

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Robert Thomas, Chair
Commission Offices, One Parkway, 13th Floor, 1515 Arch Street
25 April 2000

Present

Robert Thomas, Chair
Suzanne Pentz
Daniel McCoubrey
Tony Atkin

Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Also

Frederick A. Swope, Joseph Dugan Inc.
Joseph Grasso, 1401 Arch Street, B & A Investments L.P.
Ellen Miller
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents Association/Preservation Alliance
Christopher Scalone
Richard Cohen
Kim Kopple, St Martin in the Fields Church
Jonathan Miller, 304 Cypress Street
Philip E. Scott, Kise Straw & Kolodner
Rebecca Stoloff, Society Hill Civic Association
Robert Flagg
Dominic Aspite
David Amburn, Amburn/Javosinki
Michael DiPaolo, West Washington Square Partners
Christian A. Busch, The Sullivan Company
Jonathan Weiss, Buchanan Ingersoll P.C.
Carl Zucker, 220 West Washington Square
Ivano D'Angello, 220 West Washington Square
Scott Zucker, 220 West Washington Square
Jean Wolf, 2401 Spruce Street
Thomas P. Witt, Wolf, Block, Schorr and Solis-Cohen LLP
Steven Magnus, Smith & Wollensky Restaurant Group
Jay M. Haverson, Haverson Architecture & Design PC
David G. Benton, The Rittenhouse Hotel
Donald A. Reiff, Donald A. Reiff Architect
Joseph J. Winchester, The Sullivan Company

Robert Thomas, Chair called the meeting to order at 12:35 p.m.

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

Robert Powers, Applicant

DATE: 1902-1911

PROPOSAL: Cut masonry holes for work platform, masonry cleaning, patching

This proposal calls for masonry repair and cleaning of the Walnut Street façade of the Bellevue. Owing to projecting cornices, a hanging scaffold will not suffice. A work platform has instead been installed. It involved cutting out large masonry blocks and terra cotta so that the struts, which support the platform, can be anchored into the building. The holes will be patched with masonry patching material. Normally, dutchmen—replicated pieces of the existing masonry—would be used, however, it would take a while to replicate the stone and there are time constraints owing to the Republican National Convention.

Mr. Baron expressed his concern with regard to the patching; its failure over time would allow water to penetrate the metal and would thus be a detriment to the building's long term preservation.

The applicant noted that the mortar mix now being used will not match that which was used in a previous inappropriate repointing on the building. The Edison patching would be the same thickness as the terra cotta blocks, and masonry cleaning would be done in conjunction with the patching. The balcony, which has been braced and saved, and its decorative stonework will be restored. Terra cotta will be replaced in kind and other places will be replaced in cement. The railing will be saved and the front structural steel, still in its original configuration, will be rehabilitated.

The Committee requested that the owner and architects for the work on the Broad Street façade in the future leave enough time to manufacture true terra cotta dutchmen.

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval

1401 Arch Street, NW corner of Broad Street

David Grasso, Applicant

DATE: 1897, 1926

PROPOSAL: Signage and new entrance and stoop on Arch Street

The proposals call for window signage, the installation of a stone stoop, and cutting a new door into the eastern most bay of the building's Arch Street façade. The potential building tenant, McDonald's, has made a door on Arch Street a requirement of the lease. The ADA accessible entrance will use the existing Broad Street doors and lobby. The State Bureau for Historic Preservation and the National Park Service have both approved a Part Two Tax Act application for installing a ramp and opening at the Arch Street location.

Representatives in attendance for this project were Robert Powers, David Grasso, Scott Lang and Bob Cooney.

The sign as proposed would have been illuminated with a red background and have McDonald's logo outlined with point to point fiber optics animated with a sparkle effect. Each light would have an electronic pulsating effect. Flashing lights may be a zoning issue, so Mr. Baron suggested that the sign not pulsate. The applicant agreed to install the traditional McDonald's

logo without the pulsating effect. The applicant has avoided using any signage on the outside of the building.

The Bureau for Historic Preservation and the National Park Service had approved a Tax Act Application Part II that entails an ADA ramp on Arch Street. They approved this change because the Arch Street windows are not original. The present proposal differs from this. Now the owner now intends to comply with the requirements of ADA by using the Broad Street entrance with a lift inside the building. To provide access to McDonald's the applicant seeks to introduce a door in the easternmost Arch Street bay which lacks original windows with steps installed so as not to damage the granite base of the building and with a brass railing. This will intrude significantly less on the building than the approved Tax Act plan.

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with staff to review details, and on the condition that if another stair is introduced at the west end, it must be symmetrical with the existing stair, and if doors are replaced within ten years they must go in the same openings.

8000 St Martins Lane, St Martin in the Fields Church

Philip Scott, Architect

DATE: 1888-1889

PROPOSAL: New stair, louvers and windows

The proposal involves installing new windows in several blocked openings which historically had led into an open porte-cochere, vents in two basement openings, and excavating a new areaway for a stair to the undercroft of the church.

Kim Kopple and Philip Scott gave a presentation for this project which contains the following three parts:

1. Windows that now have stone infill will be replaced with Gothic windows;
2. A new areaway to the stair to the lower level will provide a fire exit, and
3. Install louvers in basement openings.

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with staff to review details and louvers to be dark in color.

328 and 330 Delancey Street

329 Pine Street

Christopher Scalone, Architect

DATE: c. 1950

PROPOSAL: Conceptual review to demolish 328 and 330 Delancey Street; build a new house on site

The proposal calls for demolishing two houses with 1950s facades on Delancey Street and constructing a new house on the site of these buildings as well as on the lot at the rear of 329 Pine Street.

The new house would have a single car opening for a garage, as does the present house.

This proposal involves the demolition of two 20th century contributing buildings to the Society Hill district. Contributing buildings range from buildings dating back to the early 19th century to very recent buildings constructed as part of the Redevelopment Authority activity. The staff suggested that the new construction would be an improvement on the existing buildings which

appear to be neither early nor part of the redevelopment. They suggested that these buildings be sent back to the Designation Committee for possible reassessment as non-contributing buildings.

Mr. Tyler also stated that the new building would be an improvement for the neighborhood but thought that the existing buildings should not be reclassified. He said that modern buildings should not be treated differently from an historical point of view, and that perhaps the buildings could be considered for demolition under § 7(k) of the ordinance. The Ordinance states that no permit be issued for demolition of a historic building or one that contributes to the character of the district unless the Commission finds public interest or hardship. It also states that in making a consideration for demolition, the Commission should consider the following:

1. The purposes of the Ordinance, i.e. Preservation;
2. The historical, architectural or aesthetic significance of the building;
3. Effect of the proposed work;
4. Compatibility of the proposed work with the character of the historic district, including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings and the streetscape, and
5. Design of proposed work.

Mr. Baron suggested that the demolition proposal be put before the full Commission for discussion.

Mr. Thomas suggested that the Committee not comment on the demolition but rather on the new construction.

Rebecca Stoloff, co-chair of the Society Hill Civic Association, was present to voice her opposition to the demolition of said property.

(Correction) Rebecca Stoloff, co-chair of the Society Hill Association, was not opposed to the demolition. Her understanding that these properties fell through the cracks in the decision to include modern buildings in Society Hill District. They as well as houses to the west should have been rehabilitated under the urban renewal plan of that time.

Ms. Lenore Millhollen of the Preservation Alliance asked about 329 Pine Street. The architect responded that it will be renovated and the façade restored.

Ms. Ellen Miller, a neighbor, showed photographs of Delancey Street. She said that a three-lot house is too large in this row of single lot houses. Jonathan Miller, resident of Cypress Street, spoke in opposition, owing to the incompatibility of the scale of the building and windows with the design and rhythm of the area. Ms. Tanya Rourke of 324 Delancey Street also stated that the scale and height was too massive. Ms. Dana Hall of 322 Delancey Street expressed concerns as well.

The architect stated that they are open for suggestions, and are willing to meet and work with the residents to come up with a plan that is agreeable to all parties involved, noting that the alley between the properties will be retained. The architect showed how the façade is broken up into three elements: open space, a two-story piece with a deck on top, and a 60 feet high dwelling with a generic cornice.

Architectural Committee Recommendation: The Commission to give guidance for demolition for the two contributing buildings. If the demolition is approved in concept, the Committee

recommended conceptual approval for the erection of a building on the site but modified to address concerns about the perceived width of the building.

510 Walnut Street, SW corner of 5th Street

Dominic Aspite, Applicant

DATE: c. 1839

PROPOSAL: Construct playground and cut new gate in fence

The proposal calls for installing a playground in a small portion of the grass lot next to and behind the building at 510 Walnut Street. The work includes installing a gate in the existing fence and installing play equipment.

Mr. Dominic Aspite and Bob Flagg were present to respond to questions concerning the proposal.

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval

700 South Washington Square aka 232-234 South 7th Street, SW corner 7th Street

David Amburn, Architect

DATE: c. 1818-23

PROPOSAL: Elevator addition

The proposal involves adding an elevator to the rear of the house. While it is not the main façade of the house, the rear features an elaborate iron porch. The elevator would rise up through the porch. The entry from the elevator back into the main house calls for cutting into the brick façade at the third floor.

Mr. David Amburn, the architect for the project, was present to respond to questions concerning the proposal.

Owing to the importance of the house and its character-defining rear façade, the Committee thought that cutting through the brick wall to install the elevator would mean the loss of too much historic fabric. Existing windows would have to be cut and filled in, altering the symmetry of the building. It was asked if there was any other place to put the elevator. The architect stated that this is the least intrusive place in terms of preservation of the interior space. The Committee members asked the architect to return next month with floor plans to determine whether there are other options for the location of a lift or elevator.

The Architectural Committee recommended that the application is incomplete owing to the need for more information and a review of the floor plans. No vote was taken.

334 Delancey Street, SE corner of 4th Street

Alexandra Suplina, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1920

PROPOSAL: Modify storefront, add roof deck and access

The applicant seeks to add a roof deck and new access stair onto this corner house. Because the house sits across from the Three Bears Park and the garden of the Hill-Physick-Keith House, the public will see the roof deck from several locations. The applicant also wishes to make the first floor more residential in appearance by inserting paired windows in the plate glass shop fronts and altering the type of door.

Alexandra Suplina, the owner, and Mark Fishback, the architect, were present for the meeting.

The site line study shows that there will be visibility. The roof has a sunken area which would help hide the roof deck. The staff recommended pulling the deck to the east end to minimize visibility. The adjacent house has a roof deck which would serve as a screen for this deck. There are two large storefront windows which the applicant seeks to split to match the transoms and install muntins to create a more residential look. The applicant proposes a two panel wood door.

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with staff to review the following details;

1. *Wood casement windows without muntins;*
2. *Two panel door, and*
3. *Roof deck pulled back to east end.*

410 South Front Street, through to South 2nd Street

Jonathan Weiss, Applicant

DATE: c. 1973

PROPOSAL: Conceptual review for 10-story brick hotel

The demolition of the non-contributing “Glass Box” of New Market on this site will be approved pursuant to § 7.4.a of the Rules and Regulations. The applicant seeks to build a T-shaped structure featuring a brick 10-story block along Front Street and a 4-story stuccoed pavilion that extends west toward 2nd street. A covered portico flanked by trees provides an entrance from 2nd street.

Jonathon Weiss, Roger Zampell, and K.K. Wang were in attendance to discuss the proposal.

Mr. Zampell presented renderings of the Second Street side. The 2nd Street façade of the rear ell would be brick. The question was raised about the chimney of the historic house next door, and a comment made that the visibility of air conditioners be minimized as much as possible.

It was recommended that red brick be used to fit with the Society Hill streetscape. The building’s appropriateness fits in scale, solid and void, and streetscape.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept.

216-220 West Washington Square, NW corner Locust Street

Christian Busch, Architect

DATE: 1911

PROPOSAL: Roof enclosure for elevator, masonry and window repair

This proposal involves a roof enclosure and window and masonry repair, and entails a small alteration to the west façade. A new elevator penthouse would be installed in the notch of the northwest corner to match the existing elevator penthouse in brick.

Mr. Carl Zucker and Mr. Christian Busch were present to answer any questions at this time.

Mr. Baron expressed his concern about the masonry coating on the terra cotta, which is often avoided because of the breathability issue.

The architect explained that the terra cotta was damaged, owing to a failed roof, and that it is uncertain whether a coating will be needed at this time. The purpose of the coating would be to unify and repair missing and fractured pieces of terra cotta.

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of elevator penthouse, masonry and window repair but not masonry coating until the architect has submitted further information.

216-220 West Washington Square, NW corner Locust Street

Christian Busch, Architect

DATE: 1911

PROPOSAL: Conceptual review for two-story penthouse addition

The proposal calls for conceptual review of a two-story penthouse addition to the Colonial Revival building on Washington Square. Although the plans call for a setback of ten feet from the south and east street edges of the building, the addition would have visibility from the Square and Locust Street.

Mr. Baron explained the staff position that the most important aspect of the new design is its compatibility with the building in spatial characteristics and scale. He said such a building is often compared to a column with a base, a shaft and the cornice as the capital or top of the building. To build above that changes the spatial meanings of the building and violates Standards 9 of *The Secretary of the Interior Standards*. In looking at the building as a whole, an addition one-third as high as the existing building would change the character of the building. The possibility of a one-story addition with a setback was suggested.

Mr. Busch noted that the building's historic fabric would not be changed. The applicants are willing to negotiate the overall height of the addition. It was suggested that the setback be in agreement with the configuration and layout of the building below.

Mr. Allan Domb and Michael Di Paolo spoke on behalf of this project.

This project was compared to the McIlhenny House review, and it was stated that the roof deck was denied for that house, and put on the new building. Mr. Thomas stated that on a four-story mansard roof Victorian house there has never been anything above the cornice except the possibility of cresting. He thought that the Washington Square building has more flexibility to add a rooftop addition without damage to the character of the building.

Mr. Busch explained the proposed design. It offers a nod to the original building by extending its vertical lines up into the proposed addition and by maintaining the symmetry of the fenestration. It would be executed in lightweight materials rather than in load bearing masonry or a steel frame. The color of the proposed cladding would be decided later.

Much discussion ensued about the overall height and setback. A wedding cake look was discussed but thought inappropriate.

Mr. Baron and members of the public expressed a concern about the precedent that could later apply to other buildings on the Square, such as Lea & Febinger or the Athenaeum. The Committee members suggested that each building be reviewed separately on its own merits, and that this rooftop addition does not set a precedent.

The Committee recommended that the applicant revise the design to include a set back of 20 feet with greater symmetry and submit revised drawings for the Commission meeting.

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Conceptual approval of a penthouse addition with a height not to exceed 21 feet above the cornice with a 20 foot setback on the Washington Square façade and 10 feet on the Locust Street façade, no set back on the west or north facades, and the structure to have greater symmetry.

216-220 West Washington Square, NW corner Locust Street

Ivano D'Angella, Applicant

DATE: 1911

PROPOSAL: Ramp, new door west façade

This application calls for a handicap accessibility ramp and new door on the unadorned west façade of the building facing the parking lot.

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval

237-45 South 18th Street, NE corner of Rittenhouse Square Street, The Barclay

Barclay Condominium Owners Association/ Owner

Christian Busch, Architect

DATE: 1928

PROPOSAL: Cut two new entrances on front façade

The developer of the Barclay hopes to rent the two spaces flanking the lobby to create a restaurant and ballroom. The condominium tenants of the building do not wish to have their lobby used as the entrance to these commercial spaces. The application shows alternate designs for cutting two windows down to create doors for the new uses.

The stone to be removed is unadorned. The Committee thought that installing doors which mimic the historic central doors would be inappropriate. Therefore it recommended option 3 which shows simple doors.

Mr. Baron noted that wood doors painted a putty color would be preferable to match the base of the building, which is gray. Committee members expressed concern that the wood might not hold up. Bronze would characterize it as a special opening and link it to the main door and to provide harmony with the one-over-one large glass windows.

Mr. Busch stated that the front door of the main entrance could be restored and reconfigured by re-installing the jams, glasswork and latticework. The end doors should be plain bronze in order to hold up under heavy traffic. The Committee members thought the restoration of the main entrance would give something back to make up for the historic stonework to be removed.

Ms. Lenore Millhollen spoke on behalf of the Center City Residents Association that is in favor of the restoration, but expressed concern about the amount of signage forthcoming and the canopies which were previously approved.

Mr. Baron raised the issue of ductwork and it was decided that if fans are proposed for kitchen exhausts, the louvers should be made flush on the rear facade.

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of two entrances with plain bronze doors, conditional upon the restoration of main entrance doors. Signage and any canopies including that one previously approved should be reviewed together as a package.

2401 Spruce Street, NW corner of 24th Street

Jean Wolf, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Windows, door, replace deck rail

The proposal involves installing new six-over-six windows, a four-panel door, and a new deck railing.

The roofline of the building suggests that the building is older than others near it. In the front façade, both the brick wall and the windows have been replaced.

The applicant wishes to install a picket railing on the deck and six-over-six wood windows.

The Committee recommended a six-panel door instead of a four-panel door.

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of six-over-six windows, six- panel door and picket railing for deck.

2014 Chancellor Street

Arlene Matzkin, Architect

DATE: c. 1885

PROPOSAL: Façade alterations, rooftop HVAC

The proposal calls for installing new wood two-over-two windows, new double leaf carriage doors, and a rooftop HVAC unit.

The proposed doors are not historic owing to the glazing of the upper panels; however, they are compatible with this building.

The Committee recommended that the HVAC unit be installed on the rear slope, and have staff review the stone patching material and other details.

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of two-over-two windows, new double leaf carriage door, and HVAC unit to be installed on the rear slope with staff to review stone patching and other details.

210 West Rittenhouse Square Street, Smith & Wollensky Restaurant

Thomas Witt, Esq., Applicant

DATE: c. 1985

PROPOSAL: New door, porch, railings, louvers and decorative panels

The proposal includes the installation of a restaurant in the base of the non-contributing Rittenhouse Hotel. The design calls for removing a simple glass and steel bay window, and inserting a turnstyle and swinging door with small glass lights, as well as a framework of wood paneling. A new brick platform would form a porch leading to the entrance with new stairs and a ramp all with new brass, iron and wood railings. A framework of green and white panels and

green decorative bands would help identify the new restaurant. A new exhaust vent would also cut through the soffit of the porch.

In attendance to respond to questions for the proposal were David G. Benton, Donald Reiff, Steven Magnus, Thomas Witt, Joseph Winchester and Jay Haverson

The proposal to give the restaurant its own entrance off the square would help to make it more viable. A bay window would be cut for the entrance and because the floor level is higher, a platform or porch would be built within the area, which would entail changing the stairs and railing.

The porch would be built out of red brick and a door with small panes of glass installed. The applicants have an antique wood revolving door shipped from England with brass on the bottom. The granite on the sides of the bay would be covered over with wood panels and some muntins to create symmetry and the framework of wood would be painted green and white around the whole thing to give it an entry character. A series of panels green and white would be installed across the length. The awnings would be green and white. Staff thought the doorway fine but that the design and pallet of material should be more in keeping with the character of the building and location.

The entrance will be set back, the canopies extended beyond the columns but not beyond the overhang, and the raised area would have a planter and railing. Brick will only be used on the horizontal surface of the porch and would not be seen in front. The rest of the material would be the same granite common to the rest of the building. The stair and ramp would match the existing building materials.

The Committee suggested staying behind the columns so that the contrasting design would not stand in such contrast to the building as a whole.

The Committee believed that the proposal would allow for a balance between the existing building and the Smith & Wollensky look of the 18th Street entrance.

The exhaust vent for the purpose of ventilating the bar area would be made flush with the soffit of the porch and would not project past the overhang. Drawings with notes will be needed to reflect the vent in ceiling.

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval new door, porch, railings, decorative panels and staff to review the color of the louver.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Diane M. Hughes