

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

**24 APRIL 2007
CITY HALL, ROOM 578
9:30 A.M.**

PRESENT

Suzanne Pentz
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Daniela Voith, AIA
Herbert Levy, FAIA

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician

ALSO PRESENT

David Jackson
Bill Hardy, Hardy Real Estate
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Cory Kegerise, Elfreth's Alley Association
Kip & Sheri Waide
John Ciccone, John Ciccone Architects
Jeff Wyant, Jeffrey Wyant Architects
Danielle Capozzi
Peter Wessel
Brad Roeder, John Milner Architects
Steven Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
Henry Lewis
Toddy Curry, Emerald Windows
Richard Ortega, Hillier
Nathan Flanigan
Jason Hill
Richard Stange, Fink und Stange Architects
Hope Zoss, Smith Memorial Playground

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Levy called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Mses. Pentz and Voith and Mr. McCoubrey joined him on the Architectural Committee.

6408 GERMANTOWN AVENUE

Owner: David Jackson

Applicant: David Jackson

History: 1884

Project: Reroof slate mansard with rubber shingles.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to repair a large open hole in the mansard, remove existing slate shingles, and replace the roof with a high-quality, rubber, composite shingle matching the existing in size, shape, and color.

In 1999, prior to the current ownership, this property was declared Imminently Dangerous. The applicant subsequently purchased the property and proposed a restoration project. In November 2006, the project was approved at the staff level with work to include various repairs, masonry cleaning, porch repair, window replacements, and stuccoing. This application is an amendment to the approved restoration application and will address the damaged roof, which is in urgent need of repair. Note that the staff does not have the authority to approve replacement materials for slate when on mansards and turrets.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Committee. David Jackson, the owner, represented the application.

Mr. Jackson described the deteriorating conditions of the building. Several contractors have advised him that the building is in imminent danger. He stated that he is proposing a rubber slate-like roof that will replicate the original slate roof. He explained that the deteriorated building is structurally unsound and would not support a true slate roof. He noted that sections of the building including the front porch and the rear appear as though they never had slate. Mr. Levy stated that he is concerned about the gutter material. He asked the applicant to use a dark aluminum that would not stand out.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standard 6.

1702 DIAMOND STREET

Owner: Willie C. Hardy

Applicant: Willie C. Hardy

History: 1886-1887, contributing to the Diamond Street Historic District

Project: Install internally illuminated sign.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a 2'x6' acrylic-faced, internally-illuminated sign 12' above grade to cover the storefront transoms below the storefront cornice. The sign will be attached to the wood window frame.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Committee. Willie C. Hardy, the owner, represented the application.

Mr. Levy objected to the proposed placement of the sign over the transom, which would disappear behind the sign. He suggested installing a sign below the transom that would coincide

with the glass divisions. Mr. McCoubrey objected to the internal illumination of the sign and noted that such signs are routinely denied by the Commission. Mr. Hardy stated that he attempted to keep the signage as subtle as possible. He remarked that he does not prefer to have a hanging sign, which are not typical in this area. He stated that a painted sign on the windows would be acceptable. Mr. Levy suggested that light fixtures could be installed to project downward, illuminating a painted sign on the glass.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

2028-2034 SANSOM STREET

Owner: The Sanmor Limited Partnership

Applicant: John Ciccone

History: 1910s

Project: Construct ADA ramp and rear addition.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of an ADA ramp along the front facade beginning at 2034 Sansom Street and continuing up to the porch of 2030 Sansom Street. The ramp material would include a concrete platform with a metal pipe railing with perforated metal panels.

This application also proposes a rear one-story addition for restrooms, a lobby, and a trash collection area. The addition would be located in a niche between the existing theater structure and rear of 2043 Sansom Street, which is accessible only via a small side alley leading to 21st Street. The addition would be clad in brick with a small overhang faced with aluminum for the trash collection area.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the rear addition pursuant to Standard 9, no recommendation on the ramp until additional information is provided.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Committee. No one attended the review to represent the application.

Ms. Voith asked how the applicant could propose locating a ramp in front of the adjacent properties. Ms. Sell explained that the theater occupies all of the properties that the proposed ramp would flank. Mr. Baron suggested that a portion of the ramp could be located within the open porch. Ms. Voith suggested that the ramp be relocated to the interior. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the proposed ramp would eclipse the historic basement windows. Ms. Voith and Mr. Levy stated that the architectural drawings are very confusing and lack necessary elevations. Mr. McCoubrey objected to the perforated metal panels at the railing. Mr. Baron replied that the applicant had explained that the perforated panels were designed to prevent the locking of bicycles to the railing. The Committee members suggested several revisions to the ramp to reduce its impact on the historic buildings and streetscape. They concluded that they needed to have a conversation with the architect before they could offer suggestions that would lead to an approvable design. They noted for the record that they are not opposed to the concept of a ramp, but observed that its design can be improved to protect historic resources. They stated that the architect should have attended the review. They suggested that the architect develop alternate schemes.

The Committee considered the plans for the addition. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the plans for the addition were not complete. However, they noted that the one-story addition was acceptable because it would have little or no public visibility.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the addition, but denial of the ADA ramp as submitted.

The applicant, architect John Ciccone, arrived 30 minutes late for his scheduled review, after the Committee had issued its recommendation. The Committee informally discussed its conclusions with Mr. Ciccone, but declined to reconsider its recommendation.

423 CATHERINE STREET

Owner: Kip and Sheri Waide

Applicant: Danielle A. Capozzi

History: Designated individual 12/31/1984

Project: Construct two-story rear addition

OVERVIEW: This two-and-a-half story house, built in 1832, retains its original configuration, which includes the main section with a gabled roof and a small rear ell. This application proposes to construct a two-story addition at the rear of the property, within the void created by the historic rear ell, leaving it in place. The proposal calls for the demolition of the rear wall of the main section, the infilling of the existing rear door of the ell, and the installation of a rear entrance with a French door at the ground floor and a large casement at the second floor in the rear façade of the addition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, provided the rear wall of the main section is removed only at the first-floor level, not the second, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee. Kip and Sheri Waide, the property owners, and architects Danielle Capozzi and Jeff Wyant represented the application.

In response to Ms. Voith's request for the clarification on the extent of demolition at the rear, Mr. Wyant stated that he is proposing to demolish the rear wall of the main section at the first and second-floor levels and to partially demolish the side wall of the rear ell. Ms. Cote explained that the applicant could retain the second-floor rear wall of the main section of the building, which is historic fabric, and still satisfy his program. Ms. Pentz observed that the walls appeared skewed in the drawings. Mr. Wyant replied that his survey of the building showed that the rear walls are, in fact, skewed. Mr. Waide stated that the skew is an oddity of the original construction. Ms. Voith stated that the Committee has sought to preserve rear ells when they are visible from the public right-of-way. She also stated that the ell is a character-defining feature. Ms. Voith asked if there is a public right-of-way at the rear of the property. Ms. Waide replied that there is a narrow alley. She also reported that there is an 8' fence at the rear of the property. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the proposed alterations would have a minimal impact on the public view. Mr. Levy concurred, stating that the alteration would only be minimally visible with the fence and significant setback. Ms. Voith asked the Committee if it agreed that the rear wall of the main section should be retained as the staff has suggested. Mr. Wyant stated that the purpose for removing the wall is to add space and light. If forced to retain the wall, the functionality of the space would be limited. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the architect retain small segments of the rear wall of the main block and side wall of the rear ell as "ghosts" to indicate the locations of the historic walls. His fellow Committee members agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided small segments of the walls to be demolished are retained as indicators of the historic walls.

134 ELFRETH'S ALLEY

Owner/Applicant: Peter Wessel

History: c. 1793

designated individually, 6/26/1956

significant to Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Construct two-story rear addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story addition with a roof deck at rear of the property. The non-historic CMU garden wall and wood deck at the rear would be demolished. The rear wall of the building would remain and existing openings would be utilized for access to the addition. The addition would be clad with wood clapboard siding. The new exterior doors and windows would be wood true-divided-light units. The roof deck would be located on the addition, not the historic building. It would be constructed of a synthetic decking system with a painted metal railing on all three sides and would be accessed by a metal ship's ladder leading from an exterior second-floor door.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee. Peter Wessel, the property owner, and Brad Roeder of Milner Architects represented the application.

Mr. Wessel explained his long-term plans for the replacement of shutters and roofing. He then described the current application. The addition would replace an existing patio with a CMU garden wall and a cantilevering wood deck at the second-floor level. The patio, garden wall, and deck are not historic. Ms. Pentz asked if any openings would be cut into the historic rear wall to access the addition. Mr. Roeder replied that the rear wall already has two existing doorways that would be utilized to access the addition; no other cutting would be necessary. Mr. Wessel elaborated, explaining that there are currently a rear door to the patio and a second-floor rear door to the deck. Cory Kegerise, the director of Elfreth's Alley Association, expressed his organization's support for the proposal.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

509 LOMBARD STREET

Owner: Henry and Talya Lewis

Applicant: Henry Lewis

History: c. 1965, Bower & Fradley, architects

contributing in Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Enclose existing roof deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to enclose an existing roof deck facing Lombard Street. The roof deck has side walls and a parapet and is accessed from an existing third floor. The proposed enclosure will follow the slope of the side walls and would not be higher than the existing parapet, which would make it invisible or almost invisible from Lombard Street. The applicant proposes to install a standing-seam metal roof with shallow skylights. The Historical

Commission approved an identical application for another property within the same complex, located at 505 Addison Court. The applicant has submitted a cover letter in which he states the need for an extra bedroom to accommodate his growing family.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Henry Lewis, the owner, represented the application.

Mr. Lewis noted several properties on Lombard, Addison Court and Pine Street, all of which have similar enclosed roof decks. He displayed drawings that demonstrated that the alteration would be invisible from street level.

Steven Wexler of Society Hill Civic Association stated that, because there is no public visibility and the proposal does not affect the overall integrity of the group of buildings, his association supports it.

Mr. McCoubrey mentioned the importance of the filling in of the notches. He opined that brick may not be the correct material. The applicant agreed with that assessment. However, he noted a neighboring property owner on Addison had used brick satisfactorily.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the notch repair is done with metal rather than brick.

22 S. 3RD STREET

Owner: 22 South Third Street Associates

Applicant: Nathan Flanigan

History: 1837, William Strickland, architect

alterations and additions by John T. Windrim in 1897

two-story rear addition by Edwards & Green

individually designated, 26 June 1956

designated as Significant in the Old City Historic District, 12 December 2003

Project: Install signage and construct rear balcony (balcony in concept)

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install signage on the end pilasters of the former Mechanic's Bank building. The building had illegal banner signs installed by the previous tenant. The upper poles and the banners have been removed; the bottom poles remain. The pilasters have several holes and bolts. The applicant proposes to reinstall the upper pole utilizing one of the existing holes and hang a banner sign. The sign would advertise the restaurant occupying the ground-floor commercial space.

The applicant also proposes in concept to install a balcony on the rear, west-facing façade of the rear wing of the building. The staff conducted fire-insurance atlas research and established that the rear wing is not an original feature of the Strickland design, but was built between 1860 and 1900. The balcony proposal would involve cutting a new opening in the masonry wall. The rear wing is visible from Franklin Court, where the upper portion of the façade can be seen. Standing in Franklin Court, the public would be able to see the upper most section of the doors, but not the balcony structure itself.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the banner signs; approval in-concept of the balcony, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Nathan Flanagan, the general contractor, and Darren and Jason Hill, the owners, represented the application.

Ms. Voith noted that the fluting on the pilasters was lost and lamented that any more deterioration to the masonry would be unfortunate. Ms. Voith suggested that the applicants review historic images of the building and install signage replicating the historic signage. She also suggested reinstalling the historic lighting fixtures that stood on the wings of the steps. She noted that the owners should remove the remaining blue paint as well as the illegal lighting and conduit to improve the appearance of the façade.

Ms. Pentz stated that all of the holes in the marble should be patched. Mr. Danta reminded the applicants that marble is very fragile. Because they are not stainless steel, the extant bolts and other fasteners will cause further deterioration if left in place.

Ms. Voith noted that the proposed rear French doors and balcony would not be conspicuous, but she stated that the applicants should submit a more detailed drawing when they return for a final review.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the banners; approval in-concept of the balcony, pursuant to Standard 9.

314 S. 2ND STREET

Owner: Peggy and Christian Lane

Applicant: Todd Curry

History: Built c. 1967; Designed by J.J. Fish; contributing in Society Hill Historic District, 10 March 1999.

Project: Install windows with simulated-divided-lights

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install Trimline wood double-hung replacement sash with simulated-divided-lights and sandwich bars. The replacement sash have the same dimensions as the existing sash. The building was constructed in 1967.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Todd Curry of Emerald Window represented the application.

Mr. Curry explained that the owner is seeking a sound-blocking and energy-efficient window. He showed a sample of the proposed window. He explained that it has muntin grids on the interior and exterior as well as sandwiched between the panes of glass. He claimed that it would be difficult to differentiate the new from the old at street level.

Steven Weixler of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that his association had met with the applicant and supports the proposal as a test. Mr. Wexler advocated for the new technology, which is preferable to other types of simulated-divided-light windows such as those with snap-in muntins.

Mr. Levy asked about the repair of the window if the glass is broken. Mr. Curry replied that the entire sash would require replacement if the glass was broken. He also reported that the existing storm windows would be removed.

The Committee members discussed the simulated-divided-light windows. They decided that this type of window is appropriate for this particular building because of its age, but that the employment of this window type should be limited to newer buildings like this one.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval.

1550 N. 33RD STREET, SMITH MEMORIAL PLAYGROUND, EAST FAIRMOUNT PARK

Applicant; Robert Hotes AIA

Owner: Smith Memorial Playground

History: built c. 1890

Project: demolish pergola, refurbish playground

OVERVIEW: This application proposes refurbishing a toddler play area located within a figure-8 shaped pathway called the velodrome. The applicants would like to demolish a curved open pavilion constructed along the side of the pathway to make a stroller storage area. They would like to open up the visual corridor between the play area for toddlers and the adjacent area for older children to allow parents to monitor both areas simultaneously; the pavilion may block the views. Also, they do not wish to spend the funds to restore the pavilion. The pavilion appears on a 1924 plan of the playground and therefore has historic significance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron introduced the proposal to the Committee. Hope Zoss, the director of Smith Playground, and architect Rick Ortega represented the application.

Ms. Zoss stated that the pavilion is not original to the site and was intended to shade a picnic area. She stated that, owing to health and safety concerns, the playground no longer allows grilling on site; therefore, the structure no longer serves its original purpose. Ms. Zoss noted the importance of a direct line of sight between the areas for toddlers and older children; she asserted that the pavilion disrupts the visibility. She stated that she would like to use the area now occupied by the pavilion for strollers. Ms. Zoss claimed that it would be very costly to refurbish the pavilion, about \$200,000. She stated that her non-profit could not afford to retain the pavilion. Ms. Pentz disputed the amount, contending that it was greatly inflated.

Ms. Voith asked if the applicants had requested a review of the entire plan or solely the pavilion. Mr. Baron stated that the applicants had requested a review of the entire proposal. Ms. Voith stated that the proposal for the play area would significantly alter the historic ground surface. She stated that the change to the landscape would be enormous. Ms. Zoss replied that the toddler lot is intended to separate the younger children from the older children. The change in surface is required to meet current safety standards; the soft material is a necessity under the play equipment. Ms. Voith noted that the Committee carefully reviews changes to landscapes on which historic buildings are sited. Mr. McCoubrey recalled an earlier proposal for Smith Playground that included a master plan for the site; he did not remember these proposed alterations, which will have a major impact on the landscape, on that master plan. Ms. Pentz agreed and suggested that the Committee limit its review to the pavilion. Ms. Voith proposed a recommendation of denial for the landscape plan and suggested that the applicant submit a revised proposal.

Mr. Baron asked the Committee to comment on the replacement of the grass with a soft, brightly colored material. Mr. Ortega asked if a stronger delineation of the paths, which blend into the play surfaces in the current proposal, would improve the plan. Ms. Voith responded that the proposal significantly alters the foreground of the historic building. She suggested that the applicant prepare a representation of the proposed view of the building from the new play area.

Ms. Pentz noted that it might be prudent for the applicants to withdraw their application and submit a new application with the requisite documentation. Mr. Baron advised the applicants of their right to withdraw the application and submit a new application with the documentation requested by the Committee. Mr. Ortega advised Ms. Zoss to withdraw. He noted that they could provide better documentation of the cost to rehabilitate the pavilion.

WITHDRAWAL OF APPLICATION: Ms. Zoss withdrew the application.

337 N. FRONT STREET

Owner: Carl Geiger

Applicant: Richard Stange

History: c. 1830

Project: Alter roof deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to extend an existing roof deck forward so that it would overhang the front wall of the building. Currently, the edge of the deck sits about 4' back from the front wall. The revised deck would mirror the deck on the adjacent building. The adjacent deck predates the designations of the buildings. The deck in question is already visible from the public right-of-way. Extending it forward would make it more conspicuous.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect Richard Stange represented the application.

Mr. Stange explained his proposal to the Committee. He noted that the new deck would extend out to the inner edge of the front façade. Therefore, it would be set back 12", the width of the wall, from the outer plan of the façade. Mr. Stange stated that the additional 3' of deck would allow a hot tub to be installed.

The Committee discussed the neighboring deck. Mr. Baron noted that it is more visible than the deck in question. He concluded that the neighboring deck shows why this deck should not be extended. Ms. Voith and Mr. Levy explained that extending the deck would make it more visible from the public right-of-way. They noted that the neighboring deck is grandfathered because it was erected prior to the designation. They also explained that the Commission might not approve the reconstruction of either deck if it were removed, for example for roof maintenance. Neither deck satisfies the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Altering this deck as proposed would make it more conspicuous.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ADJOURNMENT: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 1: A property will be used as it was historically or given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

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.

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.

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.