

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Commission Offices, Room 578, City Hall
28 September 2004**

Present

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Suzanne Pentz
Robert Thomas, AIA

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

Also

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Jim Straw, Kise Straw & Kolodner
Philip Scott, Kise Straw & Kolodner
Kit Matthew, Please Touch Museum
Nancy Kolb, Please Touch Museum
Mary Ellen Langsdorf, Society Hill Towers
Joseph Rollo
Karl S. Krumholz, SRK Architects
Hugh Zimmers, Zimmers & Associates
Michael Rigolizzo, 2nd Street Investors
Robert Levitt, 2nd Street Investors
Steve Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
Lorna Katz, Society Hill Civic Association
William G. Schwartz, Esq., 231 North 2nd Street
Elizabeth Armour, 214 Delancey Street
Bill O'Brien, Manayunk Law
Jeff Carsue, City Sign
Dominic Aspite, City Sign
Bryan Miller
Sabrina Soong, Soong Associates, Incorporated
Dan Vicencio
Lois Ann Handrich, 23 West Walnut Lane
Ken Handrich, 23 West Walnut Lane
David W. O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighbors Association
George Anni, 1216 Spruce Street
Benjamin Beckwith, Campbell Thomas & Company Architects
Richard Cove, Queen Village Neighbors Association
Mauta Osbourne, Hillier

Lisa Soderberg, Hillier
 David Hammond, Spring Garden Historic District
 Craig Deutsch, Harman Deutsch Architects
 Arthur Elwood, owner, 261-63 South 22nd Street
 Sean James, 124 Catharine Street
 Virginia Beier, Van Pelt Neighbor
 Joan Hooke, 264 South Van Pelt Street
 Charles Capoldi, 2118 Locust Street
 John Moore, 258 South Van Pelt Street
 A. Alberta Hewes, 256 South Van Pelt Street
 Richard Greenwald, 261 South Van Pelt Street
 F. Kreindler, 251 South 22nd Street
 Darin Steinberg, Esq., Duane Morris
 Marc Brookman, Esq., Duane Morris
 Jeff Krieger, Krieger Associates
 Lenore Millhollen, 22nd and Van Pelt Streets
 David Krahm, 1900 Wallace Street
 Gerry Gutierrez, Group G, LLC
 Sean and Allene Pulsifer, 2434 Poplar Street
 Richard W. Thom, 1314 Rodman Street
 Robert A Grimaldi, 215 South 15th Street
 Michael Horvath, 215 South 15th Street
 Jason Rose, 215 South 15th Street
 Alessandro Taurisano, 1909 Spruce Street
 Ivano D'Angella, DS Architect

Ms. Pentz, Acting-chair called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

Memorial Hall

City of Philadelphia/Fairmount Park Commission/ Please Touch Museum, Owner
 Philip Scott, Architect/Applicant
 DATE: 1876, Centennial Exhibition, Hermann Schwartzmann, architect
 PROPOSAL: Façade restoration, new windows, addition, signage and lighting – final approval

Mr. Farnham presented the application for final approval of the proposal, which would adapt the building for the Please Touch Museum. The alterations include façade rehabilitation, an addition, signage, lighting, and other improvements.

On 10 October 2003, the Historical Commission approved in concept the following: the main-façade doors and windows stipulated in Revised Scheme C, i.e. the replicated 1876 bronze and iron doors as well as new windows based on the 1921 configuration, but without the infill; the restoration of the corner pavilion windows to their 1876 appearance; the location, size, connection, and overall appearance but not the exterior details of the carousel addition; the removal of non-historic stairs, doors, and ramps and the restoration of associated areas; the addition of two emergency exits on the west façade; the redesigned drop-off lots flanking the main entrance, provided the paving matches the central walkway; the school bus drop-off road and main parking lot; and the restoration of the plaza between the branches of the Concourse. The Commission requested further study and review of alternative plans for the regrading for sidewalks

up to the main entrance and the closing of the north branch of the Concourse.

Mr. Farnham noted that with the exception of the front windows and the carousel addition, which has been modified in size, connection, and overall appearance, the plans submitted for final approval appear to comply with the Commission's in-concept approval.

The carousel addition will stand on a pre-cast panel base (color to match the base of Memorial Hall); will be constructed of glass and aluminum; and will be topped with a standing-seam roof. The design of the carousel addition has been revised since it was last reviewed. The link between Memorial Hall and the addition has been shortened and its bulk stands closer to the historic building. A shed addition for restrooms now projects out to the east. A front stair and entranceway has been added. At the roof, the clerestory has been replaced by a series of gables. Overall, the elevations of the addition are more complicated; the clarity and simplicity of the in-concept design have been abandoned for more intricacy and detail.

Site and tree plans are included. The plans no longer stipulate the closing of North Concourse Drive in front of the museum; the closing had troubled some Commission members. Paving plans for the walks and drop-off zones comply with the Commission's in-concept approval. The proposed garden walls on either side of the main entrance, one of which will hide an ADA ramp, are not fully defined. No materials or colors are specified.

Plans for a vast array of sign types are included. Most of the signage will not visibly or physically impact Memorial Hall itself. Sixteen banner signs will mount directly to the building. Attachment details have not been provided.

Plans for lighting are also included. No details for lighting attached to the building itself have been provided.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the rehabilitation of the exterior of Memorial Hall, site plan except the south facade garden walls, which are not fully defined, signage except the banners in the niches on the west facade, which obscure architectural features, and site lighting except the lighting attached to the building, which is not fully defined, all with staff to review details. Denial of the carousel addition. The link has been shortened and it therefore stands too close to the historic building. Also, the new design lacks the clarity and simplicity of the in-concept design and competes with the historic building. All pursuant to Standards 2, 9 and 10.

Phillip Scott and James Straw of Kise Straw & Kolodner attended the meeting. Mr. Scott, using elevation drawings, quickly explained the various changes to each facade of the building. On the north or rear elevation, the facade would be repaired, the windows will be restored to their 1876 configuration and the entrance for school groups will be adapted from an existing ramped basement entrance. The loading dock will be located at the rear of the carousel addition.

On the west facade, the non-historic door openings will be removed and the pavilion windows restored.

On the south façade, the windows will be restored to their 1927 condition. This would include having the concrete frames, as required by the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission. An ADA ramp will be installed on the western end and an elevated garden will be added on the eastern end to complete the symmetry. Their walls will be made of pre-cast concrete with color and texture that will match the base wall of the main building.

On the east elevation, two of the blind niches will be opened for access to the carousel addition. The carousel addition is designed to house mechanicals and bathrooms for the Kelly Pool in the basement and a restored Denzel carousel and bathrooms at the first floor. The carousel itself measures 52 feet in diameter and code requires an additional five feet of clearance. This, plus room for the lines and space to congregate determined the dimensions for the addition. The museum requires the capacity to use the carousel portion of the building without opening the main building; therefore bathrooms are necessary in the addition. Locating the bathrooms in the basement would mean not only stairs, but an ADA elevator, which the addition cannot accommodate. The addition was shifted toward the main building to accommodate the bathrooms without further impinging on Kelly Pool.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance noted that the Please Touch Museum had formed an advisory committee to evaluate the preservation issues. It included Bonnie Mark from the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, Bill Bolger of the National Park Service, and Bill Burke of the Art Commission; however, the Historical Commission declined to participate. The Committee did not like the bathrooms in the proposed location, but concluded that it was the only logical location, given the restrictions imposed by Kelly Pool. It also evaluated the design of the carousel house and determined that it should have its own identity, separate from the existing building. It thought that the original design was too restrained.

Mr. Tyler countered that Memorial Hall was the principle element and that the addition should not compete. He opined that the earlier design reads as a carousel house as well. Mr. Thomas believed that the scale of Memorial Hall was such that it could accept an addition with a stronger design. Other Committee members agreed. Nancy Kolb, of the Please Touch Museum, noted that three large trees would stand in front of the addition, partially obscuring it from North Concourse Drive.

Mr. Scott continued to outline the proposal, detailing the tree plan, parking and paving plan, signage and lighting. Mr. Thomas questioned the color of the asphalt and lines in the parking lot. Mr. Scott noted that those details had not been finalized. Mr. D'Alessandro cautioned the museum in the use of the curbing material, stating that snow removal contractors often damage the curbs, creating safety hazards; he suggested using more conventional curbing in the parking area.

For the signage, Committee members discussed the four banners proposed for the niches on the west elevation. Ms. Cull noted that the banners were meant to bring attention to the details on the building. Ms. Pentz suggested making the banners slightly smaller so that the niches themselves would be visible as well. Mr. Gallery said that the signage was meant to be playful; the building itself is rather austere.

The Committee then discussed the lighting. Mr. Scott described the four lighting fixtures to be installed around the site. Mr. Straw explained that the lighting is intended to provide safety for visitors, but also to provide a particular atmosphere for the building. Some fixtures will be attached to the roof of the structure to illuminate the dome, but the rest of the façade will be illuminated with ground and pole-mounted fixtures. Mr. Thomas questioned the use of the thirty-foot standards, owing to the large trees on the site. Messrs. Scott and Straw understood the concern, but noted that the smaller standards would be used along the pedestrian paths and that the larger standards were needed to minimize the number of overall fixtures needed on the site.

Mr. Gallery said that the special advisory committee and Preservation Alliance both support the project.

The Architectural Committee voted to approve the proposal, provided the west niche banners are reduced in size, with staff to review details, pursuant to 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 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.] and Standard 10 [New additions and 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.].

lms

1825 Porter Street

Joseph Rollo, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1907, James & John Windrim

PROPOSAL: Legalize roll-down gate at rear

Ms. Spina presented the application. She noted that the owner was out of the country last month and did not receive the notices of the meetings; he wishes to return this month to plead his case. Without a permit or Commission approval, the owner installed a metal roll-down gate at the rear of the property, which faces Roseberry Street. Although they are out of the historic district, houses on Roseberry face this work. Ms. Spina noted that a resident on Roseberry Street sent a letter opposing the gate and Ronald Donatucci submitted a letter supporting the applicant.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9. Other means of security or fencing could be installed instead that would maintain the openness and suburban quality of these yards.

Joseph Rollo, the owner, said that he had a wall at the rear of his property, but he removed it before the Commission designated the historic district in 1999 so that he and his wife can park their cars in the rear yard. Over the years, the openness has caused a problem with neighbors because people use it as a passageway to other yards. To solve the problem, he had a contractor install the roll-down gate. Owing to its height, the gate requires a zoning variance as well. He did not think it required a building permit because he was not changing anything on his building. Mr. Rollo said that almost all of

the yards in the block have solid walls. Ms. Spina noted that these were built prior to the district's designation.

Committee members discussed this and other, more open, gates that Mr. Rollo could install. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested installing a sliding gate that has two or three leaves that would allow the turning radius necessary for the cars.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of legalizing the roll-down gate, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.].

Lms

231-35 North 2nd Street

2nd Street Investors, Owner

Hugh Zimmers, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Change cast-stone to fiberglass

Ms. Spina explained the proposal. The Commission approved the construction of the six-story parking condominium in September 2002. The facing of the proposed structure included cast-stone columns, pipe metal grilles with screening and wood storefront details. The proposal calls for changing the cast-stone pilasters to fiberglass. Ms. Spina passed around a sample of the fiberglass.

Staff recommendation: Denial.

William Schwartz, Esq.; Hugh Zimmers, project architect; Bob Levitt, owner of the property, and Michael Rigolizzo attended the meeting. Mr. Zimmers said that they are petitioning to change the material of the pilasters for several reasons. The first is to homogenize the appearance of the façade with the fiberglass cornices. Second, the load-bearing of the structure cannot handle the weight of the cast-stone. Lastly, the cost of the cast-stone is \$60,000 more than the fiberglass. Ms. Spina noted that the superstructure has been built and asked why the superstructure was constructed in a way that it could not handle the load of the cast stone, a material that was proposed and approved for the project. Mr. Zimmers said that it really was the cost that motivated the change. Committee members discussed the design of the façade. Ms. Pentz asked about the salvaged cast-iron pieces. Ms. Spina said that they are to be incorporated into a mural on the south side of the building, but the applicant still has not submitted the required plans for their attachment to the staff for review. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the building originally had a cast-iron front and that perhaps the fiberglass should be made to look like cast-iron rather than cast-stone. Other Committee members countered that the Commission approved a design that had cast-stone pilasters and that is what the applicant should build. Any change from that based on finances should go to the financial hardship committee.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the material change.

Lms

400-02 Spruce Street

R. Bruce Heppenstall, Owner

William J. O'Brien II, Esq., Applicant

DATE: 1969, Hassinger and Schwam, architects for Penn Tower Development Corporation; garage and side addition, c. 1995 for Redevelopment Authority

Ms. Spina described the history of the property and the proposal. On the Spruce Street façade the application calls for enlarging the 1st floor windows in the original section of the house. This will be accomplished through the removal of the metal spandrel above the existing windows. At the entrance in the later addition, the plans stipulate the replacement of the glass block with a single-paned sidelight and the concrete stringer stairs with cascading stairs.

On the 4th Street façade, the twenty-light fixed window would be replaced with a double-leaf, single-paned casement window and an identical window would be cut just next to it. Lastly, a second-story addition would be built on the garage. The addition would have brick facing, an aluminum, standing-seam metal roof and HVAC equipment at the very western end of the roof. The aluminum garage door will have a brick arch opening and wood in-filled transom. This detail, though a bit awkward, echoes the arches over the windows on the addition.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the window change in the 1969 house, pursuant to Standard 6. Approval of the work in the 1995, subject to the area over the garage being stucco rather than brick to mirror the northern wing, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Karl Krumholz, architect for the project, Betty Jane Heppenstall, owner, and William O'Brien, Esq. attended. Mr. Krumholz explained that the 1st floor windows were installed in 1995 when the additions were constructed. Mr. Thomas opined that the south wall of the garage addition was too stark and suggested a belt course or reveal to break up the façade. He also suggested using a reveal instead of wood for the arch over the garage opening.

Lorna Katz Lawson of the Society Hill Civic Association complained that the owners did not present the plans to the civic association prior to appearing before the Historical Commission. Mr. O'Brien noted that they have contacted the civic association and have a date to appear before the organization.

The Committee voted to approve the proposal as submitted with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.] and Standard 10 [New additions and 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.].

Lms

212 Walnut Street aka 201-05 Dock Street

Lamberti Restaurant, Owner

Dominic Aspite, Applicant

DATE: 1976, Geddes Brecher Qualls Cunningham, architects

PROPOSAL: Illuminated signage on all four facades

Ms. Spina explained the proposal. The application calls for four internally-illuminated signs, with one on each façade of the building. On Walnut and 2nd Streets the signs are very narrow, 1'5" x 27', and fit in the spandrel between the first and second floors. On the south and west façades that face Dock Street, the two signs measure 10' x 10' and 8' x 8'9" respectively.

Staff recommendation: Approval of all but the western sign, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Denial of the western sign, pursuant to Standard 9 and the signage guideline. One staff member favors denial of the south façade, also owing to its incompatibility of scale.

Dominic Aspite and Jeff Carson of City Sign Company attended the meeting. Mr. Carson explained that the images for the signs replicate similar images used in the restaurant. All of the signs would have extruded aluminum cabinets, as required by the Art Commission. The location for the sign on the south façade had a sign for a number of years, but the sign was taken down when the owner did renovations to the property last year.

Mary Ellen Langsdorf, of the Society Hill Towers, asked that the restaurant give a presentation to the Towers' association. Their association objects to illuminated signage that would face their buildings.

Lorna Katz Lawson of the Society Hill Civic Association objected to the illuminated signage in general.

Mr. Carson withdrew the proposal in order to meet with the civic groups and reevaluate the design.

lms

214 Delancey Street

Bryan Miller, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1756 by John Goodwin, carpenter; front façade restored, c. 1957

PROPOSAL: 3rd-floor addition on rear ell, rear decks, new windows – in concept

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. The owner gave us the wrong mailing address so he did not receive the notice letters of the meetings. He returns this month to plead his case. The concept proposal calls for adding a third story to the rear ell of this intact 1756 house. The main section has a gambrel roof with a shed roof dormer, and the rear ell has the original half-gable roofline. To accommodate the addition, the roofline would be extended from the ridge line, demolishing the roof at the rear. The rear wall of the house and rear ell currently have stucco and the plans call for the addition to be stuccoed as well. Two wood decks would extend off the rear ell at the second and third

floors with double-leaf doors. The application form also states that the owner would like to replace the windows, but the application does not include any details.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the addition, pursuant to Standard 2, Standard 5, Standard 9 and Standard 10. Denial of the windows based on incompleteness.

Bryan Miller, the owner, stated that he does not seek to make major changes to this house. Rather, he wants to create a third floor on the ell with an extension off the rear of the gambrel roof.

Ms. Spina noted that visibility would occur from Pine Street and the parking lot at Pine and Second Streets. Steven Weixler from the Society Hill Civic Association urged the Committee to deny the application, as did Elizabeth Armour, a resident on Delancey Street.

Mr. Miller expressed a willingness to return to the Committee with more details. Mr. Thomas responded that the problem went far beyond the details. Mr. McCoubrey observed that this is an important, intact house that should be not altered as proposed. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed.

The Committee recommended denial pursuant to Standards 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.], 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.], 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.], and 10 [New additions and 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.].

RT

14 North Front Street

Luca Sena, Owner

Sabrina Soong, Architect/Applicant

DATE: bet. 1828 and 1836; rehabilitated 1989

PROPOSAL: Alter windows to sliding doors with balconettes

Ms. Spina introduced this submission. This project entails changing non-historic coupled, one-over-one windows on the south side of the building. The new configuration involves single-leaf doors and casement windows with A/C units below. Each opening will then have balconettes that project approximately 1'3". The area of work encompasses a former party wall that historically did not have openings and several rear additions.

Staff recommendation: Approval with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and 10.

The Committee recommended approval as submitted pursuant to Standards 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.] and 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.]

RT

400-02 Wood Street aka 314 York Avenue

Luigi Basile, Owner

Danilo Vicencio, Applicant

DATE: c. 1820; gable roof removed and façade stuccoed, mid-20th century

PROPOSAL: 4th – floor addition with gable roof, face building in brick, cut window openings on 1st floor

Ms. Spina described this application. According to the Smith atlas of 1909, this building originally had another half story, probably with a cedar-shingled, gable roof and six-over-six double-hung windows along the Wood Street façade. Like the house behind this one on Lawrence Street, the gable only sat on the front portion of the building and the rear ell was a three story section with a half-gable roof. The owner wishes to add one and a half stories to the property and has submitted two different versions of the proposal. Both versions include a gabled roof extending over the entire property and refacing the entire building with thin bricks; however, no other details of materials appear on the plans.

The first proposal includes two large six-over-six windows with pedimented parapets that break the roofline on the front façade. On the Wood Street façade, two six-over-six windows with fanlights and shutters flank a large bank of windows. The bank of windows stretches to the peak of the roofline and surrounds a double-leaf door leading to a balconette.

The second proposal, more modest in scale, eliminates the parapets on the front façade and has an unbroken cornice line. The fourth floor windows match the existing third floor windows. On the Wood Street façade, again, the proposed six-over-six windows match those found on the third floor, except for the middle bay. This bay has a double-leaf, multi-light door with a fanlight and balconette.

The owner also wants to expand the storefront on the first floor by cutting another bay of windows. These would be single-pane casement windows with an awning to match the existing. A sign would be installed on the corner above the second floor, but the plans do not include any details other than the size.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the window on the first floor pursuant to Standard 9. Denial of the brick facing pursuant to Standard 7 and Standard 9. Denial of both versions of the rooftop addition. The gable roof should be restored and an addition on

the rear ell could then be added on the rear for additional space.

Mr. Vicenecio exhibited photographs of the existing conditions and explained that he used the buildings to the south on York Avenue as a model. He then informed the Committee that he intended to use six over six sash in the openings. He added that he had met with the Old City Civic Association which approved his Scheme B. Despite the staff recommendation, he still seeks a full length gable from York Avenue back to Lawrence Street which would yield a four story plus loft building. Ms. Spina noted that the subject property predates those to its immediate south which cannot serve as a predicate for the present development.

Ms. Pentz said that the current proposal should more closely resemble the original building. Mr. McCoubrey agreed.

Ms. Spina prepared a simple elevation showing the portion facing Wood Street in its original form but with an ell springing from just below the ridge of the gable to the end of the lot. Mr. Thomas reiterated and expanded on this suggestion.

Committee members also addressed the applicant's proposal to apply a brick veneer to the stucco walls. They cautioned against this structurally and urged the removal of stucco to examine the condition of the brick. That would indicate the feasibility of restoring the brick or the necessity of restuccoing the walls.

Mr. Vicencio said that he would undertake further research, consult with the owner, and return to the Committee.

The Committee recommended denial pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.] and Standard 7 [Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken in the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.].

RT

23 West Walnut Lane

Ken and Lois Ann Handrich, Owners

Robert Thomas, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1849

PROPOSAL: Demolish existing one-story rear addition; construct one-story addition, cut fence for gate for parking

Mr. Farnham presented this submission. This application proposes the demolition of a non-historic, one-story, rear addition; construction of a large, one-story, rear addition; the conversion of an historic fence into a gate; and the addition of a curb cut and driveway. Although at the rear, the new addition would be visible from Walnut Lane. The plans provide no information about materials or the gate to be created from the historic fence.

Staff Recommendation:

1. Approval of the demolition
2. Approval of the concept of an addition, but denial of the addition as submitted owing to the incompleteness of the plans and the overlap of the proposed addition onto the historic building. The addition should be further disconnected visually and/or physically from the historic building.
3. Approval of the concept of the fence-gate conversion and driveway, but denial of the gate as submitted owing to the incompleteness of the plans.
Pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Thomas reviewed the site context, the materials to be used, and the history of the property.

Following a brief interchange among the Committee members, staff, Mr. Thomas, and his clients, the Committee reached a consensus.

The Committee recommended approval of the proposal subject to the redesign of the addition's cornice, especially where it overlaps onto the historic building, the annotation of materials on the plans, and the submission of a plan for the gate conversion, with staff to review details, 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.].

RT

1216 Spruce Street

George Anni, Owner/Applicant

Timothy Powel

DATE: c. 1825

PROPOSAL: Switch door and window on Camac Street façade

Mr. Farnham introduced this submission. This application originally proposed swapping a first-floor door and window on the Camac Street façade of this rowhouse, which is being converted into a restaurant. The applicant recently revised the submission to also include kitchen and bathroom fans.

The Department of Licenses & Inspections has requested that an exterior door be added at the top of a basement stairway for egress. A window currently occupies the spot. An unused door into the dining room stands to the north of the window. The locations of the door and window would be swapped.

The fans would be added to a one-story addition at the south. They would be visible from Camac Street.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the replacement of the window with a door, but not of the swapping of the door and window; approval of the bathroom fan; denial of the kitchen fan as submitted; approval of an interior kitchen fan with a flush louver in the alley painted to match the brick; with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and

5.

The Committee members, staff, Mr. Anni, and Mr. Powel discussed the existing conditions and the options for a solution to Mr. Anni's use and Code needs.

The Committee recommended approval of the conversion of a window into a door with a door and transom to match the historic door to the north and a step in marble or cast stone; the installation of the bathroom fan; and the installation of an interior kitchen fan with a flush louver in the alley painted to match the surrounding brick, with staff to review details, pursuant to 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.]; and Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.].

RT

1300 Market Street aka 100 Penn Square East, Wanamaker Building

Wanamaker Office Lease, LP, Owner

Marita Sommar Osborne, Applicant

DATE: 1902-1910, Daniel H. Burnham & Company

PROPOSAL: Carve signage over west entrance

This application proposes carving "THE WANAMAKER BUILDING" into the granite frieze band of the entablature over the west entrance to this department store and office building. The hand-carved letters would be 18" tall.

Staff Recommendation: Denial. The staff would recommend approval of a removable stone sign band mounted to the frieze in mortar joints. Pursuant to Standards 2 and 10.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Marita Osbourne, the owners' representative, and designers Lisa Soderburg and Glen Hilltack attended the meeting for the applicant.

The Committee discussed various examples of carved signage approved by the Commission in the past. These include the Fidelity building, where the stone had been updated, the Peck Center at Drexel, where the existing brownstone was deteriorated beyond repair, and the Fidelity Mutual Insurance Company at 25th and Fairmount Streets, where the Commission approved an applied carved cast stone plaque. The applicant explained that unlike those projects, this carved sign would identify and affirm the historic name of the building; it was not a new, and perhaps temporary, name.

The Committee members agreed and discussed issues including the thickness of the existing stone and whether it could be carved without cracking and the size of the letters. They said that the stone should be at least four inches thick and fully supported from the rear. The Committee asked staff to review such details with the applicant.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended approval of the proposal, with staff to review details.

RB

119, 121, and 123 Catharine Street

Christian Street Partners, Owners

Craig Deutsch, Applicant

DATE: unknown

PROPOSAL: Complete demolition of existing buildings; construction of four three-story buildings with garages and roof decks

This application to demolish several buildings completely and erect four rowhouses is the first sent to the Commission under the one-year Queen Village Demolition Moratorium Ordinance, §14-1628. The review of this application will set the standard for the review of all subsequent applications. Passed in the spring of 2004, the ordinance regulates demolitions within Queen Village, which it defines as the area bounded on the north by the south side of Locust Street, on the west by the east side of S. 5th Street, on the south by the north side of Washington Street, and on the east by the Delaware River. The ordinance states that:

No demolition of any building or other structure within Queen Village shall be permitted, unless (i) such demolition is necessary to abate an imminently dangerous condition as determined by the Department of Licenses and Inspections, (ii) a building permit for such demolition is obtained in accordance with all provisions of §14-2007 (7) [the section of the Historical Commission's ordinance that addresses permit] and the regulations issued pursuant to that Section, applying those provisions as if Queen Village were a designated historic district, or (iii) either a zoning and use registration permit for such demolition or a building permit for such demolition was issued prior to April 15, 2004, in which case the provisions of the foregoing clause (ii) shall not apply.

The moratorium ordinance empowers the Commission to treat the Queen Village area "as if it were a designated historic district" when demolition is proposed. Without a nomination for a Queen Village historic district, which would define a Period of Significance in the Statement of Significance and date and classify the buildings in the Inventory, the Commission and its Committees and staff are disadvantaged. The 1972 National Register nomination for the Southwark District is entirely insufficient. It consists of a meager one-page Statement of Significance; it does not include an Inventory. It is not possible to determine whether these buildings would contribute to a district without a precise definition of the district. Therefore, the staff will assume that all buildings within the bounds defined above are Contributing unless contrary information is provided by the applicant. Subsection §14-2007 (7) (j) of the Commission's ordinance requires that demolitions of Contributing buildings be justified by either a financial hardship or public interest claim. The application proffers no such claim.

The information submitted about the buildings on the site is woefully inadequate. The applicants are unsure of the addresses of the properties slated for demolition. The information on the existing conditions consists of a single, blurry digital photo of the facades of 119-123 Catharine Street. The Board of Revision of Taxes lists four separate parcels that may be included within the site: 119 Catharine, 119½ -123 Catharine, 125 Catharine, and 125R Catharine. The site may include the two-story brick garage building

and three-story brick rowhouse at 119½ -123 Catharine, the front facades of which are depicted in the submitted photo; the site may also include a rear building at 119, a rowhouse at 125, and rear trinities at 123 and 125R. The existing conditions should be fully documented with a site plan keyed to photos of every façade; the single photo submitted does not permit an adequate accounting of the subject properties or an adequate assessment of their historic significance.

The plans submitted for the new construction are not complete; they consist of unannotated front and rear elevations and a site plan only. Subsection §14-2007 (7) (i) of the Commission's ordinance states that the "Commission may require that a permit for the ... demolition of any building ... subject to its review be issued subject to such conditions as may reasonably advance the purposes of this section." Therefore, the Commission may elect to review not only the plans for the demolition, but also those for the new construction. The submitted plans do not permit an adequate assessment of the proposed construction.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, owing to incompleteness and pursuant to Subsection §14-2007 (7) (j); and Standards 2, 6, 9, and 10.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Craig Deutsch and developer Arthur Elwood attended the meeting. They provided a site plan to clarify the extent of the demolition. They stated that they had determined the corrected addresses of the properties, 119-123 Catharine Street. They said that they were not prepared to make a hardship argument at the present, but did consider the proposal to be in the public interest.

Bob Thomas explained that a public interest claim would be difficult, if not impossible, to justify for a private, for-profit development. He stated that this type of argument is reserved for projects like schools, convention and symphony halls, and public projects. He also said that the buildings appear to be reusable, have historic detail, and could be rehabilitated.

John Gallery said that this is an important, precedent-setting review. He added that although it seems that public interest might be broader than publicly-owned projects, it certainly should include an element of public benefit. This proposal does not appear to incorporate anything that might be deemed public. He also asserted that this particular design with its garage doors on the street would negatively impact the streetscape.

Richard Cole, a neighbor on the Zoning Committee of the Queen Village Neighbors Association, and David Hammond, a neighbor at 113 Catherine Street, thought that the proposed buildings were not appropriate for the historic neighborhood.

Shaun Jones, a neighbor at 124 Catherine Street, spoke in favor of the demolition of the printing plant and the construction of new houses. He thought that there may be toxic waste in the buildings that had been used for printing. Therefore the buildings may not make good candidates for reuse. Bob Thomas explained that any toxic waste would have to be cleaned up whether the buildings were torn down or reused. He pointed out that the buildings have vehicle entrances that are fewer in number and smaller in scale than proposed houses. He thought the buildings could be well adapted to the new residential use.

David O'Donnell, president of the Queen Village Neighbors association, explained that the neighborhood sought this ordinance to prevent demolitions of historic fabric for this type of development. He explained that, nonetheless, many neighbors are in favor of this particular demolition if the plans for the new construction are revised to be more compatible with the historic neighborhood. In particular, he expressed a concern with the garage doors and the lack of first-floor front windows and stoops.

Mr. Baron said that, although the Commission does not regulate use, the loss of the mixed use and scale may not be in the public interest.

Members of the Committee agreed with the staff recommendation owing to the incompleteness of the application, which provided little information on the extant buildings, no public use or hardship case, and little information on the proposed construction.

The Committee unanimously recommended denial owing to incompleteness and pursuant to Subsection §14-2007 (7) (j) [No permit shall be issued for the demolition ... of a building ... within an historic district which contributes, in the Commission's opinion, unless the Commission finds that issuance of the permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Commission finds that the building ... cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.]; 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 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.]

RB

261-63 South 22nd Street aka 262 South Van Pelt Street

Arthur Elwood, Owner

Craig Deutsch, Applicant

DATE: 261 S. 22nd Street, aka 262 S. Van Pelt Street, c. 1875

new façade at 261 S. 22nd Street, 1937

263 S. 22nd Street, addition to 261 S. 22nd Street, 1957

PROPOSAL: Substantial demolition of three contributing buildings and construction of three three-story buildings with garages – in concept

This application proposes in concept the partial demolition of three buildings and the

construction of three residential buildings with garages and decks in their places. All three buildings are listed as Contributing to the Rittenhouse-Filter Historic District.

The buildings, which have been consolidated as one property since the mid 1950s, have complex histories. The building at 261 S. 22nd Street was constructed as either a rowhouse or carriage house about 1875. The only nineteenth-century features surviving on the S. 22nd façade are the third-story window frames and the uncommon pierced Neo-Grec cornice. The brick of the Van Pelt Street façade, which is covered with several layers of paint, may be original. By 1895, the building was used as a livery; it occupied the entire lot from S. 22nd through to Van Pelt and probably had stable or garage doors at both facades. In 1937, part of the S. 22nd façade was demolished and reconstructed. It is likely that the awkward corbelled brick brackets at the cornice were added at this time. A four-story rowhouse with a three-story rear ell once stood at 263 S. 22nd. It was standing in 1939, but had been demolished by 1957. The two-story brick building that now stands at 263 S. 22nd was erected in 1957 as an addition to 261 S. 22nd. The façade at 261 S. 22nd was further altered when the addition was built. The facades of both 261 and 263 S. 22nd stand several inches out onto the sidewalk from the traditional building line, evidencing the fact that they are not original, but are later additions. The Colonial Revival doorway and glass block windows on Van Pelt Street probably date to the 1957 renovation and addition. The glass and aluminum storefront at 263 S. 22nd is a fairly recent addition, but predates the district designation.

The proposal stipulates the demolition of the facades at 263 S. 22nd and 262 S. Van Pelt. New brick and limestone veneer facades would be constructed. Garages would be included in all three new townhouses. The proposal also stipulates the demolition of the center section of the 261 S. 22nd/262 Van Pelt building and the rear section of the 263 S. 22nd building to create rear yards for the three new townhouses. The yards are needed to meet the open-space and rear-yard requirements specified in the zoning code. One-story additions would be constructed on the two-story pieces at 263 S. 22nd and 262 S. Van Pelt. Penthouses and roof decks would be constructed atop all three buildings.

Staff Recommendation: Approval in concept of the demolition, additions, garages, and decks. Denial of the facades. The façade at 261 S. 22nd should be restored to its late nineteenth-century livery appearance with its Neo-Grec cornice; appropriately scaled, historic, one-over-one or two-over-two, wood windows; historic lintels and sills; and compatible entry and carriage doors. The designs of the other two facades, which are awkwardly proportioned and detailed, should be improved. These recommendations are made pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Craig Deutsch and developer Arthur Elwood represented the application at the meeting. They explained the project, noting that they intend to create large yards at the rears of the properties. They offered to preserve the wood cornice at 263 S. 22nd Street.

John Moore, a neighbor, produced a photograph from 1930 of 261 S. 22nd Street that shows that it retains much of its historic appearance including the two windows at the 2nd floor, the three smaller windows at the 3rd floor, and the brick pilasters framing the upper floors and cornice.

A number of property owners on Van Pelt Street opposed the design of the proposed

four-story house on that street. Joan Hooke pointed out that the proposal sounds like demolition in substantial part and that the applicant and the Committee have not discussed hardship or public interest. She noted that the drawings also fail to show the fourth-floor penthouses. She thought that any rooftop penthouse should have set backs from the sides of the building as well as the front. She also noted the open lot at 260 S. Van Pelt, which she thought should be protected. Mr. Farnham observed that the Commission recently approved a fourth-floor addition at Ms. Hooke's house at 264 S. Van Pelt Street.

Walter Litton said that the proposed "McMansion" would not be compatible with Van Pelt Street. John Moore pointed out the variety on the block and noted especially the larger gabled house in the center of the row. He said that the applicant has not been willing to work with the neighbors.

Chuck Capaldi, an architect, spoke for several neighbors against the large sizes of the proposed houses. He said that the industrial nature of the existing building was a benefit to the street.

Richard Greenwald of 261 S. Van Pelt and Zeta Kreidler, the president of Chandler Place Residents Association, complex to the north, spoke against the proposed development from the standpoint of the sizes of the new structures.

Neighbor Virginia Beyer explained that various neighbors have photographs to help with any restorations of the buildings.

Suzanne Pentz said that the proposed demolition seems overly extensive. She recommended the restoration of 261 S. 22nd Street to its late nineteenth-century livery appearance and the construction of a contemporary three-story structure at 263. She rejected the proposed mirror-image buildings. Other Committee members suggested that the Van Pelt Street building be limited in height to two stories at the street and that any addition be set back considerably from the street façade. Mr. Farnham asserted that any fourth-story penthouses and decks must be included on the elevations. Mr. Deutsch replied that they would not be visible from the street. Several neighbors contended that they would. Mr. Farnham noted that an elevation drawing is not a perspectival drawing; what can and cannot be seen is irrelevant. The Committee recommended that the applicant return with a revised proposal.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended denial, pursuant to 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.]; and 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.].

306-08 South 19th Street aka 1901 Delancey Street

Henry McNeil, Owner

Adam Jacob, Applicant

DATE: 1900, Cope & Stewardson for E.B. Smith

PROPOSAL: Roof decks, new gates on Delancey Street and railings on 19th Street

This application proposes several alterations to the Colonial Revival mansion at the northwest corner of S. 19th Street and Delancey Place. It was designed by important architects Cope & Stewardson and is listed as Significant to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District.

At the front, the plans specify the replacement of the front step, front railings, and basement grates at grade as well as the addition of planters and railings at a tree. The existing front step and the decorative parts of railings are original. Also, basement window grates would be refurbished.

At the rear, the application proposes the replacement of gates, fences, and walkways with simple metal picket gates, fences, and walkways. An existing concrete wall would be stuccoed. It also proposes bars on some rear windows, a large sliding screen door at the first-floor rear, and a new door with sidelight at the basement rear. The basement door will not be visible, but the sliding screen door will be. The screen door will not fit within the existing door opening; instead, it will cover the entire doorway. Also, lights are proposed, but no details about the fixtures or mounting have been provided.

The application proposes an interlinked set of three roof decks with a stairway, trellises, and planters on the roof of the western end of the building. The lowest of the three decks will not be visible owing to a very tall parapet, but the upper decks as well as all of the trellises would be visible from Delancey Place.

Staff Recommendation: The staff makes the following recommendations, with staff to review details.

Front: Approval of the basement grates, tree railings, and basement window grate refurbishment. Approval of the replacement of the front steps to match the existing steps. Denial of the removal of the historic front railings and their replacement with new railings and planters, pursuant to 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.]*; and 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.]*.

Rear: Approval of the gates, fences, and walkways, the stuccoing of the concrete garden wall, the window grates, and basement door with sidelight. Denial of the sliding screen door, pursuant to Standard 9.

Roof: Approval of the lowest deck. Denial of the upper decks, stairways, and trellises, pursuant to Standard 9 and 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.].

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. The applicant was represented by Mark Brookman, Esq., and Jeffrey Krieger, architect.

Suzanne Pentz recused herself.

Mr. Brookman explained that the screen door had been deleted from the project. He said that the front rail was being altered to dissuade people from sitting on the front step.

Rudy D'Alessandro agreed with the staff recommendation that the existing rail should remain. Messrs. Riviera and McCoubrey said that the change in the rail would be acceptable if the planter were deleted.

Provided that the screen door is omitted from the plans, the work on the rear of the property was acceptable to the Committee.

Mr. Brookman showed photos to demonstrate the limited visibility of the decks. Mr. Farnham offered photographs to the Committee that showed that the upper two decks would be highly visible from Delancey Place to the west of the property. Mr. Brookman explained that the owner's art collection draws many visitors. The owner will use the outdoor space to entertain those visitors. He said that the trellises would provide shade.

Messrs. Riviera and D'Alessandro did not object to the decks if they do not have trellises. Mr. McCoubrey did not object to the decks and would also accept any trellises not visible from the street. Messrs. Riviera and D'Alessandro insisted that the trellises be deleted from the plans because the visibility could not be definitively ascertained.

The Architectural Committee recommended that the application be approved without the planters on the front stoop, the screen door at the first-floor rear, or the trellises on the roof decks. Suzanne Pentz recused herself.

RB

2118 Pine Street

John Vauricka, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1865

PROPOSAL: Legalize roof deck

This proposal calls for approval of a roof deck already under construction on top of the mansard roof of this corner house. The work received a building permit in error without review by the Historical Commission. Staff has visited the site to look at a mock up and the deck will have visibility from several directions on Pine and Van Pelt Streets. The Historical Commission also generally does not approve decks on the main roofs of buildings particularly where the public has visibility.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofing Guideline.

Joseph Graci, engineer, and Vincent Melchiorre appeared for the applicant. They presented the Committee with a letter from Mr. Vavricka explaining that he is the head of commercial operations for Chiron Vaccines and that he had to be away from the City to attend a Congressional hearing, but wanted the proposal to proceed. Mr. Melchiorre explained Mr. Vavricka's commitment to the City in terms of locating his business to 2 Logan Circle rather than the suburbs and providing a number of jobs. He purchased a house for 1.1 million dollars that has no outdoor space. He explained that Mr. Vavricka hired an engineer to draw up this deck and apply to get permits. Although L&I asked for several changes in the deck, they did not send the applicant over to the Historical Commission for review. The project received a permit and the owner has spent most of the \$67,000 cost of the new deck including the structure and a metal winding stair in the hidden side yard. Mr. Vavricka is willing to make modifications to make the deck more appropriate to the building. The applicants presented a roof plan showing a setback of three and a half feet from the front façade and two feet eight inches on a portion of the side façade.

It was noted that the building has a small rear ell that is lower than the main body of the building. Committee members thought that the placement of the deck on top of the main mansard was highly disruptive to the historic appearance of the building, but said that issuance of the permit was an important extenuating circumstance. The high visibility of the structural base of the deck, owing to the lack of a parapet, was discussed. Mr. Graci explained that they propose to cover the base structure with white aluminum flashing to match that on the newly installed roof. Committee members thought it would be better to pull the deck back a greater distance from Pine Street and make up the loss of that space by not creating a setback on Van Pelt Street. Otherwise the base structure of the deck, which needs to span between bearing walls, would be highly visible even along the areas of the deck where the rail would be pulled back from the edge. At the rear ell, Committee members thought that the deck should be lowered, since the roof in that portion is substantially lower than the main roof. They explained how the existing higher deck structure could be cut and lowered, with an access step between the two decks. They thought that the railing should be a thin metal picket to minimize visibility. Mr. Melchiorre said that they would price this compromise and take it to Mr. Vavricka for approval. If he agrees to this compromise, his lawyer said they would not pursue the City in court on this issue.

The Committee unanimously recommended that because of the extenuating circumstance of the City's issuance of a permit in error, they would recommend approval of a lowered deck on the rear ell and a full width deck on the mansard roof subject to the entire structure being pulled back five feet from the Pine Street façade with an open metal picket rail.

RB

1900 Wallace Street

David Krahn, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Legalize window alteration

Mr. Baron explained that this property had been reviewed last month for the legalization of a deck and door. This proposal calls for legalization of the bricking up of the bottom of a window and installation of a small vinyl window on the visible side wall of this corner house. The owner said that he put in the smaller window to accommodate a counter inside a kitchen.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 9.

David Krahn, the owner, attended the meeting and said that he was unaware of the historic status of the property. He concluded that the alteration to the window would allow easy maintenance and that its correction would cost approximately \$1,000.00.

Ms. Pentz informed the applicant that it is not the Committee's practice to approve changes to the size of original masonry openings or the installation of vinyl windows. The Committee concurred.

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 a 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.]

DMH

2028-30 Fairmount Avenue

Savaas Navrosidis, Owner

Gerry Gutierrez, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Remove concrete ramp and infill at storefronts, construct new wood and glass storefronts

Mr. Baron described this proposal, which calls for the installation of two modern wood storefronts at the base of these structures. The Commission has previously approved more historic looking storefronts at this location.

Staff recommendation: Approval pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a 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.]

Mr. Baron handed out copies of a letter sent by the Spring Garden Civic Association asking that the details of the storefront be better worked out before final approval.

Gerry Gutierrez, the architect, attended the meeting and presented drawings of the proposed storefront. He noted that the drawings are predicated on suggestions made by the Spring Garden Civic Association. Mr. Gutierrez said that the replication of the historic storefront from next door would be very costly for the owner; therefore he proposes a simplified storefront.

Committee members reviewed the drawings and concluded that more detailed drawings for the storefront should be submitted, particularly of a section of the cornice and details of the structure. They agreed that as submitted, the proposal should receive conceptual approval. Mr. Gutierrez urged the Committee to give the proposal its consideration as soon as possible owing to time constraints. The Committee decided that the applicant could submit detailed drawings for review by the Committee and staff.

The Architectural Committee recommended final approval of the storefront subject to the submission of detailed drawings to be reviewed by the staff and Committee at its next meeting.

DMH

2434 Poplar Street

Sean and Allene Pulsifer, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1885

PROPOSAL: Replace slate roof with imitation slate shingles

Mr. Baron presented this proposal, which calls for re-roofing the slate covered mansard of this house with dark grey rubber faux slate shingles.

Staff recommendation: Approval pursuant to Standard 6.

Sean and Allene Pulsifer, the owners, attended the meeting. They explained that they chose a darker color to match the neighboring house owing to its many years of wear. Mr. Pulsifer noted that the decorative metal cap at the top which butts into the flashing will be replaced with lead coated copper.

Committee members concurred with the replacement.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval pursuant to 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.].

DMH

215 South 15th Street, 5th District Police Station

Fel Chen 15, LP, Owner

Michael Horvath, Applicant

DATE: built as 5th District Police Station 1870, 1898 Charles Supplee, architect

PROPOSAL: Illuminated signage and awning

This application calls for re-facing an existing backlit projecting sign, installing new neon channel letters on a large existing flat wall sign and recovering an existing frame awning with a canvas like fabric. The staff thinks that the applicant should remove the awning, and install new neon flat wall and projecting signage, smaller and more in scale with the building.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 9.

Ethan Fellheimer, Jason Rose, David Keene, Robert Grimaldi and Michael Horvath attended the meeting. Mr. Fellheimer told the Committee that he is receptive to reducing the flat wall sign; however, he strongly urged the Committee to allow the blade sign as it exists, because the lease of the property is contingent on the signage. He believes that eliminating the sign would be detrimental to the character of the building.

Mr. McCoubrey remarked that the building is consumed with Bookbinder's signage. Mr. Rivera said that 15th Street is a main view shed and that it is important to be sensitive to the architecture of this Second Empire building. He thought that the awning in the front should be removed; and since the architecture of this building begins at the corner, the flat and blade sign should be reduced in size. Mr. Rivera suggested a blade sign which eliminates some of the attachment so that the quoins of the building can show through. Committee members concurred and recommended open channel letters with neon lighting. They also concluded that a shed type awning above the doorway would be more appropriate. Mr. Fellheimer was receptive to the Committee's suggestion and asked that the proposal as submitted be withdrawn. He also asked the Committee about the Chancellor Street façade's entrance which has an existing awning. The Committee thought that the re-skinning of the existing awning would be appropriate.

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 a 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.]

DMH

1312-14 Rodman Street

Robert Volpe, Owner

Edward Bell, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: Legalize cornice, window changes, stucco on watertable and starbolts
Restore door openings.

This application involves the legalization of work that does not follow approved plans. After receiving an initial stop work order, the applicant had his architect apply for a permit for exterior work. On the plans for 1314 Rodman, the applicant proposed to remove the stucco from the base of the building, restore the cornice and doorway and install new windows preserving the shutter hardware. His plans called for preserving the existing roof. The actual work resulted in the removal of the chimney and shutter hardware, and the increase in the amount of stucco at the base of the building by eight inches. The applicant rebuilt the doorway with an asymmetrical and non-historic frame and transom without reopening the full historic masonry opening. He also revised the star-bolts and rebuilt the doorway on 1312 Rodman Street without a three light transom.

Mr. Volpe has now submitted revised plans to legalize the removal of the chimney and shutter hardware, re-stucco the building base and modify the star bolts. He also seeks to legalize the removal of the corbelled brick cornice which he says a former owner altered. He offers, however, to restore the doorways by reopening the masonry opening, constructing new three light transoms and installing the historic door frame on 1314 Rodman Street.

Staff recommendation: Approval pursuant to Standard 6.

Richard Thom, the architect, Peter Eizen and Robert Volpe attended the meeting. Mr. Thom explained the circumstances surrounding the many alterations to these properties. He submitted new drawings at the meeting. He informed the Committee that owing to the cathedral ceilings, he is not proposing to re-install the chimney. Mr. Thom alluded to the damage to the face of the brick at the base of the building. The owners believed that by extending the stucco to the bottom of the brick; it would give a cleaner line. Unlike Mr. Bell's drawing, the new one did not propose the restoration of the doorway. It shows the door's dimensions changed from 30 inches to 32 inches and the frame on the left side made larger than that on the right side owing to the close proximity of the party wall and the offsetting of the hinge size. Mr. Thom noted that the drawings produced by the former architect, Mr. Bell, do not reflect the existing enlarged basement window, the larger lintel above the 1st floor window, the electrical outlet or the dryer vent. Mr. Thom proposed reinstalling the shutter hardware. Mr. Baron said that re-installing the shutter hardware correctly would be labor intensive and costly to accomplish and he thought that the resources might better be spent on restoring the more visible doorways.

The Committee members discussed the proposal at length and concluded that Mr. Bell's drawings show a more acceptable proposal. They thought that both doors should be restored to their original size and symmetrical placement with a three-light transom and a corbelled wood head.

Mr. Thom agreed to merge the two drawings with door restoration as the central feature.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the Mr. Bell's originally submitted proposal to legalize the cornice, removal of chimneys and shutter hardware subject to the restoration of the doorway with the inclusion of the larger basement window; the larger lintel at the 1st floor window; the electrical outlet and the dryer vent.

DMH

935 East Moyamensing Avenue

Massimo Taurisano, Owner

Joe Seratore, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c 1810

PROPOSAL: Legalize brick window heads over new lintels, re-painting façade

Mr. Baron presented this application, which seeks to legalize work that differs from plans approved at staff level. The approved plans call for the applicant to strip paint from the façade and to repair brick work with staff to review a masonry sample in the field. When staff reviewed the brickwork in the field, the bricks and mortar seemed a poor match. The applicant painted the formerly brick red wall and brown stone colored base a green color. When neighbors complained, he changed it to a second green color. Staff thinks he should either follow the original plans or repaint the wall and base to match the underlying colors of the red and brown.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 9.

Ivano D'Angella and Massimo Taurisano, the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. D'Angella asserted that the cost of restoration would be prohibitive and thought that an historic paint color would be acceptable. He commented that the color of paint is a matter of taste.

Ms. Pentz inquired if the original paint was removed prior to the repainting. Mr. D'Angella responded that the surface was power washed to prepare the surface. Ms. Pentz asserted that the paint color should replicate the underlying material's color. She asked if the cornice had been painted; Mr. D'Angella responded in the affirmative, a black color. Mr. Rivera said that paint covers the surface and affects the appearance, which is why it presents an issue.

The Architectural Committee agreed with the staff recommendation to deny the proposal pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a 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.]

DMH

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron
Jonathan Farnham
Diane M. Hughes
Laura M. Spina
Richard Tyler