

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

**Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Commission Offices, Room 578, City Hall
17 December 2002**

Present

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

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

Also

John M. Groff, Wyck Association
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance
Larry McEwen, Wyck Association
Joseph A. Serratore, Serratore Architects
Fred Kellogg
Amy Kellogg
Ronald Patterson, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers
Jamie Swidler
Carl Hamilton, dane décor
William G. Schwartz, Esq., Obermayer Rebmann Maxwell & Hippel, LLP
Plato Marinakos, 249-251 North 2nd Street
Jack Panitch, 322 South Lawrence Street
Richard Thom, AIA
Jerry Goodman, Esq., Schnader Harrison Segal and Lewis
Steven A. Shomer, Schnader Harrison Segal and Lewis
Charles Tonetti, Independence National Park Service
Sue Ann Prince, American Philosophical Society
R. J. Pisani, 3224-3226 Powelton Avenue
Ira Kauderer, 603 Fulton Street
Thomas Leonard, 1010 Arch Street
Domenick Lazzaro, 712 South Sheridan Street
Vincent Carnuccio, 626 Fitzwater Street
Diane M. Deely, 237 South 18th Street
Benjamin Zuckerman, 1900 Market Street
Christian A. Busch, C.A. Busch Consulting
David W. O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighbors Association
Carla Puppini, 1010 Carpenter Street, Bel Arbor Community Garden
William G. Schwartz, 619 Catherine Street
Janet Bender, 237 South 18th Street
William Alesker, AIA, 619 Catherine Street
Barbara Weinberg, 237 South 18th Street

David Nasatir, Esq., Obermayer Rebmann Maxwell and Hippel LLP
 Grey Cecil, 623 Catherine Street
 Ralph Maiolino, United Communities Southeast Philadelphia
 Heather Winett, United Communities Southeast Philadelphia
 Karen Faul, 618 Catherine Street
 Mary Ann Harvat, 771 South 7th Street
 Marilyn W. Ashbrook, 512 Queen Street
 Joseph Cannistraci, 708 South 10th Street
 Becky Harclerode, 750 South Warnock St
 Thomas Kroljic, 914 Catherine Street

Vincent Rivera, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:50 p.m.

1516 Pine Street

Joseph Ciminera Jr., Owner
 Joseph Serratore, Applicant
 DATE: 1849, Thomas U. Walter, architect
 PROPOSAL: Roof decks, stair tower, covered walkway, carport in concept

This proposal in concept involves adding a roof deck and tall skylight additions on top of the main structure of the house and a stair tower to reach that area. The plans also call for a new carport with deck above, a link to the main house, a covered walkway alongside, and a deck on the two-story section at the rear of the house. There is a high degree of visibility to the roof because of views south on Hicks Street which faces this house across Pine Street. Houses also face Waverly Street at the rear; therefore it is not a service alley. The upper portions of the rear have visibility from Lombard Street. Finally the important architect Thomas U. Walter, designer of the dome of the U.S. Capitol, designed this fine example of Italianate architecture, which has much ornamentation for a rear facade.

Staff recommendation: Approval in concept of the carport with its deck and the covered walkway alongside and the deck on the two-story section. Denial of the other elements pursuant to Standard 9, with staff to review details.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal.

Ivano D'Angello and Joseph Serratore, the applicant, attended the meeting. Mr. Serratore said that an internal stairtower exists and that the top roof deck is for use by the owner of the property, which will be multi-family. He pointed out that the front façade would be preserved and that the fourth floor would have minimal visibility from Waverly Street. Mr. Serratore proposes to do a mock-up to determine visibility. He cited a fifth-floor sun room on a neighboring house and noted that the proposed deck would be set back twelve feet from the Pine Street façade with a simple railing. The applicant said that he believes that his proposal is respectful of the streetscape. He also proposes window replacement and façade restoration as a second phase, once he gets drawings to show replication of the original windows.

Committee members were basically in agreement with staff about the approval of the concept of a carport with deck and the passageway to its side. They thought that they needed to be redesigned to have a simple wood picket rail and brick piers around the garage gate. They had the strongest reservations about the stairtower, which they thought aggressively overwhelmed the building and changed the character of an element that is repeated in this row of buildings. It was pointed out that this element will have visibility from Lombard Street, and the roof deck from Sydenham Street to the north. Members discussed the possibility an internal access to the roof deck, which would

minimize its impact on the structure. Committee members believed that the design of the proposed stairtower is not sensitive to the scale, materials, or architecture of the building. Mr. Baron said that massing is very important, since there is continuity in the heights of the properties in this row. The scale of the building should remain intact. Mr. Rivera expressed reservations about the walkway. The Committee thought that the walkway to the side of the garage door should look like a typical gate.

Mr. Serratore said that they could do a mockup of the height of the stair tower element.

Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance, expressed concern about the alterations, particularly the roof deck and the stairtower because they are very visible. In addition, she expressed opposition to the covered walkway and opined that the openness of the street must be maintained. Ms. Millhollen noted that the color of the proposed fiberglass would change over time and become unattractive, which would not be respectful to the neighbors.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept of the following:

1. *Building of the carport with the continuation of the vocabulary of the brick in a revised design;*
2. *Deck on top of the carport;*
3. *Covered walkway;*
4. *Deck on the two-story portion of the property with plain vertical rails.*

It recommended denial of the remainder of the proposal including the stairtower, fourth-floor roof elements as submitted, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] but gave the applicant guidance for a less intrusive addition.

2226 Green Street (former yard of 2224 Green Street)

Charles Ercole, Owner

Ronald Patterson, Esq., Applicant

PROPOSAL: Construct three-story rowhouse

This proposal calls for construction of a single-family neo-Italianate, row-house on the western portion of the former yard of 2224 Green Street. The Commission approved a similar house in May 2001.

Staff recommendation: Approval with somewhat less literal details per Standard 3, with staff to review details.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal and noted that the staff thought the doorway and cornice too literal.

Charles Ercole, the owner, and Ronald Patterson, Esq., counsel for the applicant, attended the meeting. Mr. Patterson said that the proposed construction is in keeping with the scale of the adjacent house. He said the massing of the design has been decreased and has a setback from the bay of the neighboring house.

Mr. McCoubrey remarked that consideration should be given to the materials being used.

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

2124 Mt. Vernon Street

Fred and Amy Kellogg, Owners/applicants

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Rear addition, garage and deck

This application involves adding a fourth story to the rear ell of this mid block row-house and a garage with deck at the rear. The rear of the house sits at Clay Street, which is a wide service alley.

Staff recommendation: Approval per Standard 9. The original wall of the rear ell should remain exposed brick to differentiate old from new fabric.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal which is an extension of the third-floor.

Amy Kellogg, the owner, and Jamie Swidler, the architect, attended the meeting. Ms. Swidler cited a neighboring property, which has an extremely large addition. She said that the addition's pitch would mimic the pitch of the rear ell. The new addition would receive stucco at the top and with brick below. She noted that there is minimal visibility, if any.

The Committee thought the addition appropriate to the context of the rear.

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

249-251 North 2nd Street

Plato Marinakos Jr., Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1760

PROPOSAL: Renovate, partial demolition and construct four-story building

This application calls for rehabilitating the designated historic house at 251 N. 2nd Street and adding a new structure on the vacant lot at 249 N. 2nd Street, which in effect will constitute an addition to 251. The developer plans to renovate the front portion of the structure but demolish the façade of a structure at the rear of the property that appears original. As currently designed, the new construction which houses parking on the first floor, allows the mid-section of the rear ell of 251 N. 2nd to remain largely intact and visible from Wood Street.

Staff recommends approval of the construction at the western end of the 249 N. 2nd Street lot, but recommends shifting the eastern portion of the new structure to allow the rear of 251 N. 2nd to

remain intact and exposed, per Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Baron introduced the project. He explained that the vacant lot at 249 N. 2nd Street is not listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, but that the eighteenth-century row house at 251 N. 2nd Street is listed. As proposed, the project would entail demolishing the façade of the historic, eastern, 3-story portion of the rear ell at 251, which is visible, erecting a new building on the vacant lot at the front of 249 and at the rear of 249 and attaching to 251, and renovating the remaining portions of 251. When completed, the new complex would be U-shaped with its arms along the east and west (N. 2nd Street) property lines, its base along the north party wall, and its opening to the south along New Street. Assessing the submission, Mr. Baron stated that the proposed renovation of the front façade at 251, the eighteenth-century structure, was acceptable with one minor alteration, the change to a Gothick type window at the 1st-story, left window to match the adjacent, existing openings. He also stated that the staff found the proposed design for the new front building at 249 to be acceptable. Continuing, Mr. Baron contended that the proposed design for the rear section of the complex posed problems from a preservation standpoint. As submitted, the plan would require the demolition of the façade of the rear, 3-story portion of the rear ell. Mr. Baron explained that the entire building at 251 including the rear ell holds great historical significance because it dates to the late eighteenth century. He explained further that the brickwork on the south façade of the rear ell is significant, especially because of its raised belt courses. The entirety of the façade, he contended, should be preserved and exposed.

Mr. Schwartz, the counsel for the applicant, explained that the project has been approved by Zoning and largely approved by the Old City Civic Association. He claimed that it would be economically infeasible to alter the project at this point. Mr. Marinakos, the applicant, added that he had every intention of preserving the N. 2nd Street façade of the historic building. Mr. Schwartz then asserted the need for parking to account for the many garage doors along New Street.

Mr. Tyler relayed the findings of his visit to the site to the Committee. He clarified the existing conditions and affirmed the historical significance of the building at 251 including its rear ell. Mr. Baron exhibited photographs to elucidate Mr. Tyler's account.

Mr. Marinakos displayed and explicated the design including the plans for the demolition at the rear ell. Ms. Pentz inquired about the brickwork along the ell's south façade. Mr. Tyler explained that a building mirroring 251 would have originally stood at 249 N. 2nd Street. Both buildings would have had large dwellings in the front sections facing N. 2nd Street and several smaller dwellings, perhaps three each, in the rear ells. The inhabitants of the rear dwellings would have entered the complex from the rear down a long narrow light court between the two rear ells. The brick façade with its significant belt courses at 251 would have been the exposed, public, front façade of the rear dwellings. Concluding, Mr. Tyler asserted that, because so little eighteenth-century fabric has survived, this important façade should be saved.

Ms. Pentz asked the applicant to elaborate on the demolition. Mr. Marinakos stated that the eastern, 3-story section of the rear ell would be demolished. The middle, 2-story section would be retained and visible from New Street to the south. Mr. Tyler again contended that the important eighteenth-century fabric should be preserved. Mr. Marinakos countered that it would be impossible to meet building codes and preserve the rear section of the ell. Mr. Baron suggested that the applicant redesign the scheme to approximate the original U-shaped footprint of the two eighteenth-century buildings with the opening to the east. Mr. Schwartz stated that any such plan would violate the zoning requirements. Mr. Tyler insisted that they reexamine the plan to save and expose the south wall of the ell. Mr. Schwartz protested that any redesign would result in a delay.

Mr. Tyler then offered a compromise. He asked the applicant if the historic brick wall could be

retained in the interior with a minimum of penetrations. Mr. Baron reasserted the historical significance of the wall. Changing the subject, Mr. Levy asked about the garage doors. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the important question of the wall must be resolved before other issues were discussed. Mr. Tyler asked again if the applicant would be willing and able to preserve the wall in the interior as a compromise. The applicant agreed that he would preserve the wall in the interior.

Ms. Pentz asked the applicant if he would preserve the historic belt courses on the middle section of the south wall, which would be exposed to the exterior. The applicant stated that he would and apologized that his drawings, which were not entirely accurate, did not document his intention to preserve the historic belt courses. He agreed to submit new drawings of the compromise design within one week.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend final approval of the application, with staff to review details, provided two conditions are met:

- *the front, 1st-story, left window at 251 N. 2nd Street must be changed to a Gothick window to match the adjacent openings*
- *the entire brick portion of the south wall of the rear ell must be preserved; the middle, 2-story section of the rear ell wall must be exposed to the exterior; the eastern, 3-story section may immured within the interior*

315-319 Arch Street

Philadelphia Management Company, Owner

Dottie Tuccio, Applicant

DATE: 1916, Schmidt Building, Sauer & Hahn, architects

PROPOSAL: Projecting signage

This application proposes signage for the *dane decor* store on the first floor of the Schmidt building at 315-319 Arch Street. This application is limited to the signage labeled sign D in the elevation drawing titled “exterior signage. Signs A, B, and C have been approved at the staff level. The type D sign, with the store’s name, would consist of an aluminum composite material board with applied red and white vinyl lettering and an aluminum mounting system. It would be mounted on the terra cotta storefront to left of the central door and would project out over the sidewalk.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of sign D, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Sign D is too large (8'-2" x 6'-0"), its mounting hardware is too complex, and it obscures the significant storefront cornice, which it straddles. Most significant, its mounting into the terra cotta would most certainly severely damage the ornamental storefront over time. The staff would recommend approval of a sign mounted on the storefront window frames or above the terra cotta storefront.

Carl Hamilton attended the meeting to represent the project. Mr. Farnham presented the proposal and explained that the applicant had split this signage project into two parts. The staff approved the application for the window signs. The applicant is now seeking approval only for sign D, the projecting sign. The Committee all agreed that the new signage should not be bolted into the terracotta storefront. Ms. Pentz and Mr. McCoubrey expressed reservations about the proposed sign “straddling” the cornice. Mr. Baron asked about possibly anchoring the sign into the brick. The Committee acknowledged that a rigid sign of this size would also require attachment at the bottom. Ms. Pentz suggested anchoring a support at the top into the brick and supporting the bottom with “guys” anchored into the wood window frames. The Committee discussed alternate materials for the sign including perforated mesh and fabric. Mr. Levy thought that a bottom support could be designed to sensitively anchor into the joints between the terracotta. Mr. Rivera

agreed and suggested suspending a sign on vertical wires between a top support, anchored into the joint between the brick, and a bottom support anchored into a joint between the terracotta.

The Committee voted to recommend denial of the sign as proposed and suggested that the applicant redesign the sign in such a way as to protect the fragile, significant storefront.

322 South Lawrence Court

Jack Panitch, Owner

Daniel Mehan, Applicant

DATE: c. 1970, Bower & Fradley architects

PROPOSAL: New windows

This application proposes installing new Pella casement windows in the Late Modern townhouse at 322 South Lawrence Court. The original triple casement windows at the 2nd-story front façade would be replaced with new, smaller, triple casement windows and 5 inches of infill at the bottom. The original paired casement windows at the 3rd-story front and rear façades would be replaced with new, paired casement windows with dimensions similar to the originals. Unlike the original wood windows, the Pella replacements would be clad with aluminum on the exterior. The provided documentation does not clearly demonstrate that the original details, like the dividing mullions and brick molding, would be duplicated. Further details should be provided to complete this application.

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

The owner, Jack Panitch explained that his contractor claimed that a window of the correct size to fill the opening would be much more expensive than a stock window and a five-inch infill panel. He also expressed a preference for this type of window, which allows for an interior louver between the panes of glass. He said that such a design is preferable because it would be safer for his young child.

Lenore Millhollen of the Preservation Alliance spoke in favor of recommending windows that fit the opening.

Committee members noted that Pella does make wood non-clad windows and they thought that it could also be able to match the brick molding, although the current drawings do not show a match.

They recommended denial of these windows because of the five-inch infill piece, the aluminum cladding, and the drawings showing an incorrect frame detail. They thought it possible for any number of manufacturers to make windows that match the existing windows in design and material as well as providing for safety.

The Committee recommended denial of the proposal per Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.], Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.] and Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and where possible material.].

104 South 5th Street, American Philosophical Society

American Philosophical Society, Owner

Steven Albert Shomer, Esq., Applicant

DATE: 1785-1789, Samuel Vaughan, architect

PROPOSAL: Banner signage

The application proposes the erection of a system for the display of banner signs on the 5th Street façade of the headquarters of the American Philosophical Society. The thin metal framework on which the banners hang would be painted to match the facade and mounted to the wood window frames and cornice, not masonry. The applicant has included a preferred design as well as three options. The system proposed in the preferred design would be situated between the two northern bays and its banner would project perpendicularly from the façade, out over the sidewalk. The banner itself would measure 14 feet in length and 3 feet in width. In the first and second options, the banners would lie flat against the façade. The first of these stipulates a single 16-foot by 5-foot banner mounted to the right of the central bay. The second stipulates two 16-foot by 5-foot banners mounted to the left and right of the central bay. The third option stipulates a single long, narrow, prism-shaped banner with two surfaces projecting at 60-degree angles out from the façade to the right of the central bay.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

Gerald Goodman, Esq. and Sue Ann Prince, curator, represented the Philosophical Society. Mr. Farnham presented the application for a banner measuring 14 feet by 3 feet. The Society gave several options for its placement. Mr. Farnham noted that the National Park Service opposes any signage on the building. Mr. Tyler said that the Society building is an extremely important 18th-century building and signage is not appropriate for it. Also, the scale of the proposed banners is not compatible to the scale of the building. He suggested a temporary sandwich board out front during the operation hours of the Society to attract pedestrians.

Mr. Goodman and Ms. Prince explained that the Society has tried to market itself over the last year as an institution that exhibits to the general public. The complications of the added security since September 11th have made it even more difficult to draw visitors to the facility. The Society would like to have exterior signage so that people can find the building. Ms. Prince said that they already have a small temporary sign on the sidewalk, but some of the guards cannot move it and it does little to raise visibility.

Charles Tonetti, Chief Historical Architect for the National Park Service, said that the Park Service supports the special exhibits mounted by the Society and its efforts to become more accessible. However, it has concerns about the proposed banners, which are too large, and the general commercialization of the buildings in Independence National Historic Park, especially Independence Square.

Mr. Levy proposed having a permanent sign on the sidewalk, much like the signage for the historic churches in Society Hill and Old City. Mr. Tyler also suggested approaching the Center City District to have the Society added to the Walk! Philadelphia signage around the area. The Committee members agreed that the Society needed to explore other options before putting signage on the building itself.

The Committee voted to recommend tabling the proposal for a period not to exceed six months. Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Pentz recused themselves.

121-135 Walnut Street, NE corner of 2nd Street

Renaissance Properties, Incorporated, Owner

Richard Thom, Applicant

DATE: 121-25: 1830s, 127: between 1796-1835;, 129-35: 1951

PROPOSAL: Approval of demolition, conceptual approval of new construction and rehabilitation

The Committee and Commission approved in concept the demolition of the rears of these buildings and the construction of a 7-story addition. The proposal now calls for final approval of the demolition so that work can begin on the project.

The demolition will include Moravian Street from the street-line and the rears of the buildings along Walnut Street.

The new construction will consist of a 7-story block set back from the buildings along Walnut Street. The west façade will have brick soldier-course panels. The proposal calls for brick panels on the lower floors of the north façade with stucco panels on the upper two stories. The east façade will have the same treatment. The south façade will have brick panels on the westernmost bays and stucco panels on the rest of the elevation. All of the façades will have aluminum spandrels between the windows.

The project also includes the restoration of the buildings along Walnut Street; however, the plans do not show any details. These details should be included in the application for final approval for the new construction.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the demolition and approval in concept of the new construction, pursuant to Standard 9.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal, which is for final approval of the demolition only.

Stanley Tarella and Richard Thom, the applicant, attended the meeting. Mr. Thom pointed out that rears of the properties have additions except 121 Walnut Street and between the historic buildings and the new construction. These additions have been greatly altered. He noted that fire code separations is an important aspect of the design. In addition, he said that a clean corridor is needed for the fire stairs.

Mr. Tyler said that the demolition portion of this proposal is simple; however, the façade facing the south could use some revisions.

The Architectural Committee recommended final approval for the demolition only.

3224 Powelton Avenue

Ida Washington, Owner

R. J. Pisani, Applicant

DATE: c. 1880

PROPOSAL: Legalize rebuilt porch

This fall, Drexel University instituted Renaissance Day to help the Powelton Village neighborhood. The program included cleaning vacant lots and other activities to revitalize properties throughout the community. Without a permit or Historical Commission approval, volunteers rebuilt the porch shared by 3224-3226 Powelton Avenue. Several parts do not match those of the historic porch at the neighboring house, 3222 Powelton Avenue. The railings have a Classical profile, rather than

the Queen Anne/Eastlake profile of the originals. The porch posts have turnings similar to the neighboring porch, but do not have striations and the top portions are not long enough to accommodate the historic brackets. The angle of the roof does not match the neighboring porch and the asphalt shingles should be three-dimensional to better mimic the slate that was used originally.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 6 and the entrance guideline. The owners should work with the staff to determine the details of the porch elements.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal and gave the applicant procedural guidance on how to cure the violation. Mr. Baron noted that on the same block the Commission denied legalizing incorrect work. The owners should work with the staff to determine the details of the porch elements.

R. J. Pisani, the applicant, acknowledged that a permit should have been acquired and that he is willing to correct all infractions.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.]; Standard 6 [Deteriorated 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.]; and the entrance guideline [Recommended: replacing in kind an entire entrance or porch that is too deteriorated to repair using the physical evidence as a model to reproduce the features.].

3226 Powelton Avenue

Ida Washington, Owner

R. J. Pisani, Applicant

DATE: c. 1880

PROPOSAL: Legalize rebuilt porch

This fall, Drexel University instituted Renaissance Day to help the Powelton Village neighborhood. The program included cleaning vacant lots and other activities to revitalize properties throughout the community. Without a permit or Historical Commission approval, volunteers rebuilt the porch shared by 3224-3226 Powelton Avenue. Several parts do not match the historic porch, which still exists on the neighboring house at 3222 Powelton Avenue. The railings have a Classical profile, rather than the Queen Anne/Eastlake profile of the originals. The porch posts have turnings similar to the neighboring porch, but do not have striations and the top portions are not long enough to accommodate the historic brackets. The angle of the roof does not match the neighboring porch and the asphalt shingles should be three-dimensional to better mimic the slate that was used originally.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 6 and the entrance guideline. The owners should work with the staff to determine the details of the porch elements.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal and gave the applicant procedural guidance on how to cure the violation. Mr. Baron noted that on the same block the Commission denied legalizing incorrect work. The owners should work with the staff to determine the details of the porch elements.

R. J. Pisani, the applicant, acknowledged that a permit should have been acquired and that he is willing to correct all infractions.

The Architectural Committee recommended Denial, pursuant to Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.]; Standard 6 [Deteriorated 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.]; and the entrance guideline [Recommended: replacing in kind an entire entrance or porch that is too deteriorated to repair using the physical evidence as a model to reproduce the features.].

1010 Arch Street, Winston Building

Saul Shenker, Owner

Daniel Messinger, Applicant

DATE: 1902, William B. Pritchett, architect

PROPOSAL: Legalize signage

This application proposes legalizing a sign on the Winston Building at 1006-1016 Arch Street. It is a box sign with red neon letters that would be updated to read “Philadelphia Eyeglass Labs 2nd Floor.” It is mounted approximately 5' above the sidewalk on a wide pilaster to the right of central doorway. It is a black metal box with a glass face and is approximately 3' x 4'.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham explained the application. Mr. Baron alerted the Committee to a banner at the fifth-floor level which had also not received Commission approval. He suggested to the applicant the possibility of utilizing the flagpole at the second story level for signage.

Thomas Leonard, representing the owner, attended the meeting. He stated that he is currently negotiating a new lease and asked for recommendations for a type of signage that would be approved by the Committee and Commission. Mr. Leonard is considering using the columns on the sides of the building, but this would require permission from the building's owner.

Mr. Rivera said that it is important that the proposed signage relates to other signage on the building. He asked the applicant to possibly consider some type of signage on a canopy over the door. The Committee believed that signage is appropriate, but that the applicant should explore other designs.

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

613-621 Catherine Street

United Communities Southeast Philadelphia, Owner

Shaffer Group Incorporated, Applicant

DATE: c. 1838

PROPOSAL: Partial demolition, rehabilitation and new construction in concept

This application in concept calls for partial demolition of the church (the annex), rehabilitation of the church into six condominium units, and the construction of 14 townhouses with on-site parking. The new development will also incorporate the neighboring property at 611 Catherine Street, which is not on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

The Methodist Episcopal Church purchased the land in 1838 and erected the St. Paul's M.E. Church. In 1903, the church sold the property to the Philadelphia City Missionary Church, an extension society of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The Philadelphia Society for the Employment and Instruction of the Poor acquired the property in 1935. Later the building became the House of Industry.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standards 2, 9 and three site guidelines. The applicant should restudy the site plan. An important historic element of the property is the visibility of the church from Catharine and Fulton Streets. The new construction should not block these historic views. On Catharine Street, this may be accomplished by moving the driveway to the area in front of the church. Also, any application for final approval of the new construction should include all of the necessary details for the rehabilitation of the church.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal and noted that the historic view of the church from Catherine Street is an important element of this site. Mr. Baron pointed out that the House of Industry was located near the old immigration station and which would have played an important role in the lives of immigrants who came to Philadelphia.

William G. Schwartz, Esq., counsel for the applicant, and William Alesker, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Alesker said that the area to the west would remain open, and that the Fulton Street view would not be obscured by this development. Mr. Schwartz acknowledged that the current plan blocks the view of the historic building, but he believes, that if moved, the driveway would allow at least a 31-foot opening, which would allow for visibility of the church from Catherine Street.

Mr. Levy questioned the difference in the property lines on the zoning plan and site plan; one plan shows 18 feet while the other plan shows 34 feet. Mr. Alesker said that 34 feet is the correct dimension. Mr. Schwartz said that a certified survey would be submitted, and it should address any of the dimensions in question.

Ms. Pentz noted that the plans do not show how the project would look upon its completion or how much of the historic view would be compromised. Mr. McCoubrey inquired if there was ever a building in front of this building. Mr. Tyler said that he doubted it, since the property was purchased and the church built so early.

Thomas Kroljic, board member of the Bel Arbor Community Garden, said that he does not oppose development; however, he believes that the community should benefit. Since this property has been a substantial anchor in the community, the garden should remain.

Mr. Tyler asked for clarification of ownership of the community garden. Heather Winett, Board member of United Communities Southeast Philadelphia, said that the building was leased to Youth Build, who in turn allowed a community garden; however, on 30 September 2002 notice was sent to the community, which nullified the community's use of the land.

Karen Faul, resident of 618 Catherine Street, expressed concern about egress and the ability to accommodate large trucks as well as cars. Mr. Schwartz said that the development would hold parking for 40 cars.

Ira Kauderer, a resident of Fulton Street, which has the view from the side of the property, believes that it is inappropriate to erect three-story houses blocking historic views of the building and leaving very little open space. He noted that the historic Neziner Synagogue on 2nd Street similarly sited had been rehabilitated into housing without hiding it from public view.

Vincent Carnuccio, a resident, said that the entire community utilizes the garden and he is opposed to its removal.

Karla Puppini, Bel Arbor Community Garden, believes that the removal of the garden would be a great loss to the community.

Nicholas Schmanek, Office of Councilman Frank DiCicco, stated that the councilman would not oppose the development, if the greenery in the rear is maintained.

Becky Harclerode stated that the garden has allowed the community to work together; their efforts were rewarded with a \$20,000 grant.

Committee members discussed the project at length and concurred that more information is needed before it could make a decision. Mr. Rivera thought the proposal is an opportunity to create a meaningful development. He believed that in order to accomplish its goal, there might have to be a trade-off, perhaps in limiting the number of cars in the parking area. Committee members agree that the important issue is to maintain the quality of this historic property.

Mr. Alesker concluded that the two major issues remain are the view of the historic building from Catherine Street and the actual usage of the ground.

Mr. McCoubrey said that it would be helpful if the applicant presented alternative arrangements. He asked the applicants to consider arranging the row houses along the east side of the property parallel to Catherine Street.

Mr. Rivera stressed the importance of the vehicular entrance and to have correct dimensions of the property.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal as submitted, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.], Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.] and three site guidelines [Not recommended: Locating any new construction on the building site in a location which contains important landscape features or open space], [Not recommended: Introducing new construction onto the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color, and texture; which destroys historic relationships on the site; or which damages or destroys important landscape features.], [Not recommended: Placing parking facilities directly adjacent to historic buildings where automobiles may cause damage to the buildings or landscape features, or be intrusive to the building site.]. It gave the applicant guidance for a design that would be sensitive to the historic building and the community's desire for open space.

237 South 18th Street, Unit 17B, The Barclay
Philip Senechal, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1928, J.E.R. Carpenter, architect
 PROPOSAL: Balcony and French door

The Committee revisits this proposal for a balcony and French doors, similar to one approved by the Historical Commission in January 1999. Mr. Senechal, the owner of the unit, began work on the project, cutting a hole in the building fabric. He stopped work and his permit lapsed. He now seeks to get a new permit. The building management has asked that the Commission not to accept any applications without its agreement. In addition, a downstairs neighbor has raised objections to the previously approved work. The new application differs from the old by adding four inches to the length of the balcony and several inches to the height of the railing. The rail would also receive decorative rings to match the balcony rails approved at the 21st floor.

Staff recommendation: Approval per Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Baron presented the application, which has a few revisions, from the previously approved design. The new drawings show diagonal braces, which protrude outwardly but are needed between the piers. It was noted by Ms. Pentz that the revised design is less visible than the one previously approved because it lacks support brackets. Mr. Tyler explained about the receipt of three letters from the condominium association, with the third letter affirming the previous letter's approval. Mr. Tyler conveyed to the Committee that Carole Price Shanis, President of the Art Alliance and owner of 5 condominium units, was unable to attend the meeting, but asked that the record reflect her opposition to the proposed balcony. Mr. Tyler said that the proposed balcony would be aligned with the north elevation, tucked behind the fire balcony. He said that this should be the standard for any future balcony.

Diane Deely, the owner, Ben Zuckerman, Esq., and Christian Busch, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Busch said that the doors on the south elevation would not change. He believes that the historic issues have been addressed with the proposed color to match the building and the railing of a black metal to mimic the existing fire balconies. Mr. Zuckerman said that in 1999, the applicants were asked to postpone their alterations until the completion of exterior façade renovations was completed. He noted that the proposed balcony would not be visible from Rittenhouse Square. Ms. Deely proposes to restore any of the exterior adversely affected by the alterations.

Ronald Patterson, counsel for Harvey Kimmel, said that ,when the balcony was approved in 1999, it was a different time and a different condition in the building, which consisted of a majority of vacant units. He believes that the proposed alteration would impact the historic façade while creating a precedent, with disruption to the historic fabric on the courtyard façade.

Harvey Kimmel said that he believes that the previous letter, which states that the Historical Commission should not approve any building permits for this building without the approval of the Condominium Association, should not be overturned. It is his contention that there are no other balconies on this building, only flower balconies with doors. Recognizing that bricks have already been removed for the opening for the French doors, Mr. Kimmel conceded to allow the applicants to construct a flower balcony for consistency. Mr. Kimmel canvassed other owners of units and received more than 30 signatures of tenants opposed to the alteration.

Janet Bender, a resident, said that she and her husband are very disturbed by the construction of a very large balcony adjacent to their condominium. She expressed concern that wind braces were removed, which could weaken the building structure and of her loss of privacy and light. In addition, she opined that the proposed alterations would necessitate the need for a security system, to hinder access from this terrace.

Virginia Kimmel remarked that the proposed balcony will darken several of her rooms and reiterated that The Condominium council has not approved the proposal. Mr. Kimmel, noted that his application for a change in his windows was denied. In addition, he said that the historic symmetry of the building is very important and believes that the proposed alteration disrupts that symmetry.

Mr. Tyler opined that, based on the design, the applicants have fulfilled its procedural obligations, and that the *Standards* should be applied.

Mr. Rivera said that it is his belief that the Committee is acting with the approval of the association because the letter addresses the alteration of the specific railing detail. The Committee also believes that the balcony is an element with minor visibility, which only impacts a tertiary façade, and does not change the character of the building. In response to the query about the need for a structural engineer, Mr. Rivera said that the Department of Licenses and Inspections would consider this matter.

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

The meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary