

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

**Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Commission Offices, Room 578, City Hall
26 November 2002**

Present

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
Herbert Levy
Suzanne Pentz

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jeffrey Barr Historic Research Technician
Jonathan Farnham, Historic Preservation Planner
Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner

Also

Janet Holmes, Queen Village Neighbor's Association
David W. O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighbor's Association
Albert Taus, Albert Taus & Associates Architects
Aaron Weiner, Aaron S. Weiner Construction
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance
George Anni, 1236 Spruce Street
Jack McDavid, 22nd & Fairmount Partnership
Afia McKinley, 69 East Logan Street
Cecil Baker, Cecil Baker and Associates
Steven Verner, Cecil Baker and Associates
Steven Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
Jay G. Crammer, MCW Enterprises, Lippincott Building
Avram Hornik
Ned Burns, Pella Windows
Jack Keeley, Pella Windows
Michael Mills, Ford Farewell Mills and Gatsch Architects, LLC
Michael Hauptman, Brawer & Hauptman Architects
Paul Couglin, Brawer Hauptman Architects
Robert Jones, NTH Consultants, LTD
Michael Sher, 235 South 23rd Street
Harry Sher, Esq., 235 South 23rd Street
Katherine Frey, Ford Farewell Mills and Gatsch Architects, LLC
William H. Hambly, NTH Consultants, LTD
Bert Wescott, Systra Consulting, Incorporated
Steve Diehl, Systra Consulting, Incorporated
T. Scott Kreilick, Kreilick Conservation, LLC
Theresa Stuhlman, Fairmount Park Commission

Mr. Rivera, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

204 Christian Street

Aaron Weiner, Owner

Albert Taus, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1805

PROPOSAL: Rear deck, windows and doors

This proposal involves alterations to the rear of a wood house. This house, which has suffered neglect and inappropriate alteration to the extent that Licenses and Inspections declared it dangerous, has recently sold to a new owner who wishes to restore the structure. The staff has signed a permit for most of the work to the front of the house. The applicant wishes to install a deck on the rear ell and some new windows and doors, on the south facing elevations.

Staff recommendation: Approval per Standard 9.

Mr. Baron explained the project. He said that at different times, the building had been declared imminently dangerous. Permits for the rehabilitation of the building have been acquired in order to save the property. Mr. Baron noted that the City removed the roof and reconstructed it without the dormers or appropriate cornice. He clarified some ambiguous notations on the drawings, which have been corrected and explained that the door's design is based on the survival of a piece of the historic door. He said that the proposed new windows and doors on the south elevation would have minimal visibility.

Aaron Weiner, the owner, and Albert Taus, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Taus said that beaded board would be added to the side of the dormer and that the new windows would be true-divided light with a more vertical orientation. He also said that the roof would be restored with Timberline shingles. Mr. Weiner said that the only remaining historic fabric is the wood framing. The clapboard's design on the front would differ from the design on the side, which would be a simpler design. In response to Mr. Levy's query about the masonry cleaning, Mr. Weiner said that the note refers to the existing chimney.

David O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighbor's Association, said that the civic association had not seen the plans for the proposed work. He inquired about the door, and the owner said that it would be a new milled door. Mr. O'Donnell said that he, as a neighbor, is in support of the project; however, he suggested that Mr. Weiner, as a courtesy, arrange to meet with the civic association for review of the plans.

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 materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the property and its environment would be unimpaired], with staff to review details.

The applicant agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

69 East Logan Street

Afia McKinley, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Rear addition, cutting new windows and door of carriage house

The proposal involves rehabilitation of a rear carriage house. The façade facing the road will receive new windows. An addition will extend off the rear façade.

Staff recommendation: Approval except for the new front windows and metal side door. Staff would prefer to see the existing crossbuck doors held open and glazing installed in those openings. The new side door should be wood. The windows should be wood true divided-light. All with staff to review details.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. He said that the property includes an 1860s house, and a carriage house modified in the 1910s with garage doors. The front façade of the carriage house would receive little change except for two small windows. On the side façade, the owner wishes to install new six-over-six windows and a new door. Mr. Farnham made a site visit to determine visibility and he noted that the rear addition would have little if any visibility.

Mr. Levy thought that since the entire building was constructed of wood, then the proposed galvanized aluminum door should also be wood. Mr. Baron said that the new front windows should relate to the board and batten and asked if the new window opening could have a longer orientation rather than a square orientation. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested retaining the openings but adding glazing to the center opening and keeping the crossbuck to the left and right to give the appearance of shutters. Mr. Rivera believed that the three crossbuck doors are essential to the historic features. He inquired about the material of the railing as well as the type of siding material on the rear. The plans indicate that the proposed rear siding would be constructed of wood panels. The Committee said that since the existing building and the addition are wood then the windows should also be wood. However, it said that it would also not have a problem with stucco on the rear addition, but it would prefer wood windows in the addition. Committee members also thought that on the south elevation, the windows should be sized to fit between the existing battens.

The applicant was not present for the discussion of the proposal, but arrived after the Committee made its recommendation. The Committee had a few minutes between proposals and it discussed with the applicant its recommendations. The applicant was receptive to the recommendations and agreed to make the appropriate changes.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with true divided light wood windows all around, a wood door and on the south elevation, the windows should be sized vertically to fit between the battens. On the rear addition, the windows may be wood clad in aluminum. They also recommended approval of a stucco covering for the addition if the applicant so chooses. These recommendations follow 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] all with staff to review details.

The applicant agreed with the recommendation.

1216 Spruce Street, SE corner of Camac Street

George Anni, Owner

Clayborn Cann, Applicant

DATE: c. 1821, altered 1840

PROPOSAL: New café windows, exhaust vent, rear decks, doors and fence

The proposal involves legalizing the building of two decks and an exhaust duct on this house and corner store. In addition, the applicant wishes to modify the storefront to feature operable café

windows and wood bulkhead panels. H.V.A.C. units, installed on the roof with out a permit would be placed on the rear decks.

Staff recommendation: Approval per Standard 9. There is some concern about adding wood panels to the brick storefront bulkhead and the plane on which the panels would sit.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. George Anni, the owner, attended the meeting and showed photographs. He proposes a storefront with Café windows and to replace the brick bulkhead with wood panels. The air conditioning units currently on the roof would be moved to the decks that were reconstructed on the rear ells of the property. Mr. Baron noted that the exhaust duct, while visible, sits in the least visible location. Mr. Anni asked the Committee if it would be possible to extend the storefront around the corner to make additional windows. The Committee informed the applicant that it believed that extending the storefront would require the removal of an excessive amount of historic fabric and would necessitate the installation of steel columns to support the walls. Mr. Anni also inquired about adding two additional windows and the Committee said that allowing the installation of two windows would interrupt the character of this corner property.

The Committee cautioned the applicant to make sure that when adding the wood panels to the brick bulkhead, they do not project, causing potential water infiltration.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal as submitted, with the legalization of the decks, with the staff to review details, 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, proportion and massing to protect the property and its environment] and the mechanical systems guideline.] as submitted, with the legalization of the decks, with the staff to review details.

The applicant agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

2130-32 Fairmount Avenue and 655-59 North 22nd Street

Jack McDavid, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1904

PROPOSAL: Legalize demolition of brick wall, construction of new wall and new brick patio

The proposal involves legalizing the demolition of a garden wall along the backs of houses facing 22nd Street, and demolishing a wall facing Fairmount Avenue. The applicant proposes building a new wall either out of brick or metal that would extend along the street and a wood fence in the yard areas of the rowhouses along 22nd Street, also owned by the same applicant. The new fence/wall would enclose a new brick patio area alongside the restaurant.

Staff recommendation: Approval of either fence pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. The staff questioned whether the patio will sit on an alley easement.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Jack McDavid, the owner, attended the meeting and stated that the properties at 655, 657, and 659 North 22nd Street are a common ownership. He is extending the patio to have outdoor space for the restaurant. Committee members expressed concern whether the new wall is sitting on the street. Mr. McDavid said that the wall runs parallel with the firehouse, which has deteriorated because of tree roots. He proposes to replace the wall with a wood fence. He pointed out that seating for customers currently exists outside and said he is not extending the seating, but rather creating a garden area .

Mr. Levy inquired if the wood fence is on the property line, and noted that if the property is ever sold, that Mr. McDavid could be required to remove the wall. It was noted that the wood fence has already been constructed. Also noted was the six-inch difference in the height of the wood fence and the brick wall. The existing gates will not be changed. Mr. Rivera recommended that the applicant construct a wrought iron fence and rebuild the wall in brick in the same height and with the same masonry to agree with the fence and the wall.

The Architectural recommended approval of the demolition and construction of a new fence in wood at the rear of the 22nd Street properties and a new front wall along Fairmount Avenue either in metal or brick of equal height 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, proportion, and massing to protect 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 property and its environment would be unimpaired.] with the staff to review details.

The applicant concurred with the recommendation.

128 South 19th Street, NW corner of Moravian Street

Jul Roe, Owner

Avram Hornik, Applicant

DATE: c. 1865, altered 1921 by Herman Wetherell

PROPOSAL: New storefront window with café windows, reopen window and door openings

The proposal involves installing a restaurant in the first floor of this former deli. The side windows will be reopened and glazed with small pane sash to match the existing. The storefront will be rebuilt to incorporate café windows.

Staff recommendation: Approval per Standards 9 and 10, with staff to review details.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal and said that the applicant intends to remove the roll down grate and signage, retain the original transom, install new Café windows based on the mullion division of the transom and restore windows on the side façade.

Avram Hornick, the owner attended the meeting and said that it is his intent to restore the building.

Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance, stated that the neighbors are opposed to the installation of café windows and believes that the café windows will disrupt the appearance of the building.

Mr. Levy inquired if railings would be needed on the outside, since the floor levels are quite high. It was pointed out that this structure incorporates three buildings that have been combined, all with different floor levels.

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 materials, features, size, scale, proportion, and

massing to protect 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 property and its environment would be unimpaired.]. All with staff to review details.

The applicant concurred with the Committee's recommendation.

227 South 6th Street, Lippincott Building

MCW Enterprises, Owner

Stephen Verner, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1900, William Pritchett, architect

PROPOSAL: Handicap ramp, creation of interior courtyard, new mechanical chimneys

This project returns to the Committee and Commission with some revisions. Previously, the applicant wanted to lower the door on 6th Street to grade to meet accessibility requirements. Now, the proposal calls for leaving the door as is and adding a granite ramp with a metal picket railing. The railing will balance the new railing for the approved basement egress on the northern part of the façade.

The second part of the application is for a new interior courtyard at the northern section of the building. To meet light and air codes for units, the owner wishes to install a courtyard. The building's north façade will not change, but a portion of it will become an exterior wall on both sides. The courtyard is 25 feet in width and eight feet deep. The wall will receive structural stiffeners on the interior face and windows will be weatherproofed.

The third part of the proposal calls for three large elevator machinery rooms on the roof. They will sit at the northern end of the building, but will be visible. The rooms will be sheathed in standing-seam metal in the same color as the roof and other mechanical chimneys. Catwalks would connect the rooms.

In addition, fenestration and roof details of the penthouse differ from the previously approved application.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the handicap ramp, pursuant to Standard 9 and the accessibility guideline.

Approval of the courtyard, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Denial of the elevator penthouses, pursuant to Standard 9 and three roofing guidelines.

Steve Verner and Cecil Baker from Cecil Baker Associates and Jay Cranmer from MCW attended the meeting to represent the project. Ms. Spina presented the new issues and the items that differ from the design as approved by Commission. Mr. Levy observed that the 8-inch rise for the new ramp platform at front appeared uncomfortably high. Mr. Verner agreed but responded that they were matching the height of the existing front step. The applicants proposed sloping the sidewalk to achieve a 6-inch to 7-inch rise.

Mr. Cranmer summarized the need for the courtyard. The Committee found no problems with the courtyard as proposed.

Mr. Verner explained several issues concerning the elevator machinery rooms. They had hoped to keep the elevator machinery under the new hipped roof of the addition but the design requirements

for a geared system requires substantial space above the elevator shaft. Mr. Baker added that the machinery rooms will “read” as dormers that extend out from the roof and will not be seen from the south. Mr. Levy objected to the catwalks and ladders connecting the machinery rooms. Mr. Verner explained that L&I required one ladder for Fire Department roof access. The catwalks and other ladders would provide access to service the mechanical rooms. The majority of the Committee felt that a ladder could service each mechanical room. Mr. Rivera, however, had no objection to the catwalks.

Ms. Spina summarized the changes to the rooftop addition at the 6th Street elevation and the Committee had no objection.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, including the ramp with a 6 or 7 inch rise for the new landing, the courtyard, the mechanical rooms at roof without catwalks and the changes to the 6th Street elevation.

226 South 16th Street aka 1601 Locust Street, University Club

Allan Domb, Owner

Gordon Fluke, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1929, Grant Simon, architect

PROPOSAL: Windows, doors, HVAC vents and penthouse

This application has several parts. The Committee and Commission previously approved changing several window openings and creating new windows in the building. The owner wishes to install new metal-clad wood windows with simulated divided lights in all of the openings. The muntin pattern and brick mold would replicate the historic windows, but the applicant must supply shop drawings to verify this.

The Committee and Commission approved, in concept, changing the entrance on 16th Street. The proposal returns with details of the new door. The entrance will have a stainless steel panel with a large, single-light storefront window on one side and a single-leaf, frame-less glass door on the other, and a stainless steel transom bar and single-light transom above. The current service door on the 16th Street façade will get new flush metal doors and frame, painted to match the surrounding stone. The application also calls for a new door on the St. James Street (north) façade of the building. This door will have a metal panel with a double-leaf door on one side and a single-leaf door on the other, with a vent in the transom area.

For the mechanical systems, the proposal includes installing a large vent on the St. James Street façade at each floor. Each vent will be four feet, four inches tall and six feet wide. The owner proposes to paint them to match the surrounding stone.

The 18th floor has a setback with a high parapet wall. Now that the building will have a residential use, the owner wishes to cut parts of the parapet wall to offer a view out of the windows. The proposal calls for cutting the stone parapet in several sections and installing a glass railing.

Lastly, the application includes a two-story penthouse addition. The Committee and Commission approved a one-story penthouse for a previous developer. This proposal calls for a stucco addition with large, one-over-one double-hung windows. The first floor of the penthouse will have a setback of five feet from the roof of the 18th floor on the south façade. The second-floor will have a setback of four feet from the roof of the first floor on the south facade, but will have a pergola and two outdoor fireplaces.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the proposed windows, pursuant to Standard 6. The new windows should be wood and true-divided-light.

Denial of the door design for 16th Street, pursuant to Standard 9 and the entrance guideline. The new door should have a scale in keeping with the building and frames on the elements. The drawing of the door on Locust Street should be used for guidance.

Denial of the door on St. James Street, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9. The new door should not include the removal of surrounding stone.

Approval of the louvers, pursuant to the mechanical system guideline.

Denial of cutting the parapet wall, pursuant to Standard 9. The work removes too much historic material and creates voids where none existed.

Approval in concept of the penthouse, but not the design, pursuant to Standard 9 and the site guideline. The proposed design emphasizes the horizontal, but the building itself has vertical lines. The windows have no relation to those on the lower floors. The new windows should have smaller panes to continue the scale of those on other floors. The proposed fireplace and pergola negate any setback created for the massing of the second floor; these should be eliminated. If a fireplace is desired, it should be designed so that it doesn't rise higher than the parapet wall. (The Committee and Commission approved a penthouse design for a former developer of this site, but it was a single story and was more compatible to the design of the building.)

Cecil Baker and Penelope Benith, architects, and Allan Domb, owner, attended the meeting to represent the project. Mr. Baker introduced representatives from the Pella Window Company. The Committee and Commission previously reviewed and approved parts of this project, in concept, and Ms. Spina summarized the new issues and changes to the project plans.

Mr. Baker stated that Mr. Domb plans a first-class conversion of this property and desires aluminum clad, wood windows with simulated divided-lites and insulated glass. He assured the Committee that the window vendor could replicate all the original profiles, details and dimensions but does not manufacture true divided-lite windows. He stressed that this project is a major undertaking and the many windows are a large budget item.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated that, to approve simulated divided lites, the Committee would need to change their standards. Mr. Levy added that Committee needed to maintain consistency on the window muntin issue. Ms. Spina asked if the Pella window had a spacer bar between the double-glazing. Ed Burns, from Pella windows, presented a sample window and described the construction with a spacer bar and muntin grid applied to the interior and exterior of the double-glazed insulated glass. Mr. D'Alessandro asked about repair and restoration of the existing windows. Mr. Baker responded that the existing windows were in poor condition. Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Pentz agreed that if the original windows could not be restored then the replacement windows must be wood to match the original material. Mr. Baron observed that the applicant had not yet provided details of the proposed windows and their profiles, details and dimensions should be compared with the originals. The Committee discussed a compromise for the restoration or replication of the lower floor windows with new true divided-lite wood windows and simulated divided-lite wood windows for the upper floors with exterior profiles, details and dimensions to match the original.

The Committee discussed the new contemporary glass entrance design proposed for S. 16th Street.

Mr. Rivera and Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with the staff recommendation that the entrance design should better match the character of the building. Mr. Levy and Ms. Pentz felt that since the 16th Street entrance is not the original opening, the design is acceptable as proposed.

The Committee discussed and found no problems with the proposed north and east doorway modifications or the new louvers as proposed on the north façade.

Mr. Domb explained the parapet wall condition at the 18th floor that blocks the view from the interior. Mr. Baron stated that the partial removal of the parapet wall changes the architecture of the building. The Committee expressed concern about the loss of original fabric and thought the glass railing would be inappropriate. Mr. Baker suggested a compromise of removing the stone masonry down to 30 inches above the floor, re-installing the cap and adding a simple railing. The Committee agreed to the concept of partial removal of the masonry and addition of a simple railing with details re-submitted to Committee for review.

The Committee discussed the penthouse addition and agreed that the window fenestration on the east and west elevations should better match the vertical character of the building. The Committee did not object to the window fenestration on the Locust Street façade. Although the Committee found the scale, massing and material of the addition acceptable, Committee members had mixed opinions about the fireplaces and pergola as designed. Mr. Levy, Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Pentz agreed that the fireplaces disrupted the setback of the rooftop addition and should be eliminated. Mr. Levy and Mr. Rivera thought the horizontal pergola was out of character with the building.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval the simulated-divided-light wood windows for the upper floors provided the profiles, details and dimensions match the original with staff to review details. The majority of the Committee voted to recommend restoration or replication of the lower floor windows (below the 3rd floor) with true-divided-light wood windows with staff to review details. The Committee split 2-2 on the proposed new glass entrance on 16th Street. They recommended approval of the north and east door modifications and the new louvers on the north façade. The Committee voted to recommend conceptual approval for the partial removal of sections of the stone parapet wall at the 18th floor (30" above floor) and the addition of a simple railing at those locations. The Committee voted to recommend approval of the penthouse addition with more vertical fenestration on the east and west elevations and staff to review details. They recommended denial of the exterior fireplaces and split 2-2 on the horizontal wooden pergola.

2232 Locust Street, SE corner of 23rd Street

Locust 23 Associates, Owner

Michael Sher, Applicant

DATE: 1907, C. Hoffman

PROPOSAL: Legalize rear fence

This application proposes legalizing a fence at the rear of 2232 Locust Street, at the corner of South 23rd and Latimer Streets. Built to hide trash containers at a rear stairwell, the fence is an amalgam of unpainted horizontal and vertical wood boards. One section, a gate, is 47 inches wide and 65 inches tall; the other is 97 inches wide and 72.5 inches tall and includes a small access door. L&I issued a violation on 22 June 2001 because the fence had been constructed without a building permit or Historical Commission approval.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9. The staff would recommend approval of a simple metal fence with vertical pickets.

Michael Sher, the applicant, and Harry Sher, Esq., counsel for the applicant, attended the meeting. Harry Sher stated that the Department of Licenses & Inspections said that a permit was not required. He said that he is not going to argue the point but would adhere to whatever the Committee recommends. He noted that trash is put behind the fence.

Some Committee members stated that they believed that the fence is encroaching on the sidewalk. Mr. Levy asked that staff make a site visit to determine whether the fence is encroaching on the sidewalk. Ms. Pentz stressed that the fence is inappropriate to the district and pointed out that it might be in violation of City code owing to the fire escape behind the fence.

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.].

2110 Chancellor Street aka 223 South Van Pelt Street

Ara Chalian, Owner

Michael Hauptman, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1867

PROPOSAL: Rooftop addition with deck in concept

This application for approval in concept proposes the construction of a 1-story addition atop a 2-story carriage house at 2110 Chancellor Street. It also proposes the maintenance of the historical facades including masonry cleaning and painting of trim and doors.

An earlier version of this project was considered at the 24 September 2002 Architectural Committee meeting. Only two Committee members were present. Mr. Rivera recommended approval; Ms. Pentz recommended denial. After the Committee meeting, the applicant requested a one-month continuance. During the interim, he presented the design to the Zoning Committee of the Center City Residents' Association. The Zoning Committee voted not to oppose the zoning for the project provided that the applicant change the contrasting metal panels on the Chancellor Street façade of the addition from the brick color to the color of the other metal pieces. A letter stating this position is included in the application.

At the 8 November 2002 Commission meeting, after the one-month continuance, the applicant presented an updated design to the Commission. The new design accounts for some of the Committee's comments, but not the request of the Center City Residents' Association. The three major changes to the design since the earlier review are:

- Elimination of the skylight above the stairs;
- Elimination of the deck extension; and
- Reduction of the height of the addition.

At its 8 November 2002 meeting, the Commission remanded the updated design back to the Committee for review.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the façade cleaning, with staff to review details; no position on the painting of trim and doors. Denial in concept of the addition, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal.

Michael Hauptman, the architect, said that the Commission did not vote because the recommendation of the Committee was absent a quorum. He stated that the addition is very visible from the eastern spur of Chancellor Street but would, in fact, improve the view. It would block the view of an unattractive party wall, deck structure, and several HVAC units. He chose a Modern style addition to differentiate it very clearly from the historical carriage house. The east façade of the addition would be gray steel painted with a large amount of glass. He said that only a portion of the addition would be visible from Van Pelt Street. He also contended that the addition would be an exciting contrast to the original building. He said that he had a letter of non-opposition from the Center City Residents' Association.

Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance, disagreed about the letter from the Center City Residents' Association, noting that it only addressed zoning issues.

Mr. Baron stated that the Commission has approved numerous rooftop additions in the past, but only when the proposed addition is small relative to the original building. This proposed addition, he asserted, would be approximately one half the size of the original building. Ms Pentz stated that, in terms of volume, the addition would overwhelm and alter the historic building. Mr. D'Alessandro proclaimed that the scale of the building should be respected. Mr. Levy said that additions could be appropriately designed and, therefore, each property should be considered individually. He also noted that an incoherent mix of buildings lines Van Pelt Street. Mr. Levy said that the addition is totally disassociated and that he did not object to the addition itself, but only the proposed color. He noted that the revised design does not include the projecting deck; he reminded Committee members that the front facade would receive needed maintenance. In addition, he noted that the addition would be removable and that the existing structure would not be permanently impacted by this addition. Committee members questioned the air conditioning units and noted that they should be included in the plans.

With a vote of two to one, the Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal in concept with the inclusion of the air conditioning units, provided that they are not visible. Ms Pentz opposed the recommendation.

The applicant agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

City Hall, Broad and Market Streets

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Peter Gaffer, Applicant

DATE: 1871-1901, John McArthur Jr. with T.U. Walter

PROPOSAL: Headhouse for sidewalk elevator lift on east side of City Hall

This application proposes constructing an elevator housing for a refurbished basement-to-street service elevator. The elevator housing would be located on the sidewalk along the southern portion of the eastern façade of City Hall. The housing design stipulates granite wing walls, a double-leaf stainless steel hatch, a stainless steel fold-down door, two bollards, and two lamps on poles, which are depicted in the photo mock-up but not on the plans.

Staff Recommendation: Approval in concept of an elevator housing in this location. Denial of the submission, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. The staff recommends moving all new construction away from the façade of the building as well as redesigning the pseudo-historical wing walls and lighting.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Bert Wescott and Steven Diehl attended the meeting. Mr. Wescott stated that the proposed elevator lift with a hoist would be used for trash removal. He noted that what currently exists is flat and flanked with wing walls and that cars continually park atop of it. He also noted that water infiltration is a problem. Finally, he stated that it would be able to be raised to a height of four feet for truck accessibility.

Mr. Levy recommended a housing that would be flush with the sidewalk. Other Committee members also objected that the proposed housing was not flush with the sidewalk.

Mr. Wescott offered a compromise; he stated that he could design a housing that would be the height of a curb. It would be able to shed water and would stop the water infiltration. When asked about the original design, he stated that the material would be similar to that of City Hall and that the wing wall would butt up against the building. Committee members questioned the proximity to the base of the facade. Mr. Wescott said that the elevator housing could be pulled away from the facade, but that it had been positioned up against the building because of the concern that vagrants would sleep behind the lift. In addition, he stated that the two lamps on poles objected to by the staff had been deleted from the design.

The Committee agreed that the bollards were appropriate but thought that the elevator housing should be redesigned to reduce its height and move it away from the facade of City Hall.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the bollards as proposed, but denial of the elevator housing design as submitted. It recommended that the applicants revise the design to include the modifications discussed.

The applicants agreed with the Committee recommendation and stated that they would revise their design to reflect the Committee's suggestions.

4231 North Concourse Drive, Memorial Hall

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Robert Jones, Applicant

DATE: 1876, Herman Schwarzmenn

PROPOSAL: Roofing, coping and gutter system

This submission proposes the repair and replacement of roofing and drainage systems, installation of a waterproofing and drainage system between the interior and exterior domes, and the repair and replacement of several ornamental details at Memorial Hall in Fairmount Park. It includes:

- re-roofing around the exterior dome
- repointing and installing lead joint covers at the north elevation coping
- cleaning the interior dome
- installing a waterproofing and drainage system above the interior dome
- replacing the copper cove sheet metal above the gutter to match existing
- replacing two damaged ornamental shields
- replacing seven 1975 foam replicas of ornamental garlands to match originals
- repairing the sheet metal rising walls
- repairing the dome gutter
- re-roofing over the north office space

The applicant provided no details regarding the replacement of the two damaged ornamental shields

and scant details regarding the replacement of the seven 1975 foam replicas of the ornamental garlands. The possibility of restoring, rather than replacing, the shields should be explored. Details of the restoration and/or replacement of the ornamental features should be submitted for review.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

Robert Jones, Bill Hambly, Michael Mills, Katherine Frey and T. Scott Kreilick attended the meeting. Mr. Jones, hired for the roofing portion of the project, said that he did a water test around the dome, which determined that several areas are leaking. He noted that most of the water infiltration was on the north side along the balustrade. He will install lead joint covers at the north elevation coping. He will also install a temporary translucent membrane to catch water between the exterior and interior of the dome. It will be able to be easily removed when the outer dome is repaired in the future. In addition, he proposes to clean the interior dome including the bird droppings.

Mr. Mills was hired to conduct a conservation study. He pointed out that some of the pressed copper ornamental shields have been replaced with fiberglass and that some of the ornamental garlands have been replaced with Styrofoam, which is not very durable. They are proposing to replace missing and damaged ornaments.

Ms. Frey stated that her goals are to stop the water infiltration, preserve as much of the historic fabric as possible, to pick a paint system with a lasting durability, and to replace the cove metal. She noted that only two shields require replacement. The walls in the areas of the water penetration will be repaired and the garlands of pressed zinc will be replicated to match the originals.

Mr. Kreilick, a specialist in metal conservation, explained how the replicas of the original ornaments would be produced. He noted that original materials and techniques would be used when possible. He also explained that the flawed restoration of the ornaments in the past had introduced numerous holes in the outer skin of the dome, allowing water to penetrate. The new restoration, he claimed, would correct this problem, making the dome much more watertight.

Ms. Pentz inquired about the wall replacement, and it was noted that the wall would be replaced in kind. In response to Mr. D'Alessandro's query about life of the interior polyurethane drainage system, the applicant stated that it would last about five years. Mr. D'Alessandro concluded that the waterproofing would be temporary and removable; therefore, he stated that the proposal is appropriate for such an important building.

Theresa Stuhlman of the Fairmount Park Commission supports the project.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval 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. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.].

The applicant agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary