

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

**Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Commission Offices, Room 576, City Hall
25 June 2002**

Present

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Herbert Levy, FAIA
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Suzanne Pentz

Jeffrey Barr, Historical Research Technician
Jon Farnham, Historic Preservation Planner
Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Also

William Carlucci, Duling Restoration
James R. Pavlock, 2212 Brandywine Street
Siraik Zakarian, 2201 Green Street
Lenore Millhollen, Preservation Alliance/Center City Residents' Association
Robert Rosenberg, 810 Locust Street
Mary Jo Ratigan, Ben Franklin House
Timothy A. Gallogly, 1529 Walnut Street/Ben Franklin House
James Campbell, Campbell Thomas and Company
Mark Hutchins, 1 Willings Alley
Bernice Hamel, Society Hill Civic Association
Joanne Phillips, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews and Ingersoll, LLP
John Turchi, 1735 Market Street
Robert Powers, 211 N 13th Street, Suite 500
Ron Lewis, 421 Chestnut Street
Mary Jane Barrett, 334 South Camac Street
Charles Kelly, 334 South Camac Street
Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Leonard Cicoorello, 608 South Paul Drive, Westmont, NJ
Richard Thom, Richard Thom Architects
David Ertz, Cope Linder Architects
Stanley Taralla, Renaissance Properties
David Fields, 253 South 20th Street
Adam Zangrilli, 253 South 20th Street
William G. Schwartz, Esq., Obmeyer Rebmman Maxwell & Hippel, LLP
Alden Blyth, 129 League Street
John Ciccone, John Ciccone Architects

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:07 p.m.

2214 Brandywine Street

Fred Duling, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Legalize roof decks

This application is for legalizing three decks, one at the first floor, one on the roof of the rear ell and the third on the roof of the main building. Although the deck on the main building is not visible from Brandywine Street, it is highly visible from Spring Garden Street and dwarfs the buildings flanking it.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the first floor and rear ell decks; approval of a revised deck on the main building, per Standard 9 and the roofing guideline. The main roof deck should not be cantilevered over the second floor.

William Carlucci, the builder, attended the meeting to explain the proposal. He said that owing to the lack of usable outdoor space the deck was constructed to maximize a minimal amount of space. He believes that the deck's design improves the rear streetscape and that it is compliant with code and meets Standards 9 and 10 of the rehabilitation guidelines. He also noted that the existing doorway leading to the deck on the rear ell has evidence of framing, and that roof decks are very common additions to this neighborhood. He also presented photographs, which showed that visibility is limited to Spring Garden and 22nd Streets.

Mr. Levy noted that there have been many illegal decks erected in this community. He inquired why the work was done without a permit. Mr. Carlucci could not answer. Mr. Levy noted that if the applicant followed proper permit procedure, the main-roof deck may have been permitted, but with a revised design. Committee members discussed the removal of the cantilever, but realized that its removal would require the removal of the stairs.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the legalizing of the deck as submitted, with a gray stain on the wood.

2212 Brandywine Street

James Pavlock, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Deck on rear ell

This proposal is for a deck on the roof of the rear ell. The historic roofline of the rear ell will remain and a window will be cut down to a single-leaf door.

Staff recommendation: Approval, per Standard 9 and the roofing guideline

James Pavlock, the owner attended the meeting. After the discussion of the previous proposal, Mr. Pavlock inquired about doing a similar deck on his main building. Committee members told him that they could not give any consideration to a proposal without reviewing plans.

Ms. Pentz questioned whether the proposed door is the same height as the existing window.

Committee members looked at the railing's attachment, because the code requires its ability to sustain a certain amount weight. It also questioned the height of the railing, which should be 42 inches from the top of the deck. Mr. McCoubrey emphasized the importance of details being reviewed by the staff.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with the staff to review details.

533 North 22nd Street, aka 2130 Brandywine Street

Joel Maruchek and Helena Grady, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Rear deck

This proposal calls for a second-floor deck on the rear of the property, which runs along Brandywine Street. The proposed seven-foot railing will create a second story wall and has a wood lattice design with finials on the posts. A rear window will be cut down to a single-leaf door to access the deck.

Staff recommendation: Approval, on the condition that the railing is simplified to a vertical board wall and the posts do not have finials, per Standard 9.

There was no one in attendance to represent the proposal. In looking at the submitted drawings, the Committee believed that the height of the fence is too extreme, and it should be constructed of simplified vertical boards.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with a simplified railing of vertical boards and the height of the front should not exceed 4 feet.

810 Locust Street, Musical Fund Hall

Musical Fund Hall, Owner

Paula Legere, Applicant

DATE: 1814, William Strickland, architect, alterations: 1891, Addison Hutton, architect

PROPOSAL: Bird netting

This proposal for bird deterrence returns to the Committee. The new proposal, worked out with staff, involves netting the tympanum of the pediment, wires and posts on capitol tops and ledges and Nixilite on the rooftop of the pediment. The Nixilite was preferred for that location because it is installed with adhesive, whereas the wires require drilling through the roofing.

Staff recommendation: Approval per Standards 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal and said that Mr. Baron made a site visit to determine the best possible solution. Robert Rosenberg and Fran Eckert, representative of the bird netting company, attended the meeting. Mr. Eckert said that there are three different applications of bird protection products proposed, owing to the varying location needs. There would be netting and two different types of wiring. The proposed wiring at the top of the capital would be drilled into the stone with a silicone sealant to protect against water infiltration and wire at the top of the columns.

Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the location of attachment for anchoring the netting, Mr. Eckert responded that the anchors would be located on the face of the building to prevent perching. Committee members expressed concern about the penetration into the stone, which the applicant said could be accomplished by drilling vertically into the mortar joints, if they exist. Mr. Levy noted his concern about the visibility of the Nixilite at the top; however, it was said that it would have minimal visibility. In response to Ms. Pentz's query about the post's length, the applicant said that the posts come in different lengths, which may need to be installed vertically in the rear and horizontally in the front. Mr. McCoubrey stressed the importance of the silicone adhesive not staining the stone and urged that the staff review the details of the fastening.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with the staff to review details.

334 South Camac Street

Charles Kelly, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1823-25

PROPOSAL: Legalize deck, install rear door and transom, HVAC, new light fixtures and new basement window

The proposal involves work to a house with visibility from both the front and back.

This application calls for legalization of work commenced without a permit, the correction of some of that work and approval for some elements that have not been started. The completed work involves an air conditioning unit attached to the rear chimney, installing a water spigot in the cheek of the bulkhead, and the cutting of a single window into a double width doorway to go out to a rear deck. This double-leaf door will feature applied muntins. The rear dormer was covered with aluminum and a vinyl window replaced the historic wood window. The applicant proposes to rectify several of these elements: removing the cladding from the dormer, installing new wood true-divided-light windows on the rear dormer and façade and moving the air conditioner to a less visible location between the front and rear chimneys.

The owner also wishes to construct a deck, which will have visibility from the side and rear, and add a transom to the recently cut door. He also proposes to replace a jalousie window in the basement front façade with an awning window with a dryer vent all hidden behind screening. The plans show new lights to be hung at the transom bar of the front door and on the rear façade.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the deck, lights, moving the air conditioner, basement window/vent, water spigot, replacement of two rear windows in wood and removing vinyl cladding all with staff to approve details. Denial of the wide doorway onto the rear deck. The Commission has consistently approved cutting down existing window openings without widening them per Standard 9. Any muntins in the door should be true-divided-light.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal. Mary J. Barrett and Charles Kelly, the owners, attended the meeting. Ms. Barrett said that she was unaware of the staff's adverse recommendation about the new door opening as well as the proposed glazing. She said that the double door is important for light and ventilation. In addition, it is consistent with the neighboring houses and that, with the new transom, it will align with the other window. Ms. Spina noted that many alterations that occurred to the neighboring buildings happened prior to designation and were not approved by the Historical Commission.

Ms. Barrett asked about clarification of Standard 9 and said that since it is in the rear, she finds no reason for the door to be disallowed. She believes that the alterations are in keeping with the historic character of the building and that the rear faces Iseminger Street, a very small street.

Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance, noted that Iseminger Street is a very visible public right-of-away.

Mr. Levy said that replacing the double-leaf door with a single-leaf door now is difficult, owing to trying to match the existing bricks. Mr. Rivera suggested the allowance of the double door, subject to the installation of doors with true-divided-lights. The applicant said that she did not feel comfortable installing wood doors with true-divided-lights as replacements for the new aluminum-clad doors because she believed the cladded doors aesthetically appropriate.

Mr. Levy gave the applicants suggestions about a recessed spigot for the bulkhead and recommended a recessed light beneath the transom instead of the lantern, which he thought inappropriate.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the following:

1. *The deck;*
2. *The rear lights;*
3. *The relocation of the air conditioning unit between the front and rear chimneys;*
4. *The basement window/vent;*
5. *The water spigot;*
6. *Replacement of two rear windows in wood;*
7. *Removal of the vinyl dormer cladding, and*
8. *The double-leaf door to the deck, subject to the installation of true-divided-light doors.*

With the staff to review all details.

Denial of:

1. *The lantern over the front door as submitted; however the Committee recommended a recessed light beneath the transom.*

822-38 Chestnut Street, Ben Franklin House

Ben Franklin Association, LP, Owner

James Campbell, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1923, Horace Trumbauer, architect

PROPOSAL: Install garage openings on Sansom Street

This proposal is for installing a parking garage on the lower level of this apartment house. Entrance and egress will occur on the Sansom Street façade in the third and fourth bays closest to 9th Street. The openings will be wider than the present window openings and do not rise to the point of the historic transom bar. Plain metal roll-down gates will close the openings.

Staff recommendation: Approval in concept, but not the actual design, per Standards 9 and 10. The openings should not involve the removal of stone on the sides and there should be a solid panel between the top of the openings and the historic transom bar, not glazing.

Timothy A. Gallogly, Esq., Mary Jo Ratigan, and James Campbell, the architect, attended the

meeting. Mr. Campbell said that this is a building with many primary facades. He said that the far east end of the Sansom Street façade already has truck docks, which makes the Sansom Street façade the most viable location. The proposed garage would house 149 parking spaces, which would be primarily for the residents. He said that the existing masonry opening is 9 feet, 10 inches. Owing to the narrowness of Sansom Street, at least a width of 11 feet may be needed to accommodate a car's maneuverability. Curbing of the ramp is proposed to keep cars away from the columns. Mr. Campbell said that since there are no site-lines from cars exiting the garage, the opening should be as wide as possible. He is also proposing to install a pedestrian bell and a mirror for approaching cars.

Mr. Levy inquired about the amount of stone being cut from the columns. Mr. McCoubrey thought it better to eliminate the column in the middle, instead of removing fabric from three columns. Ms. Pentz suggested shoring up the center and replacing the central column with something thinner. That way, the rhythm of the columns is maintained, but only one column is compromised. Mr. Levy suggested a stainless steel guard wrapped around the corners of the openings, but keeping the opening in the same location. This would eliminate the need for a curb, allowing less historic fabric to be removed. Ms. Spina inquired if the applicant had petitioned the City to eliminate parking on that side of the street, allowing drivers a larger turning radius into the garage. Mr. Campbell noted that they have made the request of the Streets Department.

Committee members concurred that more exploration should be done to establish the existing dimensions of the structural members of the columns to determine the amount of brick that could actually be removed before compromising the integrity of the columns. Mr. Campbell agreed with the Committee that exploration into the columns is needed to establish their true width.

Committee members discussed the door treatment and thought a solid panel between the transom and the top of the door appropriate, and the non-illuminated signage would be installed in this location. Members thought that the panel and signage should be simple, so as not to confuse it with the historic transom.

The Architectural Committee recommended further exploration to determine the exact proportions within the columns.

400-14 Walnut Street

Walnut Street Association, LLP, Owner

Joanne Philip, Esq., Applicant

DATE: 400-02: 1908, Frank Watson, architect; 404-14: 1923-24, Frank Watson, architect

PROPOSAL: New 1st floor windows, one-story penthouse addition, and façade restoration

Two buildings make up this property, a six-story, three-bay limestone and buff-colored brick building at the corner and a 10-story plus penthouse, 8-bay limestone addition. This proposal includes cleaning and pointing the masonry of both buildings, refurbishing all of the windows, and restoring both metal cornices. On 400-02 Walnut, the proposal calls for restoring the storefront windows on the first floor with those that match the second floor, as shown in a drawing from 1951.

All of the entrances will be rehabilitated. On the corner building, the original Walnut Street entrance will be reopened with wood paneled, double-leaf door with three-light transom. A glazed

double-leaf door and transom will be installed on the east elevation, replacing the non-historic door. In 404-14 Walnut, the replacement doors will remain. The double-leaf doors leading to the rooftop terrace will also remain.

On 404-14 Walnut, the application includes a one-story addition to the existing penthouse, set back 8 feet from the main façade. It has a roofline that falls below the existing penthouse and will be minimally visible since the parapet wall measures 5 feet. The Department of the Interior, in reviewing the project for the rehabilitation tax credits, asked for a setback of 10 feet.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the project, with a 10-foot setback of the penthouse, with staff to review details and shop drawings, per Standards 6 and 9.

John Turchi, Joanne Philips, Esq., and Bob Powers attended the meeting to represent the project. Paul Boni, from the Society Hill Civic Association, requested postponement of the consideration of the application to allow members of the community the opportunity to meet with the developer to discuss the rehabilitation plans. Mr. Tyler stated that there is no legal requirement for any owner to consult in advance with the community. He noted that the zoning and historical issues are separate and asked the applicants if they wished to proceed. Ms. Philips, attorney for the applicant, responded that they wanted to proceed with the review of the application.

Ms. Spina explained the project. Mr. Turchi noted that they are investigating several different designs for the two entrances into the corner building. Mr. Powers explained that the initial proposal was for a double-leaf door but they were considering a single-leaf door with sidelights. Mr. Levy observed that the Committee needed more information to review the proposed treatment at the doors. Lacking specifics, Ms. Spina suggested that the Committee review the application in concept. Mr. Levy agreed and added that the Committee should not consider an “either/or” application.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the project in concept with a 10-foot setback for the rooftop addition and suggested the applicant finalize details of the door treatment and return to the Committee.

421 Chestnut Street

Renaissance Properties Incorporated, Owner

Ronald Lewis, Applicant

DATE: 1857-59, John Gries, architect, for Philadelphia National Bank

PROPOSAL: Install exhaust piping and vent line

This application calls for work on the rear, Ranstead Street, façade to install a diesel backup fire pump. The pump requires a vent for the fumes of the fuel tank as well as an exhaust duct for the motor. The applicant proposes to cut through the rear wall and run the metal duct ten feet up the outside wall of the building. The rear façade has many architectural details and does not appear as a secondary façade. Staff met with the applicant to discuss an alternate, more hidden placement on the rear side of the building.

Staff recommendation: Place the new duct and exhaust at the side rear of the property if this meets code and the requirements for the system, per Standard 9 & 10 and the mechanical systems guideline.

Ron Lewis and Alex Stolyarik attended the meeting to represent the project. Ms. Spina explained that Randal Baron had met with Mr. Lewis, the contractor, and Mr. Stolyarik, property manager, at the site to explore alternative locations for the proposed vent and exhaust pipe. Mr. Stolyarik distributed a revised drawing with the vent and exhaust pipe located within the passage at the east side of the building.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the project as revised (option #2) with the exhaust pipe painted to match the color of the brick facade.

231-35 North 2nd Street

PTM Group Corporation, Owner

Liz Zimmers, Applicant

DATE: 231: c. 1865; 233: c. 1855; 235: c. 1825, new façade, c. 1890; 235-37 Rears c. 1825

PROPOSAL: Legalize demolition of rear building, build new six-story garage structure

231 North 2nd is not in the jurisdiction of the Historical Commission; however, 233 and 235 are on the Philadelphia Register and the owner has combined the three properties. The Department of Licenses and Inspections declared the buildings at 233 and 235 North 2nd Imminently Dangerous. As a result, the staff approved the applications for demolition, with the condition that pieces from the façade of 233 be salvaged for use in the redevelopment of the site.

Two houses sit at the rear of 235 and 237 North 2nd Street and the owner originally applied to demolish both of them. That application went to the Committee, which recommended denial, but was withdrawn before going to the Commission. One of the buildings, in the course of the demolition of 233, became severely damaged and L&I declared it imminently dangerous. The owner then, without a permit, demolished the building.

The application now submitted is for the legalization of the demolition of the one rear building, based on financial hardship, and the construction of a new parking structure that would stretch from 231 to 235 North 2nd Street. The proposal includes retaining the one remaining rear house that sits behind 237 North 2nd.

The façade of the parking structure mimics the design of the building originally at 233 and will have commercial space on the first floor. The entrance and exit from the garage will be in the middle of the building, not the southern end as shown in the rendering. An alley exists between 235 and 237 North 2nd, leading to the rear house, and will be retained.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the new construction, per the setting guidelines. However, the salvaged iron should be used on the new building and the non-historic parts should have a simplified design.

Robert Levitt, William Schwartz, Esq., and Mike Rigolizzo, the owner, attended the meeting. Ms. Spina presented the proposal. She noted that the appraisal submitted is based on the rehabilitation of both rear buildings and does not recognize that fact that the one rear house is no longer standing. Ms. Pentz asked about the demolition of the front buildings. Mr. Rigolizzo responded that the demolition was done by hand. However, he admitted that they did not brace the rear buildings during the demolition, even though they shared a wall with the rear portion of 233 North 2nd Street.

He stated that the small building in the rear crumbled doing the demolition.

Ms. Pentz inquired about the salvaged iron, which the Commission stipulated in granting a permit of the demolition. Committee members agreed that the salvaged iron should be used in the new design. Mr. Levitt stated that most of the iron is too damaged to be reused. He questioned the reuse of the pieces and who determines which of the elements are re-usable. In response, the Committee recommended that staff and some Committee members meet with the architect to inventory the salvaged materials. Mr. Rigolizzo asked if the salvaged iron could be used on other buildings in the city, rather than this one. The Committee noted that the reuse of the pieces was conditional of the demolition permit.

The Committee recommended that the new design should not mimic the historic features of the demolished buildings but incorporate the historic elements into the façade. Mr. Tyler thought that the design should use as much historic fabric as possible surrounded with infill and the rest of the building should be a simplified design. Mr. Levy thought that the elements should be at the edges of the façade, creating a transition from the new garage to the older neighboring properties.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of legalizing the demolition and approval in concept of the garage, with the salvaged materials incorporated into the details of the façade.

220 West Washington Square, W.B. Saunders Building

220 West Washington Square Condominium Association, Owner

John Ciccone, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1911

PROPOSAL: Exterior sprinklers on north façade

The Committee and Commission previously approved new wood windows for this building.

The north side of the building presently has original metal-clad wood window frames with wire glass and metal sash. This configuration does not meet fire code requirements; however, the previously approved wood windows do not meet code either.

To meet code, the applicant proposes installing sprinklers over each window. The sprinklers would have exterior lines across the façade above the line of windows at each floor and a vertical pipe running up the façade.

John Ciccone, the architect, attended the meeting to explain the project. He said that as an alternative to the exterior sprinklers, the building could have new metal windows with wire glass or fire-rated glass. The metal windows would be true-divided light, but would have very flat muntins with no depth or details.

Committee members thought that a compromise would be the metal windows, keeping the historic pane configurations.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the metal windows.

121-35 Walnut Street

Renaissance Properties Incorporated, Owner

Richard Thom, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 121-25: c. 1830; 127: c. 1830, façade: ; 129-35: 1961

PROPOSAL: Demolition of Moravian Street, partial demolition of buildings, rear seven-story addition and restoration of facades in concept

Several buildings along Walnut Street make up the Bookbinders Restaurant. The owner wishes to develop the property into 17 units of housing with a restaurant on the first floor. The proposal includes restoring the fronts of the buildings on Walnut Street, including replacing the cast-iron pieces of 127 Walnut, the reconstruction of the ornate iron canopy at 125 Walnut, the restoration and reinstallation of the neon “Bookbinders” sign at the corner of 121 Walnut, and the reopening of windows on the Hancock Street (east) façade.

The development would include the demolition of the rears of the Walnut Street properties and most of Moravian Street, a granite-block street in the Historic Street Paving Thematic District. The new seven-story rear addition will face Welcome Park and appear set back from the Walnut Street properties. The façades will have red brick and stucco panels and painted aluminum windows and balconies. The first floor will house a parking area, with the entrance from Hancock Street. The loading dock for the restaurant will also be on Hancock Street.

The section of Moravian Street, from 2nd Street to the new building will be restored and a plaque installed explaining the historic street.

Staff recommendation: Approval in concept, per Standards 3 and 9, with several conditions.

- All of the rears of the buildings should be documented prior to demolition.
- The south façade of the tower should have more windows at the corner and other means of relief of the expansive red brick, perhaps with reveals.
- The restoration of the windows, including the historic pane configurations on the east façade of 121 Walnut Street.
- Any leftover granite blocks from Moravian Street should be given to the Streets Department to be used in repairs of other streets.
- The creation of an archeology plan in case any artifacts are found.
- With staff to review details, including shop drawings of windows.

Richard Thom, architect, Stanley Taralla of Renaissance Properties, and David Ertz, architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Thom said that the proposal entails the complete rehabilitation of the properties incorporating a new addition which will require the demolition in the rears. Moravian Street, which is designated, but not on the City Plan, will be demolished. A plaque will be installed to symbolize its historic status and as much historic fabric as possible will be retained.

The new construction shall be differentiated from the existing structures. Mr. Ertz noted the importance of the construction relating to the existing streetscape. He also showed historic photographs, which illustrated the height of the buildings that once stood behind the Walnut Street properties. The proposed new construction will consist of red brick with industrial sash. There will be small balconies on the Welcome Park side. Mr. Ertz explained that the top two floors will have more distinction with floor-to-ceiling windows. Mr. Thom stated that the developer also proposes to re-construct the original canopy at 125 Walnut Street, giving the restaurant a focal point on the street, and restore the cast iron façade of 127.

Mr. Thom also acknowledged the possibility of archeological findings and said that if a discovery

is made, an archeologist would be hired for a determination and documentation.

Charles Tonetti, of the National Park Service, sent a letter expressing the agency's objection to the canopy over the door on 2nd Street, leading to the apartments. He noted that he is willing to meet with the applicants to discuss the design of the canopy.

John Gallery, of the Preservation Alliance, spoke in opposition to the demolition of Moravian Street, owing to its importance historically. He asked if the demolition proposal requires application to the Committee on Financial Hardship. Ms. Spina said that she believed the demolition is a case of public interest. She noted that the street does not have a lot of integrity and that some of the historic fabric will be retained in the proposed development.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept with the following conditions:

- *All of the rears of the buildings should be documented prior to demolition.*
 - *The south façade of the tower should have more windows at the corner and other means of relief of the expansive red brick, perhaps with reveals.*
 - *The restoration of the windows, including the historic pane configurations on the east façade of 121 Walnut Street.*
 - *Any leftover granite blocks from Moravian Street should be given to the Streets Department to be used in repairs of other streets.*
 - *The creation of an archeology plan in case any artifacts are found.*
- With staff to review details, including shop drawings of windows.*

129 League Street

Horn Blyth and Partners, Owners

Alden Blyth, Applicant

DATE: 1885

PROPOSAL: Partial demolition, new skylight, windows and doors

This proposal calls for a final approval for a project, which was approved two months ago in concept. The applicant seeks to create an internal atrium and to build new wood carriage doors in an existing garage opening.

Staff recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal and the Committee agreed with the staff recommendation for final approval.

The Architectural Committee recommended final approval.

253 South 20th Street

LTMM Association, LP, Owner

David Fields, Applicant

DATE: 1930

PROPOSAL: New storefront windows

This property on the corner of 20th and Rittenhouse Square Streets has large storefront windows, some with decorative mullions. The proposal includes removing the original plate-glass windows and installing vertical operable windows.

Staff recommendation: Denial as proposed, per Standard 9. The proposal includes the removal of historic fabric and introduces too many vertical elements into the design. Perhaps, changing the flanking panes of the 20th Street window into operable ones - this would allow the desired effect, but will limit the number of verticals.

David Fields and Adam Zangrilli, the owners, attended the meeting. Mr. Fields cited examples of other neighboring properties, which have undergone extensive alterations, and said that he proposes to add operable windows for the purpose of a viable business. In addition, he believed that the operable windows will enhance the spatial features of the restaurant.

Committee members compared the proposed alterations to the ones cited by the applicants. The proposed alterations would remove historic fabric from an original storefront, while a majority of the cited alterations were performed on properties already previously altered. Mr. Levy questioned the legality of the proposed windows projecting over the sidewalk. Members concurred that the proposed divisions in the window will take away the expansiveness of the windows. For the 20th Street window, Mr. Levy recommended a fixed center window with side operable casements. Ms. Spina inquired about the removal of the window frame, but the applicant proposes to keep the frame and put in new sash. On the Rittenhouse Square Street façade, Mr. Rivera suggested installing a tripartite window configuration, with a fixed central window and operating sidelights. Mr. Levy and Ms. Pentz agreed.

The Architectural Committee denied the proposal as submitted, but recommended approval of installing operable windows in the flanking openings of the 20th Street window, and replacing the Rittenhouse Square Street window with a tripartite design with a fixed central window and operating sidelights.

1608 Mt. Vernon Street

Ashley and Michael Fuchs, Owners
Marlene Cantoral, Contractor/Applicant
DATE: c. 1859
PROPOSAL: Rebuild front wall

This application is to demolish and rebuild the front wall. The owners have a report from a structural engineer, who says that shoring with tieback rods would only be temporary. He suggests removing the wall at the top story or story-and-a-half and then rebuilding the façade. The architect recommends rebuilding the entire wall.

Staff recommendation: Denial, per 6. Only, the damaged part of the wall should be rebuilt, with staff to review details including a brick match.

Marlene Cantoral, the contractor, attended the meeting and said that the owners have hired a structural engineer. She believes that the rebuilding of the entire front wall is necessitated by the

condition of the adjoining houses.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal and said that she and Ms. Pentz made a site visit to the property. They determined that the original 4th floor wooden sills were the site of the water penetration and have since been replaced with brick. Also, the building below the 3rd floor is very sound and the original bricks are in good condition. Ms. Pentz recommended the rebuilding of the front wall only entail the top one-and-a-half floors. She also thought that the 4th floor sills could be replicated in cast stone to mimic the wood.

The Architectural Committee recommended the rebuilding of only the top one-and-a-half floors, with the replication of the sills in cast stone.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary