

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

**Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Commission Offices, One Parkway, 13th Floor, 1515 Arch Street
26 February 2002**

Present

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

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

Also

Sam Harris, Sam Harris and Company
Sally Elk, Eastern State Penitentiary
Sheth Jones, Capitol Programs Office
Michael Gresko, KSK
John Milner, John Milner Architects
Christopher Anderson, Starmark Group
Jeffrey L. Grogan, , Jeffry L. Grogan Architects
Michael Mulhern, Apple Roofing
Theresa Stuhlman, Fairmount Park Commission
Paul Calvert, Calvert Architects
Audrey Cooper,
Lene Copeland, Michael Shannon Designs
Jamie Swidler, Michael Shannon Designs
Joel Goldstein, J.R. Goldstein Architects
Scott G. Humel
Anthony Ciocca, ToryPete Construction Management Company
Carol and William Menke, Menke and Menke Landscape Architects
Carl Freedman, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects
Judith Eden, Center City Residents Association
Rachel S. Schade, Schade and Bolender Architects
Fredda Lippes, Capital Programs Office
Carol Gangewere, Capitol Programs Office
Wendy Rosen, 1830 Rittenhouse Square
Richard Walker, Architect
Daniel S. Traub, Architect, 1704 Walnut Street
Avi Miller
Peter Miller

Mary Ellen Strain
 Frank Kakos, 1920 Waverly Street
 Marc Ginsburg
 Patrick Dewey, 2nd and Lombard Streets
 Jerry Roller, J.K. Roller Architects
 Jose Hernandez, J.K. Roller Architects
 Steven Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
 Joseph Alteari, 215 Lombard Street
 Frances Morley, 2103 Clay Street, 2102 Mt. Vernon Street
 Lorna Katz Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association
 Joseph Barber, 33 North 3rd Street, Unit 4
 Mary Patel, 33 North 3rd Street, Unit 4
 Mia Chomitz, Society Hill Civic Association
 Babette Snyder, owner of 234 Pine Street
 Kiki Bolender, Schade and Bolender Architects
 David Amburn, Amburn/Jarosinski Architects
 David W. O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighbors Association
 John Sherick, Queen Village Neighbors Association
 Richard Cove
 Neesa and Virgil Procaccino, 532 Spruce Street
 Thomas F. Zimmerman, Contractor, 173 Monroe Street
 Paul Steinke, Reading Terminal Market
 Peter Saylor, Dagit Saylor Architects
 Michael Lane, Hillspring Landscaping Architects
 Joanne Aitken, Dagit Saylor Architects
 Brenda Loewen, University of Pennsylvania

Vincent Rivera, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:45 a.m.

2101-2199 Fairmount Avenue, Eastern State Penitentiary

City of Philadelphia, Owner
 Sally Elk, Applicant
 DATE: 1823-36, John Havilland, Architect
 PROPOSAL: New roofing on rotunda and links

This application involves roofing and repair of masonry walls on the link structures and rotunda. Eastern State Historic Site has raised \$1,000,000 to fund these repairs. The proposal calls specifically for building a new higher roof for the intersection of links 2, 2N and 10. The reason for this is that two wing links were added onto original link 2, which destroyed the structural integrity and rain shedding ability of the original design. The masonry walls supporting the roofing structures as well as decorative corbelling will be restored. The metal roofs on links 2, 4,5,6,10 and the rotunda will be rebuilt and covered with standing or flat seam metal and painted. Plans call for stabilization of link 3S and covering the skylights with protective boxes.

Staff recommendation: Approval per Standards 6

Mr. Baron acknowledged the absence of a quorum and gave the applicant the option of hearing her proposal at a later time. Sally Elk, Sam Harris and Sheth Jones attended the meeting and were all in agreement about proceeding without a quorum present. Mr. Baron explained the project and

said the need for the repair is prompted by the deterioration owing to water infiltration. Mr. Baron raised the question of standing seam versus flat seam roofs.

Ms. Elk explained that some of the walls will need rebuilding owing to the rafters penetrating into them. She also noted that shoring exists although not visible, to keep the skylight from falling through. In response to the question of standing or flat seams, she said that some of the links have flat seams; however, a consult with the contractor is needed to determine the exact type. Ms. Elk noted that standing seams are more appropriate for the longer links because they rise sufficiently and give more protection against the stone wall. Mr. Harris stated that the roof is technically rubber with decorative metal on the top. Ms. Elk explained the approach for the links with the original plaster, which will remove the damaged area from the top and preserve as much interior plaster below for documentation. She noted that funding is made possible through grants and the City of Philadelphia.

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

1936 Wallace Street

Spring Garden Limited Housing Partners, Owners

John Gibbons, Architect

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: New front façade

This application calls for the demolition of a stuccoed, damaged brick façade and the reconstruction of a new brick façade using a different brick and joint profile. The drawing does not show the windows or door correctly; however, it calls for new two-over-two windows and paneled door to match the adjacent house. The door surround will be a simplified design in cast stone and the marble will be cleaned of paint. New limestone sills and lintels will replace the marble ones where those cannot be reused.

Staff recommendation: Approval per *Restoration Standards* with closer replication of details and materials, and with details reviewed by the staff. The drawings should be revised and details provided by the architect.

Mr. Baron reiterated the absence of a quorum and gave the applicant the option of hearing his proposal at a later time, but the applicant decided to proceed.

Michael Gresko attended the meeting to explain the project. Mr. Gresko said that he proposes to take a mold from 1934 Wallace Street using a cast stone material and recreate a new door surround. He noted that the brickwork will differ because it is not the exact size and it will have a wider joint. He said that the original mortar was white in color; however, he proposes a red mortar, which will minimize the visibility of the joint.

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

57 Summit Street, corner of Prospect Street

Malcom Sheppard, Owner

Chariss McAfee, Architect

DATE: c. 1854

PROPOSAL: Cut new windows and doors, side and rear facades

The proposal, revised since last month, now calls for cutting a window into a double door leading out to the terrace and a window in the kitchen ell. Staff recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Baron reiterated the absence of a quorum giving the applicant the option of having her proposal heard at a later time. Chariss McAfee, the architect, attended the meeting and opted to proceed without a quorum. Mr. Baron explained this project which is being revisited with changes that reflect the Committee's recommendations.

Ms. McAfee noted that the revised drawings include a new two-leaf wood door with a simple frame. In addition, the new window will have a full screen.

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

Livezey Lane Fairmount Park, Livezey House, Glen Fern

City of Philadelphia, Owner

John Milner, Architect

DATE: c. 1750

PROPOSAL: Drainage/structural repairs

This proposal calls for site work to help drain water away from the building, including building a new retaining wall behind the building and installing drains in existing walls, and restoration of windows that have received water damage.

Staff Recommendation: Approval per site guideline with staff to review details.

Mr. Baron explained the project and noted the absence of a quorum and gave the applicant the option of having the proposal heard at a later time; however, the applicant opted to proceed without the presence of a quorum.

John Milner, the architect, attended the meeting and presented color photographs of the area. He stated that the house is built right up against an embankment. He proposes minimal regrading to direct the water away from the house. Mr. Milner noted that the proposed retaining wall is a new feature and that the existing wall is merely a portion of a wall. He also said that the downspout water collects in one location thus causing a large amount of deterioration.

Ms. Spina inquired about the pointing, and the architect responded that the lower portion of the wall will get pointing to match the original pointing. Ms. Pentz questioned work to the rafter system and if the roof has to be taken off for re-roofing, the response was that the roofing structural work will be done from the interior.

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

4415 Main Street, NE corner of Gay Street

Christopher Anderson, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1825

PROPOSAL: Cut new side storefront window

This proposal calls for cutting a storefront window into the Gay Street elevation of this corner building at the first floor. Staff recommendation: Approval.

Christopher Anderson and Jeffrey L. Grogan attended the meeting. Mr. Anderson expressed that he proposes to cut the window the same size as the existing front window and replicate the window across Gay Street.

Mr. Pentz questioned if there was evidence of a window ever existing in this location and the applicant responded in the negative.

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

1909,1913,1915,1925,1930,1931,1934,2021,2032 Mt. Vernon Street**1908,1912,1914,1916,1920,1930,1932,1934 Wallace Street****619,626,628,630,634 North 18th Street**

Spring Garden Limited Housing Partners, Owners

Michael Gresko, Architect

DATE: c. 1865

PROPOSAL: Masonry coating of marble

This proposal calls for coating the marble bases, door surrounds and lintels and sill of these rowhouses with the Thorocoat system because many of them were previously painted and the paint removal has not met expectations and appear splotchy.

Staff recommendation: Denial/Approval per Standard 7, depending upon the condition of the marble in each case, with staff to review details.

Michael Gresko attended the meeting and stated that his intent is for color consistency through out the many properties. He also said that varying degrees of conditions exists within the many properties thus establishing that some may need coating while others may not.

Mr. Baron noted that the paint removal has damaged the marble and he thought that sanding the marble a better solution to remove the paint and return the marble to a smoother finish.

McCoubrey stated that coating the marble requires on going maintenance and the Thoro-Coat system leaves a coating with a sandy texture unlike marble. He stated his preference for a low pressure abrasive system such as Gomage used on City Hall or JOSS System which his firm used successfully on the marble at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

The applicant agreed to do samples for the staff to review for a determination of the best possible way to proceed.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal as submitted, but recommended other options for the applicant to explore with staff to review and approve method.

1614 North Street

Michael Treacy, Owner

James Treacy, Applicant

DATE: c. 1865

PROPOSAL: New garage doors

This proposal involves removing a side swing door that was approved by the Committee and Commission as a reconstruction of an existing historic door and replacing it with a sectional roll up garage door. The applicant has concerns about security with the glazing and convenience.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standard 9 The new reconstructed doors can be used and made more secure with internal bars if necessary.

Paul Calvert attended the meeting to represent the owner and stated his main issue is the ease of operation of the doors. He noted that a four-sectioned door requires heavy horizontals and that a safety issue exists. However, Mr. Calvert said that he is agreeable to redesigning the door to mimic better the original.

Alan Rubin, Spring Garden Civic Association, expressed concern about the doors opening outwardly owing to the threat to pedestrians and also noted that a side swinging electric door gets easily out of alignment.

Ms. Pentz stated that the approved door should be based on the historic design. Mr. Rivera stressed the importance of keeping the proportions of the previously approved door. Mr. McCoubrey suggested a single split door if possible and thought that the applicant should research an operator for a bi-fold type door.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial as submitted but recommended that the applicant explore other options which retain the proportions of the historic doors.

1912-14 Brandywine Street

Elizabeth Osborne, Owner

Lene Copeland, Architect

DATE: c. 1910

PROPOSAL: New garage doors

This proposal calls for the removal of the historic garage doors and their replacement with new roll up sectional garage doors of a different design.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standard 9. The existing doors should be restored to swing out.

Audrey Cooper, Jamie Swidler and Lene Copeland attended the meeting to explain the proposal. Ms. Copeland stated that the existing bollards on the outside interrupt the outward swing of the door. The applicant stated that the fascia and hoist beam will remain.

Ms. Pentz noted that with the existence of the hoist beam with the steel cross header, the door cannot be made operable. Mr. Rivera thought a re-proportioned door with more glass more appropriate than the proposed design. Ms. Spina said that thinning out the vertical element would make the door read as horizontal. Mr. McCoubrey said that he had concern about the large fascia above the door which he thought could be revised to read as a transom with glass or wood panels.

The applicant requested the approval of an exterior light fixture and Committee members recommended that the applicant submit a catalogue cut to staff for approval.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial as submitted but gave the applicant guidance for other options.

627-37 North 18th Street, NE corner North Street

Carriage House Condo Association, Owner

J. R. Goldstein, Applicant

DATE: c. 1886

PROPOSAL: New skylight

This proposal calls for erecting a pyramidal skylight over the internal lightwell. The free-standing structure will sit on a metal raised curb. An additional air-conditioning unit and vents will also be installed on the roof; however, the many existing units and four large penthouse additions will hide most of these. The proposal also includes a new fresh air intake louver on the rear (Bouvier Street) façade, in an existing opening and painted to match the surrounding trim.

Staff recommendation: Approval, per Standards 9 and the roofing guideline.

Joel Goldstein and Scott G. Hummel attended the meeting. Mr. Goldstein stated that the proposed skylight will provide a weathertight environment. The skylight will allow natural light into courtyard space. The skylight itself would affect the interior walls owing to its being free moving. In addition, the skylight's perimeter curve will evacuate the air by a mechanical louver system and smoke evacuation system powered by a backup generator. Mr. Goldstein proposes minimal visibility for the skylight with a minimal amount of tinting to obscure sunlight.

Ms. Pentz questioned the truss structure, which is the core of the courtyard and the makeup of the wall, which is stucco with new trusses at the same elevation. The applicant proposes a rigid structure of a heavy timber, which would be used for lighting around the building, consisting of only two trusses. Ms. Pentz also questioned if the cornice details will be removed and the applicant stated that the columns will interrupt the cornice. However, half-round columns exist but keeping the character of the building requires full columns. Mr. McCoubrey thought that the new trusses should not mimic the original but should be a modern design with the columns pulled away from the wall. Whether the columns should go into the building can be determined once the work is underway. Mr. Rivera said that since the skylight holds up itself, he thought that too many columns exist and that the window pattern does not allow for the columns. In addition, the columns should go diagonally with the trusses and since the skylight is not an object, the truss will act as a rigid frame to stabilize the skylight. Ms. Spina thought that since the penthouses are a brick color, the preferred color of sandstone would minimize the columns and lessens the impact on the building.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with a sandstone color and the staff to review details.

2057 Brandywine Street

Dermott McCartan, Owner

Larry Persofsky, Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Rear windows and deck

The application includes new rear one-over-one windows on the three floors of the main building and a new door on the third floor leading to a deck on the roof of the two-story addition.

Staff recommendation: Approval per Standard 9.

Ms. Spina explained the project which the Committee thought appropriate owing to its limited visibility.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

2025-29 Chestnut Street, Mid-city YWCA, Friere Charter School

Redevelopment Authority, Owner

Carl Freedman, Architect

DATE: 1923

PROPOSAL: Awning and sign on Ranstead Street façade

This building returns to the Committee and Commission with changes to the proposed awning on the rear of the building. Committee previously questioned the design of the awning and its placement below the fire balcony at the 2nd floor. The application now calls for the fabric awning to be attached to the fire balcony. A new sign, with individual aluminum letters will hang from the awning skeleton and a new banner will attach to the fire balcony.

Staff recommendation: Approval, per Standards 9 and 10.

Carl Freedman, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Freedman stated that the structure would attach to the balcony raising the awning's height out of the reach of students and the awning material is changed to a sunbrella fabric. The awning would be held up with tubular steel and steel plates members bracketed off the wall. In addition, signage will be included on the awning as well as a banner installed perpendicular to the street. The applicant also proposes to paint the bricks in the rear to enhance the appearance of this very dark alley like street. His choice of colors for the awning and banner was directly influenced by the need to give some brightness to the proposed location. The applicant plans to mount lights beneath the canopy.

Mr. McCoubrey questioned the oversized brackets and Mr. Freedman responded that durability is an issue. Committee members thought awning appropriate; however, they recommended a color in the green range or some other contrasting color.

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

1800 Walnut Street, Rittenhouse Square

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Carol Menke, Landscape architect

DATE: 1913, Paul Philippe Cret, architect

PROPOSAL: New paving

Through the center of Rittenhouse Square, the existing paving, installed in 1975, is made of tan brick pavers framed by poured concrete strips. The concrete has a large amount of aggregate, providing a contrast to the brick in color and texture. The proposal calls for removing the concrete strips and installing ironspot brick pavers in a dark-black color.

Staff recommendation: The proposal has insufficient information. The applicant should submit a sample of the proposed brick pavers as well as photographs showing the proposed pavers alongside the present tan brick paving. Also, information on Cret's original plan and any information he had for paving would prove helpful. One staff member thought that the difference in texture between the concrete and the brick should be retained and could not be replicated with new brick pavers.

Fredda Lippes and Carol Gangewere from the Capitol Programs Office and Carol and William Menke, the landscaping architects, attended the meeting. Mr. Menke showed illustrations of the 1913 Cret plan, the 1960s Cret plan and George Pattens plan of replacing with brick and concrete strips with granite block at edges with concrete. Mr. Menke stated that he proposes to replace the concrete strips with pavers because of the poor condition of the concrete and its susceptibility to damage from the trucks, which bring equipment to the park for concerts and other events. He noted that more deterioration occurs with the removal of portions of the strips for repair. He noted additional issues with the subbase.

Ms. Spina informed the Committee that this additional information was presented after the packets were sent out. Samples of the proposed brick and granite block was displayed. The applicant emphasized the difficulty in blending the tan color with the gray granite and also noted the importance of repair and maintenance. The proposed bricks are slip resistant with a clean edge which match the eighteen inch strip perfectly. Ms. Gangewere thought that too many types of bricks were proposed for use. Mr. Harris reiterated that the same paving material was used at the Rittenhouse Hotel.

Ms. Spina noted that Cret used concrete, and the applicant responded that the concrete cracks which allows water to infiltrate and the replacement panels are half the thickness. Mr. McCoubrey expressed concern about the variation in colors of the brick and it was noted that the processing gives a stronger brick but the color is darker. He also thought that a range of bricks should be displayed at the Square as a sample to be reviewed by staff.

Judith Eden, Center City Residents' Association, said that the concrete ribbons are a design defect and the spot repairs deteriorate the ribbon, inducing a need for additional repairs.

Fredda Lippes, Capitol Programs Office, stated that the bricks help water to percolate in the ground.

The Committee thought that a mock-up for review by staff and some of the Committee members could best resolve the issue at hand.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the change from concrete to brick system, but thought the color and uniformity should be reviewed by staff for details.

1830 Rittenhouse Square, Unit 15A, SE corner of 19th Street

Paul Rosen, Owner

Rachel Simmons Schade, Architect

DATE: 1913, Frederick Webber, architect

PROPOSAL: New windows, relocate air conditioning units

This proposal is for a condominium unit on the 15th floor, which wraps around the north façade and incorporates the first three bays of the east and west façades. The window pattern of the building includes bays that have Palladian windows, large double-hung windows with semi-circular transoms flanked by thin double-hung windows. Stone mullions separate all elements. For the central window on the north façade, the design has a coupled double-hung window, separated by wood mullion, flanked by double-hung windows of equal size, separated by stone mullions. The proposal calls for the rehabilitation of the 14 flanking double-hung windows and restoration of the double-leaf door leading out onto the western balcony. For the central windows in each bay, the owner wishes to remove the double-hung windows and install large picture windows. The proposal also calls for removing the central, coupled window and installing a large picture window. Finally, the proposal asks for the HVAC units to be relocated to the fire escape balcony on the east façade.

Staff recommendation: Approval, with staff to review details, of the restoration of the double-leaf door, per entrance guideline. Approval of the rehabilitation of the double-hung windows, per window guideline. Approval of moving the HVAC units, per mechanical systems guideline. Denial of the picture windows, per Standards 2 and 5.

Rachel Schade, the architect, attended the meeting and stated that the windows are badly deteriorated. She proposes to replace the center window with a bay window and replace the western most set of double hung windows. Ms. Schade cited the replacement of the double-hung windows on the 14th floor; however, Ms. Spina researched these windows and found that owing to extenuating circumstances concerning the violation and ownership the casements were replaced. Mr. Baron also noted that previous applications have been denied for this same type of proposal.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that this is a precedent issue for windows.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the following:

1. *Restoration of the double-leaf door,*
2. *Rehabilitation of the double hung windows, and*
3. *Placement of the HVAC units with the staff to review all details..*

In addition the Architectural Committee recommended denial of the picture windows per Standards 2 and 5.

1822 Delancey Street

Daniel Berger, Owner

David Traub, Architect

DATE: c.1855

PROPOSAL: Partial demolition and new addition on rear

The proposal calls for the removal of an original three-story rear ell and the construction of a two-story rear addition that has a garage at the lower level, a large kitchen on the first floor and a small room on the second floor leading to a new roof terrace with a pergola.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standards 2, 5 and 9.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal and noted that early maps show that the rear ell is original to the building.

Daniel Berger, the owner, and David Traub, the architect attended the meeting. Mr. Traub explained that the rear ell is a tower of three stories and that the space which extends from the landing is difficult to utilize. He said that only 14% of the building is being demolished and plans to mirror 1820 Delancey Street with identical window patterns and refine the many variations of the addition. In addition, he said that the kitchen is out of proportion to the house size, and he also proposes a two-car garage below grade. Mr. Berger stated that only one structure is being demolished, the rest is a 1920s addition. He also said that the ceiling and floors are inconsistent and that the tower of the rear ell consists of rooms between the floors, which are difficult to use and believes that the proposed alterations are an improvement. He vehemently stressed the need for off-street parking and that a negative decision would be inconsistent with the adjacent properties which are a mix of variations. He also intimated that a denial of the proposal will prompt him to reconsider the property. In addition, he refuses to redesign the house with the rear ell, with its retention the kitchen is severely affected. Mr. Traub stated that the demolition is needed to achieve a consistent look in the appearance of the rear.

Ms. Spina said that an 1862 map shows the rear ell original to the building. Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the total footage of the property. In response to the applicant's belief that the rear ell restricts light into the house, Mr. Levy stated that with the ell's removal will not ensure any more light. Some members were persuaded by the fact that Panama Street to the rear is an alley and the fact that a majority of the rear ell's have much larger rooms. Ms. Pentz suggested that the applicant keep the rear ell with a one-car garage.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial based on preservation of historic fabric and Standards 2, 5, and 9. Two members, Mr. Rivera and Mr. McCoubrey favored the proposal.

1619 Lombard Street

Ari Miller, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: Three-story rear addition

This proposal calls for construction of a three-story addition with rear deck. The proposal also calls for restoration of the front door and transom; however the proposed panels need to be altered somewhat in proportion.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the addition, with a slight reveal between the addition and the main building, per Standards 9 and 10. Approval of the door with staff to review details.

Richard Walker and Ari Miller, the owner, attended the meeting.

Committee members noted that the drawings show a gable roof, when in fact a half gable roof exists. The Committee also thought that the addition should have a reveal.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with the staff to review details, but requested revised drawings to include a reveal and the half gabled roof.

1920 Waverly Street

John and Barbara Ramb, Owners

Frank Kakos, Applicant

DATE: c. 1865

PROPOSAL: New electric meter

This proposal calls for the legalization of the installation of an enlarged electrical box and meter on the front of the building. Other houses on the block have small meters, as did this one. With remote reading it is now possible for the meter to be placed internally; however, the owners want it on the outside to save space. Staff recommendation: Denial per Standard 9.

Frank Kakos attended the meeting and stated that the upgrade in the electric service required a larger meter which is partially hidden by the closed shutters. The applicant said that the owner does not wish to put the meter on the inside.

Mr. Baron suggested putting the meter on the inside possibly at the bottom of a bookshelf, that is adjacent to the front wall but the applicant stated that a three foot zone is need for its maintenance.

Committee members said that since a new box is only a little bit larger, they thought that the existing box could remain. However, members thought that the staff should consult with the electric company to see if a meter can be put inside for future applications for similar proposals. Mr. Baron said that he knows from his own house that they can be put inside and read remotely.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with the painting of the meter red.

2220 Delancey Street

Don Bleznak, Owner

Mary Ellen Strain, Architect

DATE: c. 1877 for William Weightman

PROPOSAL: New windows and decks

The proposal calls for new windows on the rear of the property and two roof decks. This three-story house has a two-story rear bay. The owners wish to install a deck on the roof of the bay and enlarge a third floor window into a double-leaf door leading out the deck. The application also has a roof deck on the main building, but set back from the front façade.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the roof deck on the main building, per roof guideline, approval of the deck on the rear bay per same guideline; approval of a single-leaf door to the deck, kept at the same width as the historic window opening.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval subject to the rear window/door opening not being widened and the staff to review details.

7 Loxley Court

Don and Hilka Frankenfeld, Owners

Mary Ellen Strain, Architect

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Rear additions

This application calls for a large clapboard addition on the rear of 7 Loxley Court, which consists of two smaller houses previously combined into one residence. The footprint of the addition is wider than the historic building at the first floor, allowing that portion to be visible from the historic courtyard. The roofline of the proposed addition is a gable that above the historic roof.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the addition with several provisions, the footprint of the first floor should match the above floors and stand hidden behind the historic building and the roof line of the addition should be a shed roof that sits below the historic roofline, per Standards 9 and 10.

The architect explained that the higher roofline houses the elevator machinery and he thought it would not be visible from Loxley Court. He said that the first floor of the addition contains the entry and the dining room and that this would be too small if set behind the existing house.

Mr. Baron explained that Loxley Court is an ensemble unique in the City, which should not be compromised with modern intrusions.

Committee members thought that perhaps the addition could be set back a little further such that it did not engage and project out from the rear corner of the building. They also recommended that the entrance wall be redesigned to look like a brick garden fence wall with a vertical board fence gate. They said that the new design should be faxed around to them for their comments.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of a revised design that sets the west entry wall further back, and takes the appearance of a brick garden wall with wood gate.

209 Cuthbert Street, aka 51-55 Little Boys Way

Marie Ginsburg, Owner

Jerry Roller, Architect

DATE: c. 1870

PROPOSAL: New entrance, canopy and sign

This proposal calls for a new metal front door, four-panel sidelight, canopy and signage on this industrial building. That bay of the building was previously substantially altered to create the entrance and now contains a flush metal door.

Staff recommendation: Approval per Standard 9.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

215 Lombard Street aka 420-434 South 2nd Street

Steve Marsh, Cosi, Incorporated, Owner

Joseph Alteari, Architect

DATE: 1977, Leatherbee Associates, architects

PROPOSAL: Exhaust vent and illuminated signage

This application stems from the transition of the space from an XandO to a Cosi restaurant. The owner wishes to install a vent in the transom of one of the windows and shorten the awning to expose the vent. Also, the application includes two new plastic internally lit box signs at the corner of the building.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the vent per Standard 9. The architect should try to connect the exhaust system to the vent in the next opening. Denial of the sign, as proposed, per Standard 9.

The applicant explained that they could extend the awning in front of the vent to help hide it but that they could not use the vent next door because it is entirely used by a cleaners.

Staff explained that back lit plastic box signs are not typically approved on historic buildings.

The Committee recommended using either the plastic cut out letters with the bottom portion of the sign to use cream colored plastic or for the whole sign to use halo lit letters.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of allowing the vent set above a new horizontal muntin with a full width canvas like awning, and the sign with punch through letters above modified with cream colored plastic on the bottom, or halo lit metal letters.

33 North 3rd Street, corner of Filbert Street

Joseph Barber, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Roof deck, HVAC, stairhouse

This application calls for a roof deck surrounding a barrel-vault skylight. The access to the deck will be through a one-story stair penthouse at the northeast corner of the roof. An existing elevator tower stands at the southeast corner. The roof deck will be set back fifteen feet from the front wall of the building and over 2-½ feet from the parapet walls at the sides. Sight-line photographs show minimal visibility from 3rd Street.

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

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal.

116-18 Chestnut Street

116-18 Chestnut Street, LP, Owners

Joel Spivak, Applicant

DATE: c. 1905

PROPOSAL: Cutting new side windows on floors 3 through 6, close window openings and cut new window openings on rear façade

The Committee and Commission previously approved new window openings on the west façade of the 2nd floor, on the condition that they be coupled one-over-one windows. The applicant returns for new window openings on the same façade for the upper floors; however, the application is for large picture windows coupled with single casement windows. The application also calls for closing ten window openings on the rear property with brick, cutting new openings and installing coupled one-over-one windows and installing a new rear door with staircase and overhang. The proposal also includes a new blade sign on the Chestnut street façade.

Staff recommendation: Approval of new window openings, per window guideline, but not the pattern. The windows should match the coupled design that the Committee and Commission approved for the 2nd floor. Approval of the rear alterations, if the new closed areas keep a reveal to show the historic openings, per window guideline.

The Committee recommended acceptance of the window pattern provided that all the casements were changed to one over one double hung windows. The applicant noticed that the architect had failed to show a large number of windows toward the front of the building that he wishes to cut. The drawing also showed a new stair house for the roof which he said would not be at the visible front of the building as shown, but rather at the rear. The Committee recommended that the applicant have the drawings revised to show what was really being proposed and return.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal as drawn with the understanding that it would be resubmitted.

234 Pine Street

Harvey and Babs Snyder, Owners

David Amburn, Architect

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: Rear and side partial demoliton/additions

This proposal returns to Committee with several revisions. The application no longer calls for an addition in the piazza of the house. The rear addition, although the same on the first floor as previously proposed, now calls for the demolition of more historic fabric on the second floor, building a new rear wall in brick projected out several feet more. The applicant researched the history of the building, and says the addition dates to 1935.

Staff recommendation: Denial, per Standards 2, 9 and 10 Although the rear addition may date to 1935, it is more than 50 years old and is in keeping with the historic rear ell, retaining the correct roofline and window configuration.

Babette Snyder, the owner, and David Amburn, the architect, attended the meeting. Ms. Snyder canvassed her neighbors and presented written support of the revised proposal, in addition she presented renderings of the proposed addition. The renderings include a sunscreen addition which

she believes is an improvement. The addition is at the same plain as the neighboring house with the building up of the brick construction to hide the air conditioning units. She also noted that she has as of right zoning approval for the proposed addition. Ms. Snyder noted the varied architectural features such as the 1978 window openings, the rear door as well as the windows along the sides. The applicant researched other options for the design, such as rebuilding as a flat roof to accommodate the air conditioning units or retaining the existing roofline breaking the plain with wood balustrades. Ms. Snyder claimed that the rear addition dated to 1935, unfortunately the information was not legible.

Ms. Spina thought that by keeping the wall at the same plain with the retention of the window, light would still filter in. She thought the window's removal will remove an excessive amount of historic fabric.

The Committee questioned the removal of historic fabric with the replacement in a modern material, because the material is not in character with the historic features. Some Committee members thought the first floor alterations acceptable owing to being hidden by the wall. It thought the cornice should have continuity with the retention of the corner and cornice line, that the historic fabric should be retained, and maintain the center windows as well as the sloping roofline.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial as submitted per Standards 2, 9 and 10, but offered the applicant suggestions for the revised design.

242 South 3rd Street

Robert Bury, Owner

Kiki Bolender, Architect

DATE:

PROPOSAL: HVAC on roof, light over the front door

This application calls for a new HVAC unit on the third floor of the highly visible rear ell of this building. Staff previously approved the unit in a non-visible location, but the contractor prefers this site. In addition, the applicant proposes a light over the front door.

Staff recommendation: Denial, per roof guideline. Staff split on the light. One staff member thought that the light should be installed in the brick next to the door; other staff members preferred the proposed location.

Kiki Bolender, the architect, attended the meeting and stated that if the unit is placed on the low roof, the unit would run more, using more energy and noise. She noted that visibility is limited from a public court, and there would be no visibility from the Powell House, the park or from the north. She also intimated that a neighboring house has a unit in the same proposed location. In addition, Ms. Bolender requested approval of an intercom in the stone jam.

Lorna Katz Lawson apprised the Committee that the fore mentioned units were installed before the designation of the district and were grandfathered.

The Committee thought the 2nd floor location a more appropriate location.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the light on the transom bar of the door and the intercom in the stone jamb, but denied the HVAC placement on the visible roof location.

229 Fitzwater Street

Virgil and Norma Procaccino, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1859, new façade, c. 1950

PROPOSAL: Complete demolition and new construction

The owner wishes to demolish this building as well as the garage next door (231 Fitzwater) and erect two new townhouses. 231 Fitzwater is not on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

The application for demolition makes no claim for economic hardship. The application for new construction is incomplete and lacking elevations and a new site plan.

Staff recommendation: Denial, per Standards 2, 5, and 10.

Virgil and Norma Procaccino, the owners, attended the meeting. She also noted that she was not informed of the historic status prior to the purchase of the house. Ms. Procaccino questioned the alterations to the façade. She stated that the larger windows are for aesthetic reasons will allow more light infiltration. Their design intent is to integrate a mix of styles in the façade.

David O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighbors Association, spoke on behalf of the association and reiterated its opposition to the demolition and expressed its desire that for the restoration of the property. Staff explained how the façade could be restored possibly using tax credits.

The architectural Committee recommended denial of the demolition per Standards 2, 5, and 10.

143 Monroe Street

Elizabeth St. John, Owner

Thomas Zimmerman, Applicant

DATE: c. 1800; brick cornice, c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Legalize removal of brickwork and installation of new copper cornice

This early house had a corbelled brick cornice installed in the mid-19th century. In 1980 the Commission approved the removal of the brick cornice and the restoration of the earlier wood cornice. That work never commenced. In 2001 a new contractor received a new permit for roofing without cornice work, but installed a metal cornice that does not match the earlier approved wood cornice or the later brick one. This application calls for the legalization of the installed metal cornice.

Staff recommendation: Denial, per roof guidelines. There's no historic basis for the metal cornice. The contractor should install a wood cornice similar to what was previously approved.

Thomas Zimmerman and Elizabeth St. John attended the meeting. Mr. Zimmerman said that the ledge rotted out which rendered the brickwork at the front unstable. He stated that he tried to follow the scare on the wall to put back something appropriate.

Mr. Baron stated that the approved roofing application specified no copper on the cornice

The Architectural Committee recommended denial as submitted but approval of adding a wood cornice with the staff to review details.

1115-45 Market Street, aka 51 North 12th Street, Reading Terminal Headhouse

Pennsylvania Convention Center Authority, Owner

Paul Steinke, Applicant

DATE: 1891-93, Francis Kimball and Wilson Brothers, architects

PROPOSAL: Signage

This application calls for additional signage for the Reading Terminal Market, using the historic diamond-shaped logo. The proposal includes 8 new wall signs on various locations and six blade signs hanging on existing brackets. The market also wishes to replace the awnings over the four 12th Street doors, with the new awnings reading “Reading Terminal Market.”

Staff recommendation: Approval of the replacing the blade signs and the new awnings. Denial of the eight wall signs, per signage guideline.

Paul Steinke attended the meeting to answer questions and explain the project. He stated that three types of signage exist; however, the name only appears twice on all the facades. He proposes to restore the classic diamond sign at eye level for identification by pedestrians.

Mr. Tyler said that too much signage is overkill and thought that the wraparound sign is poorly designed. He also believes that the changing of the wording on the awnings and the replacement of the icons with signs is sufficient for pedestrian’s needs. Mr. Levy as well as other Committee members concurred.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the replacement awnings with the Reading Terminal Market logo and six blade signs to replace icons, but denial of the eight wall signs.

3260 South Street, University Museum

University of Pennsylvania, Owner

Joanne Aitkin, Architect

DATE: 1897-99, Wilson Eyre, Cope & Stewardson, Frank Miles Day, architects

Addition – 1971, Mitchell Guirgola, architects

Addition – 2001, Atkin Olshin Lawson-Bell, architects

PROPOSAL: New skylights, HVAC vents, new side door and rebuild garden

This complex proposal involves the ground and first floor plans of the museum. The original museum buildings do not have central HVAC systems. The proposal calls for creating a mechanical room and study facilities in the basement of the building, under the present garden area. Metal-framed skylights installed in the perimeter of the garden would provide the necessary light to these spaces. The installation of these rooms will require raising the entire garden area 8 to 12 inches above the current level. A new brick wall with marble coping will run along the edge of the skylights and new plantings will stand in front of the wall.

The new garden will match closely the original Italian-inspired design and will retain the elements of the pool, side lawns and brick paving. The original brick paving will be salvaged and restored, the marble coping will be replaced, owing to its deteriorated condition. The pool will be rebuilt; however, since the entrance at this level has become the main entrance of the building, the plans call for shortening the pool slightly and installing a small semi-circular feature facing the door.

The fresh air-intake and exhaust vents for the HVAC system will be placed in the areas between the landscaped garden and the bays of the wings. These will be minimally visible from the garden paths.

The final item is two new doors cut into window openings below grade, one the west elevation of the west wing one on the east elevation of the east wing. These doors will provide the necessary egress from the basement areas. On the west elevation, the existing areaway will have to be expanded slightly to accommodate the new door.

Staff recommendation: Approval, with staff to approve brick match, marble match and all other details, though staff questioned the noise level of the proposed vents and the need to replace all of the marble features of the pool.

Peter Saylor, Michael Lane, Brenda Loewen and Joanne Aitken attended the meeting to explain the proposal and to answer any necessary questions. Ms. Aitken said the proposal raises the garden from the existing plain six inches, the skylights would extend downward from the watertable and proportions of the pool will be shortened slightly. In addition, the height of the hedge will obscure the skylights, which will not change the existing appearance. She stated that the Cultural Resources Committee supports the concept; however it has concerns about the handicapped ramp which is only a sloping path without rails. In order to create an ADA entrance, the garden must be raised one step. The applicant proposes to reuse as much of the historic fabric as possible. The erection of a wall to prevent accidents to pedestrians becomes more visible with the garden on the top of the space.

Mr. Rivera cautioned that walkable grates and ample gutters are needed for maintenance. Committee members thought that the removal of a lot of foliage will maximize the light and have a great impact on the exterior. Mc Coubrey said that the wall is a new feature and should be stepped up at the end. The proposed lowering of the berm, should not extend any further than the end of the building changes the profile of the berm, but owing to the egress situation it is acceptable.

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

1428-34 Chestnut Street, aka 111 South 15th Street, Packard Building

Chest-Pac Associates, L.P., Owners

Anthony M. Ciocca, Applicant

DATE: 1922-24, Ritter & Shay, architects

PROPOSAL: New fire door on Chestnut Street

This proposal calls for a new fire egress on the Chestnut Street façade. Behind the historic ornate gates there is a recess of six feet to the actual front doors. The new fire door opening will be cut in the eastern concrete wall and the door itself setback approximately six inches from the face of the

wall. The door will be a flush metal door painted to match the concrete. The historic gate will help screen the new door.

Staff Recommendation: Approval.

Anthony Ciocca, Joe Grasso, John Partridge and Tuong Huyn attended the meeting. Mr. Ciocca said that the door would be cut through a concrete reveal and painted to match the concrete with the bi-fold gates acting as a screen to limit visibility.

Mr. Levy inquired about the removal of the grates on the lower window and if their whereabouts are known.

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

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary