both buildings, except for the front façade of 1721 and the roof of 1719, and replacing them with a single building that occupies the entire lot. The parapet wall between the two buildings and their chimneys will be removed completely.

On the front façade of 1719, the proposal calls for replacing the curved-glass storefront on the first floor with a limestone façade that has a double-leaf glazed door and fixed aluminum storefront windows; the installation of a limestone cornice above the first floor; new stucco on the upper floors and three bays of new fixed, aluminum windows on the second and third floors in place of the existing two bays in the original masonry openings; a new wood cornice, wood dormer with coupled, single-sash windows and a standing-seam copper roof. The drawings say that the entire front brick wall maybe replaced with CMU and that the stucco may be replaced with limestone.

On the front façade of 1721, the proposal includes removing the door and replacing it with a fixed sash; removing paint, cleaning and repointing the limestone; rebuilding the metal cornice and dormer; and installing dormer windows.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standards 2, 5, 9 and 10. The front buildings should be retained, including the window configurations, dormers and chimneys, as well as the ridgeline between the buildings. These buildings should continue to read as two separate buildings.

Mark Brookman, Esquire, and Michael Schade, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Schade stated that the proposal would combine the structures into a single façade. He also noted that 1719 has undergone changes of the roofline, but he proposes to retain the roofscape, remove the interior of the ground floor and increase the size of the windows. In addition, the window configuration of 1719 will change to three windows wide. He also claimed that very little historic fabric still remains. In 1721 Walnut Street, he proposes a complete restoration with the retention of the roof and dormer lines.

Mr. Baron stated that the Rittenhouse/Fitler Residential Historic District consists of rowhouses many of which have been refaced. Introducing three bays will practically remove any remaining historic fabric. He also had concerns about the dormers and the introduction of new fabric.

Ms. Spina noted that demolition of contributing buildings may only happen in cases of financial hardship or public interest. Mr. Baron explained that the historic brick front and window openings of 1719 almost certainly exists underneath the stucco. He said the dormer windows should be four-over-four not a single pieces of glass. He asked them to justify the removal of historic fabric based on the *Standards*. He read from Standards 9 that says “new construction will not destroy historic materials” and the guideline that recommends “Identifying and preserving masonry features that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as walls”.

The Committee discussed the character of the buildings along with the destruction of historic fabric; but concluded that owing to the previous alterations to 1719, the new design’s intent mimics the original with the retention of the dormer and the roofline. Committee members discussed the extent of historic fabric still remaining.

Lenore Millhollen, Preservation Alliance/Center City Residents’ Association, opposed the demolition of the two buildings, and questioned whether there is a new tenant in place. She stated that she would not like to see the buildings demolished, only to have a vacant lot remain. Mr. Schade stated that the owner does not have a signed lease at this time.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the restoration of an important façade will be gained.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the application as submitted with the staff to review details. Ms. Pentz and Mr. Atkin recused themselves from the vote.

1904-08 Spring Garden Street

Janet Tegler, Owner

1904-06-08 Spring Garden Street, LLC, Agreement of Sale

Monroe Buckner, Architect

DATE: 1968

PROPOSAL: New entrance, signage, fence and gate

The application for this non-contributing building has multiple parts. The owner wishes to install a four-foot-high fence at the sidewalk with some landscaping, ten-foot gates into the parking lots flanking the building, new lights at the sidewalk to illuminate the parking lot, one sign next to an existing ATM machine, and two new entrances and a canopy on the east façade. One entrance calls for a flush metal door and the one with the canopy will have a fully-glazed aluminum door.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the entrances, per entrance guideline, approval of the fence and gates, per Standard 9. Denial of the lights as proposed, per Standard 9. They should be more simple in design, and perhaps more rounded to recall the late 19th century, rather than straight-sided like colonial carriage lamps.

Joel Levinson attended the meeting to explain the project and answer questions.

The Committee concurred with the staff about a more simplified design for the lamps. The applicant agreed about the lamp's design.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with the staff to review the new lamp's details.

1921 Walnut Street

Te Chow Lei, Owner

Vern Lei, Architect

DATE: 1897, Cope and Stewardson, Architect

PROPOSAL: New storefront

This storefront application returns to Committee with several changes, which reflect the Committee's recommendations. The application now calls for retaining the historic wood transom and installing new wood storefront windows flanking a wood and glazed single-leaf door. Simple metal pipe railings flank new concrete steps leading to the new doorway. The proposal also calls for back lit plastic faced box sign to hang in the central transom pane.

Staff recommendation: Although the applicant has responded to many of the Committee and staff's concerns, the overall question of introducing a new element into this significant façade remains unanswered. On the one hand, the application does not follow Standard 9, but does conform to Standard 10. However, if the interior truly has historic features that would be destroyed with an interior entrance, perhaps this is an acceptable compromise.

Te Chow Lei and Vern Lei attended the meeting. Vern Lei showed pictures of the detailed interior, including ornate paneling in the vestibules. He also raised the possibility of neon signage on the exterior, in the middle pane of the transom. Committee members stated that the exterior sign may obscure details and signage should be installed on the inside of the window. They did not object to the neon.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the revised proposal with an interior sign, and the staff to review details.

306 South 19th Street, aka 1901-05 Delancey Place

Henry McNeil, Owner

Wesley Wei, Architect

DATE: 1900, Cope & Stewardson, architects

PROPOSAL: New rear door

This proposal calls for cutting a window opening down to accommodate a new door and cutting a gate into a brick garden wall. The house has a small areaway on its own property that has steps leading down to a basement entrance. A brick wall separates this areaway from a formal alley running behind the house. A stuccoed CMU wall separates the formal alley from the parking lot next door. The owner wishes to cut a gate in the brick wall and install a metal staircase leading from the formal alley to a new rear door of the house, bridging the areaway leading to the basement.

The wood, one-over-one window will be changed to a wood, fully-glazed door with a single-light transom above.

Staff recommendation: Approval, per entrance guideline.

Wesley Wei, the architect, and Jennifer Foster attended the meeting.

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

410 South 15th Street, SW corner of Waverly Street

Michael Sher, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850, altered c. 1885

PROPOSAL: Legalize mural on stuccoed base of side wall

This application seeks to legalize a mural painted on the Waverly Street wall of this corner rowhouse. After receiving complaints, Licenses and Inspections issued a violation. The owner claims that the portion of the wall with the mural was previously stuccoed and painted brick red.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standard 9. The mural as an alteration is not “compatible with the historic materials and features”. The wall should be repainted brick red. Unlike in the case of other murals that have been approved, this is not a former party wall. On the contrary, this wall, carries extensive architectural features such as brick corbelling and windows. In a similar circumstance at 23rd and Walnut Streets, the Commission denied a mural application on a corner property. Mr. Baron called attention to letters that had been received and distributed to the Committee members. He read from the rehabilitation guidelines, which state under masonry that it is “not recommended to radically change the type of paint or coating or its color”.

Michael Sher and Harry T. Sher, attorney for the applicant, attended the meeting. The applicant stated that he believes the mural to be an improvement for the neighborhood and a deterrent for graffiti. In addition, he stated that the neighborhood consists of varying stucco fronts and that the colors of the mural is compatible with the community. He also said that the mural raises social and cultural awareness. He also questioned murals around the city and if any other mural had been denied. In response, Mr. Baron stated that murals have been approved on former party walls, but not walls which have significant architectural features like the corbelling and windows of this facade. He cited that in 1996 Committee and Commission denied a wall mural at 2215 Walnut Street .

Judith Eden speaking as a neighbor, noted that murals can be controversial and should be discussed in a public forum. The owner did not follow the process before he installed the mural. She also said that there were mixed responses in the neighborhood but that Mr. Sher should not continue to give the impression that Councilman Clarke's office supports the mural.

Lynn Henson, a resident of Waverly Street, thought the mural is lively, sexy and ties in with the Avenue of the Arts, and expressed her support for the mural.

Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Pentz stated that the mural changes the historic character of the wall. The Committee emphasized that the work was done absent a permit and the applicant responded that it was an oversight.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended denial per Standard 9.

2000-14, 2016-26, 2001-13 West Diamond Street

Philadelphia Housing Authority, Owner

William Kramer, Architect

DATE: 19th century rowhouses demolished after district designation

PROPOSAL: New construction of 19 houses

This application, seen by the Architectural Committee in November was withdrawn and substantially revised based on the Committee's and staffs comments. The houses will now sit much closer to the front property line, take the basic form of individual rowhouses, and have modern detailing inspired by the late 19th century examples on the surrounding blocks. Parking has been moved off the front yards to the rear and units have been shifted to build a more solid streetscape.

Staff recommendation: Approval per Standard 9, ADA and the new construction guidelines. The staff recommends the option of muntins for the windows. All with staff to review details.

William Kramer, the architect, and Michael Johns, Philadelphia Housing Authority, attended the meeting. Mr. Kramer stated that the new construction is adjacent to brownstone houses and the new construction's material is a combination of split-face block and smooth face brick with cast stone lintels. The end houses will have brick-colored stucco in the rear of the upper stories. All the units will have vinyl siding on the rear facades.

Mr. Atkin thought a side window at each floor would compliment the design. Members also thought a break in the horizontal roofline at each party wall with a finial would punctuate and help separate the continuous line of the houses. Committee members also preferred the window

configuration of four-over-one even in the case that the muntins would be sandwiched between the glass.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the revised submission with the following changes:

1. *Adding a side window on each floor of the end units;*
2. *Four-over-one windows, and*
3. *Finials at the party wall divisions.*

With staff to review details.

251 South 12th Street

Paul Christner, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Three new rear decks

This proposal involves removing existing fire escapes and installing new decks as well as replacing an existing rear deck on top of the garage. The rear of the property faces houses on Sartain Street.

Staff recommendation: The staff does not object to the decks on the lower floors, although we recommend denial of the top floor deck as proposed, which appears to obscure the historic fabric of the mansard.

Tom Schnepf and Paul Christner, the owner, attended the meeting and the owner stated that he is willing to work with the staff for guidance in this project. He said that the proposed decks have an open metal floor and that he has no problems with decreasing their size if it presents a problem.

Mr. Rivera expressed concern with the stockade fence proposed on the sides of the deck on the garage, in respect to the aesthetic relationship of the metal railing and the stockade fence. Committee members thought the top deck should be scaled down so that it doesn't obscure the details of the façade.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with the fourth floor deck reduced to a small balcony, with the staff to review details.

2301 Madison Square, NW corner of 23rd Street

Dennis Milstein, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c.1865

PROPOSAL: Legalize new stucco at building base

This proposal involves the legalization of applying stucco to the base of the building. The applicant claims that he repaired stucco that already existed.

Staff recommendation: Approval.

Dennis Milstein, the owner, attended the meeting and stated that he applied stucco owing to the deterioration of the existing stucco.

The Architectural Committee recommended legalization of the repair of the existing stucco.

250 Delancey Street, SE corner of 3rd Street

Agnes Kan, Owner

Raymond Rola, Architect

DATE: c. 1826

PROPOSAL: New roof, dormers, rear deck, areaway along Delancey Street

This proposal involves extensive alterations to the historic fabric of the building. The plans call for cutting the roof extensively to make a dormer on the front façade and a recessed roof deck on the rear. At the base of the building, the applicant seeks to cut away the historic cellar bulkhead to create an areaway, lightwell and entrance to the basement. Basement windows on the front façade would be cut down.

Denial per Standards 2, 9 and the roofing guideline. The alterations shown on other properties as examples predate the adoption of *Standards* by the Commission and in some cases, such as across the street, did not involve historic fabric.

Raymond Rola, the architect attended the meeting and cited similar alterations in the neighborhood. Mr. Baron responded that the changes as far as he could identify pre-dated this Ordinance and did not involve removal of historic fabric. He also noted that a recent proposal for a dormer had been denied by Committee and Commission because end rowhouses having attic side windows, lacked dormers.

Ms. Pentz stated that as a corner property the sides should be protected, and that an oversized dormer is inappropriate for this building. In addition, the alterations do not meet the *Standards*. Committee members noted the historic roof details remain intact, especially noting that the end houses typically did not have dormer windows.

Steve Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association, stated the areaway would encroach the sidewalk and he opposes the alterations.

Penelope Batcheler expressed her opposition to the proposed alterations.

Lenore Millhollen, Preservation Alliance/Center City Residents' Association, spoke in opposition to the proposal.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial per Standards 2 and 9.

700-28 Walnut Street, between 7th & 8th Streets

St. James Walnut Association, Owner

Mark Brodsky, Applicant

DATE: 700-10 Walnut Street, 1868-69, Addison Hutton, architect; altered 1885-86, Frank

Furness, architect

712-16 Walnut Street, c. 1807

718 Walnut Street, c. 1950

PROPOSAL: Façade rehabilitation, new tower

This application received approval in concept in August 1999. The proposal is returning for final approval. There are three main changes from the previous application: the treatment of the façade at the parking garage level, treatment at the roof and glazing in the corner building.

The Committee and Commission originally approved glazing of the tower at the garage level, the tower's first nine stories. The applicant now wishes to have metal grills instead. At the roofline, the proposal now calls for metal sheathing. The proposal also calls for louvers in the 2nd floor openings in the corner of the building, rather than glazing.

The application also includes rehabilitation of the remaining historic façades, including masonry cleaning and repair and repair and painting of wood windows and doors.

Staff recommendation: The Commission gave conceptual approval to the new addition at the corner of 8th and Walnut Streets, with glazing in the second floor openings. The application now shows metal louvers. These second floor openings, at least, should retain the glass.

Approval of the façade rehabilitation for the existing buildings, with staff to review details.

On York Row, Ms. Spina noted that the plans show the upper floors as dead space within the project. Staff has concerns that a space with no access could develop undetectable problems, impacting the long-term preservation of these buildings. Mr. Brodsky stated that the space in the upper floors may be used and the floor plans for the upper floors, though not submitted, show access to these spaces.

Ms. Spina noted that drawings approved in concept show glazing at the second floor of the new building on the corner of the 8th and Walnut Streets; however, the revised plans show louvers, which will be very visible. She also reiterated about the many calls from area residents about the protection of the remaining buildings, to help prevent any further deterioration.

Mark Brodsky, the architect, and Peter Shaw attended the meeting. Mr. Brodsky responded to the louvers in place of the glazing at the second floor of the corner building stating that this is the site of the emergency generator, and noted its need for air circulation.

Committee members expressed concern about the removal of the glazing so close to street level. They urged the architect to consider an alternate location for the generator or other ways of venting the area. Some members raised the issue of the noise that the generator would produce.

Mr. Brodsky agreed to investigate other venting options, such as through the roof area. The enclosure of the generator on the sides would minimize the noise on the street.

Steve Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association, spoke on behalf of the neighbors in conveying their concerns about the noise levels at 8th and Walnut Streets.

Elizabeth Armour, Society Hill Civic Association, questioned the sight line studies from Washington Square and the material of the garage louvers. Mr. Brodsky noted that the louvers will give minimal visibility from the street and the light sources in the garage are located at a distance with some hidden by the structural columns.

The Architectural Committee recommended final approval of the entire proposal but with glazing at the second floor level of the corner building, with the staff to review all details.

400 Pine Street, aka 400-16 South 4th Street, Old Pine Presbyterian Church

Old Pine Presbyterian Church, Owner

James Crowell, Applicant

DATE: c. 1768; alterations: windows and stucco, c. 1837; front portico, columns and pediment,
c. 1857, John Fraser, architect, A. Catanach, builder

PROPOSAL: Exterior lighting

This application calls for new exterior lighting in four areas on the front of the church.

1. Recessed lighting behind the columns to illuminate the portico area. This includes six fixtures, which will highlight the front door and the windows that flank it.
2. Strip lighting inside each of the sign boxes mounted in the niches of the church's base.
3. New incandescent light fixtures above each sign box to illuminate the entire niche. These linear lights will have a metal valance, painted to match the surrounding stone.
4. New recessed fixtures installed above the double-leaf door located in the central niche of the base. The existing wood panel in the reveal will be replaced with a new wood piece that has two panels.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the lighting at the base of the building, including the sign boxes, niches and over the door. Approval of a lighting scheme for the portico, but staff questioned installing recessed fixtures, requiring the removal of historic fabric. The possibility of mounted fixtures should be explored.

James Crowell attended the meeting to explain the project and said that the existing lighting is deteriorated and needs maintenance. He stated that the recessed lighting is the best approach in the portico because they can be reached from inside the pediment. Surface mounted lights would require servicing from outside using a ladder.

For over the door at the base, Mr. Crowell proposes removing the existing wood panel and putting in two raised panels for light. However, the Committee believes that there is a stone lintel above the panel and would like to see a section and photograph of the original opening.

Penny Batcheler questioned whether lights in the portico could be angled to wash the walls so that pedestrians cannot see up into the fixtures. Mr. Crowell stated that that is his intention.

Mr. McCoubrey questioned installing a metal valance in the niches. He believed that the lights should be mounted on the signs themselves. The Committee members concurred.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the recessed lighting behind the columns and the strip lighting in each sign box as submitted.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the incandescent light fixtures above each sign box. It recommended investigating other options of attaching lights to the sign boxes.

The Architectural Committee recommended tabling the recessed lighting above the door pending review of a cross section of the lintel area.

220 West Washington Square, aka 701 Locust Street, W.B. Saunders Building

220 West Washington Associates, Owner

Christian Busch, Architect

DATE: 1911

PROPOSAL: HVAC and legalize bird netting

This building has been converted to condominiums, with a different unit on each floor. The owners of the 4th and 5th floors installed HVAC units in the open balconies of the fire stair and they prove highly visible. The Committee reviewed the application to legalize the units and asked for more information concerning placement on the building, manufacturer's requirements and the possibility of blacking out the units. At the same time, the condominium association also installed bird netting in the open balconies. Although black, the netting is visible in certain light. The staff and Committee asked the applicant to seek other options.

The proposals now return for review. The application for the HVAC calls for the units to remain in the balconies of the fire stair, but to be setback approximately 36 inches from the front façade. Air-handling requirements set by the manufacturer require at least eight inches between the unit and the wall behind them; the proposal has the units set at 12 inches. Although the proposal says nothing of painting the units black, the applicant noted that they will black out all units. The photographs in the proposal show the units on the 4th floor blacked out, but the trunk ducts are still visible. Mr. Busch stated that they will remove the trunk ducts at the 4th floor and completely relocate the units on the 5th floor.

The application for the bird netting does not show any alternatives, but simply asks for the legalization of the present condition.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the submission, per HVAC guideline. The units should be located within the north light-well. If the applicant can prove that this location is not feasible, then the units should be located as far back to the wall as possible and blacked out, as proposed.

Denial of the bird netting, per Standard 9. Although black, it reflects the sun at certain times of day and proves highly visible. Other bird netting options should be explored, such as a smaller weave or a thinner thread.

Christian Busch, the architect, attended the meeting and stated that he did investigate the north light-well as a possible location; however, this location would require a structural addition to the building. The units would have to sit on new balconies on each floor and the balconies would have to be large enough to accommodate a maintenance worker as well. Owing to liability and cost reasons this proved not to be a viable solution. He also noted that the proposed bird netting will remain in place permanently, while other types of netting would require removal each year.

Ms. Pentz recommended that all future units adhere to the same dimensions as proposed for the 4th and 5th floors.

The Architectural Committee recommended the approval of the HVAC as submitted, and the approval of the 4th floor units without trunk ducts. It also recommended approval of the legalization of the bird netting.

319-21 South 3rd Street

Lisa Colton, Owner

John Douthwade, Applicant

DATE: c. 1974, Louis Goldberg, architect

PROPOSAL: Two-story addition, new front façade – in concept

In January 2001, the Commission approved, in concept, a two-story addition and new brick facade on this contemporary building dating to the redevelopment period of Society Hill. However, the original proposal called for copying the 19th-century building next door. At the time, both the Committee and Commission said that the new design should be more contemporary in nature, rather than have a false historical appearance.

The applicant is returning with a new design, which has a brick front, cast stone detailing, and a galvanized metal roof.

Staff recommendation: Denial, per Standard 3. The proposed design has many historic elements, such as six-over-six windows, roof balustrade, and 6-panel door; however, the new design should use a contemporary vocabulary. The architect should play with the building's fenestration and roofline to create a more modern design. The staff recommends that the architect and owner meet with the staff to discuss design options.

John Douthwade attended the meeting to represent the project and answer questions. Ms. Spina explained that the Commission had approved the applicant's previous submission in concept. The previous submission replicated the historic façade next door and the Commission asked for a more contemporary façade design in order to "read" as new construction. Ms. Spina stated that the new facade appears to be a collection of historical features and suggested the applicant work with staff to improve the design. Mr. Douthwade stated that he desires a conceptual approval and would be willing to work with staff on the door and window type and dimension but the location of the door and windows are established by the floorplan. He claimed he did not care how the façade looked.

Mr. McCoubrey observed that the City codes would not permit a front porch in front of the building on the sidewalk and asked if the building was set back with a porch. Mr. Douthwade responded that the new façade aligns with the adjacent building. Mr. Baron stated that the previous design retained and incorporated the existing brick masonry at the first floor front and the elevation expressed the two-building width but the new design does neither. Mr. Douthwade maintained that "a building is a building" and could give the Historical Commission whatever it wanted. The Committee disagreed and thought the design lacked cohesion. Mr. Baron observed that the design should both fit in with the streetscape and look like something of our time. The Committee members acknowledged that that is not an easy task. Ms. Spina added that there is a difference between matching the rhythm of the streetscape and mimicking the features of the neighboring houses. The design should be compatible with the rhythm but not match assorted historic features from several architectural periods. Ms. Pentz thought that the first submission was closer to what the Committee could recommend for approval with only modifications to the details to make them appear more contemporary.

Lorna Katz from the Society Hill Civic Association commended the Committee for resisting the temptation to design the building for the applicant and also encouraged the applicant to work with the Civic Association's Zoning and Historic Preservation Committees on a mutually acceptable design.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the project, as submitted, per Standard #3 and encouraged the applicant to work with Staff.

234 Pine Street

Harvey Snyder, Owner

David Amburn, Architect

DATE: c.1835

PROPOSAL: Side and rear additions, new rear 2nd floor windows

This house has an original footprint of front building, piazza and rear ell. The proposal calls for two one-story additions. The first addition is the insertion of a sunroom in the piazza, making that part of the building the full-width of the lot. The second is an addition that wraps around the corner of the rear ell, demolishing a large amount of the rear and side walls. The rear of this building has some visibility, and houses face it from across the street.

The proposal also includes removing the double-hung windows on the second floor, installing new wood fixed-paned windows wrapping around the corner of the building and stuccoing the entire second floor. A wood grill would be installed on the roof of the second floor to hide new HVAC units.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the proposal, per Standards 2, 9, 10 and the new construction guidelines. Staff recommends approval of the wood screen at the 3rd floor to hide the HVAC units, per Standard 9.

David Amburn, architect, and Babs Snyder, owner, attended the meeting to represent the project. Ms. Spina and Mr. Baron explained the staff position that the second floor changes and first floor wall removal involved too much alteration of the original fabric. Mr. Amburn stated their desire to keep the original front portion of the house intact and explained that the changes are to the rear sections of the house. He contended that the first floor addition will not be seen from the street and the second floor changes are to allow more light into the new first floor room. Mr. Baron stated that the second floor rear is, in fact, visible from the street.

According to Ms. Snyder there is a variety of altered conditions and a mix of styles at the rear of the houses on this block. She stated that they would be willing to screen the addition with a higher fence but they require the additional space.

Ms. Spina stated that the difference between the existing original historic fabric and fenestration and the proposed modern fenestration is jarring and not in character with the historic building. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that he was not comfortable allowing removal of that much original exterior wall.

Penny Batchelor, from Society Hill, observed that the rear of these houses are very visible and stated that the second floor features and fabric are important to both the building and the historic district. She argued for the preservation of historic fabric where it exists. Ms. Pentz agreed. It was noted that this project will probably have to go before the Society Hill Civic Association because it requires a zoning variance.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the project, as submitted, per Standard #2, #9 & #10.

342 South 5th Street, NW corner of Pine Street

Richard and Margaret Ullman, Owners

Nicholas Aloï, Applicant

DATE: c. 1972

PROPOSAL: Façade alterations

In August 2001, the Committee and Commission approved an addition on the 3rd floor of this house. However, both said that the metal spandrel between the front entrance and the roof of the building should be extended.

Mr. Aloï, the contractor, has searched for metal sheathing to extend that spandrel on the addition and cannot find an exact match. The owner now proposes to remove all of the metal in the spandrel and replace it with a pinkish-cream smooth stucco or Dryvit. The removed metal sheathing would be used on the rear of the property above the second floor windows.

Staff recommendation: Denial, per Standard 9 and metal guideline. The metal details are the only ornamentation on this contemporary building. If the correct panel profile cannot be found, the staff recommends making the panels in fiberglass, tinted to match the metal's color, using an existing panel for the mold. Fiberglass can then be used on the rear of the property as well. If fiberglass does not work, then staff recommends removing all of the metal at the spandrel and replacing it with new metal panels that closely match the existing pattern. The removed metal panels can then be used on the rear of the property.

Nick Aloï, contractor, and Dick and Margaret Ullman, owners, attended the meeting to represent the project and answer questions. Ms. Spina explained that the Commission approved this project with the condition that cladding for the new addition match the existing original metal spandrel. According to Mr. Aloï, the custom heavy-gauge metal siding is impossible to match exactly. The extremely long lengths required pose additional problems. Mr. Aloï stated he has spent three months researching the issue and has concluded that there is nothing available.

The Committee reviewed samples of several products and agreed that they were not good matches. Mr. Aloï presented a letter from a consultant supporting his position that a fiberglass substitute material would not be possible and a custom metal extrusion would be too costly. The Committee still preferred a substitute metal material to the proposed stucco. Ms. Spina stated that the material match is more important than the exact profile and details. The Committee noted that the metal details were the only ornamentation on this contemporary building.

The owners explained that the rehabilitation of this house was already over budget and they objected to the potential increased costs associated with a custom metal solution. The Committee felt that the metal spandrel was an important original design feature and it should be retained. Mr. Aloï explained that the metal cannot be cut in place and would have to be removed, cut and reinstalled anyway. The Committee discussed the cladding of only the new addition in stucco, which would differentiate it from the original construction. The Committee agreed that stucco is acceptable for the areas at rear where the original metal is missing completely.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the project, as submitted, per Standard #2 & #9. They voted to recommend approval of removing, cutting and re-installing the original metal spandrel, stuccoing the new addition in a buff or champagne color and stuccoing the rear spandrel areas in a dark "bronze" color to simulate the missing original metal.

124 Queen Street

Nicholas Aloj, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1825

PROPOSAL: Legalize façade details

This proposal seeks to legalize work that varied from the approved permit. Staff approved a permit for façade restoration, much of which has come to a successful completion. The outstanding items include shutters that have incorrect panels, windows that are too small with incorrect frames, a cellar bulkhead that has small doors cut into what should have been full size doors, and steps rebuilt with brick sides rather than marble. Mr. Baron explained that the shutters had been discussed in detail to make sure that the hardware would fit below the meeting rail. Each element was correct on the approval drawing.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standard 6. As a compromise, the staff recommends approval of the upper floor windows if the rest of the work is corrected.

Nicholas Aloj, the owner, attended the meeting and said that the original marble of the steps was underneath an applied coating of stone. The Committee asked if the applicant had issue with a stucco side of the stairs. Ultimately they did not think stucco appropriate. The applicant said that the contractor installed the shutters upside down, hardware for the shutters is in the process of being made to mimic the original hardware. He made the Committee aware of the cost incurred for the shutters. In the replacement of the bulkhead door, he installed a 2 ½ inch piece of metal to help eliminate water infiltration. He noted that the first floor windows were not original at the time he began work.

The Committee viewed the designation photographs and found that the shutters did not exist at the time of designation. Members in looking at the size of the bulkhead concurred that the size of the doors is incorrect. Members agreed that the first floor windows are too small. After a lengthy discussion, the Committee concluded that the window replacement should be all or none but the bulkhead size should be corrected. They thought that the extent of the positive restoration should be taken into account.

David O'Donnell, Queen Village Civic Association, questioned the size of the bulkhead.

The Architectural Committee recommended legalization of the façade details subject to the replacement of the bulkhead door to its correct size and with the proper hardware.

608 South Front Street

Jean and Russ Barr, Owners

Frank Reis, Contractor

DATE: c. 1765

PROPOSAL: Two-story rear addition

This proposal calls for constructing an addition on the rear of this unusual and early house. The addition however, while it faces Howard Street, attaches to an existing rear addition from the late 20th century.

Staff recommendation: Approval per Standards 9 & 10.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

228 Monroe Street

Janet Levy, Owner

Christopher Beardsley, Architect

DATE: c. 1825

PROPOSAL: Rear one-story addition

The proposal involves constructing an addition in the rear yard of this house. The house contains a passageway in the front wall that serves as an entryway for a number of rear court houses. The addition will have a visual impact upon the communal space and would be visible from Monroe Street.

Staff recommendation: Approval per Standard 9 if the addition projects no further eastward than the existing garden wall, however one staff member who made a site visit thought that the proposal should be denied unless the addition was reduced to the width of the existing rear ell.

Janet and Saul Levy, the owners, and Christopher Beardsley, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Beardsley stated that the addition extends one foot past the garden wall and its visibility is limited to the rear court.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

314 Catharine Street, Unit 402

Don P. Foster, Owner/Applicant

DATE: Central Talmud Torah, built 1911 Magaziner & Potter, Architects

PROPOSAL: New windows

This application calls for the installation of new wood windows in place of the existing replacement windows. The new windows, while true divided light, do not match the dimensions of the existing. For example the glass width is nearly three inches less per sash because of differences in frame dimensions. This becomes especially significant because most of the windows on each façade will not change, making for easy comparison.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standard 6. When an applicant from a building proposes to replace only the windows of one unit, the windows should be custom milled to match exactly those in the rest of the building.

Don Foster, the applicant, and George Tait, of Tague Lumber, attended the meeting. Mr. Foster stated that the window replacement is a crisis situation owing to water damage to his property and said that his windows have minimal visibility. He reiterated that the existing windows are not original. Mr. Tait said that the proposed window would be single-hung instead of double-hung and the front will be putty glazed. He noted that the reason for the three-inch difference is that it has a jam-liner and thought this an insignificant issue.

Each tenant in the building is responsible for his/her own window replacement; therefore, the Committee thought that the new windows would serve as a model for future window applications.

Mr. Baron cited the window replacement project for the Barclay Hotel as a model for the windows in this building. The Committee stated that the applicant should consider ordering a larger custom milled window that matches the profile of the existing window.

The Architectural Committee thought that three inches less glass width significantly changes the profile, and recommended denial per Standard 6.

314 Catharine Street, Unit 303

Craig M. Martin, Owner/Applicant

DATE: Central Talmud Torah, built 1911 Magaziner & Potter, Architects

PROPOSAL: New window sash

This application calls for the installation of new wood windows in place of the existing replacement windows. The new windows, while true divided light, do not match the dimensions of the existing. For example the glass width is nearly three inches less per sash because of differences in frame dimensions. This becomes especially significant because most of the windows on each façade will not change, making for easy comparison.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standard 6. When an applicant from a building proposes to replace only the windows of one unit, the windows should be custom milled to match those in the rest of the building exactly.

Craig Martin, the owner, did not attend the meeting, but Mr. Foster the owner of the previous proposal said that Mr. Martin would wait for the outcome of Mr. Foster's proposal. The comments from the previous application apply to this proposal as well.

The Architectural Committee thought that three inches less glass width significantly changes the profile, and recommended denial per Standard 6.

57 Summit Street, corner of Prospect Street

Malcolm Sheppard, Owner

Chariss McAfee, Architect

DATE: c. 1870

PROPOSAL: Cut new side and rear windows and doors

This application calls for installing new windows and doors on the side and rear of this building, which prove visible from Prospect Street. The main house has a stuccoed rear ell, a stuccoed rear extension and then a wood-framed rear wing with clapboarding. In the rear ell of the building, the owner wishes to remove an existing window and cut a large opening to install large double-leaf doors out to an existing terrace and install a new metal canopy over the door. Also, the proposal calls for cutting a new double-hung one-over-one window in the stuccoed extension of the rear ell. In the wood-framed rear wing, the owners wish to stucco the brick base and install a new, large cross-gable bay window on the side, which breaks the historic cornice line. On the rear, the proposal calls for cutting a bank of new windows in the rear wing.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the proposal, per Standard 9 and the window guidelines.

As a compromise, staff thought that the window in the extension of the rear and a new coupled double-hung window in the rear of the wood wing (keeping the small historic window intact) would be appropriate. Also, turning a window into a door to the terrace would meet the Standards, if the door had the same width as the current window.

Malcolm Sheppard, the owner, and Chariss McAfee, the architect, attended the meeting. Ms. McAfee said that the Prospect Street side of the property is not very visible; however, Mr. Baron noted that Prospect Street is not a secondary street. She said that this proposal shifts the building's orientation from the service area to the garden area owing to the existence of a large transformer adjacent to the Summit Street facade. In addition, she noted that details of the rear are not symmetrical, the windows do not align.

Committee members thought the metal framing of the proposed door should be wood, and that the intersection of the roof on the side was very awkward. It further believed that the cornice line of the rear wing should be maintained and that the clapboard walls and brick base should be retained and continued. The Committee also requested details of the canopy.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the design as submitted per Standard 9, except for the approval of the single double-hung window in the extension of the rear-ell. The Committee made design recommendations to the applicant for a revised proposal for other aspects of the design.

313 North 3rd Street

Paul Wade, Wade Properties, Owner

Christopher Beardsley, Architect

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Replace entrances, new windows, firestair

This multi-faceted proposal includes installing a new elevator and fire-stair tower, new windows and new entrances to rehabilitate this former light-industrial building into housing units. The proposal calls for cleaning and restoring the 3rd Street façades and replacing the non-historic entrance with a two-light transom and fully-glazed double-leaf doors. On the Wood Street façade, the proposal includes restoring a former entrance opening and installing a new single-leaf fully-glazed door with a sidelight and handicap-access ramp, and cutting new window openings in the easternmost bay on the top three stories and installing six-over-six double-hung windows to match the others on the façade. Finally, the proposal calls for a new elevator and fire-stair tower. These will be slightly visible from down 3rd Street, but sit in the middle of the building.

Staff recommendation: Approval per Standards 9, though staff thought that the applicant should research the historic entrances to revisit the entrance designs.

Scott Craven and Christopher Beardsley, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Beardsley said that the proposed door of steel would mimic wood with the transoms restored. He also said that the mechanical equipment to the elevator will be in a non-visible location.

McCoubrey thought wood doors would be more appropriate for the building since all other elements, such as the windows, are wood. After staff showed historic photographs of the original doors, the Committee recommended that the 3rd Street door match the historic configuration. The applicant agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with all wood doors and windows including a double-leaf wood door with a four-light transom on the 3rd Street façade, with the staff to review details.

236 Quarry Street

S & S Properties, Owner

Sandra Lazovitz, Applicant

DATE: c. 1820

PROPOSAL: 3rd floor addition, façade alterations

This proposal involves building a floor and roof deck and altering the 1st floor on a much altered former house. The building has Flemish bond brickwork at the second floor, but the first floor and roof have been replaced/rebuilt. The Hexamer & Locher atlas of 1860 indicates the building had a passageway to rear court houses and a gabled wood-shake roof. Staff worked with the applicant to develop a reasonable approximation of the former appearance of the property. The applicant has deviated from this by eliminating the installing a door in its place passageway and retaining the copper belt course.

Staff recommendation: Approval per Standard 6, replacement of missing features.

John Marshall and Sandra Lazovitz attended the meeting. The applicant's proposal is for either two or three floors, but the preference is for three stories. They noted that the cost is the determining factor.

Since the staff does not have evidence showing the original height of the building but thought that either proposal was acceptable. The Committee concurred. The Committee noted that the belt course would be more appropriate as masonry rather than copper.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of either the two or three floor design with the staff to review details.

235 North 2nd Street

R. Levitt and R. Rigolizzo, Owners

Hugh Zimmers, Architect

DATE: c 1810

PROPOSAL: Demolition of two rear houses for new construction

This proposal involves the demolition of two court houses sitting on the rear of the lot at 235 S. 2nd Street. The Historical Commission staff has approved the demolition of two structures fronting on the street at 233 and 235 N. 2nd Street because of imminently dangerous conditions found there by Licenses and Inspections. The demolition permit for the cast iron structure at 233 N. 2nd stipulated that the iron façade pieces will be retained for possible reuse on the site. The applicants seek to develop the lots with town houses sitting on top of a parking garage. The ramp to the garage would face 2nd Street. The application contains neither a discussion of the demolition in the public interest or because of financial hardship. The two houses have been occupied until recently and have a new roof covering.

Staff recommendation: Absent a case for demolition, the houses should be retained and reused as part of the development.

Michael Rigolizzo, Bob Levitt, Hugh Zimmers, Larry Mitchell and Dan Banks attended the meeting. Mr. Banks, the structural engineer, vehemently argued that the buildings in the rear should be demolished owing to their being structurally unsound. He also said that access for the wrecking crew is hampered by the rear houses. Mr. Mitchell, the contractor for the demolition,

stated that his machinery needs at least twenty-five to thirty-two feet of operating space. Mr. Rigolizzo said that Licenses and Inspections had determined the buildings at the rear Imminently Dangerous but did not have documentation saying so. Mr. Baron and an inspector from Licenses and Inspections made a site visit and thought that the buildings were in relatively good condition. The applicant stated that the rear buildings do not have a separate address and they create a problem for the proposed development.

Ms. Pentz, an engineer, stated that the buildings on 2nd Street can be shored and that demolition can proceed without the removal of the rear buildings. She and Mr. D'Alessandro explained how the front buildings could be demolished without closing 2nd Street, yet also saving the rear buildings. Members reiterated to the applicant about the Committee on Financial Hardship, if the denial of the demolition proves to be a financial hardship. Committee members agreed with staff that the rear buildings retain much historic fabric and could easily be reused in the new development.

Dick Tucker, Old City Civic Association, strongly opposed the demolition and believed it would be demolition by neglect.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the demolition.

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary