

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

**Robert Thomas, Chair  
Commission Offices, One Parkway, 13<sup>th</sup> Floor, 1515 Arch Street  
29 May 2001**

Present

---

Robert Thomas, Chair  
Rudolph D'Alessandro  
Daniel McCoubrey  
Suzanne Pentz

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

Also

Charles Thompson, Dream Home Remodelers  
Alfred D. Whitman, Esq.  
Clarence Norman, Principal Officer, Church of Christ  
Willie Rupert, Pastor, Church of Christ  
Lorna Katz Larson, Society Hill Civic Association  
Robert Galli, Fairmount Rowing Association  
Allen Rubin  
Tom Buck, 2208 Brandywine Street  
James D. Grainge, 2202 Brandywine Street  
Monika Klatte, 2202 Brandywine Street  
J. Stump, 301 South 17<sup>th</sup> Street  
Patricia J. Carroll, 1705 Panama Street  
Robin Reshetar, 301 South 17<sup>th</sup> Street  
Lenore Millhollen, 2047 Waverly Street  
Shirley Vernon, 1704 Delancey Street  
Daniel Glynn, 3502 Frankford Street  
Cecil Baker, Cecil Baker and Associates  
Penelope Benith, Cecil Baker and Associates  
Peter Miller  
Jack Parry, 1902 North Park Avenue, Park Mall  
Eric Rymshaw, Fury Design  
David Seltzer, 734 Addison Street  
Ray Lyons  
Kim Tanaira  
Christian Busch, The Sullivan Company  
Craig Rosenfeld, The Barclay  
Elizabeth Armour  
Matthew DeJulio, Society Hill Civic Association  
Bernice Hamel, Society Hill Civic Association  
David Amburn, Amburn/Jarosinski Associates  
Richard Thom, 153 North 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Michael S. Gill, Duane Morris and Heckscher, LLP

Philip Price, The Woodlands Cemetery Company  
Eric Goldstein, University City District  
Mark Blum, University of the Sciences in Philadelphia  
Michael Bitny, 208 Fitzwater Street  
Neil Sandvold, 208 Fitzwater Street  
John Schellenberg, Keating Building Corporation  
Jonathan Weiss, Templeton Properties  
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association

Rudolph D'Alessandro, Acting-Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

**101 B Lombard Street, NW corner of Front Street**

John Wong, Owner  
Charles Thompson, Contractor  
DATE: c. 1978  
PROPOSAL: Replace 3<sup>rd</sup> floor front green house

The proposal involves legalizing the removal of the original metal and glass solarium from the front façade of a 1978 row house in Society Hill and installing another greenhouse that more closely matches the neighboring house but does not match the historic design. The staff recommended denial per Standards 5 and 6.

Randal Baron described the submission and offered the staff's recommendation.

In response to a question on the feasibility of recreating the historic form of this feature, Mr. Thompson cited the unavailability of materials and shapes compatible with the original in insulated glass. Members of the committee acknowledged this.

*The Architectural Committee recommended:*

1. *Denial of the proposal as submitted.*
2. *Approval of a revised proposal that maintained the shed shape of the original submission with the glazing and muntin pattern to replicate the historic appearance of this feature.*
3. *Approval of the removal of the original solarium subject to its replacement as suggested in Recommendation 2.*

RT

**300-318 North 63<sup>rd</sup> Street, NW corner of Vine Street**

Patterson Memorial Presbyterian Church  
Church of Christ, Clarence Norman, Principal Officer  
Willie Rupert, Pastor  
Alfred Whitman, Esq., Applicant  
DATE: 1888, 1895, T.P. Chandler, Architect  
PROPOSAL: Complete demolition of all structures

This proposal involves the complete demolition of this church. A fire caused extensive damage to the sanctuary of this church a number of years ago; insurance proceeds helped the congregation rebuild it. Since then, a portion of the west wall of Fellowship Hall collapsed. Although the congregation had it repaired, this structure evinces further distress. A structural engineer has

found the tower at the junction of the hall and the sanctuary very perilous. The congregation lacks the funds, an estimated \$92,000 for the tower alone and yet more for the hall, to undertake remediation. Owing to these conditions, attempts to sell the property to another religious organization have failed; the only interest in acquiring it comes from persons interested in a cleared development parcel.

The staff recommended denial of the application, the exploration of the availability of preservation grants, and possible removal of the tower if that enables the preservation of the sanctuary and hall. The building has considerable architectural significance and its demolition does not meet the Secretary of Interior Standards. The Architecture Committee should advise the Commission to submit the application to the Committee on Financial Hardship.

Mr. Baron introduced the application, and Mr. Tyler reported on his own inspection of the property and noted that the present application rests on hardship.

Alfred Whitman, counsel for the church, explained that this small, aging congregation simply cannot afford to undertake the necessary repairs and cannot find another religious body interested in acquiring the property.

*The Architectural Committee recommended:*

1. *Denial of this application on architectural and historical grounds.*
2. *Referral of the application to the Committee on Financial Hardship.*

RT

## **#2 Boathouse Row, Fairmount Rowing Association**

Fairmount Rowing Club, Owner

Robert Galli, Applicant

DATE: 1904, Walter Smedley, Architect

PROPOSAL: Install new terrace rails

The proposal involves installing a new railing on both the front and rear facades. The former wood rail on the river elevation was replaced with cinderblock and the cornice removed. The new rail fails to match the old in many details because the applicant seeks to use a substitute material with different structural properties than wood. The staff recommended denial per Standards 5 and 6.

Mr. Baron described the application and offered the staff's recommendation.

Mr. D'Allesandro abstained from participating in the discussion and vote on this application.

The Committee, the staff and Mr. Galli, the applicant, discussed the properties of the proposed substitute material. Mr. Galli also noted that the loading requirements of the current codes necessitated some modification of Smedley's original design.

*The Architectural Committee recommended:*

1. *Denial of the application as submitted.*
2. *Approval of a design that duplicates as closely as possible the historic rail, consistent with the Building Code and its lateral load requirements with staff to review details.*

RT

**2208 Brandywine Street**

Thomas C. Buck, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Rear alterations

Mr. Buck proposes to renovate the rear of his house which has visibility through a parking lot on Spring Garden Street. He seeks to install new 1/1 windows, widen one window and stucco a frame addition, currently covered in asphalt siding. The staff brought this submission to the Committee as one that falls on the cusp of staff review provided by the Rules and Regulations. In the event of review by the Committee and Commission, the staff recommended denial per Standards 4 and 6; the applicant should install 6/6 sash and either wood clapboard or wood shingle siding.

Mr. Baron introduced the submission and the staff's recommendation.

Mr. Buck described his proposal and presented various photographs to illustrate the context of the property. He thought that the staff should review and approve his submission, owing to the very limited visibility from Spring Garden Street, the non-historic setting created by the service station at 22<sup>nd</sup> and Spring Garden Streets, the highly variegated character of the rears of the houses on this block, the common use of stucco on those rears, and his maintenance of the openings.

*The Committee agreed and determined that the staff should process this application pursuant to Section 6.3.c.1 of the Rules and Regulations. The Commission need take no action on this application.*

RT

**2202 Brandywine Street**

Kevin Klatte, Owner

James D. Grainge, Architect

DATE: c. 1859; altered 1924

PROPOSAL: Windows, rear alterations

Mr. Grainge seeks to install new wood 2/2 windows on both the front and rear façades of this much-altered row house. On the first floor of the rear the applicant proposes altering two windows to become a new door. The staff recommended approval per Standard 9 because of the recent vintage and massive alterations to the building. The front façade, however, should retain its present window configuration per Standards 4 and 6.

Mr. Baron described the submission and presented the staff's recommendation.

The submitted design reflects the owner's seeking greater consistency in the appearance of the front elevation with those on the rest of the block.

The Committee, staff and applicant discussed the alterations to this house that occurred in 1924 that resulted in a dwelling different in visual character from the others in the row and the historical significance of these alterations.

*The Architectural Committee recommended:*

1. *Approval of the proposal as submitted for the rear elevation.*
2. *Retention by repair or replication of the existing three-part window at the first floor of the front façade.*
3. *Installation of either 2/2 or 6/6 double hung wooden windows at the second and third floors of the front elevation, for either conforms with the Standards.*

RT

**2146 Green Street**

Allen W. Rubin, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1854; altered 1892, Edward R. Parry, Architect

PROPOSAL: Wall removal, new garage/deck

This proposal calls for the construction of a parking garage and deck on the rear of this row house in place of an existing fence and deck. The construction will have some visibility from 22<sup>nd</sup> Street. The staff recommended approval per Standard 9.

Mr. Baron introduced the application and offered the staff's recommendation.

The Committee, staff and Mr. Rubin discussed the treatment of the proposed garage doors and reached a consensus on a horizontal arrangement in wood or a material that resembles wood.

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

RT

**1600 Mt. Vernon Street, SW corner of 16<sup>th</sup> Street**

Uriel Tedgi, Owner/Contractor

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Legalize roll down gate

This proposal calls for legalizing the installation of a metal roll down door in a former storefront opening. Staff recommendation: Denial per Standard 6, the design should have a door and storefront window.

This proposal calls for legalizing the installation of a metal roll down door in a former storefront opening. Staff recommendation: Denial per Standard 6; the design should have a door and storefront window.

The applicant did not appear before the Committee.

Mr. Baron presented the application and the staff's recommendation.

*The Architectural Committee recommended:*

1. *Denial of the application as submitted per Standard 6.*
2. *Approval in concept of the installation of a door and window with transom lights.*

RT

**301 South 17<sup>th</sup> Street, SE corner of Spruce Street**

Robin Reshetar, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1865

PROPOSAL: Rooftop addition and deck; railings atop a bay to create a balcony, and legalization of glass block and glazing of dormer pediments

This proposal calls for constructing a penthouse and roof deck on the mansard roof of this corner building. Mr. Reshetar also seeks to cure violations issued owing to the installation of glass block in the window in the main entrance stoop of the building and glass in place of beaded board in the pediments of the roof dormers.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standards 6 & 9. The new addition will have high visibility and sits atop a mansard.

Mr. Baron described the application and offered the staff's recommendation.

Mr. Reshetar presented site-line drawings to the Committee and said that they illustrate the minimal visibility from the public right-of-way of the proposed penthouse. He added that during much of the year foliage would conceal it. He noted that the Commission had permitted a neighborhood church to install visible air handlers. The Committee, staff and Mr. Reshetar discussed the placing of mockup in outline on the roof; he agreed to do this.

Lenore Millhollen asked if the proposal conformed to the Zoning Code.

Mr. Reshetar cited the need for security for the installation of glass block in the front stair window and the desire to introduce additional light for the glazing of the dormer pediments.

The applicant also described his proposal to create balconies for one of the apartments by converting windows into doors and installing railings on two bays.

*The Architectural Committee recommended:*

- 1. Erection of a mockup of the proposed penthouse for inspection by a member of the Committee and staff with approval of the submission if this inspection demonstrates acceptably minimal visibility.*
- 2. Removal of the glass block and the installation of a frame glazed with Plexiglass or similar material with an appropriate security grate*
- 3. Denial of the glazing of the dormer pediments.*
- 4. No determination on the balcony owing to the incompleteness of the application*

RT

**2224 Pine Street**

Peter Askey, Owner

Peter Miller, Architect

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Rear addition

This proposal involves constructing a rear addition and deck. The addition will have some visibility from Croskey Street. The staff recommended approval, except that the existing masonry should not receive stucco.

The proposal involves two houses on Pine Street with separate levels on each floor. Peter Miller attended the meeting to explain the proposal. He said that the proposed addition would be located between the two buildings. The proposed additions will step up beginning with one story at the rear of the property progressing to a second story and culminating with three stories at the back wall of the main house. This approach will lessen the visibility of these additions from the rear. Mr. Miller also said that a wall would minimize visibility. The second floor addition will contain a deck.

Mr. Baron questioned the window and stuccoing of the masonry. The applicant addressed his concern by explaining that only 2224 Pine Street, which is currently stuccoed, would be re-stuccoed.

*The Architectural Committee recommended approval.*

#### **1818 Addison Street**

Craig LaBan, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850; altered c. 1960

PROPOSAL: Roof deck and stair house

This proposal calls for the construction of a roof deck and stair house on the roof of this row house. The house has a tall parapet wall, which will hide most of the deck from the front. It will have visibility from Lombard Street through a parking lot. The Staff recommended approval per Standard 10.

The addition of a parapet wall has rendered this building taller than its surrounding buildings. Craig LaBan, the applicant, attended the meeting and stated that the replacement of the stair house is necessary owing to water infiltration. The proposed stair house will be larger and higher with visibility from the rear. A mock-up established that visibility from the front would be minimal; Mr. Baron agreed. The applicant also proposes the addition of a rear window, which Mr. Baron noted that code requirements might require its removal.

The Committee thought the stair house should sit with the parapet wall.

*The Architectural Committee recommended approval with staff to review details and also any detail changes required by code.*

#### **1703 Spruce Street**

Mark Bojanoski, Owner

Daniel J. Glynn, Contractor

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: New front door and surround

This proposal seeks to legalize the removal of a decorative marble door surround and its replacement with concrete and Fypon shapes that do not match the original form. The applicant also seeks to install a new door.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standards 5 & 6 on the surround and the door per Standard 6. The new door should match the original double door in the row two houses down.

Mark Bojanoski, David Richards and Daniel Glynn attended the meeting. The applicant stated he believed that time was of the essence owing to the condition of the marble and its posing a danger to the public. He also said that there is a cost factor for replacing in kind. Mr. Bojanoski questioned the length of time given to resolve the violation.

Staff and Committee members thought that the marble could have been salvaged and pinned back in place. The Fypon replacement pieces do not match; they are much shorter and of a different shape. The dentils of the cornice do not match and it has a simpler design. To address the concern of the applicant about the size of the infill opening in order to accommodate the astragal in the middle, it recommended a site visit to measure the dimensions from marble to marble. The Committee urged a single-leaf door that resembles a double-leaf door with glazing at the top and curved cornered panels below.

*The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the door surround and the door as submitted, but approval of a new door surround in marble to match the original and a single or double door that uses the details of the doors at 1707 Spruce Street with two panels on the bottom and two larger glass panels at the top with the staff to review details.*

#### **1706 Delancey Place**

Jeffrey Yablonovitz, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Legalize revised roof deck

The applicant seeks to legalize his rooftop and rear deck by further reducing its size. Because of its height, staff thinks it will still have visibility from both the front and rear.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the rooftop portion of the deck per Standard 9.

Jeffrey Yablonovitz attended the meeting. He questioned whether a change in the materials used for construction would have any impact on the legalization of the decks. He asked if it is possible to move the stairs to another location, the Committee responded in the negative owing to their visibility.

The Committee thought that even though the revised plans show the railings pulled back ten feet from the south and west, the columns and the overall mass of the exterior construction compromises the rear. It also commented that if the stair access were situated on the interior, this would eliminate the large construction in the rear, but the deck's design would still need reviewing.

Shirley Vernon, the neighbor, questioned the number of times a proposal is seen by the Committee and Commission. Patricia Carroll, a neighbor, presented photographs to show how the construction intrudes on her exterior.

*The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the revised proposal.*

**250 South 18<sup>th</sup> Street, corner of Rittenhouse Square Street**

Jack Wolgin, Owner

Penelope Benith, Architect

DATE: 1923; McIlvaine & Roberts, Architect

PROPOSAL: Window and porch infill

This proposal calls for re-glazing some windows on the south side of the building with single panes as opposed to the historic wood multi-pane windows. On the west façade, the applicant seeks to create an enlarged greenhouse enclosure on the fire balcony.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the windows per Standard 6, Approval of the glazed porch.

This building currently has single pane windows and the applicant wishes to replicate the existing. The Committee said that replicating the existing condition does not achieve historical accuracy as required by the *Standards* for restoration of the windows. It thought the proposal to expand the porch infill to the north, which would bring it in line with the vertical pier and enhance the façade's design by giving it uniformity on this less visible side. The applicant asked the staff for guidance in determining the historic window features.

*The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the porch infill but denial of the windows as submitted.*

**237 South 18<sup>th</sup> Street, NE corner of Rittenhouse Square Street**

The Barclay

Barclay Owner's Association, Owner

Christian Busch, Architect

DATE: 1928; J.E.R. Carpenter, Architect

PROPOSAL: Conceptual review of cooling tower and screen

This application in concept addresses both a violation for the removal of a former, architecturally significant water tower and the need to install central cooling towers in the building. The towers will allow for the removal of all the air-conditioning units from the stair balconies of the courtyard. Mr. Busch proposes to site the towers on the location of the former water tower because this is the only place on the roof that has the structural capacity to carry the load. Before the meeting he proposed to clothe the units with the architectural vocabulary of the former water tower. The staff recommended approval.

The proposed unit's width is double the size of the former water tower and has stairs and a balcony for maintenance purposes, which necessitates the need for some type of screening. The unit has minimal visibility from Rittenhouse Square owing to the bulkheads, but it is very visible from the south. However, since the submission, an engineer's report has examined the issues of windloads and determined that the load capacity is at its maximum which hampers the installation of screening.

Christian Busch, the architect, has explored other options such as splitting cells or other locations but found these options not workable. He presented renderings, which encompassed the structure with the bottom exposed for ventilation, seeking some guidance for its enclosure.

Mr. Thomas recommended a non-solid enclosure, possibly a dark painted mesh.

Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association, spoke on its behalf in favor of the direction of the guidance given the applicant.

*The Architectural Committee recommended conceptual approval of some type of architectural screening which fits with the building.*

**233 South Quince Street**

Kenneth Panciera, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1811,1838

PROPOSAL: Side elevation rear deck

The owner proposes to install a visible wood deck on the rear ell of this corner property. He will enlarge a previously altered window to accommodate a door.

Staff recommendation: Approval, per Standards 9 & 10 if the deck is painted cream to match the existing trim and the door has multi-pane true divide lights.

Mary and Kenneth Panciera attended the meeting. Mr. Baron questioned whether the projecting structure beneath the deck could be decreased. The applicant stated that he proposed setting the deck back three feet from the property line.

Committee members thought the deck should be flush with the Latimer Street elevation and the proposed French door should have a true divided light system to match the existing windows. In addition, it believed that a cream color less intrusive for the deck. However, the applicant thought that a color other than white more appropriate and suggested the possibility of the green shutter color.

*The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the deck flush with the side elevation of Latimer Street in a cream or green color with the staff to review details.*

**1902 North Park Avenue, Park Mall**

Temple University, Owner

John R. Parry, Jr., Architect

DATE: c. 1870

PROPOSAL: Front façade/ATM installations

The applicant proposes to install cash machines in the door and window of this row house, removing the historic material.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standards 2,5 and 9. The machines should sit inside a lobby.

The Committee reiterated its position per the *Standards* about the removal of historic fabric and stated that the applicant should consider a vestibule location for the ATM's such as had been recommended for other ATM installations both on the Reading Terminal Headhouse and on Walnut Street.

Jack Parry attended the meeting to explain the project and answer questions. He asked for clarification of the *Standards*, to give his client a better understanding of the reason for the Committee's recommendation.

*The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal.*

**724 and 726 Pine Street**

724 Pine Street, Bruce Comens, Owner,

726 Pine Street, Tom Bernas, Owner

Eric B. Rymshaw, Architect

DATE: 724 Pine Street, c. 1830; altered c. 1930

726 Pine Street, façade c. 1940

PROPOSAL: Conceptual review of exterior restoration/reconstruction, rear addition, and new building on Addison Street

This proposal in concept involves removing a stucco coating from the front façade of 724 Pine Street and a 20<sup>th</sup> century brick façade from 726 Pine Street and restoring/reconstructing both facades to their c. 1830 design. Both buildings have earlier dormers. At the rear, the architect proposes to reverse the door and garage opening in the façade of 723 Addison Street and construct an identical structure on the open ground at 725 Addison Street. He also seeks to build an addition on the rear of the Pine Street houses.

Staff recommendation: Approval if enough information can be gleaned about the historic façade design to inform the restoration per Standard 6. Mr. Tyler questioned the date and significance of the façade at 726 Pine Street and whether it should be protected.

Mr. Baron explained the conceptual proposal that would combine two houses into one. 724 and 726 Pine Street were constructed in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, but the façades of both have been changed. 724 Pine Street has stucco over the original brick façade and a 20<sup>th</sup>-century door surround and entrance. 726 Pine Street has a new brick front dating to the 1940s, smaller window openings and a door surround similar to 724.

The prospective owner wishes to restore the façades of both houses. This would include removing the stucco and restoring the arched entranceway on 724 and rebuilding the front wall, restoring the arched entranceway and the cornice on 726. Eric Rymshaw, architect for the project, asked if he could design a front door to reflect the fact that only one door will serve as the front door. The Committee stated that if the proposal is for restoration, then all elements must be restored to the period of significance.

On the rear of the houses, the proposal calls for a new two-story addition, in place of a non-historic two-story rear ell. Also, at the rear of 724 is another house facing Addison Street. This significant, 2-½-story house dates to c. 1808-10, but has a non-historic garage door and entranceway. The proposal includes switching the garage entrance with the pedestrian door and adding another structure that mirrors the existing building, creating a two-car garage.

Bernice Hamel and Matt DeJulio of the Society Hill Civic Association's Historic Preservation Committee stated that the organization supports the proposed changes.

*The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal in concept, including the restoration of the front facades of 724 and 726 Pine Street, the rear two-story addition and the addition to the house on Addison Street.*

lms

**600 South Washington Square, SW corner of 6<sup>th</sup> Street**

Gene and Sueyun Locks, Owners

David Amburn, Architect

DATE: 1923, Earle Nelson Edwards, Architect

PROPOSAL: Rooftop addition and stair towers

This proposal calls for constructing two stair towers and a two-story penthouse gallery addition at the roof level of this Renaissance revival structure. The plans show tall metal walls surrounding an open roof garden space.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standard 9. The staff thought the design should set the new addition over to the west side of the building where the Hopkinson House blocks visibility. The metal baffles on the roof addition would have too much visibility from the Square.

David Amburn, architect for the project, explained the multi-faceted proposal for this Renaissance revival building on the corner of Washington Square. The proposal is in concept for the building, which has high visibility from all four sides.

Currently, the building's owners cannot use the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor owing to a lack of a second fire stair. The proposal includes a new fire stair and tower at the southeast corner of the building to meet life-safety requirements for upper floor use.

Mr. Amburn noted that the top of the balustrade stands 92 inches above the roof. The owners wish to install a full fourth floor and then a small fifth floor room at the rear of the building, leading out to a rooftop sculpture garden. He stated that the owners have a private art collection that they wish to hang on the fourth floor. The metal baffle, creating a mansard-like roof, would hide the fourth floor and provide the necessary railing for the rooftop garden. Owing to its high visibility, the Committee did not find the fourth floor addition appropriate for the building. Mr. Thomas suggested putting the private collection in a finished basement, eliminating the need for the fourth floor. Committee members also said that since the balustrade is a full 92 inches above the roof, that would provide the necessary railing for a rooftop garden.

*The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of the stair tower and denial of the fourth floor and sculpture garden as proposed.*

lms

**141-45 North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, a.k.a. 138-40 North Front Street**

141-45 North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street Partners-Zeev, Owner

David Amburn, Architect

DATE: 141-43, 1905

145, 1830

PROPOSAL: Exterior renovations and windows

This proposal calls for converting these several buildings into residential units. At 141 N. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, the architect proposes to retain the windows of the front façade, install a new aluminum storefront at the first floor and install a new aluminum window on the upper floor. On the north party wall façade the architect proposes cutting new windows and installing aluminum one over

one windows and on the rear façade cutting new openings and installing windows to match those above.

At 145 N. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street the architect proposes installing a wood storefront in place of the current aluminum one. On the side façade he shows true divided light windows in the existing openings as well as in several new openings. On the rear façade, he intends to install an aluminum storefront in an existing opening.

At 140 N. Front Street, the architect shows cutting new openings in the cinderblock infill of the loading dock and installing aluminum windows to match those above. The loading dock area will receive stucco over the cinderblock. At the Quarry Street façade, he proposes to reopen windows to their original size and install steel windows to match those above.

Staff recommendation: Approval per Standards 9 & 10, except that the front doors for 145 N. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street should match the double doors of our historic photo all with staff to review details.

Mr. Amburn also described this project. Two buildings on Second Street and one on Front Street form this tax-credit project. The proposal includes new windows in boarded-up and new openings along the Quarry Street façade. The windows in 145 North 2<sup>nd</sup>, which stands only two stories high, will have wood sash. The windows in the four-story 141-43 North 2<sup>nd</sup> will have aluminum sash. The proposal also calls for the demolition of a one-story rear addition behind 141-43 North 2<sup>nd</sup>, and the rehabilitation of the stucco addition and front to 138-40 North Front Street.

Mr. Baron noted that the Commission has a photograph of the original door surround, transom and double-leaf door for 145 North 2<sup>nd</sup> and he recommended using that as the guide for the new design.

Mr. Amburn stated that access to the apartments will be through the existing entrance on Quarry Street and all of the brick will be cleaned. No new stucco will be added to any of the buildings.

*The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval with the storefront of 145 North Front modified to match the historic photograph and staff to review details.*

lms

#### **46 North Front Street, a.k.a. 101 Cuthbert Street**

Jim and Ellen Curry, Owners

Gerry Gutierrez, Architect

DATE: c. 1785

PROPOSAL: Window and door replacement

This proposal involves removing the existing windows and installing new wood windows with shop drawings to be reviewed by the staff. The applicant proposes a window with an applied muntin because of the specific sound conditions associated with the highway running in front of the building. The window and door configuration shows a restoration to the period of the Greek Revival storefront.

Staff Recommendation: Approval per Standard 6.

Mr. Baron explained the history of this building. The house was built in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century with multi-paned windows on both the front and side elevations. During the Greek Revival period, c. 1825, a storefront was added, but the multi-light windows on the side elevation were not changed. In the 20<sup>th</sup> century, a previous owner removed the doors of the Greek Revival storefront and installed glass block. Mr. Baron stated that the proposal includes restoring the Greek Revival storefront and installing multi-paned windows typical of the 18<sup>th</sup> century house. However, owing to the noise generated by the traffic on Interstate 95, the owner wishes to install double-glazed windows with soundproofing. The proposed wood windows would have applied muntins on both the interior and exterior and a spacer bar between the glass panes. The muntins have the proper profile.

*The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the windows with applied muntins and a spacer bar because of the necessary soundproofing with staff to review details.*

lms

**153 North 3<sup>rd</sup> Street**

William Whalton, Owner  
Richard W. Thom, Architect  
DATE: c. 1830  
PROPOSAL: Rear deck

The architect proposes rebuilding an existing rear deck. Staff Recommendation: Approval per Standard 9.

Richard Thom, architect for the project, described the proposal. The building has an existing deck on the rear of the property that is visible from Quarry Street. The owner wishes to replace the deck with one slightly larger.

*The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval.*

lms

**3900 Woodland Avenue, Woodlands Cemetery**

Woodlands Cemetery Company of Philadelphia, Owner  
Mark Blum, Applicant  
DATE: 1748-1786  
PROPOSAL: Fence construction

The application proposes the legalization of a black vinyl covered chain link fence installed to fence off property now leased to the University of the Sciences in Philadelphia.

Staff Recommendation: Approval per Standard 9 & 10, with landscaping to be applied only sparingly to preserve the openness of the landscape. The staff had concerns, however, about the possible landscaping or construction on the portion leased to the University.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal. The Woodlands Cemetery has leased part of its land to the University of the Sciences to use for passive outdoor activities. Since the cemetery closes to the public at 5:00 p.m. each night, the University erected a black vinyl-coated, chain-link fence to

separate its leased land from the rest of the cemetery grounds. Staff agreed that the transparency of the fence should remain, rather than calling attention to it with landscaping or other methods to hide it. Mr. Baron asked for photographs illustrating the proximity of the fence to the historic mansion.

Mark Blum, representing the University, stated that the lease with the cemetery forbids any development of the land, even landscaping or formal ball fields. He also noted that the land leased by the University contains a ravine. The University wishes to install a similar chain-link fence around the ravine.

Mr. Thomas asked if the University planned to restore the historic entrance to the cemetery on 42<sup>nd</sup> Street. Mr. Blum stated that the University did not have any plans to do so, but may return with that proposal since only one entrance into the leased land now exists.

*The Architectural Committee voted to recommend legalizing the fence and to approve the fence around the ravine.*

lms

### **208 and 210 Fitzwater Street**

Michele Armstrong, Owner

Neil Sandvold, Architect

DATE: 1790

PROPOSAL: New construction, roofing

The applicant proposes to construct a new building on the lot of the demolished building on Fitzwater Street as well as re-roofing the house at 210 Fitzwater Street with black shingles.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of re-roofing 210 Fitzwater Street with weathered wood color shingles. Denial of new design for 208 Fitzwater Street per Standard 9. The new design disrupts the streetscape with its height and vertical orientation of openings. The top floor should perhaps consist of a dormer within the roof.

The Committee and Commission approved the demolition of 208 Fitzwater Street several months ago. The owner has returned with a proposal for the new building at that site. The new 3-½-story house will have a granite base, white stucco front and a vertical emphasis in the fenestration.

Staff agreed that the design was too vertical and out of scale with the rest of the block. Neil Sandvold, architect for the project, stated that the house under construction next to this, facing 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, is four stories in height.

Mr. Baron also noted that the proposal includes new black, asphalt-fiberglass shingles on 210 Fitzwater. He said the shingles should mimic wood shakes and be in a weathered wood color. The owner, Michael Bitney, agreed.

*The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the weathered wood colored shingles on 210 Fitzwater and the new building as designed at 208 Fitzwater Street, with staff to review details.*

lms

**1524 North 16<sup>th</sup> Street**

Templetown Properties II, Owner

Jonathan Weiss, Developer

DATE: 1882-86

PROPOSAL: Window replacement

The proposal involves legalizing some aluminum one over one windows on the barely visible side and rear of this long abandoned house. The window frames remain. The staff recommended approval.

Mr. Baron noted that Jonathan Weiss, the owner, has restored several buildings in the area for market-rate housing. On this building, he proposes to install wood windows on the front façade to match the originals. On the slightly visible side and rear elevation, Mr. Weiss has installed aluminum sash in the original wood frames.

*The Architectural Committee voted to recommend legalizing the aluminum sash.*

lms

**411 Manheim Street, Germantown Cricket Club**

Germantown Cricket Club, Owner

Van M. Potteiger, Architect

DATE: 1890-1891, 1902, 1907

PROPOSAL: Skylight and roof replacement

The proposal involves re-roofing a formerly glass roofed structure with corrugated fiberglass. The current fiberglass roof has worn out.

Staff recommendation: Needs photos to assess former appearance.

This building originally had a glass roof to allow natural light onto the courts. In 1978, the glass was replaced with corrugated fiberglass reinforced panels. Those panels have now failed and the roof is leaking. The owner wishes to replace the panels in kind. The Committee asked about the cost of installing glass and the life-cycle costs of glass versus fiberglass. Mr. Baron noted that the replacement of the fiberglass with fiberglass could be seen as analogous to the replacement of an asphalt shingle roof with asphalt shingles that the Commission currently allows. Since the Cricket Club already removed the glass in 1978 and it would be prohibitively expensive to re-install it, the Committee and Commission could approve the fiberglass panels.

*The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval.*

lms

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes  
Executive Secretary