

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

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

Present

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Rudolph D'Alessandro
Herbert Levy, FAIA
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Suzanne Pentz

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

Also

Steve Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
Ana Maria Reyes and George Soto, 106 Kenilworth Street
Wayne Davis, 1615-17 Spruce Street
Richard DiPasquale, 1615-17 Spruce Street
Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association
Morris Chemitz, Society Hill Civic Association
Elizabeth Armour, Society Hill Civic Association
Edward Robinson, 2322 Lombard Street
Rebecca Stoloff, Society Hill Civic Association
Brother Joseph Willard, Archdiocese of Philadelphia
Herbert Lewis, Ueland Junker McCauley Nickolson
Joel Spivak
Amy Stein, 420 South Camac Street
Philip Otto, Otto Design Group
Jerry Roller, J.K. Roller Architects
Clifford Mumm
Christine Mumm
Jennifer Bonaccorsi, J. K. Roller Architects
David Schmidt, J. K. Roller Architects
Vince Vito, Marvin Windows
George Tait, Tague Lumber
Kenneth and Mary Panciera
Howard R. Lander, 919 Clinton Association
Carol Magen, 318 St James Street
Paula Legere, Musical Fund Hall Condominium
Lance Kraemer, Lance R. Kraemer Associates
Marianne Baker, George Baker Architects

Alan Karpo, Second Street Wholesale
 Lene Copeland, Michael Shannon Designs
 Elizabeth Osborne
 Anthony Imbiscuso, Wells Appel
 Christian A. Busch, The Sullivan Company
 Craig Rosenfeld, The Barclay
 Kathryn Hiester, 222 St. Marks Square
 W. Davis, 1615-17 Spruce Street
 Mary Ellen Strain, 2013 Sansom Street
 Len Sciulli, 2135 Wallace Street
 Megan McDuffee, 410 South 15th Street
 Frank Mallas, 2215 Delancey Street
 Patrick Dewey, 235 South 15th Street
 Kalyan Som, 2051 Walnut Street
 William Kane, Kane Woodworking
 Anthony Ciocca, ToryPete Management
 Ilan Seidenwar, 227 Market Street
 Neale F. Quenzel, John Milner Associates
 Tuong Huynk, Patridge Architects
 Manuel Delgado, Spring Garden Community Development Corporation
 Lori Aument, John Milner Associates

Herbert Levy, Vice-Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

106 Kenilworth Street

George Soto, Owner
 Joel Spivak, Architect
 DATE: c. 1740
 PROPOSAL: Rear addition and deck

This proposal involves alterations to the visible rear of this early rowhouse. The proposal involves raising and changing the shape of the original three-story rear ell, adding a deck and stair- house. The plans also show adding another story over the two-story southern most section of the building. This piece will cantilever out over the side yard of the building and hide the whole rear of the historic house.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standards 9 & 10. The addition damages and hide historic fabric and the new design is not compatible with the existing building.

George Soto and Ana Reyes, the owners, and Joel Spivak, the architect attended the meeting. Ms. Reyes said that the four-foot space in the rear can only be seen in the winter and expressed the need for additional space. She also noted the existence of decks in the area and also noted that the reason for the cantilevering outward is because the space is only 11 feet wide. Ms. Reyes said that the overhang would not be visible; however, the dormer will have visibility.

Committee members had concern with the overhang and the changing of the roofline. Members also concurred that the retention of the sloped roof profile is an important aspect to the proposal. After a lengthy discussed the Committee agreed that the third story addition, the southern most

portion should be revised to reflect a sloped roof to mimic the old rear ell with the removal of the transom windows and adjusting the remaining windows to match the scale of the fenestration of the rest of the building. The roof deck should be a continuous single level with the railing setback at least four feet from the rear.

The applicant owing to time constraints agreed to revise the plans to reflect the Committee's recommendations with the staff to review the design before the Commission meeting.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial as submitted but the approval of a revised design with the new third story roof on the southern most section of the building revised with a sloped roof, removal of the transom windows and the remaining windows adjusted to the scale of those on the rest of the building, which shall be reviewed by the staff prior to the Commission meeting.

116-18 Chestnut Street

116-18 Chestnut Street, LP, Owners

Joel Spivak, Architect

DATE: v. 1857, façade c, 1905

PROPOSAL: New windows and door on rear, close rear openings and cut new side windows, roof top stair enclosure and HVAC

This proposal involves alterations to this commercial structure, adding windows on the stuccoed side party wall, a new stairhouse and AC units on the roof and closing and replacing windows on the rear façade and adding a stair, door and stucco.

Staff recommendation: Approval; however the side windows should be paired or tripled one-over-ones and the rear windows should follow their current three-over-three muntin pattern per Standards 6, and 10.

Joel Spivak, the architect, and Michael Samschick, attended the meeting. Mr. Spivak proposes to stucco from the second floor down and retain a reveal where he is closing openings.

Committee members noted that the plans show paired one-over-one windows in the rear but the photographs show existing three-over-three windows. Mr. Rivera commented that for consistency, one-over-one is typical of the building as whole. Ms. Pentz inquired whether the proposed door on the rear could be moved into the existing opening. The applicant stated that the existence of a transformer pad may not allow for the door to be moved into the opening; but he would try to move it as much as possible.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the following:

1. *Stuccoeing from the second floor down in a brick color;*
2. *Rooftop stair house;*
3. *Placement of the HVAC;*
4. *Moving the rear door to align with the upper floor windows, and*
5. *Approval of the new windows on the side of the building.*

319-21 South 3rd Street

Lisa Colton, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1788, Addition c. 1968

PROPOSAL: 2nd story addition

Unlike the previous proposals for adding to this structure, this proposal maintains much more of the existing structure by adding a floor on top of the existing c. 1968 house addition. The architect has presented three proposals. Alternate A involves raising the roof, reversing the slope and building up the side wall in masonry with stucco as a continuation of the existing side wall. Alternate B shows the front window clerestory brought around the side and a new flat roofline projecting back from that point with standing seam metal siding covering the new wall. Alternate C retains the outline of the current roofline, but adds a roof that slopes downward from the existing front wall sheathed in the standing seam metal. The new side roof wall sits inboard of the existing side wall and chimney.

Staff recommendation: Approval of scheme C per Standard 9.

Kirk Clark and Edward Robinson attended the meeting. The applicant presented a choice of three options.

Rebecca Stoloff, Society Hill Civic Association, stated that elevations for the east façade with the courtyard have not been seen.

Committee members favored scheme #1 using the same metal on the roof. The Committee recognized that without elevations of all the facades, that the application is incomplete; a conceptual approval could be given for a scheme but before a final approval the Committee must see rear elevations, site plans and photographs of the existing rear façade.

The Architectural Committee recommended conceptual approval of scheme A but requested proposed rear elevations, site plans and photographs of the existing conditions of the rear façade.

320 Walnut Street

Archdiocese of Philadelphia, Owner

Mark Ueland, Architect

DATE: c. 1930

PROPOSAL: New windows, penthouse, rear additions and front doorway

The proposal returns to the Committee after a delay of six months during which the applicant has worked with the community, the congregation of Old St. Joseph's Church, and the National Park Service to modify the design. On the front façade, the architects have changed the doorway with the removal of the canopy and a new multi-pane side sliding door design. The plans still show a banner above the door. On the roof, the architect has modified the penthouse design with hipped roofs and raising the parapet wall with a stuccoed masonry extension. The windows of the side and rear facades will now retain their historic three-over-three pattern. The rear façade now features a larger stair tower with the HVAC cooling tower placed on top.

Staff recommendation: Approval with staff to review details with the following exceptions. The

front doorway design should follow the original historic design and the rail at the parapet should not be built up in masonry, but rather retain the former open rail design per Standards 9 & 10.

Herbert Lewis and Brother Joseph Willard attended the meeting. The applicant said that the existing finish of the front door frame is a painted-steel but the proposed color for the new door is bronze champagne with the rest of the metal a chrome or stainless steel and the stucco will be a clay pot color.

Committee members thought the proposal appropriate with the exception of the door details. It thought the door should have a larger frame. It also thought that the staff should review a stucco sample. Mr. Rivera said that anchoring the railing into the masonry could pose a problem; however, the applicant proposes to attach the railing to the inside of the parapet wall and extend inwardly.

Rebecca Stoloff speaking on behalf of the Society Hill Civic Association said that the revised proposal has addressed the concerns of the community.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the following:

1. *Approval of the side window mullion pattern;*
2. *Approval of the penthouse addition;*
3. *Approval of the railing attached to the inside of the parapet;*
4. *Approval of stairhouse with the air conditioning unit on the top;*
5. *Approval of the infill of the atrium;*
6. *Approval of the banner placement, and*
7. *Approval of the door with modifications and the staff to review all details.*

Two Committee members favored the proposal. Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Pentz recused themselves from the vote. It was noted that the replacement windows lack any detail and that the windows will need to return for a separate review.

420 South Camac Street

Marcy BonDurant, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Visible rear addition

This proposal involves adding a three-story addition to the rear of this half-gabled rowhouse. The third floor portion of the addition has visibility from Lombard Street.

Staff recommendation: Approval with lowered roof and possibly a setback to retain the sense of the half-gabled roof per Standard 9.

Amy Stein attended the meeting, to represent the owners and stated that lowering the roof could pose drainage problems but believes that the pitch could be changed slightly. She also said that the roof materials have been modified to match the existing and presented roof plans that show the existing dormer with a new cricket to drain water off existing shed roof. Ms. Stein noted that the addition would be stucco with wood siding and have glass block in the recess behind the deck and all the facades will be setback. She said that a possible drain for the yard might be needed.

Mr. Rivera questioned the width of the addition, which is from party wall to party wall. Committee members discussed the proposal and believed that a lower roof profile will help with water infiltration.

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

323 Cypress Street, NW corner St. Peters Way

Adam and Emily Martidez, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1890

PROPOSAL: 3rd floor addition and roof deck

This proposal involves two schemes to add a floor and a deck on top of this carriage house. Scheme A involves a box-like addition with a deck and trellis at the front of the building. Scheme B shows a stuccoed gable roofed addition with cross gable dormers. This proposal shows a deck at front and rear with a painted metal railing. A former application for a roof top addition received a denial as well, based on the massing and scale which overwhelms the existing house. The roofline of this house has great visibility from its location on a corner and the fact that it sits across the street from a park.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standards 9 & 10.

Kirk Clark and Edward Robinson attended the meeting. Mr. Clark stressed that the building has already been altered.

Committee members believed that the proposal changes the character of the building and overwhelms the scale of the existing structure.

Paul Boni speaking on behalf of the Society Hill Civic Association expressed that the Association has not reviewed the proposal, which it considers a high priority issue.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial per Standards 9 and 10.

223 Delancey Street

Steven Grasse, Owner

Scott Ritchie, Architect

DATE: Front façade c. 1966, rear addition c. 1890

PROPOSAL: Cut new rear windows, replace roof deck

This proposal involves rebuilding an existing roof deck and cutting some rear façade windows down into two leaf doors, adding balconies and transom windows. This work has some visibility from American Street.

Staff recommendation: Approval with the doors changed to wood French doors with muntins, without transoms, and the top floor windows changed to wood double hung windows with muntins per Standards 9 & 10.

Philip Otto and Scott Ritchie attended the meeting to explain the project and answer questions.

Elizabeth Armour inquired about the finish on the deck, and the applicant responded that it would be with horizontal cedar with vertical pickets and that planters will finish off the horizontal elements.

Paul Boni, speaking on behalf of the Society Hill Civic Association as well as the neighbors expressed support for the proposal.

Mr. Levy questioned the window match and Ms. Pentz questioned the double hung windows, and it was noted that the first floor's vocabulary would match the French doors. Mr. Levy believed that muntins should be consistent on both floors and that without the transom the masonry will be disproportional.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval as submitted.

220 West Washington Square, NW corner of Locust Street

Clifford Mumm, Owner

Jennifer Bonaccorsi, Architect

DATE: 1911

PROPOSAL: Penthouse addition

This proposal involves a penthouse for the roof of the building. The penthouse meets the criteria for setbacks from the south and east facades as well as the height limits established by the former conceptual approval. The penthouse has multiple windows with arch top fanlights.

Staff recommendation: Approval with staff to review details; however, the fanlights should be changed to rectangular transoms and the rooftop gate and railings should be lowered to a code compliant height and pulled back from the parapet per Standard 9.

In attendance of the meeting was Jerry Roller, the architect, Christine and Clifford Mumm, the owners, David Schmidt and Jennifer Bonicorrsi. Mr. Roller said that the high fence is not along the front parapet, it separates the garden from the mechanical equipment and is needed for security. The rest of the deck rail would be anchored on the inside of the parapet wall. In addition, he noted that the exterior would consist of a light cream color stucco to match the building's trim and a standing seam metal roof of a neutral green color.

Committee members thought the fanlight element should be of a rectangular design to match the existing elements of the building.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval as submitted with a change in the fanlight transom element to a rectangular element and the fence with a squared top. Mr. D'Alessandro recused himself.

220 West Washington Square, NW corner of Locust Street

220 West Washington Square Condominium Association, Owner

Alan Hartell, Applicant

DATE: 1911

PROPOSAL: New wood windows

This proposal calls for the replacement of all the windows in the building including the wood sash on the Washington Square side of the building and the metal sash of the Locust Street side of the building. The applicant proposes a new wood sash with a muntin that is wider than those on the east façade and narrower than those on the south side. The applicant shows both narrow applied muntins and wide true-divided-light muntins as options. In both cases the putty slope lacks the depth of the existing windows.

Staff recommendation: Denial. The metal windows have been restored and should be retained. The wood window replacements should match the existing exactly in terms of muntin width and putty slope as well as being true-divided-light per Standard 6.

George Tait, Tague Lumber, Vince Vita and John Ciccone attended the meeting. Mr. Ciccone stated that after meeting with Mr. Baron, they have changed the proposal. Now they propose to match the existing window muntins within a 1/8 of an inch. In addition, he proposes to replace all the windows for uniformity and he noted that the drawings show true divided light windows. The 11/16 muntins will now be 7/16 with the putty slope depth slightly different. Mr. Ciccone also said that the operational issue is most important, since the first floor windows are very large and much heavier in weight.

Mr. Levy inquired whether the National Park Service has reviewed the proposal. Mr. D'Alessandro thought that the first floor windows should be restored rather than replaced. Mr. Baron suggested that in places on the first floor where there are metal windows, they should be retained. When this idea was rejected, he recommended that a sample of each type of window be retained on the building.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval as submitted using wood, on both facades, and the retention of one of the original metal windows for documentation.

233 South Quince Street, SE corner of Latimer Street

Mary and Kenneth Panciera, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1830, modified c. 1867

PROPOSAL: Legalize changes to deck, change in paint color

This proposal involves modifications to a rear highly visible deck. Although this deck was approved last year, it was constructed differently than approved with a different rail and flower boxes. At that time the Commission approved a scheme to paint it either cream or green to match the existing trim. The applicant would now like to stain the wood a redwood color.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the redwood stain, and new faux-historic deck rail per Standard 9.

Mary and Kenneth Panciera, the owners, attended the meeting and stated that the deck has the engineer's approval as design. Although the Commission previously approved a green color to match the shutters or a light cream color, the applicants prefer a stain, which will show the grain in the wood.

Mr. Rivera noted that the deck was not built to the specifications approved by the Commission. He noted that the railing spindles vary from the approved submission. The Committee thought that since it is on the street façade that it should be compatible with the house and therefore any color other than the green or light cream should be denied. It recommended that the applicant bring samples of paint or stain colors back to the Committee for review.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the legalization of the deck's design subject to the denial of a color other than the approved green or light cream.

919 Clinton Street

Howard Lander and Kevin Clark, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1836

PROPOSAL: Demolish rear addition and add new rear bay

This proposal involves removing a late 19th century rear addition that faces onto an alley and installing a rear bay onto the original rear ell in its place. The insurance survey indicates that a bay existed previously in that location. The chimney on the rear extension is Imminently Dangerous.

Staff recommendation: Approval per the Restoration guidelines.

Howard Lander, Kevin Clark and Sean Clark attended the meeting. The Committee thought the proposal an appropriate restoration.

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

810 Locust Street, Musical Fund Hall

Musical Fund Hall, Owner

Paula Legere, Applicant

DATE: 1824, modified by William Strickland, Napoleon LeBrun and 1891 Addison Hutton, site of first Republican presidential convention.

PROPOSAL: Bird repellent

This proposal attempts bird control with the installation of Nixalite on the ledges and column capitals on the front façade of the building.

Staff recommendation: Denial, the applicant should consider bird netting as a less visible alternative. A sample should be installed for review.

Paula Legere attended the meeting and said that the areas most impacted with birds are the cornice, roof, top level and the capital area. She said that exterminators ruled out netting as a possibility over the center area.

The Committee cited various buildings such as the Free Library, which has netting and recommended that she explore that option.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the Nixalite as submitted but gave the applicant recommendations for other options.

124 Market Street

Sue-Jan L.L.C., Owner

Keith Hobbs, Applicant

DATE: c. 1830 altered c. 1900

PROPOSAL: New windows and storefront

This proposal involves adding a door to the front façade to reach living spaces upstairs. The existing storefront has a central entrance. The applicant proposes a second entrance in the left bay as a single-leaf door with a sidelight.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the second entrance as a double-leaf door.

Jan Handler, Jeffrey Cairone and Lance Kraemer, the architect attended the meeting. Mr. Kraemer said that the overall opening is 4 feet 10 inches column to column, which will give an extremely large door. He also said that owing to the ramp on the interior the door location must remain the same.

Mr. Levy thought a single door more appropriate on the entrance to the upper floor and that the removal of the upper transom on the central entrance will give more light. He also thought that the two doors and window should all be the same height. Mr. Rivera suggested that a metal system instead of wood be used so it could read as a glazed opening, and make the center different with a thin transom with the center 46 inch door with divided lights mimicing the door in 122 Market Street.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the side entrance as proposed with the jambs built out and a sidelight with the continuation of the transom all the way across, but the removal of the secondary transom and install a taller door in the center bay to mimic the height of the new proposed door. All details shall be reviewed by the staff.

102 North 2nd Street

Alan Karp, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Handicap ramp and railing

The applicant proposes to install a handicap ramp and railing to run nearly 18 feet along the front façade of his and his neighbor's storefronts. He has secured his neighbor's permission to build the ramp.

Staff recommendation: The ramp should be installed inside the store, cutting down the step.

Alan Karpo, the owner, and Mary Anne Baker, the architect attended the meeting. Mr. Karpo stated that he wants to sell lottery tickets and the ramp is a state requirement for that use. The owner of the adjoining property which will receive the ramp, does not use his cellar area often.

Committee members questioned the possibility of an interior ramp and the material of the existing paving. The applicant responded that an interior ramp is not possible and that the existing paving is concrete. Mr. Levy thought that the applicant should consider an easement in case of a change in ownership of the neighboring property.

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

1912-14 Brandywine Street

Elizabeth Osborne, Owner

Lene Copeland, Architect

DATE: c. 1910

PROPOSAL: Replace garage doors, new exterior lighting

This proposal appears before the Committee again with a revised garage door design modified to appear more like the historic door it would replace. The design also calls for a new door and light design.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the door and light design with staff to review details. Denial of the garage door per Standard 9. The staff thought the historic garage doors should be preserved and the glass panes in the proposed door are horizontal in orientation unlike the historic design.

Elizabeth Osborne, the owner, and Lene Copeland, the architect, attended the meeting. The applicant submitted three options for the revised plans, with both square and horizontal panes of glass but the Committee thought the glass should be more in the direction of the original. The owners preference is option #1 with a fixed transom at the top. The applicant believes that option #1 best ties into the character of the block and relates more to the original door.

Mr. D'Alessandro thought that the original doors should be retained on the property. Mr. Baron questioned if the drawings need to be revised to show a bottom rail on the transom window panes. He believed that option #3 allows for vertical proportions. Committee members discussed the various options presented and thought that option #1 more appropriate. It also recommended option #1 of the proposed exterior lighting designs and the approval of the person door.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of option #1 door design and option #1 of the exterior light design and approval of the person door subject to the retention of the original door on the site, with the staff to review details.

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

Barclay Condominium Owner's Association, Owners

Christian A. Busch, Architect

DATE: 1928, J.E.R. Carpenter, Architect

PROPOSAL: Cooling tower on roof and streetscape alterations

The proposal involves the installation of a cooling tower on the roof of the Barclay in place of the Classical water tower that formerly existed in that location, which a former owner removed without a permit. The Commission gave conceptual approval to such a scheme with the new cooling tower to be screened with a design appropriate to the architecture of the building. Mr. Busch has returned with three schemes, one of which leaves the units unscreened, another design wraps a simple scrim around the top portion of the units, and the third covers the base structure of the units. In addition the applicant proposes streetscape alteration with paving, bollards and planters and railings.

Staff recommendation: Denial, The screen should not copy the historic water tower because the HVAC units will occupy twice the space of that structure, but it should fit the architecture of the building per the Commission's directive. Approval of the streetscape alterations except that the new railings and planters should not attach to the existing building.

Christian Busch, the architect, Craig Rosenfeld, the Barclay and Anthony Imbiscuso attended the meeting. Mr. Busch said that he proposes to clad the modern equipment in a Dryvit and fiberglass construction. The bottom would be covered with a stainless steel mesh. The proposed construction will eliminate the units from the balconies. The construction will be visible from 18th Street but owing to not being able to add a lot of additional weight the structure will need to be light weight. Mr. Rosenfeld believes that the structure should be less ornamental to lessen its visual impact.

Committee members thought that because of its high visibility, the design should be revised to incorporate some architectural references to the building such as a horizontal band and some arches. The Committee concurred that the streetscape alterations fit the overall scheme of the building but thought that the planters should not attach to the building.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of a revised design of the cooling tower's screening using a light material with details such as the horizontal band and applied arch design and expanding the flat panel to extend to the catwalk and divisions in the lower panels to lessen the wind load. They also recommended approval of the streetscape alterations with the planters not attaching to the building.

2029 Cherry Street

Robert Sutton, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Legalize painting the façade, new front door and transom

This proposal calls for the legalization of painting the building façade and replacing the front door and transom. The house was painted previously. The replacement door is a metal, six-panel door with the two upper panels glazed. The vinyl transom has a single light.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the transom and door, per entrance guideline, the door and transom should be replaced in wood and the door should have six wood panels. Denial of the

paint, per the masonry guideline, the house should be repainted in colors that reflect the actual masonry material.

Robert Sutton, the owner, attended the meeting and claimed that he checked the guidelines before proceeding with the painting of the house to correct its poor paint condition. He thought that the paint was consistent with other houses on the block and asked that the Committee accept the painting. He also said that replacing the door would be a major expense; however, the applicant said that he still has the original door, which is in very poor condition. He described the door as an early 20th century door, with eight lights and long lower panels.

Committee members said that the door was not the original. They stated that the original door would've had six panels. Some Committee members noted that some shutters have been removed, but they were not the original shutters.

The Architectural Committee recommended legalization of the paint and transom subject to the door replacement and gave the applicant the option of removing or retaining the shutters.

222 St. Marks Square

Christopher and Kathryn Hiester, Owners/Applicants

DATE: 1877-80, George W. and William D. Hewitt

PROPOSAL: Legalize storm doors

The application calls for the legalization of storm doors on the front façade. The double-leaf doors are fully glazed but have metal frames and the bottom rail does not match the height of the original door.

Staff recommendation: Denial, per Standard 9. The doors should match the glazing of the original doors and be made in wood (as the doors on the neighboring house).

Kathy Heister, owner, attended the meeting to answer any questions. Ms. Spina explained that this house had storm doors previously. The new storm doors have been installed and the applicant wishes to legalize the work. Ms. Spina stated that although they have not reviewed many storm door applications, the Commission has typically approved simple wood doors with full glazing. Ms. Pentz commented that these doors are practically fully glazed and they do not alter the original double doors or any existing historic fabric.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the project as submitted.

1615-17 Spruce Street

Jon Hollander, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Roof deck, painting façade

This proposal calls for a roof deck on the rear ell of the building. It proves slightly visible from 16th Street. Also, the owner wishes to repaint the front façade in colors that match the existing, cream with olive green trim.

Staff recommendation: Approval, per roofing guideline. Denial of the paint, per masonry guideline. The house should be repainted in colors that reflect the actual masonry material.

Wayne Davis attended the meeting to represent the owner. Ms. Spina explained the staff position that the new paint colors proposed on this previously painted façade should simulate the colors of the original masonry. Mr. Davis pointed out that the facades of 1613 and 1615 Spruce Street are a matching pair and both are painted the same. The owners believe that the existing paint scheme unifies the group and they want to maintain the existing appearance. Ms. Spina added that these facades were painted at the time of designation. Mr. Levy observed that the Garden restaurant was always painted this color. Mr. Rivera thought that the existing paint scheme provided a sort of identification for the restaurant. The Committee agreed that repainting with the same color was acceptable in this case.

Ms. Spina explained that a portion of the roof deck at the rear would be slightly visible from 16th Street. The Committee agreed that the visibility, down a passage between two buildings, was minimal.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the project as submitted.

2220 Delancey Street

Dan Bleznak, Owner

Mary Ellen Strain, Architect

DATE: c. 1877 for William Weightman

PROPOSAL: New rear door and railing

The Commission denied the previously proposed deck on the rear bay of this building. The owner is now proposing cutting the window down to a door, installing a double-leaf multi-paned door and a balconette of painted metal pickets.

Staff recommendation: Approval, per Standard 9.

Mary Ellen Strain, architect, attended the meeting to represent the project. Ms. Spina explained that the Commission previously reviewed this submission and a proposed deck, and door alteration on the rear bay, was denied. The work at rear has been revised in response to comments made by the Commission at the previous meeting. Mr. Rivera asked if the new railing would be located within the opening. Ms. Strain confirmed that it would and it would be a simple, straight black metal rail. Mr. Rivera stated that the revised submission was a good compromise.

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

1428-30 Locust Street, aka 235 South 15th Street, Vida Building

Philadelphia Management Company, Owner

Patrick Dewey, Applicant

DATE: 1915

PROPOSAL: New signs

This proposal calls for the removal of the neon signs at the corner of the building and replacing them with internally-lit plastic box signs. The same applicant installed signs of individual halo-lit metal letters at another location. That signage would be more appropriate for this Beaux-Arts building.

Staff recommendation: Denial, per Standard 9 and the signage guideline. One staff member suggested a projecting sign at the corner so that the sign does not obscure the historic masonry detailing at the corner.

Steve Marsh, project manager, and Patrick Dewey, contractor, attended the meeting to represent the project. Ms. Spina explained that the Cosi restaurant chain is updating signage at their locations in the City. Previously, the Commission reviewed a signage proposal for the location at 2nd and Lombard Streets. Ms. Spina stated that the staff would handle the review of the proposed awnings. Mr. Marsh explained that the background of the bottom section of the proposed sign was modified in response to comments made by Committee at the previous meeting for the 2nd Street location. The background has been changed to a solid burgundy. Ms. Spina observed that the existing sign has individual neon letters, which do not obscure the architectural details the way this plastic box sign would. The Committee discussed the architecture and the prominence of this corner. Mr. Rivera stated that the signage should be designed to fit with the architecture of the building. Staff thought that individual halo-lit letters, as approved at the 2nd Street location, would be acceptable for this building. The Committee also discussed the idea of a double-sided projecting sign, which would not obscure any architectural details. Mr. Dewey responded that a projecting sign of this size would require a variance from the zoning requirements. Mr. Marsh stated that he understood that if they rework, or “re-letter”, the existing sign then the work could be reviewed at staff level. The Staff and Committee confirmed that since Commission approved the existing sign, the staff could approve its modification.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the project as submitted and suggested that the applicant work with staff on a revised design.

2215 Delancey Street

Sophia Demas and Frank Mallas, Owners/Applicants

DATE: 1879

PROPOSAL: New windows

The proposal calls for new sash in a box frame to be installed within the existing frames. This will cut the glazing by approximate 2 inches on each window.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standard 6 and the window guideline.

Frank Mallas, owner, attended the meeting with Neil Steiner, a representative from Marvin windows. Ms. Spina explained the proposal to remove the storms and install a new wood window, with frame, inside the existing frame. Although this approach retains the existing exterior brickmoulding and interior trim, the glass area is reduced 2 1/8” in width. Mr. Mallas stated that they want to remove the square-head storm windows and maintain the segmental-arch top sash. He

stressed that they do not want to install vinyl jamb liners, as is the common practice when replacing sash in existing frames, because the plastic is unsightly and not historic. There are interior shutters attached to the interior trim and Mr. Mallas does not want to remove that material in order to fit a wider window unit behind the existing brickmoulding. The Committee discussed the technology of jamb liners. Mr. Steiner discussed the jambs of the proposed window, which feature wood filler pieces that cover the vinyl mechanism. Marvin windows also make a tilt pack sash replacement kit with vinyl jamb liners. Mr. Rivera stated that the reduction of the width of the glass would not be as noticeable in a large one over one unit. Mr. Levy agreed that the change would be more noticeable in a smaller window or a window with multiple panes. The Committee agreed that three new windows at rear should be two over two to match the three existing historic windows visible in photographs.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposed windows with the staff to review details. The Committee voted to recommend approval of the replacement of the two over two windows at rear with tilt pack sash kits with jamb liners

2051 Walnut Street, NE corner of 21st Street

Nature's Gallery Florist, Incorporated, Owner

Kalyan Som, Architect

DATE: c. 1855-60

PROPOSAL: New storefront

This application calls for removing the existing storefront and replacing it with a new metal and glass storefront. The existing façade, though non-historic fabric, has a symmetrical design with a central door flanked by two plate-glass windows. The proposed storefront calls for a door to the west and a single plate-glass window to the east.

Staff recommendation: Approval of replacing the storefront, in concept, per the storefront guideline. However, some staff members thought the symmetry of the existing storefront reflects the overall symmetry of the building's architecture and that a central door should remain in the new storefront as well.

Kalyan Som, the architect, attended the meeting and stressed the need for more space and believes that the off-centered door can accomplish this. In addition, he noted that the storefront has already been altered. He showed two design options for the door, one with an arched top and one with a squared top.

Committee members thought that the squared off-centered doorway an appropriate solution.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the squared off-centered storefront.

218 South 20th Street

NWJ Management, Owner

John Coffen, Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: New cornice

This building suffered a serious fire, which destroyed the roof and cornice. This proposal is for the installation of a pierced wood cornice. Some evidence remains that the house originally had a Neo-Grec pierced, slanted cornice, rather than the typical bracketed cornice found on most Italianate buildings. The actual pattern of piercing is unknown and the proposal mimics the cornice found on another building in the neighborhood.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the design with staff to review details, per Standard 6 and the roofing guideline.

William Kane attended the meeting to explain and answer questions about the proposed new cornice.

Committee members thought the proposed cornice appropriate to the building.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal as submitted.

1428-34 Chestnut Street, SE corner of 15th Street, Packard Building

Chest-Pac Associates, LP, Owners

Anthony Ciocca, Applicant

DATE: 1922-24, Ritter & Shay, architects

PROPOSAL: Cut new rear door

The developer for this building wishes to install an entrance on the Sansom Street façade of this building. The proposal involves cutting a door under an existing window and installing a frameless-glass double-leaf door. The proposal also includes two new lights flanking the door and a bronze plaque for signage.

Staff recommendation: Approval, with staff to review details, per Standard 9. However, the door should be moved to the middle bay, if possible, to remain in keeping with the symmetry of the original façade and the doors should have metal frames.

Anthony Ciocca and Twong Huynk, the architect, attended the meeting. When questioned by the Committee about the possibility of moving the proposed door over for symmetry, Mr. Ciocca responded that a four-foot differentiation exists between levels on the interior, and that the stairs have been shifted to create the entranceway.

Committee members discussed the door details and thought a framed metal door more appropriate to the building; however, they thought the proposed exterior lights and signage compatible to the building.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal as submitted but with metal-framed doors.

1909,1913,1915,1925,1930,1931,1934,2021, Mt. Vernon Street**1908,1912,1914,1916,1920,1930,1932,1934 2032 Wallace Street****619,626,628,630,634 North 18th Street**

Spring Garden Limited Housing Partners, Owners

Manuel Delgado, Applicant

DATE: c. 1865

PROPOSAL: Masonry coating of marble

This proposal, for a coating, using the Thoro-coat system, on the marble door surrounds, lintels and sills, returns to the committee for further discussion. At the previous meeting, the Committee recommended denial, and instead, recommended treating the marble with a light abrasive treatment, such as Gomage or JOSS. The Commission agreed and denied the proposal as submitted.

Staff recommendation: Denial, per Standard 7. The applicant has not investigated the recommended abrasive treatments, so the staff considers the application incomplete.

Manuel Delgado attended the meeting noted that the suggested JOSS system is too expensive. Mr. Delgado and Mr. Baron made on site determinations for each of the proposed properties. Mr. Baron thought that each property should be considered individually because some could be left as is and some need sanding while others need painting. He noted that with the varying conditions, uniformity is not possible. Mr. Baron compiled a chart with the proposed addresses and noted the recommended solution for each property. Mr. Rivera suggested the use of a wire brush to remove

paint from the more intricate areas. The Committee recommended that a sample be presented to the staff before proceeding with the process in its entirety.

The Architectural Committee recommended that each property be taken individually and that the staff should review a sample before proceeding with the recommended process entirely.

One East Penn Square, aka 1-21 North Juniper Street, NE corner of Market Street

Granite Penn Square L.L.C., Owner

F. Neale Quenzel, Architect

DATE: 1930, Ritter and Shay Architects

PROPOSAL: Alter transom above main entrance for canopy hangers

This application calls for a revision of the support system for a previously approved canopy on the Juniper Street façade of this building. The proposal involves removing two panes of glass in the window above the door so that the cables can be attached to the support structure of the building. The other alternative would be to penetrate the ornate terra cotta on the sides of the window.

Staff recommendation: Approval, since the glazing is new material.

Laurie Aument and Neale Quenzel attended that meeting and Mr. Quenzel stated that the non-historic metal spandrels have been removed and replaced with glass. The structural cables that are needed to support the canopy cannot be anchored to the masonry because of floor location and they are too thick to go through the vertical mullions of the new glazing.

The Committee thought the proposed location appropriate owing to the historic fabric of the new windows.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary