

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
Philadelphia Historical Commission

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

Present

Robert Thomas, Chair
Tony Atkin
Rudolph D'Alessandro
Herb Levy, FAIA
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Suzanne Pentz

Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Jeffrey Barr, Historic Research Technician
Julianne Brennan, Historic Preservation Planner
Elizabeth Harvey, Historic Preservation Planner
Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary
Laura Spina, Historic Preservation Planner
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Also

Jim Cardano, Cardano Goodson Construction Company
Piero Grimaldi, Grimaldi Architecture
Alson Alston, Owner 2226 Green Street
Michael Sklaroff, 2223 Green Street
Judith Eden, Center City Residents' Association
Morris Zimmerman, Becker Winston Architects
John C. Van Horne, Library Company of Philadelphia
Christina Wuenshcel, Becker Winston Architects
P. Zyats and T. Gilbert, 2228 Green Street
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association
Paul Steele, PS & A Architects
Tanya Krawchuk, Kass and Associates
Edgar Einhorn
Chris Carter, John Milner Architects
George Guzzie, VLBJR Architects
Lynne Sarota, Graboyes Windows
Maria MacLaury, Agoos and Lovera Architects
Neil Rosenberg, 2026 Locust Street
Elaine Levitt, 250 South 18th Street
Joel Gershman, 250 South 18th Street
Michael Isador, 1901 J.F.K. Boulevard, Apartment #2415
David Bauman, 135 South 18th Street, Apartment #501
Natalie Bauman, 135 South 18th Street, Apartment #501
Rita Copeland, 1722 Delancey Street
James Bogle, 1830 Pine Street
Beth Adams, 1018 Clinton Street

Jennifer Drummond, Cope Linder Architects
 Ellen Levin, Cope Linder Architects
 Gerald Cope, Cope Linder Architects
 Rhoda Polish, 1940 Delancey Street
 Bernard Mazie, 2226 Spruce Street
 Reba Haimowitz, 118 South 21st Street
 Benson Fishman, 1919 Chestnut St
 Bernice Hamel, 302 South 2nd Street
 Kenneth Kaiserman, 201 South 18th Street
 Janet Mason, 118 South 21st Street
 Roger Johnson, 1915 Delancey Street
 Roger French, 1809 Walnut Street
 Society for the Restoration of Philadelphia, P.O. Box 1107, William Penn Annex
 L. Streckler, 135 South 19th Street, Apartment #710
 Nash Cox, 226 West Rittenhouse Square, Apartment #2210
 R. L. Shayar, 226 West Rittenhouse Square, Apartment #2210
 Mark Gaertner, Commercial Realty Review
 Cory Huniat, Klink Linquist
 Kirby Kean, 1821 Sansom Street
 Ronald Patterson, Klehr, Harrison, Harvey, Branzburg and Ellers
 John Douthwade, 319 South 3rd Street
 Tom Prettyman, 1521 Spruce Street, Apartment #102
 M.R. Halbert, 1901 J.F.K. Boulevard, Apartment #1509
 R. Toriak, 1700 Walnut Street, Apartment #12A
 Rheuda Faulk, 113 Elfreths Alley
 Gerry Guttierrez, Group G
 Stephen Goldner, SPG Architects
 Benmur Koksuz, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
 Susan Garfinkle, G GK Architects
 Robert Krachak
 Robert Powers, Powers and Company
 Sarah Took, Center City Resident
 William Kriebel, Center City Resident
 Samuel Silver, Center City Resident
 Mary H. Fingerote
 Matthew W. White, 1920 Waverly Street
 Patricia Wilson Aden, Preservation Alliance
 Janet Potter, The Foundation for Architecture
 Iris Newman, 1919 Chestnut Street, Apartment #2524
 Jerome Kaplan, 135 South 18th Street, Apartment #801
 Aurale Evans, 311 Smedley Street
 Scott Brucker, 1500 Locust Street
 Ramy Duerassi, Esq.
 Albert D. Malmfelt, Elfreths' Alley resident
 Albert Taus, Albert Taus and Associates
 Charles Castorina, 2531 South Lambert Street
 Ivano D'Angella, 235 Chestnut Street
 Alan M. Kaplan, Esq.
 John DeWaele, 1022 Clinton Street
 Kathy Dowdell, University City Historical Society
 Michael Samschick, 128 Bainbridge Street

Joel Spivak, 126-28 League Street
Greg Woodring, 4200 Spruce Street
Sabrina Soong, 625-627 North 16th Street

Owing to the very brief interval between the meetings of the Architectural Committee and of the Commission, each member of the staff participated in the writing of these minutes. The initials of the reporter appear after each entry. Diane Hughes prepared the structure and headings.

Herbert Levy, Vice-chair, called the meeting to order at 10:05

1320 Locust Street, SE corner of Juniper Street

Library Company of Philadelphia, Owner

Christina Wuenshel, Architect

DATE: 1883

PROPOSAL: Rear stair tower, HVAC on roof

Morris Zimmerman, architect for the project, described the proposal, which calls for the construction of a stair tower on the southwest corner of the Latimer Street façade. Some cuts will be required in the rear façade to accommodate the brick tower; closure of some windows along the side of the rear ell are also necessary. Brick reveals will replace these openings. The proposal also calls for a new HVAC unit on the roof. The chimney will remain intact.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the stair tower and HVAC unit under the condition that the unit is set farther back towards the center of the main building.

LH

2226 Green Street

Alson Alston, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1866

PROPOSAL: Conceptual review of new construction, restructure bay of 2224 Green Street and mansard and windows of 2228 Green Street

Alson Alston, owner and applicant, described the conceptual proposal. He noted that the proposal has changed in part to retain the bay at 2224 Green Street.

The construction of this 3-story condominium building includes 1) partial demolition of the grass berm that fronts the property for the creation of a driveway and garage and 2) the blockage of mansard windows at 2228 Green Street.

Michael Sklaroff, a Commission member and neighbor at 2223 Green Street, raised a concern regarding the legality of the sub-division of the 2224-2226 property several years ago. He said that on-site parking is not necessary and that most people park on the street. He noted that the neighborhood has developed a nearby lot that has solved the parking problems in the neighborhood. Ms. T. J. Gilbert, the neighbor at 2228 Green Street, expressed her opposition to the blockage of the mansard windows on her property. The Committee did not discuss the façade details of the new construction; however, the applicant stated that the windows will be wood.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of this conceptual proposal owing to the inclusion of the garage which violates Standards 9 and 10; however, it determined that retention of the bay at 2224 Green Street and a 3-foot setback at the third floor to accommodate the mansard windows at 2228 Green Street would be acceptable.

LH

1512 Spruce Street, The Drake, SW corner of Hicks Street

David Levey, Owner

George Guzzie, Applicant

DATE: 1927

PROPOSAL: Signage

George Guzzi, architect and applicant, described the proposal, which calls for re-installation of historic lettering on the marquee of The Drake. Mr. Guzzi explained that marquee bulbs would be installed within the lettering. The Committee recommended the use of the original neon instead of marquee bulbs, stating that neon is more appropriate historically and would better accentuate the fluid strokes of the lettering.

The Committee voted unanimously to approve the signage application under the condition that the owner install a red-hued neon; the shade will be approved by the staff.

LH

2118 Pine Street, SW corner of Van Pelt Street

Robert Dugan, Owner

Andrew Fielding, Applicant

DATE: c. 1865

PROPOSAL: Windows, deck and garage

The proposal includes two permits; the first permit addresses windows. The applicant's proposal calls for changing the six over six windows in the rear of the building to two over two windows that match the front portion of the building. The applicant showed photographs of neighboring houses which have two over two windows in the front and rear portions of the building. Mr. Baron told the Committee that historically the back portion of the building, which served as the servants quarters, would have had cheaper, smaller six over six windows while the front façade would have had larger two over two windows. Mr. Thomas agreed with Mr. Baron and stated that the six over six windows serve as an important historical feature of the building and should be retained.

The applicant understood the Committee's view and accepted the recommendation to retain the six over six windows.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of new six over six windows with staff to review the details.

The second permit calls for the construction of a rear deck and a new garage door. Mr. Baron explained that the applicant's proposal shows the deck extending from a rear bay and the addition of french doors to access the deck. The plans also show a horizontally slatted metal garage door topped by a wood beam that extends beyond the deck in an "outrigger" fashion. Mr. Baron stated

that staff recommended approval of french doors, the deck and the need for a new garage door; however, the proposed door and the outrigger decoration were not recommended.

Mr. Thomas agreed with the staff that the modern elements, mainly the horizontally clad metal door and the outrigger decoration would not look consistent with the scale or historic character of the house. Mr. Dugan expressed budget concerns over ordering a custom garage door. Mr. Thomas recommended a raised panel door, Mr. Levy added that the door should be wood and Mr. Baron suggested the door have a painted finish.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the french doors, the deck, and a wood raised panel painted garage door with staff to review the details. The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the outrigger decoration above the garage door.

JLB

237 South 18th Street, The Barclay, NE corner of Rittenhouse Square Street

Ellis and Peggy Wachs, Owners

Christina Carter, Architect

DATE: 1928

PROPOSAL: Windows for one condominium unit

The applicant seeks to replace the windows on the south side of their apartment facing Rittenhouse Square Street for acoustic reasons. Mr. explained that the building management has decided to restore the building's existing windows and has no plans to replace windows in the building. The staff recommended denial of the new windows and encouraged the repair of the existing windows.

Ms. Carter stated that the owner's concern dealt with noise infiltrating the perimeter of the window and not the glass. Mr. D'Alessandro believed that a carpenter would be able to resolve the issue by repairing the perimeter of the window. Mr. Thomas recommended further resolution of the noise by reglazing with laminated glass, placing a removable storm window on the interior, and sealing the surround with a caulking cord. Mr. Thomas reiterated that enough alternatives exist to repair the existing windows.

Ms. Millhollen, speaking on behalf of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, stated her strong objection to the piecemeal replacement of any new windows ng replaced piecemeal in the building.

The Architectural Committee recommended the denial of new windows and suggested repair of the existing windows with staff to review the details.

JLB

270 South 20th Street

David and Judy Einhorn, Owners

Edgar Einhorn, Esq. Applicant

DATE: c. 1920

PROPOSAL: Café windows, replace steps

The application calls for the installation of café style, bi-fold windows in an existing opening on the building's front façade. In addition, the proposal includes the replacement of two slate steps in-kind. Mr. Baron stated that the staff recommended approval.

Mr. Einhorn explained the current condition of the steps to the Committee and stated that the tread and riser would be replaced with slate. Mr. Thomas noted that the existing window opening was not original to the building. He also suggested that Mr. Einhorn remember to take into account compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act in the replacement of the slate steps. Mr. Baron asked Mr. Einhorn if any signage had been proposed and reminded Mr. Einhorn to bring such proposals to the Commission staff.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the window and step replacement.

JLB

1604 Locust Street

David Sura, Owner

Edward O'Reilly, Contractor

DATE: 1853

PROPOSAL: Louver in basement window

The applicant seeks to install a vent on the front façade of the building behind an existing basement window. The application calls for the retention of the basement window grille and muntins. In the six light window, the plans show four lights removed and replaced with a screen that covers the louvers. Mr. Baron explained that placing the vent in the back of the building was not feasible.

The architect recommended an alternative proposal to the Committee suggesting full removal of the glass, its replacement with a screen, and the louver placed behind the screen. Mr. Levy raised a concern about gaining access to the screen. The Committee determined that the grille in front of the window did open and therefore cleaning the screen would be possible.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of placing the louver behind a screen in the window and full removal of the glass with the staff to review details.

JLB

2026 Locust Street

Harvey Robin, Owner

Neil Rosenberg, Applicant

DATE: c. 1890

PROPOSAL: Stucco mansard and cornice facing Manning Street

Mr. Baron explained that the owner had stuccoed all of the rear window lintels and sills and the rear cornice and mansard roof without a permit or Commission approval. As a result, the Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation. The rear of the building faces Manning Street, which does have the fronts of several houses facing it. Neil Rosenberg, an agent for the owner, stated that the owner purchased the property only nine months ago. The mansard

and cornice already had stucco and the owner simply repaired the existing stucco. The owner thought the contractor had received the proper permits for the work.

Mr. Baron noted that the staff recommended denial of legalizing the stucco and that the owner should remove the stucco, repair the cornice and install slate-like shingles on the mansard. After some discussion, the Committee members agreed.

The Committee voted to recommend denial of legalizing the stucco, but recommended approving an asphalt shingle that would mimic slate.

LS

1914 Rittenhouse Square Street

Henry McNeil, Owner

Jennifer Foster, Architect

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Shutter removal

Ms. Pentz recused herself owing to her firm's involvement with the project.

Mr. Baron stated that owner removed the vinyl shutters without a permit. Wesley Wei, architect for the project, explained that the shutters had deteriorated greatly, and they removed them for public safety reasons. Mr. Baron noted that the proposal for the property that the Committee and Commission previously reviewed and approved included installing new wood, architecturally appropriate shutters. He stated that the staff recommended approval of the removal of the vinyl shutters, on the condition that the new wood shutters be installed within one calendar year. The Committee members agreed.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the removal of the vinyl shutters on the condition that new wood, architecturally appropriate shutters be installed within one calendar year, with staff to review and approve shutter details.

LS

318-324 South 7th Street, NW corner of Pine Street

H.H. Townhouses L.C.C., Owner

Susan Garfinkle, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Comment on new construction of six townhouses

Mr. Baron stated that the Ordinance gives the Committee and Commission the right to review and comment on the proposal because it is undeveloped land at the time of designation. Their comments are not binding.

Stephen Goldner, architect for the project, described the proposal for the empty lot, which sits between Delancey and Pine Streets in Society Hill. The proposal calls for the construction of six single-family houses, with four facing 7th Street and two facing Delancey Street. Each property has the dimensions of 44 feet in depth and 33 feet in width. All of the four-story houses have brick façades with cast stone details and stucco dormers on the rears.

Mr. Baron stated that the staff approved of the scale and materials of the houses, but objected to the 2-car garage openings on the street. Having large garage doors breaks the rhythm of the street and interrupts the pedestrian aspect of the neighborhood. Mr. Goldner replied that in order to compete in the housing market, new houses must have on-site parking, preferably for two cars. He noted that the lot is too small to accommodate a common parking lot or to have the parking underground as in other contemporary developments in the neighborhood. Mr. Thomas agreed and asked if the garage doors could have more of an architectural detail rather than just a simple door. Mr. Goldner responded that they considered making the garage door an architectural feature of the house but decided to downplay its presence by keeping the door very simple since it is only one-half of the façade.

Bernice Hamel, co-chair of the Historic Preservation Committee of the Society Hill Civic Association, also objected to the presence of the garages along 7th Street. She emphasized the pedestrian nature of the neighborhood and the interruption caused by vehicular traffic into and out of garages. She asked that the garages have carriage-type of doors to give them character and add to the overall streetscape.

Mr. Goldner said that he would discuss various aspects of this proposal with the community.

LS

319-321 South 3rd Street

Gregory Colton, Owner

John Douthwade, Contractor

DATE: 1788-1795

PROPOSAL: Addition of 2nd and 3rd floor on single story wing

Mr. Baron explained that he received plans and a building permit application for “a second and third story addition” on a “single family dwelling.” The drawing seems to show the demolition of a building and construction of two new row houses. Mr. Baron explained that he attempted to reach the applicant a number of times without success to clarify the application.

The Committee found the application unclear and incomplete.

RB

2125 Porter Street

Marian DeRita, Owner

Robert Kravchak, Contractor

DATE: 1914

PROPOSAL: Remove slate, re-roof with asphalt shingles

Mr. Baron explained that the applicant has a slate roof which currently leaks. Robert Kravchak, the roofer, said that the leaking occurs at the pole gutter which has already had repairs. The applicant seeks to install an asphalt, slate-line type shingle on the entire roof and replace the pole gutter with a K-type hanging gutter. In the interest of fairness and cost reduction, the Committee discussed a variation of a solution used on the re-roofing of another slate roof Girard Estate house. That solution involved covering the most visible part of the roof in slate or a look alike material and the other part in a slate-line type asphalt shingle. The Committee explained that the

applicant also had the option of applying for relief under the hardship provision of the ordinance to determine if such circumstances apply.

The Committee recommended approval of the installation of the proposed slate-line shingles on the rear half of the roof behind the termination of the projecting cornice and the installation of slate or a more realistic hard or rubber slate-like shingle on the forward portion of the roof.

RB

1801, 1805-09, 1811-13 Walnut Street
126, 128, 130, 132 South 18th Street

Rittenhouse Club Development L.P., Owners

Jack Weiner, Applicant

DATE: 1801-03 Walnut Street, 1896-1898

1805-09 Walnut Street, c. 1923

1811-13 Walnut Street, c. 1845; combined and refacaded 1901

126-32 South 18th Street, c. 1845; 126 and 132 altered 1920s

PROPOSAL: Conceptual review for substantial demolition of five buildings and two-phase development of commercial and residential tower

Mr. Baron summarized the application for conceptual approval as a two phase project involving the complete retention of the Fell-Van Rensselaer Mansion and the Allison Building and the substantial demolition of five other designated historic buildings. In the first phase, plans call for the demolition of all but the façade of the Rittenhouse Club and all but the façades and a small portion of the Sansom Street façade of the four buildings at 126-132 S. 18th Street. The architect plans to remove other visible portions of the buildings, including the side and rear facades, character defining rooflines, mansard, chimneys and dormers. In their place, the design calls for an L- shaped, eight-story retail and office structure, set back five feet from the 18th Street facades and stepped back in 16 foot intervals from the front façade of the Rittenhouse Club. In the newest plans, revised since last month's Committee meeting, a porte-cochere will enter and exit on the Sansom Street façade. Two truck loading docks will enter from Sansom Street. In the second phase, the developer plans to construct an L-shaped, 33-story tower to sit atop the commercial structure. The tower will sit back more than 60 feet from the Walnut Street façade, but it will rise approximately five feet behind the 18th Street façades and flush with the Sansom Street elevation.

Mr. Baron explained that the staff applauds the applicant's revision that removes the curb cut and vehicle entrance from 18th Street and retains the facades of 128 and 130 S. 18th Street. The staff recommends the denial of the concept as proposed because of the extent of the demolition and the lack of sufficient information to make a finding of hardship. The staff does not find a compelling public interest argument for the demolition. The staff also recommended that if the applicant wishes to make a hardship argument that the Committee and the Commission direct the conduct of studies at the owner expense as provided in the ordinance to examine the economics of greater retention of the historic fabric and massing of the structures.

Mr. Cope, the architect for the proposal, said that following the last Committee meeting, they had moved the porte-cochere to the Sansom Street façade, and retained two more facades on 18th Street. He continued that the new building has bowed bays on the south façade to relate to the Rittenhouse Club façade. The architect will clad the base of the building in granite and the tower

in pre-cast concrete panels above. The applicants added that they had looked into creating a greater setback on 18th Street, while regaining the space by extending the height of the building.

Mr. Wiener, counsel to the applicant, explained that they had arrived at an agreement with the Center City Residents Association not to exceed a height limit of 360 feet, and that after speaking with Judith Eden, they did not think that they could in good faith reopen that issue. Mr. Wiener noted that building higher as opposed to wider adds to the cost and reduces certain building efficiencies.

Mr. Powers articulated the applicant's view that the buildings on 18th Street were only contributing to the district and had considerably less significance than the buildings and Rittenhouse Club façade facing Walnut Street. They will save these and protect them with easements.

Mr. Wiener informed the Committee that the Fell-Van Rensselaer Mansion would receive protection, not through an easement, but by the utilization of the air rights above it to allow the tower to rise higher. He also stated that the project needed the space over the 18th Street buildings in order to finance the construction. Building farther forward on the Rittenhouse Club site would interrupt the views to the east from 1845 Walnut Street. He explained that the construction of the project would bring revenue to the City in terms of both the higher real estate tax and the high-income residents who would live in the units. The developer plans to construct the most expensive residential units in the City. He said that, although it might prove difficult to show economic hardship on the 18th Street buildings, the lack of economic viability for the Rittenhouse Club is evidenced by the lack of success others have had redeveloping the building. He added that he thought the Commission not bound to follow *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards*.

Mr. Baron said that the Commission has adopted *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards* as its standards in the review of projects and is bound by them. He stated that the buildings on 18th Street have substantial significance and form part of an important streetscape. He asked the question: if the Commission allows historic buildings to be demolished which are occupied, in a thriving area, and historically designated even before the owner's purchase, what message will this send to developers. Noting that the owners of historic buildings on the east side of 18th Street are now seeking zoning to create a single lot, he said that an approval of the proposed scheme would encourage people to buy historic buildings to demolish them. Richard Tyler observed that the standard of review is not less for contributing historic structures; in fact many historic districts consist almost entirely of contributing structures.

The Committee heard comments from the public.

Mary Fingerote expressed her opposition to the project and requested that the architect show the model they built to give a more accurate sense of the impact of the design.

Cory Hunicut, an architect and resident, said that he would object less to the loss of the buildings on 18th Street if the tower contributed rather than detracted as a piece of architecture.

Samuel Silver objected strongly to the loss of the neighborhood businesses as well as the scale and buildings on 18th Street. He said that development should be spread to the lots at the edges of Center City on Market or Arch Streets rather than crowding an area already containing beneficial buildings. In this way, the investment in the City could spread to areas where it is needed. He continued that this project will not only remove services useful to existing residents but likely result in increased taxes for all members of the community as the property values increase.

Judith Eden explained the position of the Center City Residents Association, based on study, that the agreed upon maximum height of 380 feet with the substantial setback would preserve the visibility of the sky from Rittenhouse Square and make this proposed building analogous to existing buildings on the Square.

Matthew White, Janet Mason and another gentleman supported the idea of bringing new young people and energy into the neighborhood with increased housing and development.

Patricia Wilson Aden of the Preservation Alliance Greater Philadelphia expressed the support of her organization for the concept of the project with appropriate setbacks on 18th Street. She also explained that her organization, which will receive the easements, supports this form of protection for these important buildings.

Janet Potter, representing the Foundation for Architecture, opposed the project and reminded the Committee members that contributing and significant buildings receive the same level of protection under the preservation ordinance. She said that usually when “Facadectomys” occur, buildings have been vacant for a long time. The 18th Street buildings are occupied and vibrant. She remarked that the plans for the proposal do not show stores on the ground floor on 18th Street but rather a lobby. This arrangement with an upstairs shopping area will rob 18th Street of its interest and vitality.

Ramy Djerassi, President of Synagogue Beth Zion Beth Israel, commented on the importance of the tower not rising so high that it sticks out in comparison to the other high rises on the Square. He also said that, although his congregation will gladly receive the empty nesters coming to live in these luxury condominiums, this is not the price level that will house young people seeking to come into the neighborhood. The proposal to demolish the buildings and businesses on 18th Street destroys the affordable amenities needed by the families living in the neighborhood now. He supports the retention of the buildings on 18th Street.

Kirby Kean, owner and developer of the buildings at the northwest corner of 18th and Sansom Streets, said that while he didn’t begrudge another developer the right to making a profit, he and his father have spent over half a million dollars restoring their buildings and creating apartments. Those apartments will be damaged by the loss of light and air taken by the new building. He wondered what could be done to pull the new building back from Sansom Street.

Kenneth Kaiserman, owner of the Rittenhouse Claridge, urged that the new building be substantially setback on 18th Street to protect views from his building and the Square. He also expressed concern about losing the businesses in those buildings which are used by his tenants.

Rita Copland spoke in opposition to the project noting that the buildings on 18th Street are not a “mish mash” but represent an accumulation of historical changes that add to their significance. She also expressed concern about the message the allowance of the demolition of these structures would send to developers for the future.

Sarah Torok spoke in opposition to the project and about the importance of preserving these neighborhood businesses as opposed to large expensive chain stores. She said that 18th Street appealed both to tourists and neighborhood residents because of its individual unique shops.

Natalie Woolman, Roger Johnson, Michael Isadore and many others opposed the proposal and said that over-developing this area and destroying the village atmosphere would create a

disincentive to people considering living and shopping in the area. Ms. Woolman stressed that the view of the sky is an important amenity and we will soon see many projects which will destroy the character of 18th Street, Sansom Street and other low-rise historic streets in this area.

Members of the Architecture Committee discussed these points and each commented on the project.

Mr. Thomas stressed that the Committee tries to find a way to make projects work. He supported setting back the tower off Walnut Street and the placement of the porte-cochere on Sansom Street; however, given the role and duties of the Historical Commission, he could not agree to the amount of demolition on the 18th Street properties and the tower rising five feet behind the historic facades. He said that he could support the concept of the tower set behind the preserved main blocks of the buildings and demolishing the rear ells approximately 30 feet behind the façade on 132 S. 18th Street. He suggested that the extent of preservation of the fabric should be determined by a careful examination of the perception of the preservation of the massing of building from the pedestrian level on 18th Street. He thought that further demolition would require the applicant to show hardship through the process prescribed in the ordinance including appropriate economic studies.

Mr. Atkins said that retaining five or thirty feet created a de-natured building and that it would be better to demolish the 18th Street buildings. He did not favor retaining any of the 18th Street buildings, but rather thought that what must be preserved are the existing stores. He suggested that any new building have a much more substantial setback from 18th Street above the fourth floor than currently proposed in order to protect the cornice line and streetscape of 18th Street.

Mr. Levy also said that having a five foot set back did not amount to preservation. He favored either real preservation of the buildings or their complete demolition.

Ms. Pentz, Mr. D'Alessandro and Mr. McCoubrey all rejected the idea of the amount of proposed demolition and the new construction rising five feet behind the 18th Street facades. Instead they favored retention of the substantial mass of the 18th Street buildings with the removal of the rear ells or a portion of the buildings that enables the buildings to read as whole structures.

The Committee unanimously recommended the denial of the concept as proposed and thought the proposed set back on 18th Street insufficient in preserving the massing of the historic buildings or the historic streetscape of 18th Street. Four of the six members suggested that any future approval should rest on the retention of a much more substantial mass of the existing historic buildings.

RB

319 Market Street

Daniel Katz, Owner

Janice Woodcock, Architect

DATE: 1831

PROPOSAL: Legalize side windows and install fire escape

The proposal involves legalizing one-over-one aluminum windows installed on the side façade of the building as well as the construction of a new fire escape. Mr. Baron explained that the side façade faces a public walkway. Mr. Patterson said that the owner will restore the front façade

which also has violations and that this owner was a partner in an entity that owned the building when much of the work was done. He did not know if this owner was responsible for these windows.

Raymond Resino, Chief Engineer for Conesco Corporation, the occupant of the neighboring building, explained his company's concern for all of the work done to the building at 319 Market Street which they view from their building. He observed that the side windows had been replaced in the last year as part of the renovations currently going on in the building as well as the rebuilding of steps and filling of the planters with concrete.

Mr. Baron showed a picture of the original wood windows, 12-over-12 on the second floor, 6-over-6 above.

The Committee recommended approval of a new fire escape, but denial of the legalization of the windows. They recommended the replacement of these windows with the correct wood windows described above.

RB

235 Chestnut Street

Frank Ragosio, Owner

Ivano D'Angella, Architect

DATE: 1856

PROPOSAL: New canopy, internally illuminated projecting signs and lighting

Mr. Baron explained that this proposal entails the removal of the existing awnings installed without permits. Proposed work includes the installation of a new freestanding glass and metal canopy with individually backlit letters, two new non-illuminated blade signs and new façade lighting. In addition, the applicant proposes to remove the raised concrete platform at the front and replace it with a new poured concrete platform with a granite curb. The applicant stated that the hotel has a visibility problem and the client wishes to improve its identity. Much of the discussion centered on the design of the proposed canopy. The plans show a gabled canopy supported by four square metal posts with signage within the front gable end and lettering on the front and sides. The committee thought the edge, or lip, of the canopy should align with the transom bar of the entrance opening. The committee agreed that a simple, more horizontal canopy with a shallower roof pitch would be more compatible with the façade. Several committee members said that the logo signage proposed for the gable end should be eliminated as there would be no space for it within the gable end of a reduced pitched roof. Mr. Baron raised a concern over the attachment of the façade lighting. The applicant responded that the granite had been previously drilled and damaged for earlier attachments but has no interest in destroying or damaging additional original fabric. The applicant agreed to install the façade lighting above or below the decorative carved stonework of the cornice.

The Committee recommended approval of wood blade signs, a new raised sidewalk platform and façade lighting with details to be reviewed by staff. The Committee recommended approval of a modified freestanding metal and glass canopy that aligns with the transom bar but with a shallower pitched roof that would still shed water but appear flatter and more horizontal with details to be reviewed by staff.

JRB

113 Elfreths Alley

Albert Malmfelt, Owner

Gerry Guttierrez, Architect

DATE: c. 1811

PROPOSAL: Visible rear addition

Mr. Baron explained that this project proposes two additions to the existing rear ell of this property. These additions would have some visibility from Bladens Court and North Front Street. The plans show a third story addition over the two story rear portion of the house, as well as a second story addition and roof deck above the one story kitchen portion at the rear of the house. The applicant stated that the additions would have very limited visibility. The architect for the project, Mr. Guttierrez, said that the owners recognize the significance of their property and, as part of this project, were correcting water drainage problems and restoring interior plaster. The additions are desired to relieve a storage space problem and make the house more functional. The Committee expressed a desire to retain the historic forms of the rear ell, i.e. the sloping shed roofs of the paired houses within the row. Mr. Atkin questioned the overhang at the rear wall of the proposed second story addition and thought the rear wall should be aligned with the first story wall below.

The Committee recommended approval of the third floor addition, second floor roof deck and a modified second story addition with a sloping parapet wall at rear that would simulate the historic form of the sloping shed roof.

JRB

209 North 3rd Street

Dr. Michael Yaron, Owner

Albert Taus, Architect

DATE: c. 1825

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation, cut new windows

This proposal involves the cutting of new windows on the largely blank side façade and the enlargement of existing window openings at each floor of the rear façade. Mr. Baron explained that the Commission reviewed and approved a similar scheme previously. Plans call for a new metal gate to access a proposed courtyard between this building and the building to the south. Mr. Baron added that the staff opposes the new storefront window opening in the first floor side behind the gate. The applicant stated that the upper floor windows at the side are required by code for the living spaces of the upper floor apartments and he proposes the new storefront to make a friendlier courtyard space. The Committee found the cutting of additional window openings in the partially visible rear facade and largely blank side facade acceptable, but the new fourth floor window in the side elevation should not “crowd” the original fanlight opening. Several Committee members suggested a more simple design for the new gate.

The Committee recommended approval of the enlarged rear window openings and simplified gate with details to be reviewed by staff. The Committee recommended approval of the new side window openings provided the second register of windows is shifted slightly east, away from the existing original fanlight opening.

JRB

625 North 16th Street

Peter Kura, Owner

Sabrina Soong, Architect

DATE: c 1859

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation, legalize removal of rear shed

This proposal entails a complete renovation of the property including new windows, repointing and a new entrance door. Plans call for new wood, two over two, double hung windows on the front façade, and six over six, double hung windows and a new fanlight window on the south façade. The applicant proposes to legalize the removal of a deteriorated wood framed rear shed. He also seeks to infill window and door openings and stucco the rear façade. In addition, the proposal includes a new transom and four panel door at the front, repair of the existing steps, a new metal railing and new in-swing basement windows. Plans show new concrete steps, railing and a four light back door at the rear, a new asphalt shingle roof and replacement of the cornice in wood. The architect, Sabrina Soong, stated that she has salvaged an original bracket from the cornice and new wood brackets will be milled to match.

The Committee recommended approval as proposed, per Standard # 6, with details to be reviewed by staff.

JRB

627 North 16th Street

Peter Kura, Owner

Sabrina Soong, Architect

DATE: 1875

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation, legalize removal of rear shed and bay

The application calls for a façade renovation to this three-story brick row house including new windows, repointing and a new entrance. The applicant proposes to install wood, two over two, double hung windows on the front façade; new wood six over six, double hung windows on the north façade, and multiple new windows on the partially visible rear elevation. The applicant removed the deteriorated wood portions of the building and now seeks to build a new frame addition and upper floor bay. The applicant also proposes to repoint and patch existing brick on the west elevation. The plans show work on the front façade including a new transom, a new four-panel door and metal railing. Plans also propose new glass, three pane basement windows. On the rear of the building, plans have new concrete steps, a new railing and a new back door, and a stucco finish.

The staff recommended approval per Standards 9 and 10 with staff to review details.

Mr. Baron described the project.

Following a brief discussion the Committee voted to recommend:

Approval of the proposal as submitted with staff to review and approve details, as well as a pointing and brick samples.

RT

2531 South Lambert Street

Joanne Castorina, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1914

PROPOSAL: Close window, install stained glass

The applicant seeks to remove a window on the side of her house in the bathroom, block it most of the way up with brick and add a leaded glass window. The window location has limited visibility. The staff recommended approval based on limited visibility, subject to the retention of a reveal and the window frame.

Mr. Baron described this proposal.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of this project with a reveal and retention of the window frame with the staff to review details.

RT

4341 Main Street, SW corner of Grape Street

Ilyas Shah, Owner

Alan Kaplan, Esq., Applicant

DATE: c. 1905

PROPOSAL: Legalize aluminum-clad windows and shopfront alterations

The proposal involves legalizing the installation of aluminum clad windows in the side wall of this corner building, covering the cornice with aluminum and recladding the front storefront with varnished wood.

Staff recommendation: The staff reached no consensus. Baron favored denial per the Manayunk Ordinance. Harvey and Spina favored denial of the windows in the side wall and approval of the unfinished storefront as submitted. Tyler favored approval of the windows in the side wall and requiring the painting of the front. Brennan favored approval as submitted. All favored painting the aluminum cornice.

After a discussion of the applicant's account of the discovery of concealed openings in the Grape Street elevation, staff's comment on alterations to this building made by previous owners with and without permits, and the finishes that characterize Main Street, the Committee recommended:

1. Approval of the windows as submitted;
2. Approval of the existing stucco on the Grape Street elevation;
3. Painting the aluminum cornice, and
4. Painting the varnished storefront.

RT

4200 Spruce Street, SW corner of 42nd Street

Omicron Association of Theta Xi, Owner

Greg Woodring, Applicant

DATE: c. 1902

PROPOSAL: Stair tower and ADA ramp

The proposal involves removing a fire escape from the east side façade of this fraternity house and building a brick stair tower on the more concealed west side. A new ramp will allow handicapped accessibility. The architect proposes a new roof and several windows. The staff recommended approval of the ramp and stair tower.

Mr. Baron described the project.

The Committee recommended approval of the proposal with a simplified ramp detail and with staff to review details.

The applicant also sought guidance for the future reroofing of this building which now has asphalt shingles. Presumably slate shingles originally covered this roof.

Inasmuch as the building has had asphalt shingles for at least twenty years, the Committee thought the use of slate-line or a similar substitute material appropriate.

RT

1022 Clinton Street

John DeWaele, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1839-40

PROPOSAL: Remake Pine Street store into garage

The applicant seeks to create a garage out of a one-story building at the back of this Clinton Street lot, most recently used as an antique store on Pine Street. Mr. DeWaele claims that the structure was formerly a garage.

The staff recommended approval; however, the staff thought that the proposal damages the experience of Antique Row, absent a local historic district, the history of the specific building would seem to favor allowing the alteration.

Mr. Baron described the proposal.

The Committee recommended the approval of the submission with the doors to resemble carriage doors.

RT

128 Bainbridge Street

Michael Samschick, Owner

Joel Spivak, Architect

DATE: c. 1771-1792

PROPOSAL: Conceptual review, reface in brick and new construction

The conceptual application involves reconstructing and adding onto a perma-stone covered frame, half gabled house. The applicant who seeks to purchase this long empty house proposes to reconstruct the face of the building in brick and construct a large addition set in the yard behind the existing house.

The staff recommended approval of the massing of the addition per Standards 9 and 10. Denial of refacing the frame house in brick per Standard 6.

Mr. Baron introduced the proposal.

The Committee discussed the uniqueness of this building and considered the context of its rear lot.

The Committee recommended:

1. *Approval of the proposal in concept;*
2. *Denial of the refacing the building in brick, and*
3. *Approval of a siding treatment discovered in the course of a closer physical examination of the building, or in the absence of any surviving material, siding to match comparable buildings of the period in the neighborhood.*

RT

126-28 League Street

Michael Samschick, Owner

Joel Spivak, Architect

DATE: 1806-1817

PROPOSAL: Conceptual review, partial demolition and new construction

The conceptual application calls for rebuilding much of these Imminently Dangerous frame structures and attaching them to a new structure set behind the ridge line. The construction would demolish the rear roof slopes and dormers.

The staff recommended approval in concept owing to the condition of the structures; however, the design of the Washington Street façade and the view of the side roof line from League Street needs careful consideration.

Mr. Baron introduced this proposal for a review in concept. He also informed the Committee of the staff's having had the Department issue demolition by neglect violations with a requirement to repair rather than repair or demolish the structure.

Owing to the imminently dangerous building determination by the Department of Licenses and Inspections, the Committee agreed to recommend:

1. *Approve this proposal in concept with the rear addition designed in such a manner as to convey a stronger sense of the rear slope of the historic building*
2. *Final approval of the project if the applicant submits satisfactory drawings of the Washington Avenue elevation before 8 November for review by the Chair of the Committee and staff.*

RT

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes