

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Commission Offices, Room 578, City Hall
29 June 2004**

Present

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

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

Also

John McGovern
David Amburn, Amburn/Jaronsinski Architects
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Richard DiMarco, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers
Jim O'Brien
Richard W. Thom, Old City Civic Association
Stan Tang, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Dan Nasatin
Susan Mariano, Obermayer Rebmann Maxwell & Hippel LLP
Joe Serratore, DSA
Ivano D'Angella, DSA
William G. Schwartz, Esq., Obermayer Rebmann Maxwell & Hippel LLP
Tina Makouljian, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll
Barbara Botting, 318 North Lawrence Street
James Datz, 318 North Lawrence Street
Dan Kopple, DPK&A Architects
Michael Euker, DPK&A Architects
Robert Hotes, DPK&A Architects
Todd Strine, 421 Chestnut Street
Gina Williams, Steven Singer Jewelers
Steven Singer, Steven Singer Jewelers
Morris Chomitz, Society Hill Civic Association
Jane Green
Irv Green
Cecil Baker, Cecil Baker & Associates
Don Ventresca, Cornerstone Building Group
Coni Soifer
Jesse Soifer

Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Bransburg & Ellers LLP
 Robert Fitzpatrick, 1811 Spring Garden Street
 Donald Kopczynski, D.V.K. Associates
 Ian Cope, 1621 North Street
 Allen Rubin, Spring Garden Civic Association
 Vincent Maiello, Kelly/Maiello Architects
 Kathryn Babcock, Kelly/Maiello Architects
 Richard Wesley, Wesley Architects
 Samuel Weiner, DOV Properties
 Perry Whidden, Gluckman Mayner Architects
 George Ross, Philadelphia Museum of Art
 Liz Zimmers, Zimmers Associates
 Hugh Zimmers, Zimmers Associates
 Al Shapiro, Spruce 1530 LLC
 ArcAngelo Guida, DPK&A Architects
 Lew M. Halas, Tantala Associates
 George Aussprung, J.J. White, Incorporated
 James Daley, J.J. White, Incorporated
 Matthew, Millan, Matthew Millan Architects, Incorporated
 Michael Phillips, Gardner/Fox Associates, Incorporated
 John Morris, John Morris Associates

Daniel McCoubrey, Acting-Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

4111 Main Street

John McGovern, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Legalize altering storefront window and door

Without a permit or Historical Commission approval, the owner altered the storefront window and door. The storefront window originally had a two-light transom above a large, plate-glass window. After a vandal broke the window, the owner removed the transoms and installed a single, plate-glass window in the opening. At the entrance, the owner removed the aluminum storm door and aluminum covering the transom, and infilled the transom with another wood panel.

Staff recommendation: Approval of removing the storm door but denial of the storefront and transom alterations, pursuant to Standard 6.

Ms. Spina explained to John McGovern, the applicant, that a quorum was lacking and he agreed to proceed. Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Mr. McGovern stated that he didn't realize that the transoms were historic and that he only wanted to improve the property. He noted the several letters of support, especially the one from Mike's Pizza, his tenant, who prefers the larger window. Mr. McGovern also said that when he rehabilitated the property several years earlier he received approval from the State Historical and Museum Commission for the tax credits. Mr. D'Alessandro said that removing the transoms in the storefront window simply does not meet the *Standards*.

The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend approval of removing the storm door, but denial of the storefront and transom alterations, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated

historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old in design, texture, and where possible, materials.].

4113-25 Main Street

Daniel Neduscin, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 4113-15: c. 1930; 4119, 4121, 4123 & 4125: c. 1860s

PROPOSAL: Complete demolition of 4117-25, new construction of 4-story mixed use building, with infill construction at 4115 and rehabilitation of 4113

The proposal calls for the rehabilitation of the power station at 4113 Main Street, infill construction at 4115 Main Street, and the complete demolition of 4117-25 Main Street and the construction of a four-story building with a single commercial space on the first floor and residential units above.

The rehabilitation of 4113 Main Street involves removing the brick panels below the steel windows and inserting plate-glass storefront windows.

The new four-story building will sit on the properties at 4115-25 and have a set back at the third and fourth floors. The design at 4115 consists of an aluminum curtain wall at the first floor and multi-light windows at the second floor. The rest of the new façade will mimic the historic buildings at the first two floors with storefront windows on the first floor and six-over-six double-hung windows on the upper floor. The upper floors will have stucco walls and one-over-one windows. The roof of the second floor will have a deck with an aluminum pergola and a metal railing. The entrance to the commercial space will be through what is now 4123 Main Street, with a double-leaf, fully-glazed door with sidelights set in a two-story bay.

The Station Street façade will have stucco with single-paned windows and a recessed balcony at the third floor with a standing-seam metal roof and a metal railing. The rear of the power station will have glass and metal panels in the garage door. The entrance to the residential units will be from this façade with a double-leaf, fully-glazed door.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 9, and 10.

Ms. Spina presented the project. Dan Neduscin, the owner, and David Amburn, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Amburn said that the project is similar to that further down the street, which the Commission approved several years ago. In that project, there were two buildings separated by a vacant lot. Originally that project was to save the façades of the two buildings, but after construction began engineers noted that the façades were unsafe and the Commission subsequently allowed their demolition. Ms. Spina pointed out that the present proposal includes four contiguous buildings and includes complete demolition. Also, the streetscape photographs of the other proposal shows how the new construction dominates the scale of the smaller buildings along the block. Mr. Neduscin said that the first floor was designed for a single retail client who does not want to use rehabilitated buildings. He noted that the boiler building has been vacant for almost 35 years and some of the rowhouses have been vacant for almost 10 years. Mr. Amburn pointed out that the decks for the residential units would be set behind the ridgelines of the lower portion of the building.

Ms. Pentz said that the district is meant to protect the buildings along Main Street and the two-story structures contribute to the character of the district. Mr. McCoubrey would like to see an effort made to maintain the façades of the historic buildings. Committee members agreed that saving the front sections of the buildings and achieving the retail goals of the tenant could be done together.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance supported the staff recommendation. He opined that the new construction did not fit with the character of the district and particularly questioned the curtain wall design for 4115 Main Street. He also objected to the demolition of four contributing buildings in an historic district to cater to a commercial tenant, noting the transient nature of commercial entities.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposal, 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 3 [Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.], 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.].

1030-32 Spruce Street

Michael Carosella, Owner

David Amburn, Architect

DATE: 1030: c. 1840, George Witman, bricklayer

1032: between 1832 and 1840, George Witman, bricklayer

PROPOSAL: Alter window openings, rear addition between buildings, entrance ramps, elevator tower

The fire that destroyed the building next door also severely damaged these two buildings on the interior. The work involves the rears and includes installing an elevator tower on 1032, cutting all of the windows for balconies in the piazzas, and an addition that would link the rear ells at the second and third floors. The addition has a bank of windows with fully-glazed, single-leaf doors at each end leading out to balconies with metal railings. The historic piazza areas would be kept, including the curved portion of 1030. Handicap-access ramps would be installed at the first floor. The ground will be excavated at the basement level and new fully-glazed doors will be cut leading to a courtyard area.

Staff Recommendation: Approval with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal and David Amburn, the architect, and Michael Carosella, the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Amburn noted that the rears of the buildings are now visible from 11th Street because the corner building has been demolished. The rear yards will be used for five parking spaces and landscaping. All of the windows will be wood, true-divided-light and the rear bay on 1030 will have wood clapboarding.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, 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.]

1034 Spruce Street

Central Apartments, LLC

Jim O'Brien, Applicant

DATE: between 1832 and 1840, George Witman, bricklayer; façade alterations and metal bays added, c. 1890s; complete demolition after major fire, 2003

PROPOSAL: Construct 7-story, multi-unit building on vacant lot

The Historical Commission individually designated 1034 Spruce Street in April 1973. After a severe fire last year, the Department of Licenses & Inspections declared the building imminently dangerous and had it demolished.

The owners wish to build a seven-story, multi-unit contemporary building. The building will have red brick panel-facing up to the 5th floor and then white or tan brick panels at the upper two stories. At the corner of 11th and Spruce there will be a storefront with a door angled to the corner and large, plate-glass windows. The main entrance to the residential units will be in the middle, along 11th Street, with a large, double-leaf door with sidelights. The upper floors will have vertical lines of projecting metal bays.

Staff recommendation: Approval, but one staff member thinks the façade should be all red brick rather than a change in color at the 5th floor. One staff member believes that we should exercise nominal jurisdiction since the historic resource is now missing and the owner has submitted a request for rescission.

Rich DeMarco, Esq., Jim O'Brien, contractor for the project, and Stan Tang of Bower Lewis Thrower attended the meeting. Ms. Spina gave the history of the property and described the proposed new construction. Mr. DeMarco explained that the developer had many zoning issues with the property and worked with the Washington Square West Civic Association and the Clinton Street neighbors on the design. The project has received zoning approval.

Mr. Tyler opined that the historic resource is now gone and, since the property is not in an historic district, the Commission should not say anything about the new design. Mr. Levy countered that the proposal is before the Committee, therefore, the Committee members have a right to comment on it.

Several Committee members questioned the change in brick color at the 5th floor without any changes to the windows or other design details. Mr. DeMarco said that the color change was done in response to a member of the Washington Square West Civic Association to reflect the cornice line of the neighboring buildings. Mr. Tang noted that the HVAC equipment will probably not be visible.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance strongly disagreed with Mr. Tyler's opinion on the Commission's jurisdiction of the proposal. The building is located on a prominent corner and the Commission should not treat the proposal lightly. He also objected to the staff's recommendation of approval. He believed that the storefront at an angle at the corner is out of character for Washington Square and the box bays should be changed to angled bays. To

illustrate his point he distributed a photograph of the Alexander Inn, which he said should be used as a reference for the new design.

Mr. DeMarco said that the developer had worked with several groups in the neighborhood to reach this design, which has the support of the community and public officials.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, with the red brick extending up the entire façade.

48-50 South Front Street aka 101 Chestnut Street

Janice and Paul Rimmeir, Owners

Joseph Serratore, Applicant

DATE: c. 1840-1850

PROPOSAL: Rehab buildings, add 3-story rooftop addition with roof decks

This application proposes an extremely large rooftop addition with several decks on the Greek Revival or Utilitarian Classical loft buildings at the northwest corner of Front and Chestnut Streets. The existing buildings are 44'-6" tall. The addition would be 39'-0" tall, for a total height of 83'-6". The facades of the historic buildings would ostensibly be restored; some of the restoration details shown in the plans, for example the storefront transoms at 48 S. Front, are incorrect. The addition and decks would be highly visible from Front, Chestnut, and other streets. They would overwhelm the buildings as well as surrounding neighborhood.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. William Schwartz, Esq. and architects Joseph Seratore and Ivano D'Angella attended the meeting. Mr. Schwartz said that developer now wants to explore a one-story, not a three-story, addition so that the new construction does not overwhelm the building. Mr. Levy noted that even with a one-story addition the project will require an elevator tower and mechanical equipment. The Committee members agreed that to discuss those types of details without any drawings would be too difficult; simply saying the three-story addition is now a one-story addition does not suffice for design purposes.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance expressed relief that the proposed addition had been reduced from three stories to one story. He noted that the Commission has used the guidance of visibility to determine the appropriateness of additions in the past and most additions approved by the Commission have been invisible from public right-of-ways. This particular proposal, even at one-story, will be highly visible from Penns Landing and other locations.

Mr. Schwartz conceded that even a one-story addition may not be viable on this property. He formally withdrew the application, noting that the developer and architects will return with an application for a one-story addition at a future date.

117-21 Chestnut Street

Michael Samschick, Owner

Stephan Potts, Applicant

DATE: c. 1840 with alterations c. 1885 and c. 1910

PROPOSAL: Rooftop addition, new windows and door

This application proposes the construction of a rooftop addition as well as the rehabilitation of the facades of three consolidated loft buildings on the 100-block of Chestnut Street. The buildings were constructed about 1840 in the Greek Revival or Utilitarian Classical style. They were altered about 1885; one-story additions and Queen Anne cornices were added to 117 and 119 Chestnut; an entirely new Queen Anne façade above the storefront was added to 121 Chestnut. The properties were again altered about 1910, when a central Neoclassical style entrance and new storefront were added.

One story at the sixth-floor level would be added to 117 and 119; two stories at the fifth and sixth-floor levels would be added at 121. The new fifth-floor addition at 121 would be positioned behind the massive cornice. The sixth-floor additions would be set back 7'-7" from the front facades and would be visible from the east and west along Chestnut Street. The addition would be faced with stucco and fenestrated with aluminum windows. Roof decks, a stair tower, and a mechanical penthouse would be set back a minimum of 35'-1" from the front façade; they would not be visible from public rights-of-way. The parcel is entirely enclosed by surrounding buildings at the sides and rear.

At the front façade, the windows including the ornate Queen Anne windows would be repaired or replaced with appropriate wood windows. All but the westernmost bay of the storefront would be retained in its current condition until a tenant is secured for the ground-floor commercial space. A door with sidelight compatible with the extant storefront system would be installed in the westernmost bay to access the residential units on the upper floors.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the window repair and replacement; denial of the storefront door in the westernmost bay, which should be restored to its historic appearance; denial of the rooftop addition as submitted, but approval of an addition that is set back so as not to be visible from any public right-of-way; with staff to determine the set back of the addition and review details; pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 5, 6, and 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Tina Makouljian, Esq., and Stephan Potts, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Potts explained that there will be three units on each of the upper floors and a single commercial tenant on the ground floor. The main, central entrance will serve the commercial space. He showed photographs of the street with the proposed rooftop addition. The placement of the elevator determined the setback for the addition, which will be visible from Chestnut Street from the east. Mr. Potts also presented a revised elevation drawing and noted that the openings in the addition will have large casement windows with railings. The units will not have rooftop decks. The Committee questioned the floor and ceiling heights of the proposed addition and asked for a section drawing for clarification. The Committee members also thought the addition was too visible from Chestnut Street and asked that the architect investigate pushing the addition further back. One Committee member questioned the windows in the addition, which will invite tenants to erect decks on the roof.

The Committee also discussed the treatment of the first floor. Only one door is proposed to be changed for the entrance to the residential units. The rest of the storefront will be rehabilitated when the owner signs a tenant for the commercial space. The Committee thought that the door to the residential units should be in the westernmost bay to balance the necessary fire door in the easternmost bay. Some Committee members questioned the proposed ramps, noting that they may be a tripping hazard for pedestrians.

Richard Thom of the Old City Civic Association said that the neighborhood has been waiting for years to have these buildings rehabilitated, but is concerned because the project includes a rooftop addition. The addition should be as innocuous and invisible as possible.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance supported the staff recommendation.

The Committee agreed that more thought needed to be put into the project and the drawings needed more details.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend 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.]

318 North Lawrence Street

Jim Datz and Barbara Botting, Owners

Gerry Gutierrez, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1920, declared Imminently Dangerous by L&I June 2004

PROPOSAL: Construct 3-story residence

An application to demolish the vacant one-story building and construct a 3-story single-family residence on this site was reviewed by the Architectural Committee in February 2004. The Committee recommended denial of the project owing to the demolition of the building, which is listed as Contributing to the Old City Historic District. The Committee suggested that the applicant file a financial hardship application to justify the demolition. The applicant withdrew the proposal prior to its review by the Commission.

Since that aborted review, an inspector from the Department of Licenses & Inspections examined the building and declared it Imminently Dangerous because of severe structural problems that might lead to a collapse onto the sidewalk and street. Therefore, the staff can approve a demolition permit because of the threat to public safety. Despite the demolition, the Commission retains full jurisdiction over the new construction.

The first story of the new building would evoke the historic building that stood on the site. It would be faced with brick and include a garage on Wood Street. It would require the extension of the chimney on the neighboring house to the south. The owner of that property has consented to the alteration and will join in the permit application. The Old City Civic Association wholeheartedly supports the project.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, provided that the historic height of the chimney on the neighboring building is indicated on the altered chimney, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association, offered support of the proposal. He said that the owners have expended a significant amount of effort and expense planning for the new construction. He asserted that the long term investment outweighs the loss of the building.

Barbara Botting and James Datz, the owners, attended the meeting. Ms. Botting noted that neighbors have signed a petition supporting the proposal.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that the proposed wood siding at the third story is problematic. Mr. Tyler suggested that the applicant consider a ribbed metal panel system. Mr. Datz said that he is receptive to suggestions for materials. Mr. Levy recommended that the Committee and staff review the color of the metal.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, with a metal panel system at the third story, with the staff and Committee 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.]

421 Chestnut Street

421 Chestnut Street Partners

Michael Euker, Applicant

DATE: 1857-1859, John M. Gries, architect; penthouse, 1903, Theophilus Chandler, architect

PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing penthouse, construction of 6th floor addition, cut new windows, replace windows

This application proposes alterations and additions to the Bank of Pennsylvania building, a highly significant building on Bank Row in the Old City Historic District by important architect John Gries. It proposes the replacement of windows on the front façade; the demolition of a penthouse and several skylights; the construction of a penthouse with deck; and the addition of new windows at the west facade.

The front façade windows would be replaced with historically appropriate windows.

The proposal calls for the demolition of a penthouse added by prominent architect Theophilus Chandler in 1903 and the construction of a new penthouse. The penthouse would consist of frameless glass and metal panels. It would open onto a deck at the front of the building. The deck would be surrounded by a glass and aluminum railing and shaded by an aluminum sun screen. The building has little or no parapet wall at the roofline; therefore, the railing would be visible at every point except the center of the front façade, where the façade peaks. The addition would likewise be visible from the south, east, and west including Independence National Historical Park.

Windows in new openings would be added at the top floor of the west wall of the historic building. They would be visible from the west including Independence National Historical Park.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the front façade window replacement; approval of the penthouse, provided it is set back 10' from the west façade; approval of the deck, provided it is set back from both side facades to the outer pairs of French doors; approval of the five northernmost windows on the west façade; denial of the two southernmost windows on the west façade; with staff to review details; pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

Todd Strine, Bob Hotes, Michael Euker and Dan Koppel attended the meeting. Mr. Strine asserted that the plans for the proposal have been adjusted several times in response to the concerns of Mr. Baron of the staff. He believes that any further adjustments would reduce the marketability and salability of the units.

Mr. Levy suggested the installation of a glass railing instead of the proposed metal railing. He added that the railing should be setback to minimize its visibility. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the party wall is an important feature; therefore, he thought that two southernmost windows should be eliminated from the west wall at the fifth-story level and the addition should be set back from the west wall.

Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association, offered his support of the project, noting that the proposed alterations will enhance the visual appearance of the rooftop area.

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance, commented that any addition on this building would be inappropriate. He believes that an addition will remove historic fabric; set a negative precedent; and detract from the neighboring buildings. Mr. Gallery pointed out that the key for a successful addition is its visibility and its compatibility with the character of the existing building.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the front façade window replacement; approval of the penthouse, provided it is set back approximately 10' from the west façade of the historic building for the first 25' back from the front façade of the penthouse; approval of the deck, provided the railing is all glass and is set back 2' from the front parapet; approval of the five northernmost 5th-story windows on the west façade but denial of the two southernmost; denial of the sunscreen as proposed; with staff to review details; 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.].

739 Walnut Street

Danad, Incorporated

Gina Williams, Applicant

DATE: c. 1928, storefronts altered, 2001

PROPOSAL: Two banners

The proposal calls for two banners on the building, one on Walnut Street and one on 8th Street. The banners measure nine feet by ten feet and would be attached on the inside of the building through the windows.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

Steven Singer, the owner, and Gina Williams attended the meeting. The Committee members reviewed the application and concluded that the proposed signs are too large. Mr. Rivera thought that the signs should be contained within the two center panes within the window frame, without any masonry attachment. Committee members concurred that time restrictions should be imposed. They concluded that the allowance for the signage should not exceed six months. The owner was receptive to the Committee's recommendation for the decrease in the size of the signs and the time allowance.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the signs located within the two center panes of the window frame for a period not to exceed six (6) months.

227 South 6th Street, Lippincott Building

Irv Green, Owner

Stephen Verner, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1900, William Prichett, architect

PROPOSAL: Alter Locust Walk entrance, install gate

The entrance on Locust Walk will lead into a private condominium unit rather than a lobby space for the building. The condominium's owner wishes to remove the existing single-leaf door, transom and sidelights, and install a frameless glass door system on the outside of the brick piers. Also, the proposal includes a metal picket fence and gate that would separate the entrance at the line of the new flower beds.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

Cecil Baker and Stephen Verner, architects, attended the meeting. Mr. Baker apprised the Committee of the owner's reflection that the proposed alterations would bring new life historically to the building. The Committee agreed that the proposed alterations change the historic character of the building. Mr. Tyler remarked that a lot of concessions have already been made for this building.

Morris Chomitz, Society Hill Civic Association, complimented the architect's work; however, he thought that the proposed alterations are out of context with the streetscape and that the architect should seek a more sympathetic approach.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old in design, texture, and where possible, materials.].

238 Christian Street

Cornerstone Building Group, Owner

Don Ventresca, Applicant

DATE: c. 1819

PROPOSAL: Façade rehabilitation, cut garden wall for parking on Bodine Street

The owner proposes to rehabilitate the property, including the restoring of the front façade. However, the side and rear of the building is also visible. On the side, the house now has a non-historic one-story addition in the piazza and the owner wishes to remove the addition and replace it with another one-story addition for an entry vestibule. The very top of it would be visible over the garden wall. On the rear, the rear ell has a later addition, to which the owner would like to add a small balcony. Lastly, the proposal calls for cutting the non-historic CMU garden wall for parking. The sliding gate would be made of wood.

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

Don Ventresca and Coni and Jesse Soifer attended the meeting. Mr. and Mrs Soifer will purchase the property once the rehabilitation is complete. Mr. Ventresca said that the front portion of the roof would be weathered-wood colored, asphalt shingles and that the rear would be repaired with a rubber roof. The Committee discussed the pitch of the rear-ell and concluded that the rear ell should also have asphalt shingles as well. Mr. Ventresca agreed. Ms. Pentz inquired about the proposed masonry capping and offered that a metal capping would be more appropriate.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with metal capping and an asphalt shingle roof on the rear ell if enough slope exists, 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.].

1811-17 Spring Garden Street

Metropolitan Regional Council Carpenters' Union

Anthony Rabutino, Applicant

DATE: 1925

PROPOSAL: Alter windows, entrance and façade details, install new canopy, install balustrade at grade and roof

Without referral to the Historical Commission, the Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a permit for alterations to the front of the Art Deco building. Work has started; the black granite has been removed from the base and the windows have been replaced with aluminum ones.

The proposal calls for covering the stone façade with coatings typically used for Dryvit. A new cornice with a balustrade will be installed along the roofline. A matching balustrade will also be installed along the base and will have four pylons or lights. The two balustrades will have a pseudo-Classical diamond shape.

At the entrance, the proposal includes moving the recessed entry out to be flush with the face of the building. The new double-leaf doors have decorative cross designs and sidelights of similar dimensions. The new four-light transoms also have decorative muntins. Above the entrance the building now has a large panel of glass block flanked by black granite with decorative mosaic squares. The application calls for removing the granite and mosaics and installing piers with flagpoles. The plans do not specify the material of the piers. The same piers will also be installed at either end of the building. The simple canopy will be replaced by a substantial canopy with a hipped roof, modillioned entablature and columns.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the windows, the balustrade at the base, the four pylons or lights, and flags. Denial of changing the plane of the entrance doors, the piers on the façade, the canopy alterations, the balustrade at the roof and coating the stone. A simplified design for a new canopy and new doors in the existing location would be in keeping with the Art Deco style of the building, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 7, and 9.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal and noted that the real issue is the coating of the stone, which

would damage the stone and eliminate the carved details. She believes that a compromise can be reached regarding the door and the canopy.

Donald Kopczynski, architect for the project, Robert Fitzpatrick, and Brett Feldman, counsel for the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Feldman emphasized that the building has been vacant for ten years and that the proposed alterations will enhance the neighborhood with a vibrant building. Mr. Kopczynski said that the concern of the Spring Garden Civic Association about street people occupying the doorway at night would be addressed with the change in the plane of the door. He said that the black masonry panels at the bottom were removed owing to deterioration caused by the elements. Mr. Fitzpatrick said that the masonry has been cleaned several times but to no avail. He noted that the proposed coating will be very thin.

Committee members agreed that the proposed cornice with a balustrade at the roof line is architecturally unnecessary. They also thought that the canopy should have a simplified design. The Committee offered the applicant a compromise which would allow the door as proposed, the canopy with a simplified design, the lanterns. It thought that the black stone at the bottom of the building should be replaced with cast stone or a similar stone, the cornice with a balustrade and Dryvit framing eliminated.

The Committee discussed the coating of the stone at length. The Committee members expressed concern that any coatings would obscure the bas relief carving, which is very shallow. They determined that a site visit would better determine whether a coating or staining would be acceptable. Mr. Rivera and Mr. Levy will make a site visit on 1 July 2004 to make a determination.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the windows, the balustrade at the base, the four pylons or lights, flags, door as proposed, and a simplified canopy. It recommended denial of the piers, Dryvit framing and the cornice with a balustrade at the roof, 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 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old in design, texture, and where possible, materials.], Standard 7 [Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.] and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]

1620 North Street

Spring Garden Community Development Corporation, Owner

Ian Cope, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1886

PROPOSAL: Façade rehabilitation, partial demolition in rear, penthouse and roof deck additions

This proposal involves several parts. First, the front façade will be rehabilitated, with new, wood four-over-four windows, a four-panel front door and a cross-buck, overhead garage door. In the second floor opening that used to have doors, the proposal calls for a multi-light window. Second, on the west façade, the proposal calls for moving two of the window openings and re-installing the wood, four-over-four windows. Third, there is a stuccoed penthouse addition

leading to a roof deck. The penthouse is set back about 13 feet, but would be visible from North Street. In the area between this building and the new construction next door, the owner must install a PECO transformer at grade and proposes an eight-foot, metal picket fence for security.

Staff Recommendation: Approval with several conditions: the central opening at the second floor should be changed to double-leaf doors with glazing, the garage door should have a larger frame and the transom incorporated into the door itself, and the fence should be brought to the streetline, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina presented this submission. Ian Cope, the architect, described the design briefly. Members of the Committee addressed the treatment of the garage door transom and the center window of the second floor front. They determined that the former should have a fixed transom and the latter examined for physical evidence to ascertain whether it was a loft door or a window.

The Architectural Committee recommended the adoption of the staff recommendation with further study of the second floor central window opening, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old in design, texture, and where possible, materials.], 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.].

1622-30 North Street

Spring Garden Community Development Corporation, Owner

Ian Cope, Architect/Applicant

PROPOSAL: New construction on vacant lots

This application is for seven new townhouses on vacant lots. The houses will have brick facing, with rustication at the first floor, and cast-stone door surrounds and lintels. All of the houses will have single-leaf, four-panel doors, but some will have sidelights as well as transoms. Four-over-four windows and multi-light single-leaf doors leading to balconettes are in the upper stories. Four of the houses have two-story, wood bays with four-over-four windows. The roofs of the properties will have a stuccoed penthouses leading to roof decks.

The 17th Street façade has similar detailing as the front. The southern portion has a roll-down garage door that leads to the alley for all of the houses and 1620 North Street. The alley is covered and on top there are decks for each house.

The south or rear elevations have stucco facades with multi-light doors leading to balconies and four-over-four windows.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and Setting Guideline.

Ms. Spina presented this proposal to the Committee. She observed that it constitutes new construction and is subject to Commission review and comment only for a period of 45 days. Ian Cope, architect, added further brief comments.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of this submission, 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 Setting Guideline [Recommended: New work should be compatible with the historic character of the setting in terms of size, scale, design, material, color, and texture.].

636 North 17th Street

Aaron Weiner, Owner/Applicant

PROPOSAL: New construction on vacant lot

This proposal is for new construction at the southwest corner of 17th and North Streets. On a lot that used to have a single house, the application calls for two houses with garages. The houses will be oriented towards North Street with a central garden area. The main entrances will be from the garden area. The facades on 17th and North Streets will have brick facing, four-over-four windows and multi-light, double-leaf doors leading to balconettes. The garden area will have a metal garden fence at the street line. The facades that face the garden will be stucco with single-leaf doors, four-over-four windows and balconettes at the 3rd floor.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and Setting Guideline.

Ms. Spina presented this application for new construction to the Committee and noted the Commission has a jurisdiction of review and comment only for 45 days. Richard Wesley, architect, described his efforts to respond to the built context of North Seventeenth Street and North Street while meeting the Zoning Code's requirement for off-street parking. He also sought not to mimic the nearby historic structures. Mr. Rivera suggested making the third floor door in the east elevation taller by eliminating the transom.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of this project with the transom over the door of the third floor east elevation, 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 Setting Guideline [Recommended: New work should be compatible with the historic character of the setting in terms of size, scale, design, material, color, and texture.].

2501 Fairmount Avenue

Philadelphia Museum of Art, Owner

James Karmolinski, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1927, Zantzinger, Borie & Medary, architects

PROPOSAL: Partial demolition at rear, 3-story rear addition, façade rehabilitation

This application proposes the demolition of a rear projection; the construction of a 60,000 square foot glass and masonry rear addition; the restoration of exterior envelope of the historic building; the addition of skylights; and the replacement of windows with louvers. The Preservation Alliance holds a façade easement on this property.

A relatively insignificant projection, which the applicant is calling a “knuckle,” would be demolished. It stands at the rear of the building and is not visible from the front along the Parkway, Pennsylvania Avenue, or Kelly Drive. The addition would be constructed at the rear,

behind the wing of the historic building that runs along Fairmount Avenue. It would not be visible from the front, but would face onto 25th and Olive Streets. Olive Street is a very narrow street. Three rowhouses front onto this block at the east. The “back-of-house” facilities for the museum building would be located along Olive Street.

The proposal includes plans for the restoration of exterior envelope of the historic building such as the masonry, windows, and tile roof; the addition of skylights on the rear roof slopes; and the replacement of windows with louvers in the two towers. The skylights would not be visible from the front. The louvers would replace windows in original openings in the two towers. Some of the louvers would be visible from the front.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, provided the louvers are finished to match the surrounding windows, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, 6, and 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application. George Ross of the Philadelphia Museum of Art offered a brief history of the project. A master plan undertaken for the Museum demonstrated the need for addition space. The former Fidelity Mutual Life Insurance Company building will house the Museum’s prints and photographs collection, its textiles collection, library, laboratories and offices including one for the director. Perry Whidden of Gluckman Mayner Architects presented an overview of the design of the addition.

This proposal will restore the exterior of the building as well as its significant interior spaces. A glazed corridor will separate the historic building from the new addition.

In addition to the present review by the Historical Commission, this project is subject to the approval of the Art Commission, the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, and the Preservation Alliance, which holds a façade easement on the property.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, provided that the louvers are finished to match the surrounding windows, with staff to review the details of the exterior restoration work, pursuant to [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 3 [Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.]; Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.]; 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.].

1514 Waverly Street

Hugh and Eleanor Zimmers, Owners

Liz Zimmers, Applicant

DATE: c. 1880

PROPOSAL: Demolish 1-story stair tower, erect rooftop addition, reopen infilled windows

This application proposes the rehabilitation of a 2-story carriage house for two apartments and an architect's office. A small stair tower would be demolished at the southeast corner of the property and a 2nd-story deck added in its place. A large 1-story addition with decks would be added to create a 3rd story. The addition would be metal and glass; it would be roofed with metal. Several infilled openings would be reopened. Lighting and a wrought-iron gate would be added.

The building fronts onto three streets, Waverly, Sydenham, and Addison Streets and is visible from Lombard Street. The historic building is 21' to 24' tall; the addition would be more than 18' tall, almost doubling the height of the building.

An application for a similar addition was reviewed by the Architectural Committee at its 25 May 2004 meeting. At that time, the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of a 3rd-story addition, provided the Waverly Street façade was not impacted, but denial of the proposal as submitted. The application was withdrawn before the Commission's 11 June meeting.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented this submission to the Committee.

Ms. Zimmers showed to the Committee glass samples and photographs of poles with flags to illustrate various proposed building lines and heights. Mr. Zimmers said that glass as the principal façade material would provide a greater and less intrusive contrast than wood or stucco.

Members of the Committee concentrated on the height and massing of the addition, which will almost double the height of the historic building. Ms. Zimmers suggested using a flat rather than a pitched roof as a means to mitigate this impact. Committee members thought this solution inadequate. Ms. Pentz remarked that only the revising of the existing roof structure could reduce the effect of the addition. This, however, as Ms. Zimmers replied, would negatively impact the lower floors.

This proposal does not satisfy the possible condition posed by the Architectural Committee in May that a redesigned addition should not be visible from Waverly Street.

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

1518 and 1520 Latimer Street

Owner: Gold Street Financial & DuBar Development Partners

Applicant: Liz Zimmers

History: c. 1885

Project: Alter façades, construct rooftop addition and decks, construct 3-story rear addition

This application proposes to alter the façades of the carriage houses at 1518 and 1520 Latimer Street and to construct a rooftop addition, 3-story rear addition, and decks on both buildings.

The front façade of 1518 Latimer Street has been altered significantly, but it retains the potential for restoration. The treatment proposed for the façade in this application is not based on the current or historic facade. The façade should be restored. The front façade of 1520 Latimer Street has been minimally altered and should also be restored. The treatment proposed for the façade in this application is not an accurate restoration, but could be revised to reflect an accurate restoration.

The proposed rooftop decks would be set back 15' from the front façade. The proposed 1-story rooftop addition would be set back 26'-7" from the front façade. Complete sight-line studies should be prepared to determine the extent of their visibility from the east and west on Latimer Street.

Behind the carriage houses, a 3-story addition would be constructed. The addition would not be visible if the proposed rooftop addition was erected.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the front façade alterations, but approval of a restoration, pursuant to Standard 6. Approval of the rooftop addition, decks, and rear addition, provided sight-line studies demonstrate that they will not be highly visible, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Hugh Zimmers, Liz Zimmers, and developer Rev. Tyrone Gilliam represented the project. Committee members discussed the proposal and agreed that the rooftop additions were set back significantly from the front façade. They concluded that they would be minimally visible from Latimer Street, but asked the applicants to provide verification of that conclusion with sight-line studies or a mock-up at the site.

Committee members reviewed the proposals for the front façades and unanimously deemed the proposal for the 1518 façade inappropriate. They determined that the façade of 1518 should be restored to look like the façade proposed for 1520. The applicants asked for proof that the façade at 1518 had historically looked like that at 1520. Mr. Farnham showed a 1907 photograph to the Committee and applicants that included a sliver of the façade at 1518. That photograph proves that the façade at 1518 was brick with an arched window at the 2nd floor and a denticulated cornice, all exactly like those surviving on 1520. The Committee agreed that the 1518 facade had been historically identical to that proposed for 1520. It suggested that the applicant restore the façade to its original appearance. The applicant noted that he would like a single-leaf door in the façade; it did not include a single-leaf door historically. Committee members agreed that a door could be included in the façade provided its design was compatible with the historic façade. The Committee stated that it would like an opportunity to review for approval an updated design for the façade of 1518.

Mr. Farnham stated that the central, 2nd floor window proposed for 1520 was not appropriate. He noted that the Commission has approved numerous “hay-door” type windows for similar buildings. The Committee suggested that the applicant work with the staff to improve the design of the central window.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the proposed front façade alterations, but approval of the restoration of the facades with a compatible single-leaf entry door at 1518, with the Architectural Committee and staff to review details, 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.]. Approval of the rooftop addition, decks, and rear addition, provided sight-line studies or a mock-up at the site demonstrate that they will not be highly visible, 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.].

1530 Spruce Street

Owner: Al Shapiro

Applicant: Michael DelRossi, Jr.

History: 1898, Thomas Bennett, architect

Project: Replace wood windows with aluminum windows

This application proposes the replacement of 200 wood windows with aluminum windows in this residential building on Spruce Street. Two types of one-over-one windows would be replaced. What are labeled the Type A windows would be replaced above the cornice line at floors 5, 6, 7, and 8. The Type B windows, which are in the bays, would be replaced at floors 2 to 8. The dimensions of the proposed aluminum windows would approximate but not replicate the original wood windows. The wood brick molds would be approximated with a custom extruded aluminum forms.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Al Shapiro, the owner, and Michael DelRossi Jr. of Graboyes Commercial Window Co. represented the project. The Committee asked the applicant to clarify his labeled photographs, which delineate where the different windows types would be installed. He explained that they Type A windows are delineated by the A on the photos and would be installed above at the 5th to 8th floors. The Type B windows are delineated by the B and would be installed in the bays from the 2nd to the 8th floors. The Xs on the photos indicate windows for which no work is proposed in this application.

Mr. Levy and Mr. Rivera immediately noted several problems with the proposed windows. Mr. Rivera determined that the daylight openings would be reduced by as much as 3" in each dimension. Mr. Levy suggested removing the putty slopes to enlarge the glass sizes. Mr. DelRossi warned that removing the putty slope would cause the glass to be positioned at the front plane of the sash, not set back as it would have been historically. Mr. Levy then suggested removing the putty slopes from the lower sash, which are positioned below and behind the upper sash, but leaving the putty slopes in the upper sash. Some cautioned that this would result in a mismatch between the upper and lower sash opening sizes, which would be discernable from the street. If the putty slope was removed from the lower sash but not the upper, the glazed opening in the lower sash would be larger than that in the upper sash by almost 3" in each dimension.

Mr. D'Alessandro pointed out that the reduction in glass size would most profoundly impact the very tall narrow windows in the sides of the bays. The applicants showed elevation drawings of the existing and proposed windows in the sides of the bays to the Committee. Committee members agreed that the Type B segment of the proposal was unacceptable, especially because

the windows would be installed as low as the second floor.

Mr. Levy again suggested removing the putty slopes in the lower sash of the Type A windows to enlarge the daylight opening. Others warned that this would produce a discernable, very awkward mismatch of nearly 3" in each glass dimension between the upper and lower sash.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the Type A windows, provided the putty slope is removed from the lower sash; denial of the Type B windows, 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.]. The Committee suggests that the Type B windows be restored or replicated in wood.

1913 Spruce Street

Owner: Dan Nasser & Caren Cohen

Applicant: Benjamin Nia, Matthew Millan Architects, Inc.

History: c. 1875

Project: Façade rehabilitation, rear roof deck and alterations

This application proposes window replacement throughout the building, sliding glass door replacement at the rear, changes to four window openings at the rear, infilling of basement windows at the rear, masonry restoration, repair or replacement of the front cornice, the addition of a roof deck with small stair tower on the rear ell, and the replacement of the garage door.

The proposed two-over-two windows at the front and four-over-four windows at the rear have 1" wide vertical muntins. The historic muntin would have been wider. No details of the front cornice repair or replacement have been provided.

The alterations at the rear including the window infill, changes to window openings, and stair tower and deck addition would be minimally visible or invisible from Manning Street, which runs along the rear of the property.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, with staff to review details, especially the windows and cornice, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Matthew Millan represented the project. The Committee reviewed the proposal and agreed with the staff that it was acceptable. The Committee noted that most of the alterations at the rear would not be visible from the public right-of-way; it also noted that the deck was proposed for the rear ell, the appropriate location.

Mr. Millan clarified that he had surveyed the surviving original front windows and determined that the center vertical muntin was, in fact, 1" wide exactly. He also stated that he may need to revise the design of the deck to reduce its cost. Mr. Farnham inquired into the nature of the potential revisions. Mr. Millan explained that the stair tower extension to the piazza might be deleted, the deck shifted from the ell to the piazza and cantilevered out over the ell, and a top-story window cut into a door to provide access. Mr. Farnham informed him that the Commission might accept minor revisions to the plans between the Committee and Commission meetings, but

would likely remand any plans incorporating significant revisions back to the Architectural Committee for its review.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval, with staff to review details, especially the windows and cornice, 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.].

237 S. 18th Street, The Barclay

Owner: The Barclay Condominium Association

Applicant: Albert Tantala

History: 1928, J.E.R. Carpenter, architect

Project: Legalize vents and alarms on east façade of building

This application proposes the legalization of several vents and a large metal box containing overfill alarms added to the east façade of the Barclay along Bouvier Street, also known as Mozart Place. The Historical Commission approved and the Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a permit for related interior work, but not this exterior work. The permit application stated “Interior non-structural alterations” and was stamped “No Changes to Exterior” by the Commission staff. In addition, all exterior work was crossed out with large Xs on the Commission-approved plans used to obtain the interior-only permit. Nonetheless, the interior work was undertaken.

The vents and alarm box are highly visible from public rights-of-way. Their installation damaged the limestone façade of the building.

The Commission recently reviewed and approved a sensitive proposal for venting on the same façade for the restaurant under construction in the Barclay. That approved application is unrelated to this current legalization application.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Lew Hallas of Tantala Associates along with James Daley and George Aussprung of J.J. White, Inc, the contractor, represented the project. Mr. Hallas explained that PGW required the vents and alarms for the equipment in the basement. Mr. Hallas noted that the exterior work had been crossed out on the approved plans, which he showed to the Committee.

Committee members agreed that the vents and alarms were unacceptable. They suggested that the applicants seek better solutions to satisfy the PGW’s and L&I’s requirements for the equipment. They suggested moving the equipment to one of the boarded windows if feasible. They urged the applicants to develop a creative solution to the difficult problem. Mr. Levy stated that the alarm box obstructs the sidewalk. Committee members noted that the stone façade should be repaired

after the vents are removed.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the legalization, 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.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.]

1715-17 Walnut Street

Owner: Midwood Management

Applicant: Michael Phillips, Gardner Fox Associates, Inc.

History: 2003, Atkins, Olshin, Lawson-Bell, architects

Project: Alter storefront doors and canopy, signage

This application proposes minor modifications to the design of a new commercial building approved by the Commission at its 8 August 2001 meeting. The building is listed as Non-contributing in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District. The proposal includes replacing a double leaf door with a window and exchanging one metal canopy for another. The canopy would include signage.

Staff Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Michael Phillips of Gardner Fox Associates, Inc. represented the project. Committee members deemed the proposal appropriate.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to approve the proposal as submitted.

Mr. Farnham informed the Mr. Phillips that his application did not require review by the Commission at its forthcoming meeting, owing to the Committee's approval and Sections 6.5.d-e of the *Rules & Regulations*, which govern the review of Non-contributing buildings.

271 S. Van Pelt Street

Owner/Applicant: John Morris

History: c. 1870; modified c. 1970

Project: Install garage door and metal grille, replace brick sidewalk

This application proposes the addition of a garage door and a metal security grate in existing openings in this much modified carriage house at 271 S. Van Pelt Street. It also proposes the replication of the extant brick sidewalk.

The garage door depicted in the elevation drawing is oddly configured and proportioned. The staff should review shop drawings of the door.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. John Morris, the owner and applicant, represented the project. Committee members concurred with the staff introduction, which asserted that the garage door design appeared awkward. The applicant stated that the awkwardness resulted from a drawing error and that he would present the final door design to the staff for its approval. Committee members agreed that the remainder of the design was acceptable.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval, 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.].

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Tyler
Jonathan Farnham
Diane M. Hughes
Laura Spina