

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

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

Present

Robert Thomas, Chair
Tony Atkin
Herbert W. Levy, FAIA
Daniel McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

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

Also

Patricia J. Carroll
Shirley J. Vernon
Brian Estelle, Home Depot
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance
Rob Nicholls
Jackie Kruetzer
Christopher Beardsley, Christopher Beardsley Architects
Scott Craven, Christopher Beardsley Architects
Judith Eden, Center City Residents' Association
Thomas J. Vanleer
Arnold Dalton, Gardner Fox Architects
Scott Kotcamp, Gardner Fox Architects
Christina Carter, John Milner Architects
Erika Perna
Christian Busch, The Sullivan Company
L. Rosenfeld, General Manager, The Barclay
Michael Schade, Atkin Olshin Lawson-Bell Associates
Brian Hare, Atkin Olshin Lawson-Bell Associates
Carol Kaminski
Gunter Buchholz, Architect
Michael Prifti, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Ed Clifton, BVI Architectural Group/Asian Bank
Cynthia Tori, 1216 Arch Street
Susan Savage, 1216 Arch Street
Michael Samschick
Joel Spivak, 616 Carpenter Street
William Dorsey, 131 Bainbridge Street
Dana Spain-Smith, 141 League Street
Jahan Sheikholeslami, Architecture and Planning

Jack Parry, JRP Architects
Adam Xu, 1412 Diamond Street
Bert Trama
John Andrien
Philip E. Scott, Kise Straw and Kolodner Architects

Herbert Levy, Vice-Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:25.

1706 Delancey Street

Jeffrey Yablonovitz, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Revised roof and rear decks

This application calls for further revisions to roof and rear decks and a stair tower that have previously received a violation. The applicant now proposes removing the existing upper rear porch deck and metal stair tower entirely. Plans show the lower 2nd floor rear porch deck retained and access to the roof deck through an internal stair. The roof deck dimensions have been shortened to a length of 15 feet and the rail has been pulled away from the east elevation by several feet. The staff recommended approval under Standards 9 and 10.

Ms. Brennan introduced this submission. The applicant did not appear before the Committee.

The Committee discussed the proposal and suggested modifications to it that appear in the Committee recommendation. Neighbors present expressly did not object to the proposal subject to the incorporation on the Committee's revisions.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the submission subject to:

- 1. the elimination of the rear overhang of the roof deck;*
- 2. the realignment of the rear of the deck to coincide with the plane of the rear wall of the house, and*
- 3. the relocation toward Delancey Street of the north end of the deck a distance not to exceed two feet (2').*

The Committee made this recommendation for approval with the understanding that this is a single-family residence as represented on the building permit application and that the Building Code does not require a stair house.

RT

2401 Pine Street, NW corner of 24th Street

Bruno Calabretta, Owner

Robert Boothroyd, Applicant

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: Window replacement

This application calls for the installation of 10 new vinyl windows and one casement window on this corner row house. The applicant proposes 6/1 vinyl windows with sandwich muntins. These windows possess a high level of visibility from Pine and 24th Streets. The staff recommended denial per Standard 6. The staff recommended the use of wood, true divided light 6/6 windows.

Ms. Brennan introduced this proposal.

Brian Estelle, Home Depot, showed to the Committee a model of a new Corning vinyl window with muntins sandwiched between the glazing. He said that it will not discolor.

Mr. Thomas explained the Commission's consistent policy of requiring true-divided light, wooden sash in the historically accurate configuration on principal elevations. Historically this house had six over six windows.

The Architectural Committee recommended the denial of this application under Standards 5 and 6.

RT

2414 Delancey Street

Jackie Kruezer and Rob Nicholls, Owners

Christopher Beardsley, Architect

DATE: c. 1850; 2416 refaced c. 1970

PROPOSAL: Addition and garage

This application calls for a two-story addition to 2414 Delancey, a vacant lot currently used for parking for 2416 Delancey Street. Photographs show the front façade of 2414 Delancey Street as concrete paved to accommodate two cars with an approximately 6-foot CMU wall. Behind the wall exists a patio landlocked from view by the rears of houses fronting on Panama Street. The applicant proposes the construction of a two-story infill on the empty lot. Plans show the first floor, front façade of the addition with a flat panel, metal roll-up garage door and brick piers. A metal cornice and lintel with decorative bolts separate the first and second floors. The brick second floor has two, 12/12 true divided light wood windows with fixed shutters. Both the shutters and the windows match the profile of those at 2416 Delancey Street. A new metal cornice will match the height and profile of those at 2416 Delancey Street. Plans show the rear façade of the new addition as stucco on CMU with aluminum windows and doors, galvanized metal coping, and a patio. The rear of the building lacks visibility from a public right-of-way.

The staff recommended approval of the addition in concept, but denied as submitted per Standard 9. Staff recommends differentiating the addition by not matching the windows, cornice and brick to 2416 Delancey Street.

Ms. Brennan introduced this submission.

The Committee, the applicant and the architect discussed the question of differentiating the new from the old in the context of an historic district.

The Architectural Committee recommended:

- 1. approval in concept of the construction of a two-story building with a garage at the first floor on this vacant lot;*
- 2. approval of the design for the rear elevation as submitted;*
- 3. approval of the proposed garage treatment, and*
- 4. approval of the design for the front elevation subject to a) the separation of the new at 2414 Delancey from the old at 2416 Delancey by a recess of one wythe of brick or a notch, b) the revision of the cornice in a form not duplicative of 2416 Delancey*

Street, and c) use of one over one sash or paired casement windows in the second floor openings. With the Chair of the Committee and the staff to review details.

RT

1711 Rittenhouse Square Street

Peter Ryan, Owner

Thomas J. Vanleer, Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Window replacement

This application calls for the installation of wood replacement windows and the retention of existing frames. The applicant proposes the use of 6/6 Pozzi wood windows with a ¾” muntin profile. Detail drawings show the windows as simulated divided light-applied wood muntins on the interior and exterior with a spacer bar between the glass. The applicant proposes four windows on the front façade, first and second floors only; the remaining windows are in an interior courtyard that has no visibility whatsoever. The staff recommended approval for courtyard windows owing to no visibility from a public right-of-way. Denial of façade windows per Standard 6. Recommendation that front façade windows be wood, true divided light.

Ms. Brennan introduced this proposal.

Mr. Thomas explained the Commission’s consistent policy of requiring true-divided light, wooden sash in the historically accurate pattern on principal elevations.

The Architectural Committee recommended:

1. *approval of the windows as submitted for the interior atrium not visible from a public right-of-way, and*
2. *denial of proposed windows on the principal facades.*

RT

237 South 18th Street, NE corner of Rittenhouse Square Street

Barclay Condominium Owners Association, Owner

Christian Busch, Architect

DATE: 1928

PROPOSAL: Window replacement

Mr. Baron explained the intricacies of the proposal. The original windows in the Barclay had single-glazed one-over-one double-hung windows. The condominium association plans to refurbish many of the windows, keeping the original configuration. However, individual unit owners may apply to change their windows, if they wish. Several months ago, the Committee and Commission approved a new window for one of the units, which matched the original window except it had double-glazing.

Mr. Baron said that the new windows approved previously have been installed. The double-glazing is highly reflective and appears almost mirror-like in certain lights. Also some unit owners, without approvals, have installed films on some windows to lower UV damage and increase the window’s energy efficiency. The staff expressed concern that all of the different

glazing and films would produce a mottled effect across the façade of the building, rather than a uniform appearance.

This proposal calls for installing new single-glazed sash and replacing glazing in sash throughout the building. Christian Busch, architect for the project, and Craig Rosenfeld, general manager for the condominium association, stated that they may install double-glazed sash in some windows if the owner wishes to have it. Staff did not object to the proposal, but asked that a single UV – low E film be approved for any future proposals.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal with the staff to review details.

lms

237 South 18th Street, NE corner of Rittenhouse Square Street

Hal Pote and Linda Johnson, Owners

Chris Heller, Architect

DATE: 1928

PROPOSAL: Legalize window replacement

Mr. Baron stated that the owners already installed these double-glazed windows, which match the originals in material and profile. The owners wish to install a clear 3M Low-E film on the windows.

The Committee voted to recommend approval.

lms

237 South 18th Street, NE corner of Rittenhouse Square Street

Ellis and Peggy Wachs, Owners

Christina Carter

DATE: 1928

PROPOSAL: Window replacement

Chris Carter, architect for the project, stated that the owner wishes to replace eight of the eleven windows in the unit. The replacements will match the originals in profile and material, but have double-glazing and the clear 3M UV film. The owners also wish to install the film on the remaining original windows in the unit.

The Committee voted to recommend approval.

1715-1717 Walnut Street

Midwood Management Corporation, Owner

Michael Schade, Architect

DATE: Mid 19th Century; refaced c. 1950

PROPOSAL: Demolition and new building

Ms. Pentz recused herself, owing to office's involvement with the project.

Mr. Baron explained that the present property originally consisted of two rowhouses, the rear ell of one of these remaining visible in the rear. In the 1950s or '60s, a new brick façade, combining the two buildings, was added. The inventory lists the property as “non-contributing.” The proposal calls for demolition of the building and the construction of a new two-story structure.

Michael Schade, architect for the project, presented a revised drawing and explained that the new building, though only two stories, will match the cornice lines of the neighboring buildings. He also stated that the design has been modified at the entrance. The central column will not be recessed at the entrance, but will stay at the building’s plane. Only the entrance doors will be recessed. He said that the new tenant will return with a signage proposal.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the demolition, on the condition that the owner has secured the finances and obtains a building permit for the new construction. It also recommended approval of the new construction as modified.

lms

256 South Van Pelt Street

Clinton Hewes, Owner

Arthur Wilson, Applicant

DATE: c. 1910

PROPOSAL: New front door

Mr. Baron presented the proposal to install a new front door on behalf of the applicant Arthur Wilson. The applicant proposes to replace the existing non-original door with a door that references the garage door. He could find no historic records to document the original door.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

RB

1927 Brandywine Street

Brian McLelland, Owner

Greg Berzinsky, Applicant

DATE: c. 1867

PROPOSAL: Façade renovations

The proposal involves renovations to the façade of a former carriage house including: replacement of a garage door with a new sectional roll down door to mimic the historic cross-buck design, a new front door, windows in the transom of the garage door, as well as the first and second floor, and new shutters. Mr. Baron explained that when the Commission designated the building individually in 1985, pictures showed a design for the first floor window and transom over the garage, removed by a former owner without a permit and not reflected in the current design proposal. In addition the Commission possesses an insurance survey from 1867 which describes a four-panel front door. The insurance survey in part conflicts with the 1985 photograph particularly in terms of window patterns.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with the following changes:

1. *The front door should have a vertical four-panel design,*

2. *The first floor window should follow the 7 pane or 4 pane design visible in the 1985 photograph of 1925 and 1927 Brandywine Street from the Commission's file*
3. *The staff should review details, particularly in the design of the garage transom bar and shutters which need some modification.*

RB

1612 North Street

Mary B. Mallon, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1886

PROPOSAL: Partial demolition and addition

Ms. Brennan described the application which calls for the construction of a new three-story rear addition with a two-story sloped addition to the existing house. Plans show an existing one-story rear ell removed. The Commission approved restoration work to the front façade, including the windows and doors, at the 11 October 2000 meeting. On the front elevation, two skylights penetrate the two-story fiberglass shingle sloped addition. The applicant's sightline study indicates that the sloped addition does not have visibility from North Street. A site visit by Mr. Tyler and Ms. Brennan confirmed, however, that the addition would be visible from North Street, 16th Street and Wallace Street. The sloped addition culminates in a one-story stucco-clad penthouse with two skylights. Plans show the penthouse having three, double hung 1/1 windows on the west elevation and a door and window on the rear elevation. On the rear façade, a wood roof deck extends approximately 17 feet behind the penthouse. The deck's railing, the rear of the penthouse, and the new three-story stucco addition all have visibility from the rear façade owing to vacant lots on Wallace Street. In addition, plans show new glass doors and double hung 1/1 windows on the addition's rear elevation. Staff recommended denial as submitted per Standard 9.

Mr. Atkins asked Manuel Delgado, Spring Garden Community Development Corporation, for clarification on the use of the space below the new roof slope. Mr. Delgado contended that owing to the higher roof on 1616 North Street and the planned new construction on Wallace Street, the slope's visibility would be minimal. A discussion among Committee members ensued on the visibility of the sloped roof portion.

Mr. Thomas stated that he did object to the sloped roof since new construction will alter the streetscape in the years to come. Mr. Atkins suggested lowering the slope of the roof to lessen the impact on the streetscape. The lowering of the slope would result in the penthouse forming a box shape.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the rear ell removal, the three-story rear addition and the rear deck. The Architectural Committee recommended approval of reducing the roof angle on the front façade to lower the slope of the roof and approval of a penthouse box all with staff to review details.

JLB

1614 North Street

Michael and Catherine Treacy, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1886

PROPOSAL: Partial demolition and addition

Ms. Brennan described the application which calls for the construction of a new three-story rear addition with a two-story sloped addition to the existing house. Plans show an existing one-story rear ell removed. The Commission approved restoration work to the front façade, including the windows and doors, at the 11 October 2000 meeting. On the front elevation, two skylights penetrate the two-story fiberglass shingle sloped addition. The applicant's sightline study indicates that the sloped addition does not have visibility from North Street. A site visit by Mr. Tyler and Ms. Brennan, however, confirmed that the addition would be visible from North Street, 16th Street and Wallace Street. The sloped addition culminates in a one-story stucco-clad penthouse with two skylights. Plans show the penthouse having three, double hung 1/1 windows on the east elevation and a door and window on the rear elevation. On the rear façade, a wood roof deck extends approximately 17 feet behind the penthouse. The deck's railing, the rear of the penthouse, and the new three-story stucco addition all have visibility from the rear façade owing to vacant lots on Wallace Street. In addition, plans show new glass doors and double hung 1/1 windows on the addition's rear elevation. Staff recommended denial as submitted per Standard 9.

The Committee members deferred to their discussion on 1612 North Street and agreed on the same recommendation for 1614 North Street.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the rear ell removal, the three-story rear addition and the rear deck. The Architectural Committee recommended approval of reducing the roof angle on the front façade to lower the slope of the roof and approval of a penthouse box all with staff to review details.

JLB

1616 North Street

Spring Garden Community Development Corporation, Owner

Manuel Delgado, Applicant

DATE: c.1886

PROPOSAL: Legalize penthouse and roof deck, rear alterations

Ms. Brennan described the application which calls for the legalization of a one-story, fourth floor penthouse and two roof decks and the approval of additional rear alterations. The Commission approved restoration work to the front façade, including the windows and doors, at the 11 October 2000 meeting. On the front elevation, a sightline study indicates that the nearly 13 foot long and 12 foot wide penthouse, as well as the roof deck railing which spans the width of the house, does not have visibility from North Street. A site visit by Mr. Tyler and Ms. Brennan proved, however, that the penthouse and decks had visibility from North Street, 16th Street and Wallace Street. The stucco-clad penthouse houses the entrance to a stair tower. On the rear façade, a wood roof deck extends approximately 17 feet behind the penthouse. The deck's railing, the rear of the penthouse, and the building's rear all have visibility from the rear façade owing to vacant lots on Wallace Street. In addition, plans show new glass doors and a stucco finish on the building's rear elevation. The double hung 1/1 vinyl windows shown on the rear have been previously reviewed by staff. Staff recommended legalization of the penthouse and roof decks per Standard 9. They also advocated approval of the remaining rear alterations per Standard 9.

The Committee members discussed the height of the roof at 1616 North Street and noted that its height exceeded that of both 1612 and 1614 North Street. Owing to the height of the building, the Committee members agreed that the penthouse treatment suited the structure.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of legalizing the three-story rear addition, the roof decks, and the penthouse box all with staff to review details.

Mr. Delgado then presented a request by PECO to place all of the meters on the front façade of 1612, 1614 and 1616 North Streets.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of PECO's request to place all meters on the front façade of 1612, 1614 and 1616 North Streets.

JLB

507 North 21st Street, SE corner of Brandywine Street

Carol Kaminski, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c.1855

PROPOSAL: Rear deck and rear dormer

Ms. Brennan presented the application which calls for a new dormer and a third floor roof deck on the rear of this corner property. Plans show a gable roofed dormer on the rear of the house constructed of wood siding with rubber roofing to match the existing roof material. The proposal also includes aluminum clad french doors that open onto the new third floor deck from the front of the dormer. The third floor deck utilizes wood decking and rails. Plans show a screen and pergola on the new deck. The deck and dormer have visibility from Brandywine Street. Staff recommended approval of the rear deck per Standards 9 and 10 and denial of the dormer per Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Atkins asked how the owner would access the third floor deck if the dormer was denied per staff's recommendation. The owner, Carol Kaminski, stated that access to the third floor deck would be exclusively through the dormer doors. Ms. Kaminski argued in favor of the dormer stating that it would add crucial light and air to the third floor of the house. Owing to the depth of the roof eave, Ms. Kaminski contended the dormer would have minimal visibility. Mr. Thomas commented that he was in favor of the dormer owing to its limited visibility.

A discussion among Committee members ensued regarding the importance of retaining the original roof brackets. Mr. Atkins suggested moving the dormer closer to the party wall and removing one of the symmetrical windows on the rear. After further discussion on the brackets and the dormer placement, Mr. Levy suggested narrowing the dormer allowing it to fit between the original brackets. Mr. Atkins concurred and recommended a dormer with a single door and no disruption of the brackets. Ms. Pentz suggested a shed roof on the dormer to simplify the roofline.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the third floor deck and approval of a modified dormer design with a shed roof, all brackets to remain and the new dormer to fit between the original brackets with a single door, all with staff to review details.

JLB

1216 Arch Street

Young Smyth Field Associates, Owner

Michael L. Prifti, Architect

DATE: 1902

PROPOSAL: Exterior alterations, rooftop installation

Ms. Brennan presented the application which calls for several building modifications to this eight-story structure. First, the applicant proposes replacing solid metal panels at the base of the Arch Street storefront window with perforated metal panels painted to match the existing trim. This perforated panel would serve to screen the intake louver of a new heat pump unit located in the building's interior. Second, plans show the addition of cable railing behind the existing metal rail on all seven Arch Street exit balconies. The cable railing height meets code and would wrap all three balcony sides. In addition, plans show a new railing on the building's rear balconies. Third, the application calls for the installation of a metal armature to support future antenna placement. Plans show metal tubes attached to an existing steel parapet brace. The armature would serve to support antennas proposed in separate building permits. The Telecommunications Committee met on 6 October 2000 to review an armature design and on 11 October 2000, the Commission denied the previously proposed placement of antennas on a similar armature. Finally, the applicant proposes replacing an existing pair of egress doors on Cuthbert Street with two separate, single leaf egress doors. The new door proposal shows the opening widened, and the original brick solidier course lintel removed and replaced with a steel lintel. Staff recommended denial of the perforated metal panels per Standards 6 and 9. Staff further recommended approval of the cable railing per Standard 9 with staff to review details of the cable color and texture. Staff recommended denial of the deck rails on the rear façade per Standard 9 with a recommendation for the same treatment as the Arch Street balcony rails. Owing to the Commission's decision on 11 October 2000, staff recommended denial of the armature placement. Staff recommended approval of the egress doors per Standard 6 with a recommendation that the lintel is placed behind the original solidier course lintel.

Ms. Pentz recused herself from the discussion. Michael Prifti, architect, elaborated on the perforated metal panels stating that the design was kept low on the building so as not to disrupt more of the building's façade. Mr. Baron asked if the mechanical system could tie into that of the rear tenant and therefore be placed in the rear of the building. Mr. Prifti replied that tying the two systems together would not be a viable option owing to lease issues. Mr. Thomas noted the need for the mechanical system and recommended approval of the perforated panels.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the perforated metal panels on the Arch Street façade with staff to review details including materials and color.

Ms. Brennan noted that plans show the Cuthbert Street balconies with a different rail than that of the existing Arch Street balconies. Mr. Prifti stated that the plans of the existing condition were not drawn correctly and that the Cuthbert Street balconies are already altered and built to code. Mr. Prifti then stated the black, stainless steel cable rail on the Arch Street balconies would allow the balconies to meet code.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the cable railings on the Arch Street balconies with staff to review details including materials and color.

Mr. Prifti stated the purpose of the armature proposal is to solve compliance issues for Nextel and other antenna providers. The armature design, he added, is a hybrid of new design and of the previously reviewed design. Mr. Prifti stressed his desire to designate an antenna zone with the

armature hidden by the parapet return. Mr. Baron commented that the Telecommunications Committee looked at several mock-ups to make their 6 October 2000 recommendation. Mr. Levy stated that antennas would not be visible in the middle portion of the front façade. Mr. Atkins concurred. Mr. Thomas noted the importance of establishing an antenna zone which would prevent the applicant from returning to the Committee and Commission for each antenna approval. Mr. Baron stated that since the Committee had not viewed a mock-up on the building and no technical expert was present at the meeting, it should not recommend approval for an antenna zone. Mr. Thomas asked the applicant and Nextel attorney Cynthia Tedeschi to bring a technical expert to the 8 August 2001 Commission meeting.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept of an antenna zone to be determined with technical input and perhaps a mock-up.

Mr. Prifti explained the need for new egress doors on the Cuthbert Street elevation to the Committee members. The new doors, with a wider doorway, would provide a dedicated entry for the basement tenant and would separate the upper and lower stairwells while adding security. Ms. Brennan reiterated staff's recommendation that the brick soldier course be retained if possible.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the egress doors as proposed with staff to review details.

JLB

1008-1010 Arch Street

Asian Bank, 1008 Arch Street, Owner

Liz Ricciardi, Applicant

DATE: 1902

PROPOSAL: Night deposit box

The proposal involves the installation of a night deposit box in the front window of the Asian Bank facing Arch Street. The façade, first altered in the 1940s received alterations approved by the Historical Commission a few years ago, which converted a former door into the window. The bank will use this twice-altered window as a location to install the box.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal

RB

128 Bainbridge Street

Michael Samschick, Owner

Joel Spivak, Applicant

DATE: c. 1771-1792

PROPOSAL: Legalize rear addition and façade renovations

The proposal seeks to legalize the substantial demolition of this late 18th century half gable wooden house and four-story addition constructed without a permit. The owner, Michael Samschick, submitted a conceptual design for the renovation of the existing house and construction of a three-story addition last November. That design received conceptual approval

in November 2000 with the condition that the front façade be restored in wood with window openings based on further research. The owner recently proceeded without a permit to demolish much of the wood house, which he explained had termite damage, and build an addition which exceeds the size of the structure formerly seen by the Commission. The applicant explained that his four-story structure exceeds the former three-story concept by about three feet because of lowered ceiling heights. The bulk of the building however, rises above the roof ridge of the historic house at 17 feet back from the front property line, rather than the formerly approved 24 feet. From the street this makes the addition loom above the smaller historic house. The Committee explained that they could not recommend approval of the proposed design, but urged the applicant to submit a redesign of the addition that maintains a 24-foot setback for the third and fourth floors. They did not object to the rise of three additional feet above the historic roof ridge at a setback of 24 feet. The Committee emphasized that any recommendation for approval of an addition would be subject to restoring/reconstructing the wood façades in their historic plane.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the current proposal based on Secretary of the Interior Standards 9 & 10.

RB

141-145 League Street

Dana Spain-Smith, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c.1850; c.1920

PROPOSAL: Façade alterations, roof deck

This application for alterations to an historic schoolhouse turned factory involves cutting down an existing opening, installing new and restoring old windows and building a roof deck. Two new pediments would sit over non-historic doorways. The windows on the side façade will have a one over one design. The staff recommended approval per Standards 9 and 10; however, any side windows visible to the public should have the original six over six true divided light design and the side pediment window should also match the historic design.

This building had large windows which are now bricked up and the doorway was formally in the side yard. The applicant proposes the current loading dock opening with the roll up gate as the main entrance and the smaller door as a secondary entrance with pediments above both entrances.

Committee members questioned the need for two doors. Mr. Levy raised the issue of the pediments aligning equally owing to the unequal sizes of the door openings. The Committee thought only one pediment necessary, over the main entrance and keeping the smaller door simple. It agreed with the staff recommendation for the windows.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with the following conditions:

- 1. six-over-six windows on the visible portions of the side façade, and*
- 2. one pediment above the larger door opening to the main entrance with the smaller opening remaining a simpler design.*

With the staff to review all details.

DMH

1900 Shunk Street, SW corner of 19th Street

Joseph Costanzo, Owner

Regina Trama, Applicant

DATE: 1910; James and John Windrim

PROPOSAL: Legalize removal of slate roof, replacement with black asphalt shingles

This application calls for legalizing the removal of the original slate roof and installation of black asphalt shingles without a permit. Staff advised the applicant of the need for a permit shortly after the start of construction. The staff recommended denial per Standard 6. The roofer should install slate on at least the front gambrel on Shunk Street.

Bert Trama attended the meeting and argued that he did not know about the need for a permit.

Mr. Baron explained that the Commission sent Mr. Costanzo a letter in 1999 explaining that the Commission reviews roofing. The Committee reiterated the importance of not setting precedents and giving equal consideration to neighbors faced with the same situation. Therefore, the Committee offered a compromise, that the existing asphalt shingles in the rear may remain subject to the restoration of slate in the front.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal as submitted but approval of the retention of the existing rear asphalt shingles subject to the restoration of the four slopes of the front gambrel and dormer with slate.

DMH

1412 Diamond Street

Yung King Lou, Owner

Philip Scott, Architect

DATE: 1886; John M. Sharp, Builder

PROPOSAL: Cut down front door

This proposal involves cutting down the entrance of this row house to create a handicap accessible ramp to a new restaurant. The staff recommended approval per A.D.A.

Philip Scott and Adam Xu attended the meeting to answer questions and explain the project. This building has been previously altered. The proposal removes steps and rebuilds the door opening for handicap accessibility. The plans show two options for the proposed new door. The Committee thought the option with the vertical divided transom appropriate.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of door with the vertical divided transom with the staff to review details.

DMH

1934-36 Park Mall

Temple University, Owner

Chris Zoog, Applicant

DATE: c. 1870

PROPOSAL: Exterior ductwork

Mr. Barr explained that the Commission, at its March meeting, voted to refer the proposed kitchen exhaust at the rear of the buildings back to the Committee. At that time the applicant had not established exact locations of the tenants that required kitchen exhaust ducts. Now, two restaurant tenants are located adjacent to one another and the kitchen exhaust chimneys can be placed at one location, on the new stucco infill wall, between 1934 and 1936 Park Mall. Mr. Parry explained that the ducts could not be incorporated into the wall, or located within the new space, because construction is almost complete and the upper floors have all been leased to Temple as office space. The exhaust ducts will be encased in stucco to match the stucco surface of the infill wall. Louvers are also proposed at the rear in both the new stucco wall and original brick wall at the first floor level.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the kitchen exhaust chimney, as proposed, and louvers with staff to review details.

JRB

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary