

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Commission Offices, Room 578, City Hall
25 November 2003**

Present

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

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jeffrey Barr, Historic Preservation Planner
Jonathan Farnham, Historic Preservation Planner
Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Also

Douglas Grainge, AIA, 558 Judson Street
Ralph Clapp, owner, 2049 Brandywine Street
Matthew Wilcox, 1503 Green Street
Joseph Pagano, 2236 Mt. Vernon Street
George Acevedo, 1601 Mt. Vernon Street
Joseph DiMauro, 1530 North Street
Paul McIntyre, Miller Carlfield Restoration
Sheth Jones, Capital Programs Office
Bill Conley, Burn ENG, Incorporated
Jeff Diromaldo, Marianna Thomas Architects
Marianna Thomas, Marianna Thomas Architects
Chris Ames, Kroll
Frederick Robinson
Marc Morfei, Center City District
Bob Keppel, Center City District
Al Borden, The Lighting Practice
Michael Martella, Center City District
Matt Johnson, Center City District
Alex Smith, Penn Law
Marvin Gerstein, Temple University
Robert Buckholz, Temple University
Joseph Beller, Esq., 4163 Main Street
Hyman Myers, Vitetta Group, Temple University
David Amburn, Amburn/Jarosinski Architects, 125 Queen Street
Jim Hanson, Vitetta Group, Temple University
Louis Acciavatti, 1723 Porter Street
Theresa Criniti, 1713 Porter Street
Cynthia Philo, Old City District
Peter Rothberg, Old City Development Committee
Martin Fischer, Old City Civic Association
Joe Schiavo, Old City Civic Association
Bob Berma, Old City Civic Association
Rebecca Stoloff, Society Hill Civic Association

Bernice Hamel, Society Hill Civic Association
 Hal Banker, Novanni Group, Incorporated
 Suzanna Barucco, 1:1:6 Technologies, Incorporated
 Elaine Ulmer, Martin Rosenblum Architects

Vincent Rivera, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m.

558 Judson Street

John Dogum, Owner

J. Douglas Grainge, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1861

PROPOSAL: Widen front door, remove pent eve, install transom

Mr. Baron presented this application, which calls for legalization of part of the work that was done with the removal of a pent eave and the widening of a masonry doorway. The applicant proposes to close down the masonry opening to nearly its original dimension, install a transom and new door frame, and a door that is still wider and taller than the original.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the removal of the pent eave and installation of a door frame, transom, and door (a six-panel door is acceptable) sized to match other originals on the block, pursuant to Standard 6.

Douglas Grainge, the architect, attended the meeting and noted that the proposed door is one inch wider and two inches taller than the original door.

Mr. McCoubrey thought that a simple molding around the proposed door more appropriate and the other members concurred.

Mr. Grainge agreed to the Committees suggestions.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the removal of the pent eave and the installation of a transom, and the proposed door replacement, with the staff to review details pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and where possible material].

2049 Brandywine Street

Ralph Clapp, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Roof deck on main roof, new skylight

Mr. Baron explained this proposal, which involves adding a large skylight and roof deck on the front portion or main block of the house. The staff has approved a façade restoration and a roof deck on the rear ell of the house.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the skylight if a mock up proves not visible; denial of the deck pursuant to Standard 9.

Ralph Clapp, the owner, attended the meeting and said that the proposed skylight would give the area a less confined aura, since it has a low ceiling.

Ms. Pentz inquired if the skylight would have visibility, for a determination, she thought that the applicant should provide a mock-up. Mr. McCoubrey suggested a lower profile for the skylight or the raising of the ceiling. Mr. Clapp responded that snow would accumulate if a slope did not exist. Ms. Pentz questioned the visibility of the roof deck. Mr. Rivera remarked that the Committee should remain consistent in its denial of decks on the main roof. Mr. Clapp argued that the deck will not have visibility and therefore it should be allowed.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the skylight, subject to a determination of visibility, but denial of the roof deck pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]

1503 Green Street

PJR Realty, Incorporated, Owner
Matthew Wilcox, Applicant
DATE: 1859
PROPOSAL: Extend rear deck

Mr. Baron presented this proposal, which involves extending a visible rear deck at the back of the building ten feet.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

Bonnie DosSantos, the owner, and Matthew Wilcox attended the meeting. Mr. Wilcox disclosed that the existing deck is 5 feet and the extension would render the deck 10 feet.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that the fascia board beneath the deck should be thin and unintrusive. The other Committee members concurred.

Mr. Wilcox agreed to the Committee's suggestion.

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

1601 Mt. Vernon Street

Miguel Santiago, Owner
George Acevedo, Applicant
DATE: c. 1859, Home of Robert Purvis from 1875 until 1898, a writer and spokesperson for abolition.
PROPOSAL: Façade rehabilitation, demolish rear building, new 3-story rear addition

This proposal was seen several Committee meetings ago, but withdrawn before it reached the Commission. The project involves rehabilitating the vacant structure, demolishing a single story rear addition and constructing a new three-story rear addition with a three-car garage. The applicant wishes to retain the existing commercial front and add a frame and cornice to the window. The applicant will replace windows and add several new windows, rebuild the cornice and restore the brick side façade. Several porches open and one closed will be added on the side and rear of the building.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

The staff asserts that, given the significance of the property and the evidence on the façade, the residential first floor should be restored. The Committee also voted last time not to approve the three-car garage. The staff would find the demolition of the rear and the construction of a new addition acceptable as a trade off if the applicant restores the residential front façades. The staff also would prefer to determine the design of the windows of the side stairhall after the removal of the stucco. The side windows should be 6 over 6 as shown except for the very small windows.

George Acevedo, the applicant, attended the meeting. In response to Ms. Pentz's query about the penetration of the rear wall, Mr. Acevedo said that the new addition would abut the rear wall. He also said that the proposed garage would follow the footprint of the existing garage.

Mr. Baron commented that the one story rear storefront with a pressed tin cornice dates to about 1905 and he believes that allowing the demolition of this historic piece represents a compromise. He thought that in exchange the front façade should be restored back to the residential look of Mr. Purvis's time. He also noted that with regards to this project, there have been a lot of compromises.

Mr. Acevedo said that much of the historic fabric has been lost, since the building has been extensively altered and the first floor front room has been lowered. He did say however that the floor joists are in poor condition and will have to be replaced.

Ms. Pentz and Mr. McCoubrey thought that the applicant should explore the cost of a restoration since the floor will be rebuilt and the cost of the new storefront will not be minor. Mr. Rivera offered his preference for returning the first floor back to residential. Mr. Acevedo disclosed that the cost of a marble surround for the door would be \$6,000.00. Mr. Baron suggested cast stone. Ms. Pentz thought that the design of the side windows should be resolved after the removal of the stucco. Mr. McCoubrey thought that the enclosure for the stair on the rear addition should have a flat roof instead of the proposed shingles. Committee members thought that two-over-two windows are more appropriate for the very small windows on the side facade. They also discussed the importance of having the neighboring house, which is apparently owned by the community organization stabilized owing to its severely deteriorated condition.

Mr. Acevedo was in agreement with the Committee's suggestions except for the restoration of the front façade at the first floor.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with revisions to the designs for the rear roof and side windows, with the staff to review details.

2236 Mt. Vernon Street

Joseph Pagano, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c.1859

PROPOSAL: Replacement windows with applied muntins, enlarge balconette

This proposal involves installing new wood windows with applied muntins without spacer bars and narrow muntin bars of 7/8 inch. The proposal also calls for extending the second floor balconies and adding flower boxes.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the window boxes and balconies and lighting the gas lamp pursuant to Standard 9. Denial of the windows as proposed. The windows should be true-divided-light with 1-¼" wide muntins, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal and commented that he believes that the new work should be done correctly.

Joseph Pagano, the owner, asserted that some of the windows were changed prior to designation of the District, but the 1st and 3rd floors were not done. He proposes to replace these floors to match the existing. Mr. Pagano believes the difference in the proposed windows and the correct windows are minimal.

Mr. McCoubrey said that the issue is the width of the muntin and Committee members agreed that the replacement windows should be true-divided light.

Mr. Pagano presented the Committee members drawings with alternate drawings for true-divided light windows, but with a 1-5/8" muntin. Committee members thought that a 1-5/8" muntin was too wide. Mr. McCoubrey said that a correct profile with true-divided light would be the Committee's recommendation. The Committee suggested that the applicant work with the staff for the correct window.

The Architectural Committee recommended true-divided light windows with the 1-1/4" wide muntin.

1524 North Street

Joseph DiMauro, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1875

PROPOSAL: Demolish and rebuild 3-story building

This application calls for demolishing the structure and rebuilding a new structure to match the old reusing the cornice. The rears, which have minor visibility from Wallace Street, would be rebuilt at three stories with a T-111 pressed wood grain siding. The applicant has submitted an engineer's preliminary report, which says that "the front façade and party walls can be repaired and restored for continued use." The drawings show an incorrect door design and give no window details.

Staff recommendation: Denial as proposed, but approval if the façade is retained and restored subject to the review of windows, door and other mill work by staff and the use of stucco or horizontal wood siding rather than T-111 on the rear façade, pursuant to Standard 6.

Joseph DiMauro, the owner, attended the meeting and explained that the collapse of the neighboring building necessitated the demolition of the rear. He said that the proposed addition would raise the rear and additional two stories with visibility from Wallace Street.

The Committee thought it important that the front façade be retained and that the addition be faced with stucco instead of the T-111. Mr. DiMauro agreed to the Committees suggestions.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, subject to the retention of the front façade and the stuccoing of the addition, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and where possible materials.]; with staff to review details.

1711 Spring Garden Street

George Kaoulas, Owner

Paul McIntyre, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1878 by Charles W. Budd, carpenter/builder; garage, c. 1940

PROPOSAL: Rebuild collapsed garage

Mr. Spina explained that during the construction of the carriage house for the Electrical Workers Union next door, the garage at the rear of this property collapsed. The proposal calls for rebuilding the garage with a brick-faced front and painted CMU sides. A wood gate will close off the alley on the western side.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Paul McIntyre attended the meeting to explain the proposal and answer any questions. He said that the replacement garage doors would have panels and that the door on the side would match the garage doors.

The Committee agreed that the proposed garage is an improvement.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

2000 Spring Garden Street

Robert Ingram and Josh Markel, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1970

PROPOSAL: New windows, doors, awnings, railings and lights

Ms. Spina explained that the owners have purchased this non-contributing building for apartments and the offices for their custom-made furniture company, and propose several alterations. First, the first floor windows would be expanded and all windows would be replaced with vinyl one-over-one windows. Second, all three entrances would be altered with new metal doors, curved metal railings, and frosted glass and metal canopies. Last, the owners will use the rear door as the main door to their offices and want to install a panel that relates to the building the same way the stone does at the 20th Street entrance. The proposed area will have cut-outs of furniture to reflect their products. Although this is a non-contributing building, its contemporary design is relatively uncompromised.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of railings and cut-outs above the rear entrance, pursuant to Standard 9 and Standard 10. Approval of expanding the first floor windows, but they should match the 2nd floor in configuration and window type. Denial of the vinyl windows and denial of the replacement doors, pursuant to Standard 6. The new doors should match the original door found in the 20th Street entrance. Denial of the proposed awnings, pursuant to Standard 9.

Robert Ingram, the owner, said that it is his desire to create uniform entrances for all three facades. He noted that the proposed cut-outs of furniture would be installed within the mortar joints.

The Committee thought that the door on the 20th Street façade should be retained and the other two doors should be changed to ones with diamond-shaped windows to match. The Committee agreed that the 1st floor windows could be expanded, but that all the windows be changed to aluminum sliders. Some Committee members thought that the proposed glass awnings should have a straight edge and that the glass should be widened. Mr. McCoubrey believed that the awnings should be simplified. Mr. Ingram agreed to the changes.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of expanding the 1st floor windows and aluminum sliding windows in all openings, the proposed railings, cut-outs of furniture installed within the mortar

joints over the rear door, replacement doors to match door on the 20th Street façade with diamond-shaped windows, glass awnings with widened glass sections and straight edges, and frosted exterior light fixtures, all with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

City Hall, Broad and Market Streets

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Sheth Jones, Applicant

DATE: 1871-1901, John McArthur, architect

PROPOSAL: New windows with louvers on south side

Ms. Spina presented this application, which calls for installing louvers in windows on the south side to accommodate a central air-conditioning system for the Records Department. Presently the segmentally-arched openings have a double casement with a single-light transom. The proposed louvers will be installed in the transoms of two windows just west of the South Portal on the first floor and in one window in the basement area. The first floor windows are highly visible. Ms. Spina noted that the windows are drawn incorrectly on the plans.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the 1st floor louvers and approval of the basement louver, pursuant to Standard 9. The applicant should explore other options, including having all of the vents in the basement area.

Bill Conley and Sheth Jones, Capital Programs Office, attended the meeting. Mr. Jones noted that the office requiring the louvers is situated in a location that is not readily accessible to the courtyard. To run the ducts so that the louvers are in the courtyard would be very costly. Mr. Conley noted that the basement area is only 15 feet wide. The louvers handle both air-intake and exhaust, so they must be apart from each other so the exhaust does not pollute the quality of the air-intake. Therefore, they cannot locate all three louvers in the basement area. Mr. Conley said that when the 6th floor was renovated, the air intake was accomplished from the courtyard.

Mr. McCoubrey thought that a fundamental plan for louvers in the entire building should be presented. Mr. Rivera commented that the proposed louvers should be within the original frame. Committee members agreed that the glazing should be removed and the louver set-in behind the original frame. Mr. McCoubrey remarked that more information should be submitted on other options. Committee members also thought that the Capital Programs Office should consider an overall plan for HVAC for City Hall.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the basement louver, but denial of the 1st floor, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

City Hall, Broad and Market Streets

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Marianna Thomas, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1871-1901, John McArthur, architect

PROPOSAL: Security gates, signage, lighting and cameras

Ms. Spina presented this multifaceted proposal, which is for enhanced security throughout City Hall. Once these measures are in place, only City employees with proper identification may enter the building using any entrance. All visitors will have to use the Northeast Pavilion and pass through security to enter. Security cameras, keyless entry systems and signage must be installed at each of the 22 doors into the building. The handicap entrance to City Hall is in the East Portal. Frederick Robinson, Chris Ames, Jeff Diromaldo and Marianna Thomas, the architect, attended the meeting.

Lighting

The lights around Dilworth Plaza do not provide enough illumination. The proposal calls for installing new sconces that have the same globes as the derivative Paul Cret-designed lighting used throughout Center City. The Modern light standards around the apron of City Hall will be replaced with modified Cobra lights that will provide a larger band of illumination. The lights in the courtyard will be replaced with replicas.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the lights in Dilworth Plaza, pursuant to Standard 3. The plaza was designed in the 1960s and the fixtures should reflect that period. Approval of the other lighting designs, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Tyler thought that the level of illumination in the Dilworth Plaza should be increased. Mr. Levy opined that the City Hall lighting project should be incorporated with this project. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the lights should be consistent with those currently in Dilworth Plaza as opposed to the other lights around City Hall.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the lights in Dilworth Plaza, pursuant to Standard 3, but approval of the other lighting designs, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Cameras

Security cameras will be placed at all entrances and in various interior spaces throughout the building. Some will be mounted on light poles in the courtyard using armatures, as recently proposed and approved for the Philadelphia Museum of Art. The cameras will have plastic housing and bubble caps.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the cameras, subject to the bases being painted to match the background materials, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. McCoubrey thought that the cameras should be consistent with the cameras installed at the Art Museum.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the cameras, subject to the bases being painted to match the background materials, pursuant to Standard 9.

Keyless Entry

Boxes that measure approximately 4' x 4" x 2-1/8" will be placed at each door to house the electronic system to read the cards for employees. Some of these will be placed rather far from the doors themselves, owing to the depth of the doors in the thick masonry walls. Emergency release pads must be installed on the inside of the entrances to allow for egress. The handicap entrances are in the central Portals. Presently the doors in the Portals have central swinging doors flanked by wide sidelights. Like

the other doors in the building, these will be changed to keyless entry. For handicap visitor access, there will be an intercom system installed in the East Portal and a security guard will go to that entrance to assist the visitor.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, subject to the boxes moving closer to the doors where possible, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

The Committee concurred that the boxes should be moved closer to the doors.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, subject to the boxes moving closer to the doors where possible, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Signage

All signage will have grey backgrounds and white lettering. At each entrance there will be signs giving a map of City Hall and directing visitors to the appropriate entrance. It will have two aluminum posts. On each floor as visitors exit the elevator lobbies, there will be a large floor map and directory for every city office. These will measure 3'4" wide and 5'8" tall (the scale of the enclosed drawings is incorrect).

Staff Recommendation: Approval, subject to the applicant re-evaluating the color scheme, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. One staff member thought the color scheme should be blue and yellow (the City's colors) like the existing exterior signage.

The Committee approved of the proposed signage.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Security Desk at Northeast Corner

The final pieces of the application include the installation of a security counter and turnstiles in the Northeast Pavilion for visitor access. The security counter will have wood paneling and polished granite counters.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

The Committee agreed with the staff.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Philadelphia Museum of Art

City of Philadelphia, Owner

222 North 20th Street, Franklin Institute

Franklin Institute, Owner

1801 Vine Street, Family Court Building

City of Philadelphia, Owner

1901 Vine Street, Free Library of Philadelphia

City of Philadelphia, Owner

209-25 North 18th Street, Cathedral of Saints Peter and Paul

Archdiocese of Philadelphia, Owner

Center City District, Applicant

DATE: Phila. Museum of Art: 1919-28, Horace Trumbauer, Clarence Zantzinger, Charles Borie

Franklin Institute: 1932, John T. Windrim

Free Library: 1912-27, Horace Trumbauer

Family Court: 1938-40, John T. Windrim

Cathedral of SS. Peter & Paul: 1846-64, John Notman, John Mahoney, Napoleon LeBrun

PROPOSAL: Lighting

This multi-faceted proposal calls for new lighting for five buildings along the Benjamin Franklin Parkway. Marc Morfei of the Center City District, Robert Keppel, Michael Martelli and Al Borden attended the meeting.

Cathedral of Saints Peter & Paul:

Eight fixtures will be mounted on the roof to highlight the central dome. The plans do not include any attachment details. Seven fixtures will be mounted on posts across 18th Street in the Sister Cities Park and highlight the front façade. Fixtures will also highlight the doorways.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the post-mounted fixtures only. Denial of the other fixtures, owing to lack of information.

Mr. Borden explained that the doorways presently have non-historic valances that have light that no longer work. The spotlights in the valances would be removed and new junction boxes installed with closure plates on the bottom. The new light fixtures would be installed behind the valances, hidden from view. The statues in the niches would be lit from across the street and the dome would be lit with floodlights mounted on the roof. It is the intention to keep the conduit on the roof surface. The attachment of the floodlights would not penetrate the roof.

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

Franklin Institute:

Thirteen fixtures will be mounted in the limestone along the flanking arcades of the building along 20th Street. In the porticos on 20th Street and on Winter Street, the application calls for mounting five recessed fixtures in the coffered ceiling. This requires the removal of the glass panels. Fixtures will stand on two poles across 20th Street.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of fixtures on poles across street. Denial of fixtures attached to front of building and denial of fixtures in coffered ceilings, pursuant to Standard 2.

Mr. Borden explained that the existing lights in the coffers are out of date. He said that there is a brass frame with a piece of glass and that the fixture would replace the glass. The process is reversible and the glass would be stored. The lights to highlight the window openings would be mounted in the joints and painted to match the stone. Mr. Borden also explained that the conduits would be concealed on the ledge

below. Mr. McCoubrey said that the junction boxes should run out of the basement windows.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval on the condition that the glass from the coffers is stored on site, with the staff to review details.

Free Library:

Twelve fixtures will sit in the recessed arcade behind the columns to light the arcade. Six fixtures with armatures will be attached to the limestone to highlight the façade along Vine Street. Twelve fixtures tucked into the bushes along 19th and 20th Streets will highlight the side façades. Fixtures mounted on four existing poles across Vine Street will highlight the front façade.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of fixtures in arcade, those in bushes and those mounted on poles along Vine Street. Denial of fixtures attached to front of building, pursuant to Standard 2.

Committee members emphasized that the lighting effect should not be achieved at the expense of the historic fabric. They recommended that the four exterior lighting fixtures be installed within the mortar joints. If they cannot be accomplished within the joints, then the proposal would have to be reviewed by the Committee again.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, provided that the lighting attached to the front of the building occurs within the mortar joints, with staff to review details.

Family Court:

Twelve fixtures will sit in the recessed arcade behind the columns to light the arcade. Four fixtures with armatures will be attached to the limestone to highlight the façade along Vine Street. Twelve fixtures tucked into the bushes along 18th and 19th Streets will highlight the side façades. Fixtures mounted on new existing poles across Vine Street will highlight the front façade.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of fixtures in arcade, those in bushes and those mounted on poles along Vine Street. Denial of fixtures attached to front of building, pursuant to Standard 2.

Committee members thought it important aesthetically to achieve a lighting effect that would create a disturbance to the historical fabric. They recommended that the lighting be vertical and be installed within the mortar joints. If it cannot be accomplished within the joints, then the proposal would have to be reviewed by the Committee again.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, provided that the lighting attached to the front of the building occurs within the mortar joints, with staff to review details.

Philadelphia Museum of Art:

In each portico, four recessed fixtures would sit in the coffered ceiling. Six fixtures mounted at ground level will highlight the end pavilions. Two, twelve-foot poles mounted in the corners of the end pavilions will carry five fixtures each to highlight the central portico.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of ground-level fixtures. Denial of pole-mounted fixtures and denial of fixtures in coffered ceilings, pursuant to Standard 2.

Mr. Borden said that lights exist in the colonnades and that panels had already been removed from some of the coffers for them. This application calls for creating new grates for those coffers that would replicate the historic grate design, but accommodate new light fixtures. The proposed lighting will provide a less dangerous situation for the museum staff when changing the lamps. The pole-mounted lights will replace the numerous fixtures that are attached to the building itself in the corners of the end pavilions. The height of the poles corresponds to the height of the current lights.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the application as proposed, with staff to review details, including the location of the light poles.

4163 Main Street

Michele David, Owner

Larry Persofsky, Applicant

DATE: c. 1865

PROPOSAL: Demolish and redesign front façade

Ms. Spina presented the application, which calls for removing the façade and installing a curved glass curtain wall. The owner now rents the building next door and is moving his business into this building.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9, 10 and the Manayunk Ordinance, Section 4.2-100 of the Philadelphia Code, “Special Controls in Designated Neighborhood Commercial Revitalization Areas” [*Original architectural features... shall not be removed.*]

Joseph Beller, Esq., attended the meeting to represent the owner. He said that the existing condition of the façade is not conducive for the proposed usage.

Committee members suggested that the applicant work with the staff to arrive at an appropriate design for the first floor storefront.

*The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.], Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.], Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.] and Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.] and the Manayunk Ordinance, Section 4.2-100 of the Philadelphia Code, “Special Controls in Designated Neighborhood Commercial Revitalization Areas” [*Original architectural features... shall not be removed.*]*

125 Queen Street

Michael and Mario Carosella, Owners

Albert Tantala, Applicant

PROPOSAL: New construction

Ms. Spina explained this proposal. The Committee and Commission had denied the owner’s application for complete demolition. The owner appealed to the Board of License & Inspection Review (BLIR), and the Commission’s decision was overturned. The Commission appealed to the Court of Common Pleas and the BLIR’s decision was affirmed. The owner demolished the building earlier this month, but the property remains listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The owner returns for approval of the new construction. The proposed new 3-story residence has a contemporary design. The front façade will have brick facing with cast-stone base and beltcourses and a standing-seam metal gable roof. Single-paned fixed and casement windows will be on all three floors and the front entrance will have a single-leaf, fully-glazed door. The rear façade will have stucco and two sets of double-leaf glazed doors on the first floor with fixed and casement windows on the upper floors. Two skylight will be on the roof and an insulated metal chimney flue will be the central detail of the rear façade.

Staff Recommendation: Staff split. Two staff members recommend approval of the contemporary design, pursuant to Standard 3. Three staff members recommend denial and believe the building should be reconstructed in its historic form using photographic documentation to guide the design, pursuant to Standard 6.

Michael Carosella, the owner, and David Amburn, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Carosella noted that the party wall would not be stuccoed. Mr. Amburn pointed out that the Queen Street has a mixed context.

Committee members discussed the proposal and concurred that there is no remaining historic fabric and that a contemporary design is appropriate. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the exposed block wall be stuccoed to prevent water infiltration.

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

1800-18 Park Mall aka Liacouras Walk

Temple University, Owner

Hyman Myers, Architect/Applicant

History: 1872, David A. Woelpper, builder

Project: In concept, demolition of buildings except facades, new construction behind facades

This application for approval in concept proposes the substantial demolition of most of the row of buildings at 1800-1818 Park Mall on the campus of Temple University. The rowhouses at 1800 to 1946 Park Mall were designated as the Park Avenue Historic District in 1990. The buildings at 1800 and 1804-1818 Park Mall are listed as “contributing” to the district; the building at 1802, the home of David A. Woelpper, the builder of the row, is listed as “significant.” In 1998 the Commission approved the demolition of 1820-1830 Park Mall.

This application proposes the demolition of most but not all of the buildings. The front or east facades including the mansards of all ten buildings as well as the side or south façade and rear or west façade of 1800 Park Mall would be saved. The remainder of the buildings would be demolished. A new 5-story building would be constructed within and behind the historic 4-story facades.

Section 14-2007 (7) (j) of the Philadelphia Code stipulates that no demolition permit shall be issued unless the Commission finds that the permit “is necessary in the public interest” or the building “cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.” This application advances neither a public interest nor a financial hardship argument; therefore it must be deemed incomplete.

Staff Recommendation: Denial because the application is incomplete.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Marvin Gerstein and Robert Buchholz of Temple University and Hyman Myers and Jim Hanson of Vitteta Architects represented the project. Mr. Myers addressed the Committee. He stated that the site is centrally located on the campus. The new building would house many facilities including a presidential reception area as well as medical, counseling, and tutoring spaces. They all need to be centrally located, he claimed. He also noted that the spaces must be ADA accessible; accessibility would be difficult to provide in the old buildings. He stated that the bays would be preserved at 1800 Park Mall and that the 5th story of the new construction would be set back 20 feet from the old facades. Following questions from the Committee, he confirmed that only 5 or 10 feet of the fronts of the buildings would be saved, not 20 feet, the size of the setback. He also remarked that the old facades would be stabilized before any demolition and that the existing non-historic double doorway on Park Mall would be preserved and reused.

Mr. Atkins inquired about the relation of the new façade to the old. He asked if it would be visible through the windows of the old facades. Mr. Tyler and Committee members noted that the Spruce Street project for Pennsylvania Hospital, which the Commission reviewed, confronted the same issues. All agreed that the hospital solution had not been successful. Mr. Tyler and others suggested that architects secure the required square footage by excavating at the basement level rather than adding a 5th story. Mr. Myers replied that an important steam line runs below the buildings, preventing the use of the basement level. Mr. Atkins noted that the York Row project recently approved by the Commission would suffer from the same problem that plagued the hospital building. Mr. Tyler agreed. Mr. Atkins suggested that Mr. Myers preserve the entirety of the front sections of the buildings, demolish the rear ends, and building a tall addition at the rear. Jim Hanson, an associate of Mr. Myers, explained that the demolition was necessary because the architectural program for the new building demanded a large floor plate.

Mr. Tyler explained that the proposed demolition is substantial. He asserted that the applicant must therefore comply with the Commission's ordinance and Rules & Regulations and make a case for the demolition on public interest or hardship grounds. He contended that no such case had been made in the application.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that he has great concerns about the proposal. He noted that this application proposes the demolition of 50% of the buildings still standing in the district. He then asserted that the application does not comply with the ordinance; he claimed that no evidence had been presented to support the application. He further asserted that the plans are not adequately developed, even for an application in concept. He also noted that the Commission never takes advantage of section 14-2007 (7) (h) of the Philadelphia Code, which states that after tabling an application for up to six months the Commission "shall consult with the owner, civic groups, public and private agencies, and interested parties to ascertain what may be done by the City or others to preserve the building." Mr. Gallery concluded with an assertion that the Committee on Financial Hardship should review the application.

Prompted by questions from the Committee, Mr. Tyler clarified the procedure, stating that the Committee could recommend to the Commission that the matter be referred to the Committee on Financial Hardship. He also cautioned that the Committee should not address the architectural details of an application predicated on hardship before the Committee on Financial Hardship had reviewed it. Mr. Gerstein stated that the university needed to move facilities into the new building soon. Mr. Gallery contended that it would be a mistake to approve this application subject to a finding of hardship. He suggested that the Committee table the application to give the Committee on Financial Hardship time to review it.

Mr. Atkins confirmed that he considered the application inappropriate from a preservation perspective and asked his fellow Committee members to deny it. He added that the applicant needed to devise a new, better solution; the design, he asserted is incomplete and what is presented is inappropriate. He stated that he would not recommend approval of another failure like Pennsylvania Hospital building on Spruce Street. He also suggested that the applicant work to prove his hardship case.

Ms. Pentz suggested that the applicant find a way to retain the buildings. She noted that similar buildings in the same district had been rehabilitated one block north of this site. Mr. Gerstein claimed that the situation surrounding those buildings was not analogous. Mr. Hanson insisted that he and Mr. Myers could not save the buildings because they could not work with the existing masonry walls.

Mr. Gallery asked to speak, but Mr. Rivera, the chair, stated that the Committee was ready to render a decision on a recommendation. Mr. Atkins and Ms. Pentz reiterated that the design was inappropriate and inadequate.

The Architectural Committee concurs with the staff and recommends denial because the application is

incomplete.

Mr. Rivera left the meeting.

1713 Porter Street

Theresa Criniti, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1906, John Windrim, architect

PROPOSAL: Fence along sides of yard

Mr. Farnham presented this application, which proposes the removal of two historic hairpin fences along the rear, side property lines as well as a historic side gate and the installation of vinyl fences and a gate in their places. The staff recently approved the rear vinyl fence and deck, neither of which required the demolition of historic fabric.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

Theresa Criniti, the owner, said that she has a deck and wants the fence along the sides of the yard for privacy and the safety of her children.

Mr. Levy opined that the proposed fence is not in character with the open rear yards that characterize Girard Estate. Committee members suggested that the applicant erect a fence in the deck area for privacy. The applicant did not agree with the Committee's suggestion.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]; and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

1723 Porter Street

Louis and Marylou Acciavatti, Owners

Liz Pisano and Chris Antico, Applicants

DATE: 1906, John Windrim, architect

PROPOSAL: Two-story rear addition

Mr. Farnham presented this application, which proposes the construction of a 2-story addition at the rear of the twin house at 1723 Porter Street. The addition would be 18' deep and 16'-6" wide, the width of the existing residence. It would be faced with stucco and fenestrated with vinyl windows. Photographs submitted by the applicant show that the rear porch was demolished recently without a permit or Historical Commission approval.

Note that the rear addition and deck at 1721 Porter, 1723's twin, was constructed more than 10 years ago, prior to the designation of the district. It was constructed without a permit and includes windows on the party wall, which would be covered by the proposed addition. The recent 1-story rear addition at 1725

Porter was constructed with a building permit and the Historical Commission's approval.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 [*New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*]. The applicant should remedy the illegal demolition of the porch.

Louis Acciavatti, the owner, presented photographs of similar conditions in the neighborhood. He noted that he proposes to restore the front of his house to its original condition. Mr. Acciavatti argued for the two-story addition owing to the need for additional space.

Committee members concurred that there is a precedent for one-story additions, but it believed that a two-story addition would overwhelm the structure and the open rear yard.

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

120 Chestnut Street

Finesse Entertainment, Incorporated, Owner

Hal Banker, Applicant

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: Cut new window openings, cover granite storefront with Corian, new windows and doors, illuminated signage

This application proposes extensive alterations to the historic façade of the Greek Revival loft building at 120 Chestnut Street. It also proposes minor alterations at the rear. The building would be converted to DREAMZ, a new nightclub. The front façade of this building was meticulously restored to its 1835 appearance in the late 1970s. F. Otto Haas, the chair of the Commission at the time, congratulated the owner "on the accurate restoration" and awarded him a Commission plaque for display on the building.

The current application proposes to cover the original granite storefront, which is in pristine condition, with a new pseudo-classical storefront made of Corian, a plastic manufactured by DuPont. Non-historic windows and a door would be installed in the storefront openings, which would be narrowed by the new, oversized, plastic pilasters. An internally illuminated plastic sign reading "DREAMZ" would be installed in the new plastic storefront cornice. At the 2nd story, the historic wood windows, wood shutters, and original brick façade would be removed and a new plastic tripartite window system with frosted glazing would be installed. The window system would be flanked by plastic panels and topped with a plastic cornice.

At the rear, which faces Ionic Street, a service alley, a new flush metal door and stucco infill would replace an existing metal door with infill. New concrete steps with a metal railing would also be added. The rear brick façade would be "stained" according to the plans. Further details about the "staining" should be supplied.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the rear door alterations. Denial of the front façade alterations as well as the brick "staining," pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, Restoration Standard 7, the Window Guideline, the Entrance Guideline and the Storefronts Guideline.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Several members of the Old City community attended to protest the proposal. Hal Banker, the applicant, conceded that the current design was unacceptable to the staff, Committee, and public. He stated that he would devise a new proposal and asked the Committee for its advice. He added that he would like to keep the historic storefront, clean it, and convert the two historic storefront doors to windows and the historic storefront window to a door. He argued that the storefront is not in pristine condition, as Mr. Farnham had contended, and noted his intention to sand blast the granite elements. Committee members caution him that sandblasting would damage the historic stone. He then suggested an acid wash; Committee members replied that it would also be too harsh for the historic materials. They suggested that the applicant work with the staff to find an appropriate cleaning method.

Mr. Levy questioned the staining of the bricks noted on the plans for the rear façade. Mr. Banker replied that he did not understand the architect's intention in that matter and offered to withdraw that portion of the proposal. Ms. Pentz suggested again that the applicant work with the staff on the cleaning of the masonry. The Committee agreed that the signage should be located in the flat cornice area. Mr. Banker said that he would propose a sign consisting of frosted lucite backlit with neon, projecting four inches off the granite. The Committee cautioned against damaging the granite with the attachment of the sign. They again suggested that the applicant work with the staff to safeguard the historic resources.

Cynthia Philo, Old City District, commented that the submission is out of character for the historic 100-block of Chestnut Street. Ms. Philo remarked that the applicant has not presented his proposal to the community.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, Restoration Standard 7, the Window Guideline, the Entrance Guideline and the Storefronts Guideline. It suggested that the applicant work with the staff to develop an appropriate design.

329 Spruce Street

Martin Brown, Owner

Carlitos Hernandez, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1810, altered c. 1950

PROPOSAL: Replace lintels, sills and windows, repoint

This application proposes several façade alterations, some of which are not fully defined. First, it proposes the legalization of the reconstruction of exterior window woodwork. Second, it proposes the removal of the wood windowsills throughout the building and their replacement in concrete. Third, it proposes the removal of two wood lintels at the 3rd story of the 4th Street façade and their replacements with cast stone or concrete lintels. Fourth, it proposes the repair and painting of two marble and concrete lintels at the 2nd story of the 4th Street façade. The windows were shortened many years ago and concrete was added beneath the historic marble lintels. Fifth, the application proposes to rectify illegal pointing. The 4th Street façade and a portion of the Spruce Street façade were repointed illegally, without a building permit or the Historical Commission's approval. This application proposes cutting out the mortar and repointing the entire building.

This application does not address the illegal vinyl windows, which were installed without a building permit or the Historical Commission's approval. This building contains numerous residential units and would therefore require a building permit for new windows regardless of whether it is listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. This application does propose work related to the windows and therefore should also address the illegal vinyl windows.

Staff Recommendation: No position on the replacement of the wood sills with concrete; the staff has concerns that the concrete might lead to further damage to the wood windows and frames. Approval of

the reconstruction of the exterior window woodwork if the illegal vinyl windows are replaced with appropriate wood windows; approval of the replacement of the wood lintels with cast stone or concrete, provided that the wood lintels are preserved and donated to a local repository; approval of the repair of the concrete and marble lintels and the painting of the concrete, but not the marble; with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 6.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Charles Hernandez, the contractor, and Suzanna Barucco, the newly-retained architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Baron also attended the meeting because he had visited the site and conducted extensive discussions with the contractor and owner. The applicants began the discussion by clarifying some issues. First, in response to staff concerns, they stated that they had decided to replace the sills in wood instead of concrete. Second, they stated that they would replace the 3rd-story lintels on the 4th Street façade with new wood, not cast stone or concrete, lintels. The Committee asserted that the original, marble 2nd-story lintels on the 4th Street façade should be retained and should not be painted.

The Committee members looked carefully at the many other pieces of the application. They agreed with the staff that the illegal vinyl windows needed to be addressed. They also believed that the 4th Street façade, with its unusual window openings and lintels, needed restoration, not further alteration. Ms. Barucco stated that the 4th Street window openings had been significantly altered. Committee members asserted that the window openings should be restored to the original sizes. They also asserted that the illegal vinyl windows should be removed and replaced with the appropriate wood windows. Mr. Baron suggested a compromise that would allow the rear vinyl windows to remain in exchange for the restoration of the 4th Street window openings at the 2nd and 3rd floors and the installation of the appropriate wood windows in the Spruce Street and 4th Street facades. After much thought, the applicants agreed to the compromise. The applicants also agreed to replace the wood window molding recently installed with the historically appropriate molding.

The building was recently repointed without a permit or Commission approval. The repointing was very poorly executed. The applicants agreed to remove the bad pointing and repoint the entire building. Mr. Levy cautioned that the brick not be damaged with the removal of the existing mortar.

Bernice Hamel, speaking for the Society Hill Civic Association, said that it supports the compromise hammered out during the Committee meeting.

The Architectural Committee recommends approval of the following, with staff to review details:

1. *the legalization of the rear vinyl windows, provided historically appropriate wood windows are installed in the 4th and Spruce Street facades;*
2. *the installation of the appropriate wood window molding in place of the illegally installed window molding on all facades;*
3. *the restoration of the original window openings at the 2nd and 3rd stories of the 4th Street façade;*
4. *the replacement of the 3rd-story lintels in wood, provided the historic lintels are preserved and donated to a local repository such as Independence National Historical Park;*
5. *the retention of the historic 2nd-story stone lintels;*
6. *the repointing of the entire façade;*
7. *and the replacement of the sills in wood.*

306 Cypress Street

Rolf Windh and Karen Tourian, Owners

Martin Jay Rosenblum, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1808, rear ell added in the late nineteenth century

PROPOSAL: Rear addition

This application proposes a small 2nd-story addition (4'-0" x 9'-5") and other alterations at rear ell of the rowhouse at 306 Cypress Street. The addition would be visible from Three Bears Park to the west. The stucco addition would be built on a 1-story section of the rear ell. The brick salvaged from demolition for the addition would be used to infill two 1st-story and one 2nd-story rear ell windows. Wood true-divided-light windows would be installed in the addition and in a new opening in the 1st story. The door at the rear of the rear ell would be moved. A metal fence shielding existing HVAC equipment is proposed as an option.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

The Committee concurred that the proposal was appropriate.

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

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary