

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

**Robert Thomas, Chair
Commission Offices, One Parkway, 13th Floor, 1515 Arch Street
16 October 2000**

Present

Robert Thomas, Chair
Rudolph D'Alessandro
Daniel McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Also

Jane Glenn, Manayunk Neighborhood Council
Kevin Smith, Manayunk Neighborhood Council
Daniel J. Glynn, Daniel J. Glynn Building Contractor
David Amburn, Amburn/Jarosinski Architects
Ronald Patterson, Klehr, Harrison, Harvey, Branzburg and Ellers
Daniel Neducsin, Neducsin Properties
S. Falike, The Review

Robert Thomas, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

2-10 Shurs Lane

Daniel Neducsin, Owner
David Amburn, Architect
DATE: c. 1850 and c. 1930
PROPOSAL: Façade alterations

The proposal involves the alterations to an historic factory building, a property bounded by Shurs Lane, Station Street, Jamestown Street and the former Philadelphia and Reading Railroad viaduct.

Richard Tyler stated that the review of building permit applications for the Manayunk National Register Historic District is governed by an ordinance entitled Special Building Standards Applicable to Designated Areas, Section PM-704.0 of the Philadelphia Code.

Randal Baron described the submission and by reference to the attached staff denial letter of 6 September 2000 reviewed the project in detail. He read from the ordinance that govern all the proposed work which reads "original windows and doors openings, sills, lintels and sashes shall be retained and repaired whenever possible. Replacement elements shall match the original appearance in proportion, form and materials as closely as possible".

Ronald Patterson, attorney for the project, Dan Neducsin, the owner, and David Amburn, the architect, attended the meeting to explain the project and answer questions.

The Committee discussed the elements of the proposed alterations and of the denial letter at length. During the course of these deliberations, Mr. Neducsin, the owner, said that tenants' perception of this building is that it should resemble comparable buildings they occupy in other cities such as San Francisco. He also stated several times that the proposal's denial posed a hardship. Mr. Tyler reviewed the financial hardship process and asked if the applicant sought a recommendation from the Architectural Committee to refer this matter to the Committee on Financial Hardship. He responded in the negative.

Following the discussion, the Architectural Committee recommended the following:

Shurs Lane façade:

1. *Elevator lobby doorway, approval of door treatment in wood or metal; but if metal, the elements should have a baked finish;*
2. *In bay #1 second floor: Denial of installation of fixed single pane windows; approval of 6/6 wood double-hung sash.*
3. *In bay #2: Denial of installation of fixed single pane windows; approval of wood arched double hung windows.*
4. *In bay #3 second floor also bays #4,5,6,8,9 and 10 ground and second floor: Denial of installation of 2/2 windows; approval of 20/20 wood with frame to match historic window and frame on Station Street in bay #24.*
5. *In bay #7: Hoistway entrance with window above designed as a two-leaf door, and*
6. *In bay #9: Denial of installation of 2 pane basement windows; approval of four-pane wood with square head.*

Station Street façade:

1. *In bays #1 through 18, 20, 24 and 26 on ground and second floors also bay #23 second floor: Denial of installation of aluminum 2/2; approval of 20/20 wood windows to match historic window and frame of bay #24 of the Station Street ground floor.*
2. *In bays #1 through 3: Denial of installation of two-pane aluminum window in basement; approval of 8 pane wood window based on existing original.*
3. *In bay #3: approval of current door changed to windows.*
4. *In bays #19 and 22 second floor: Denial of the reduction and conversion to 2/2 windows; approval of retention of the two 2nd floor hoistways, with 10 light transom and square head with 2 leaf door that can be made into windows.*
5. *In bay #19: Approval of door under hoistway getting 2 leaf door with square head at top;*
6. *In bays #25 and 27: Denial of out of scale new windows; approval of cutting three new openings, with the scale comparable with rest of the windows.*
7. *Approval of loading dock glazing.*
8. *In bays #28 through 34: Denial of removal of industrial sash, enlarging brick opening and installation of large pane aluminum sash; approval of lengthening windows with new aluminum sash proportionate with the existing.*
9. *Approval of 1st floor window keeping light pattern that exists, operation and material can change pattern, and 3rd floor approval of the proposed sash.*

Jamestown façade:

1. *In bays #1 and 2: Denial of removal of industrial steel sash, brick opening enlarged by 1/3 and installation of large pane aluminum sash; approval of lengthening windows with new aluminum sash proportionate with the existing.*

2. *Approval of glazing of loading dock;*
3. *In bay #4: Approval of cutting of new entrance and new aluminum storefront system.*
4. *In bays #4 and 5: Denial of modern aluminum windows; approval of 12 pane, keeping the same pane pattern, change to aluminum and change of operation.*
5. *Approval of blocking up the AC unit with staff to review toothing of brick and pointing.*

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary