

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

14 January 1988

David Hollenberg, Chairman

Present: David Hollenberg, Chairman
David DeLong, University of Pennsylvania, Preservation
Program
John Dickey, F.A.I.A.
Herbert W. Levy, A.I.A.

Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer
Patricia A. Siemiontkowski, Assistant Historic Preservation
Officer
Sally Elk, Historic Research Planner
Merrie Winston, Historical Architect
Randal Baron, Preservation Planner

Also: Theodore T. Bartley, Jr. of Bartley, Bronstein, Long, Mirenda
to present a proposal for the rehabilitation and reuse of the
Jayne Estate Building located at 2-16 Vine Street including
the construction of a mid-rise tower on the site.
John Phillips of Treby Howard Phillips to present a proposal for
a substantial rehabilitation of the building located at 320 S.
10th Street.
Kevin D. Flynn, Rhett Jones, Joe Winchester and Tom Sullivan to
present a proposal which calls for a substantial renovation of
1600 Callowhill Street for conversion to commercial use
including parking.
Sabrina Soong of Soong Associates and Luca Sena, owner to
present a preliminary proposal involving alterations to the
front facade of La Famiglia Restaurant located at 8 S. Front
Street.
Sam LaRussa, Michael LaRussa and Lawrence Gilbert, Architect,
for extensive alterations to 226-228 Vine Street.
Andrew Rota, John Konick, Ray Gaecas and Michael Bomstein to
present a proposal for major alterations to the property
located at 602 S. Front Street.
John Romano, Architect, to present a proposal for the proposed
work at 2226 Delancey Street.
W.W. Cunningham and M. Kinn of Geddes, Brecker, Qualls,
Cunningham to present a proposal for the construction of an
addition to the existing 1930's building.
John D. Sacksteder, A.I.A. Rivers Edge Civic Association
Suzanne Love, South Street Star
MaryLou McFarland and Ellen Freedman, Preservation Coalition of
Greater Philadelphia
Thomas Noon, Rivers Edge Civic Association
Gary Thompson, The Philadelphia Daily News
Sara Reiter, K.K.F.S.
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents Association
And others.

ALTERATIONS

2-16 Vine Street, Theodore T. Bartley, Jr., Architect. Mr. Bartley appeared before the members of the Architectural Committee to present a preliminary submission consisting of block diagrams illustrating the proposed development of the Jayne Estate Building and its adjoining site to the south. The block diagrams show the development of approximately 9,500 square feet of commercial/retail space on the first level, with 9 apartment units on each of the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th levels of the reused portion of the structure of 2-16 Vine Street, a 140 car parking deck constructed to the south, and a 13 story mid rise tower with 100-120 apartments. The proposed 13-story tower addition, as proposed, is wedge shaped and sits partially atop the Jayne Estate Building at 2-16 Vine Street.

The Committee was advised that members of the Planning Commission staff and this office met with Mr. Bartley to review his proposed development of the site and its impact on the historically designated Jayne Estate Building. The Planning Commission expressed concern over the construction of a 13 story mid-rise tower along the riverfront and advised Mr. Bartley that a variance might be necessary under either the present G-2 zoning or the proposed change to C-4 zoning. The Planning Commission suggested the possibility of acquisition of a parcel of land across Water Street, currently held by Penn DOT, which could allow for the development of a parking facility on the west side of Water Street and thus for some reduction in the height of the proposed tower.

In fact, a subsequent meeting with the Planning Commission has led to further discussion regarding the acquisition of an adjoining parcel to the south and the acquisition of a lot owned by Penn DOT on the west side of Water Street.

Following some general discussion of the proposed development, the chairman of the Committee summarized its position. The Committee discouraged any construction on top of The Jayne Building preferring to see the highrise construction confined to the adjacent site. However, the Committee expressed flexibility toward the idea of an addition atop the Jayne Building provided that the proposed new tower be confined to the south and west portions of the structure and kept substantially back from the Delaware Avenue and Vine Street elevations. The Committee further recommended that the shape of the tower be designed to conform more to the geometry of the site and neighborhood and that it be reduced in both scale and bulk if possible. Every effort should be made to acquire additional land both to the south of the Jayne Building and across Water Street in order to provide the architect more flexibility in the development of a design which has minimal impact on the historic integrity of the Jayne Estate Building.

The Committee advised Mr. Bartley that a formal application accompanied by a full set of plans and specifications would be required before a final review could be undertaken and an approval granted.

320 S. 10th Street, Kerry Kowalcheck, Architect. Mr. Kowalcheck presented to the members of the Architectural Committee plans for the proposed rehabilitation of 320 S. 10th Street a three story 1830's townhouse with a fourth floor 1870's mansard. The proposed work includes:

1. rehabilitation of dormer window trim and installation of new double hung sash;
2. new asphalt shingles on Mansard roof;
3. repair of wood cornice;
4. repair of wood, double hung, six-over-six window sash on first, second and third floors;
5. repair of stone frontispiece, wood door and transom window, and;
6. repointing of existing masonry wall.

The Committee voted to recommend a final approval of this project subject to the installation of two-over-two double hung, wood window sash in the Mansard and the relocation of the existing iron bars at the first floor window openings to the interior of the house. The Committee agreed that shutters would be permitted if the architect and his client wished to hang them where shutter hardware exists. However, shutters are not required.

8 S. Front Street, Sabrina Soong, Architect and Mr. Luca Sena, owner of La Cucina Restaurant. Ms. Soong explained to the Architectural Committee her client's desire to enlarge the second floor window openings into a picture or bay window in order to allow more light into the second floor dining room and to offer a view of the Delaware River waterfront. The architect supplied the Committee with examples of second floor bay windows which exist on historic buildings in the Old City area.

The Committee noted that the 8 S. Front Street building stood as an intact example of a Greek Revival 19th century commercial loft structure in a row of similar buildings and that the addition of a new bay window would be inappropriate. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines require the retention and preservation of original fabric where that fabric has survived intact and is a significant character defining feature of the building.

The Committee voted to recommend that this application for alterations to the second floor front facade be denied.

350-352 N. 16th Street, a.k.a. 1600 Callowhill Street, Middishade Clothing Factory, Rhett Hamilton Jones Associates, Architects Planners Designers and Kevin D. Flynn presented to the Committee plans for the proposed conversion of the Middishade factory into offices with parking on the first floor. Mr. Flynn explained to the Committee his belief that the installation of new, thermal pane window sash was necessary to achieve energy savings and to market the building more

effectively. Mr. Flynn explained that he explored the possibility of rehabilitating the existing window sash and that such rehabilitation would be relatively inexpensive. However, the existing sash provides little insulating capacity requiring the installation of interior storms. According to Mr. Flynn, interior storm sash would increase the cost of the window rehabilitation significantly and present an on-going maintenance problem. Mr. Flynn stated that the repair of the existing sash and the addition of interior storms would be inconsistent with a first class office building.

Mr. Jones, architect for the project, suggested to the Committee members that they should consider allowing the use of one-over-one double-hung window sash in this building since such sash was in common use at the turn of the century. The Committee suggested the replacement of glass within the existing sash with insulated glass. The architect, however, noted that this option had been explored but that the existing sash could not hold the thicker, heavier insulated glass.

The Committee agreed to consider the fabrication of a new sash with insulated glass and applied muntins on the exterior surface. It was pointed out to Mr. Flynn that the existing original window sash constituted a significant architectural feature of the Middishade building and that every effort must be made to duplicate the configuration and appearance of these sash.

The Committee also advised the developer that existing brick and concrete masonry should not be painted but simply cleaned and, where necessary, repointed.

Following extensive discussion of the proposed window sash, the Committee agreed to call a special meeting to review the Middishade submission. This decision was taken particularly in view of the fact that numerous other alterations being proposed raised concern among several of the members including the removal of window sash on the first floor and their replacement with a chain link fence screen. The Chairman explained that retention of the sash and frame with the removal of the glass would be more acceptable than a chain link fence.

The developer and his architect were asked to revise their submission in agreement with the direction provided by the Committee. Mr. Flynn agreed to contact Ms. Siemiontkowski when his resubmission is prepared and ready for review.

No action is recommended by the Committee at this time.

226-228 Vine Street, Larry Gilbert, Architect. Ms. Siemiontkowski reported to the Committee that illegal work undertaken without the review and approval of the Historical Commission had occurred at 226-228 Vine Street. In response to this work, the staff asked the Department of Licenses and Inspections to issue a "stop work" order and direct the applicant to meet with the Historical Commission staff to review the alterations already completed and to discuss any additional proposed work. The completed work involved the partial demolition of back buildings at the rear of the property, the walls between the two properties and extensive interior alterations.

Subsequently, the applicant and his architect met with the staff. Revised elevation drawings were prepared as directed by the staff.

The Committee reviewed the proposed work, including the rehabilitation of the front facades to their mid-nineteenth century commercial appearance, and voted to recommend to the Historical Commission that a final approval of this project be granted.

- 602 S. Front Street, John Konig, Architect. Ms. Siemiontkowski reported to the Architectural Committee that a building permit for 602 S. Front Street was issued by the Department of Licenses and Inspections, in error, without the approval of the Historical Commission. During the conduct of site inspections in the riverfront area, the staff noted that extensive construction was underway at 602 S. Front Street. Upon returning to the office, the staff telephoned the Department of Licenses and Inspections. Upon learning that a building permit had been issued without the approval of the Historical Commission the staff asked that a "stop work" order be issued and that the permit be revoked until such time as the Historical Commission could review the proposed work on this historically designated building.

Mr. Konig, at this time, presented to the Committee his plans for the substantial rehabilitation of 602 S. Front Street. Mr. Konig explained that the interior of the building suffered serious mutilation and deterioration as did the rear of the structure. While under rehabilitation, the roof collapsed; in addition, a substantial portions of brick masonry was removed from the ground floor in order to allow for the introduction of a garage door for off-street parking.

Mr. Konig explained that it was his client's intention to construct a dark-bronze glass roof which would resemble in its visual appearance a standing seam metal roof. The dormer to be reconstructed in glass would be faced with wood trim and contain a six-over-six, double-hung wood sash. Mr. Konig explained that the proposed glass roof would allow light into the top floor and provide a view of the waterfront but that a special screen behind the glass would prevent light on the inside from escaping, at night, except through the double-hung sash. In addition, Mr. Konig explained his client's further intention to introduce a garage into the ground floor of the existing building to provide off-street parking as demanded by the Queen Village Neighbors Association.

The Committee advised Mr. Konig and his client that the plans submitted would have to be reviewed and evaluated according to the same standards as every other designated building despite the fact that work was done in reliance on an erroneously issued building permit. The Committee agreed that in the ordinary course of review a glass roof and a ground floor garage would not be acceptable. The Committee suggested the use of an asphalt shingle roof or a standing seam metal roof - both of which would result in an historically correct appearance. It was further noted that the garage door on the ground floor violently disrupts the main facade. Mr. Konig argued that the City of Philadelphia zoning division demanded that his client provide off-street parking in response to the neighborhood's wishes. The staff and Committee questioned this requirement by

Licenses and Inspections particularly in view of this buildings' status as an historically designated building.

Following extensive discussion, the Committee expressed its desire to have the building secured from the elements through the installation of a roof and to have the front wall stabilized to prevent its collapse. It was agreed, however, that the new roof should not be executed as a glass roof but rather as a shingle or standing seam metal roof. The applicants architect and attorney asked for a brief recess to discuss the issues raised by the Committee. Upon their return, the Chairman reviewed the situation including Licenses & Inspections error is issuing a permit without the Historical Commission's approval and the question as to whether the applicant his architect, and his attorney were aware or should have been aware of the building's status as an historic structure. The Committee reiterated its desire to have a new roof placed on the building. This roof must be compatible with the historic character of the building and, therefore, must be executed in either shingle or in standing seam metal and not in glass. The issue of the ground floor garage would be reserved until the staff has had an opportunity to explore the question of Licenses and Inspection's requirement of a garage for this building.

The Committee agreed to find a way to expedite an approval which would allow the construction of an appropriate roof to protect the remainder of the historic building.

Following the Chairman's statements, Mr. Bomstein addressed the Committee. He denied any knowledge on the part of his client and his client's architect with regard to the historical designation of the building despite a staff report that the Commission received a telephone call from a building permit expeditor who questioned the staff concerning designation and proposed alterations to this building. He further stated that his client is unwilling to build a roof different from that proposed since without a view of the river, this property could not be marketed at a price which would provide a reasonable financial return on his investment. The applicant also objected to the Historical Commission staff's request for a revocation of the permit by Licenses and Inspections without notice and without a hearing,. It was Mr. Bomstein's view that this action was improper. He asked finally that the Historical Commission staff request that the permit be reinstated immediately to allow construction to continue.

If this is not done, Mr. Bomstein advised the Committee that he would seek a temporary restraining order and a preliminary injunction through the courts.

The Committee advised the applicant and his lawyer that it could not request reinstatement of the permit to allow construction to continue in accord with the plans as submitted since the proposed rehabilitation of the property is not appropriate to the historic and architectural character of the building.

The applicant and Committee could reach no agreement on the matters. As a result, the permit remains revoked. The Committee recommended that the maintenance clause be enforced to ensure the preservation of

the remaining historic building fabric.

2226 Delancey Street, John Romano, Architect. Mr. Romano presented to the Architectural Committee his proposal for the introduction of full length French doors at the first floor level of the west (side) elevation of 2226 Delancey Street. The architect explained his client's desire to get additional light into the front parlour and to make the room a more attractive interior space. He further argued that such an alteration was in keeping with the architectural character of the neighborhood. Several photographs illustrating buildings in the Rittenhouse Square area similarly situated on corners with windows on the side elevation were presented for the Committee's perusal.

The Committee did acknowledge the fact that the proposed alteration occurs on the side rather than the front elevation. However, the puncturing of the facade alters the original design of the building and destroys original brick masonry. The Committee also expressed concern over the design of the proposed alteration which is not compatible with the size, placement and configuration of the existing fenestration of the west elevation.

Although the Committee members agreed to consider a revised design and resubmission, they warned the architect and his client that it may be determined that no alteration to the original masonry fabric should occur on this highly visible facade. The Committee expressed an ambivalence on this application and invited the architect and client to return if they wish to revise the proposed design and pursue the matter further. The submission, as presented however, was determined to be unacceptable and the Committee recommends its rejection.

Franklin Institute, Warren Cunningham of Geddes, Brecher, Qualls, Cunningham. Mr. Cunningham presented to the Committee members his firm's proposal for the construction of an addition to the existing 1930's John T. Windrim Building. The new addition will contain ground floor parking, with theatre, restaurant, exhibit space and other facilities at the atrium and upper levels.

The Committee found the design, the massing and the materials proposed for the new addition to be sympathetic to the historic integrity of the designated building. It was pointed out that connections to the historic building will be minimal and will be executed in such a way so as not to cause unnecessary damage to historic fabric. In most instances, existing window openings or previously infilled openings will be used to achieve access between the buildings.

Following a general discussion of the project, the Committee voted to recommend its approval to the Commission. The committee did request, however, to be kept informed of additional design development as it progresses.

There being no further the business, the meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Siemiontkowski
Assistant Historic Preservation
Officer