

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

**Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Commission Offices, One Parkway, 13th Floor, 1515 Arch Street
28 August 2001**

Present

Vincent Rivera, Chair
Rudolph D'Alessandro
Daniel McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Julianne L. Brennan, Historic Preservation Planner
Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Also

William G. Dorsey, 131 Bainbridge Street
Joel Spivak, 616 Carpenter Street
Susan Milner, Jefferson Hospital
Dan Vallieri, Jefferson Hospital
Henry Stirman
William Kerr, Esq.
Sabrina Soong, Soong Associates
Charles Datner
Dennis and Joan Hummel
Joseph Beller, Esq.
Brett Feldman, Esq.
Steve Roberts
Michelle Wright
Cory and Aimie Hunnicut
Rudolph Ponzio
Nicholas Aloï, Jr.
Richard and Margaret Ullman
Carl Primavera, Esq.
Eric Leighton
Cecil Baker, Cecil Baker Associates
Jay Cramner
Barbara and Thomas Holland
Hugh Zimmers
Maksym Szpilczak
Tina Rocha
Thea Raison
Rosa Myers
Crisante Ianni
Bin Dang
William McDowell
James Price
Michael Ytterberg

Mike Allen, Alliant Energy-Cogenex
Bob Dick, WJTCE
Yuly Vinogradov, Alliant Energy-Cogenex

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:05 a.m.

233 South 24th Street

Henry Stirman, Owner
Sabrina Soong, Architect
DATE: c. 1840
PROPOSAL: Legalize/cure addition

This proposal seeks to legalize or cure a violation for the construction of a three-story visible addition at the rear of this half gable row house. Both the Committee and Commission voted to deny the legalization at a previous meeting. The Committee previously advised the applicant to consider creating a greater setback from the side wall, changing the direction of the rear roof pitch and possibly removing the vinyl windows. The applicant proposes to retain the location of the side wall because the internal placement of the stair makes it expensive to rebuild, but in two of the options proposes to cure the violation with a change to the roof of the rear addition. Plans show two variations: the existing roof altered with a notch over the stair showing a transverse slope, and a completely re-framed roof sloped from north to south. The applicant proposes to retain the vinyl windows with a code variance.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the retention of the existing building setback subject to the construction of a fully re-framed roof over the rear addition. The staff again split on the issue of vinyl windows in the rear addition.

Henry Stirman, William Kerr, Esq. and Sabrina Soong attended the meeting to explain the project. The applicant has submitted three options for the revised addition. Mr. Kerr said that the contractor is not willing to make substantial changes but will make minor changes to respect the historic features of the building. Ms. Soong, the architect, thought the change to the roofline would have minimal impact and to make changes would mean the removal of the whole roof. This would entail the raising of the north end of the roof, which is now lower.

Committee members still took issue with doing the work without a permit. Mr. Tyler suggested a compromise of retaining the present wall of the rear addition with a one-foot setback and differentiation of the stucco color. In addition, he suggested that this should be subject to treating the addition as a rear ell with a sloping roof which would allow for a viable use of the room space. Committee members agreed and discussed the material for the roof and the windows. The applicant explained that the number of windows will be less than shown. The Committee thought the addition should be expressed differently as architecture and the massing should be considered. Option #2 does not take into account the view from Locust Street. They concluded that option #3 better conforms to Standards 9 and 10.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of option #3 retaining the existing building's footprint subject to changing the framing of the roofline to slope from north to south, with the reduced number of vinyl windows on the addition.

1924-28 Delancey Street

Dennis Hummel, Owner

Charles Datner, Architect

DATE: c.1855 as dwellings; stables by 1875; residential c 1922

PROPOSAL: Alter façade, cut door and garage openings

The proposal calls for blocking up a door and part of a window and cutting a new entrance and garage door into the front wall of the building. The Commission reviewed a nearly identical proposal on the same building in September 1999 and rejected it.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standards 1, 2, 4 and 9.

Charles Datner, Joseph Beller, Esq., and Dennis and Joan Hummel attended the meeting. They explained that the previous application did not have their authorization. Mr. Datner expressed his client's need for a garage and said that the stucco defines the character of the building. In addition, he stated that the proposed openings will not change the building's character, and owing to the narrowness of the street, the proposal will have limited visibility. Ms. Hummel stated that the existing door is too narrow and therefore would need enlargement. She also presented photographs of the streetscape which shows the existence of other garage doors to further emphasize her desire for the garage.

Some Committee members questioned the date of the alterations. Mr. Baron stated that alterations can also add significance to a property as recognized by the Secretary of Interior Standards. Mr. Tyler said that other garages were grandfathered into the district, and that the building never looked like what is proposed.

Members believed that this is a principal façade, that the quality of the street experience is very important, and that the proposal would remove a great amount of historic fabric. Some members also thought that the buildings proportions would be interrupted with this proposal.

Judith Eden, Center City Residents' Association, spoke on its behalf and said that the Association did not take any position on the matter. In addition, she said that this building is a premier expression of the Arts and Crafts era and this street is a complex block that includes carriage houses converted into residential use with altering their essential character. Many of the carriage doors are not used for vehicles.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial per Standards 1, 2, 4 and 9.

1501-1509 Spruce Street, NW corner of 15th Street

Parkway Corporation, Owner

Brett Feldman, Esq., Applicant

DATE: 2001

PROPOSAL: Façade alterations and new building signage

This application calls for a restaurant storefront on the 15th Street façade of the newly constructed parking garage. Plans show replacing the existing glass façade with brick veneer and a stone base. The proposal includes two awnings of different shapes and patterns. Drawings show a red barrel fabric awning with a logo over the double entry doors facing 15th Street and a green striped shed awning over the façade's four windows. The proposal calls for illumination underneath both awnings. The applicant proposes a flower box under the fixed glass windows. Plans also have two concrete female statues, almost 7-feet tall, flanking the double entry doors. Finally, the design calls for a significant amount of signage on the restaurant's façade:

- a green neon sign above the windows;
- a large logo sign in both red and green neon and clear bulbs mounted on the brick and stretching almost 10-feet in length and over 5-feet in height, and
- a double-faced blade sign using both cream and red paint and flashing neon in red and green approximately 12-feet high and 4-feet wide.

Staff recommendation: The staff was split on a recommendation. Mr. Tyler recommended approval of the proposal while Ms. Brennan recommended the awning profiles match one another. Mr. Baron and Ms. Spina recommended denial and suggested retaining the glass façade.

Attorney Brett Feldman described the restaurant and its family style focus to the Committee. Michele Wright, of the restaurant Buca di Beppo, presented a perspective drawing to the Committee and reminded them of the restaurant's placement in a new parking garage—not in an old historic building. She also stated that both the Art Commission and the Center City Residents' Association approved of the façade, signage and awnings.

Mr. McCoubrey asked project designer Steve Roberts if the proposed brick veneer's shape imitated that of real brick. Mr. Roberts responded that it did and discussion ensued among Committee members regarding the awnings, which they agreed upon. Mr. Tyler reminded the Committee of the garage's non-contributing status and commented that the proposed façade begins the creation of a pedestrian rhythm to the street. Mr. Roberts concurred and stated that in his design, he tried to maintain a rhythm to the storefront. He indicated that he designed a pedestrian-friendly façade of a small scale to offset the restaurant's location in a large parking garage. Mr. McCoubrey applauded the façade commenting that stores in a parking garage need to obtain their own identity through variety. Attorney Ron Patterson added that as retail tenants of the garage occupy space, they will likely create their own unique façades, ultimately bringing a pedestrian scale to the streetscape.

Mr. Rivera disagreed with the Committee members and expressed his preference for a more consistent glass façade. He stated that there exists no transition between the glass focus of the garage and the solid storefront. Owing to the issue of the storefront's scale against the large garage, Mr. Rivera recommended denial of the proposed façade. Mr. Baron agreed and reminded the Committee members that by approving the proposed façade, the design of the garage and its consistency in glass would be lost.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposed façade, awnings, signage and statues by a vote of three to one. Mr. Rivera recommended denial.

JLB

1913 Pine Street

Cory Hunnicut, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1870

PROPOSAL: Façade renovation

This application calls for façade renovation to this two-bay, three-story rowhouse. The applicant proposes installing smooth stucco on the façade to replace the current rough faced stucco. Plans show changing the windows from 6 over 6 to 2 over 2 wood, true divided light windows. The plans also call for a three-light transom, an exterior light fixture, and a new wood, single panel door. The proposal includes a new, 2-foot high marble water table and the addition of cellar doors at the base of the water table. Plans show the removal of the through-the-wall air conditioners on the first and second floors and the removal of the brick perimeter around the first floor windows. Drawings show the first floor window opening rebuilt and enlarged by the removal of brick courses. The application calls for the removal of the existing non-original cornice and reconstruction of the cornice and eave to match those at the neighboring house. In addition, the plans show construction of a new cupola behind the existing house and extending above the existing roofline by one story. Cedar clapboard siding and trim, and asphalt shingle roofing clad the cupola. Atop the existing rear, a third floor roof deck with steel guard rails extends behind the cupola and is accessed by double doors in the cupola. No visibility of the rear façade exists owing to the landlocked lot. The cupola is not likely to have visibility because of its set back.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the façade restoration per Standard 6 with a recommendation for 6 over 6 wood windows, and a different front door and cornice. Approval of the rear roof deck per Standards 9 and 10. Approval of the cupola per Standards 9 and 10, providing that no visibility of the cupola exists from a public right-of-way.

Aimie and Cory Hunnicut attended the meeting to explain the project. Mr. Hunnicut said that although the cornice has been altered, he plans to duplicate details from the neighboring houses. The proposed water table's height is lower than the others in the row. The applicant presented drawings that show alternate options for the cupola, one with a double-pitched roof and the other with a lower single pitched roof. In addition, he said that the neighboring church would minimize the cupola's visibility. The applicant requested the insertion of a hexagonal window on the side of the building. The proposed exterior would be a smooth stucco finish.

The Committee thought a four-panel door and six over six windows appropriate historically. It also believed that either option for the cupola appropriate. It also noted the greater appropriateness of the retention of the existing, previously altered six over one sash at the first floor. In consideration of the side window, some Committee members thought the window should be rectangular in shape; however, the window is contingent on the approval of the owner of the neighboring building and compliance with the building and zoning codes.

The Architectural Committee recommended the following:

1. *four-panel door configuration;*
2. *six over six windows except the first floor with six over one;*
3. *reconstruction of the cornice;*

4. *marble water table with cellar doors at the base;*
5. *approval of both options for the cupola with double doors, and*
6. *insertion of a rectangular side window subject to code requirements and the approval of the owner of the neighboring house.*

With the staff to review all details

Mr. McCoubrey opposed the Committee's recommendation for the side window.

1409 Lombard Street

C.A.T.C.H., Owner

Rudolph Ponzio, Applicant

DATE: 1915

PROPOSAL: Façade renovations/ramp

This application calls for masonry repair to the building and the construction of a handicapped access ramp on the east elevation facing Broad Street. Plans show the south façade having masonry repair to the cast stone veneer as well as local repointing. On the north elevation, the applicant proposes a new wrought iron fence and balcony guardrails as well as repointing. On the east façade, the proposal calls for local repointing. In addition, plans show a new wrought iron fence and concrete and aluminum grate retaining wall at the base of the proposed handicapped ramp. One side of the new construction is a ramp, while the other side shows stairs leading to the top of the ramp. Some visibility of the ramp would exist from Broad Street owing to the parking lot at the corner of Lombard and Broad Streets.

Staff recommendation: Approval of masonry repair per Standard 6 with staff to review details. Approval of the handicapped ramp per Standards 9 and 10.

The current fencing is a chain link fence. Committee members inquired into the proposed material for the ramp, which will be Ohio grating and the fascia on the stringer made of steel. The railing would be anchored into the below grade concrete footing and the retainer wall. Ms. Pentz thought the continuous steel channel anchored to the building should have a small clearance to prevent moisture from collecting against the masonry.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with a ¼ inch clearance between the face of the brick and back of the steel channel with the staff to review details.

340-342 South 5th Street, NW corner of Pine Street

Richard and Margaret Ullman, Owners

Nicholas Aloï, Jr., Applicant

DATE: c. 1972

PROPOSAL: Façade alterations

This application calls for the replacement of metal windows in wood, the cutting of new windows, and a small third floor addition to this contributing rowhouse built circa 1972. On the Pine Street elevation, the proposal involves the cutting of a new double window on the first floor and the replacement of the second and third floor windows. The new second and third floor windows have a transom at the top of the window with a double window below as opposed to the current windows, which have two smaller panes at the bottom of the window. On the South 5th Street façade, the applicant proposes cutting four new windows and replacing the wood entry door. In addition, the plans show a third floor addition extending the line of the current third

floor approximately 11-feet on the South 5th Street façade and 18-feet along the rear. The rear of the addition shown on the plans has floor-to-ceiling glass windows and a sliding glass door that leads to an existing roof terrace. The proposal also calls for the new addition clad in stucco and the current metal spandrel, which stretches down the building, replaced with stucco. Finally, the applicant proposes a new 4-foot wide opening in the existing South 5th Street masonry wall adjacent to the garage. Plans show a wrought iron gate in the opening.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the Pine Street second and third floor replacement windows in metal per Standard 6. Denial of cutting a new window on the Pine Street façade per Standards 9 and 10. Approval of cutting new windows on the South 5th Street façade and installing metal windows per Standards 9 and 10. Approval of the new entry door and metal gate with staff to review details per Standards 9 and 10. Approval of the new third floor addition clad in metal and retention of the metal spandrel per Standards 9 and 10. Denial of the stucco finish on the South 5th Street façade and addition per Standard 6.

Nicholas Aloï and Richard and Margaret Ullman attended the meeting. The applicant proposes wood to covered wood Krylon Kolbe and Kolbe casement windows instead of metal sliders for low maintenance. In addition, owing areas of missing siding, the applicant wishes to remove the siding and finish it with a dryvit finish and remove the planters for the insertion of a center window.

The Committee thought the metal a distinguishing feature of the house and the combination of metal and masonry a fundamental aspect. Therefore it believed that the applicant should investigate the use of metal and stucco. Ms. Pentz expresses her opposition to the insertion of the center window, although there is clear justification owing to the window's location is the kitchen that should have a window. It recommended that the applicant possibly reconfigure their kitchen plans to accommodate two windows on either side so as not to disturb the vertical orientation of the building. It also believed that the 5th Street side triple window compromises the façade. Members thought the metal band should be maintained and the addition on the 3rd floor's new wall should be metal, instead of stucco, to match below. It thought the window configuration should continue with the four lights.

Rebecca Stoloff, Society Hill Civic Association, inquired about the proposed gate, and thought the gate would be an enhancement instead of the solid wall.

The Architectural Committee recommended the following:

1. *façade materials of brick and metal;*
2. *metal four-light windows;*
3. *approval of the gate and lowering the wall;*
4. *addition with metal cladding and metal clad casement windows*
5. *removal of the planters and reopening of exterior front steps;*
6. *denial of side triple window on the 5th Street façade, and*
7. *denial of center window on the Pine Street façade as proposed, but approval of a scheme for two side windows in the recesses.*

With the staff to review all details.

227 South 6th Street

MCW Enterprises, Owner

Eric Leighton, Architect

DATE: 1900; William Prichett, Architect

PROPOSAL: Conceptual review of rooftop two-story addition

The proposal calls for a conceptual review of a two-story addition on top of the building. The architect includes three optional designs, the first showing the two floors set back with vertical walls and flat appearing roofs. The other two designs cap the same setbacks with a sloped, hipped roof, one with shed type dormers and the other with arch head dormers.

Staff recommendation: Denial of all three proposals per Standards 9 and 10. The staff would favors a single-story setback rooftop addition.

Carl Primerva, Esq., Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker and Jay Cramner attended the meeting to explain the project. Mr. Cramner explained the need for additional floor space and noted that all the windows have lead base paint and asbestos tiles. Mr. Baker stated that the addition would be setback to minimize visibility and that the building has a very high parapet .

Mr. Tyler noted other properties where the Commission has denied rooftop additions on Washington Square. If approved, he thought scheme #1 best conformed to Standards 9 and 10. The applicant's drawings give three options for the proposed addition; however, the Committee thought the modern rather than the option with the hipped roof more appropriate. It further thought a mock-up to show visibility is necessary. Since this façade is very rich in character, the setback will minimize the addition's height and effect.

The Architectural Committee recommended conceptual approval of option #1 subject to a mock-up to determine the addition's visibility, scale, as well as amount of setback needed.

1122 East Berks Street

Thomas and Barbara Holland, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1820

PROPOSAL: Vinyl siding and windows

The proposal involves installing insulation and vinyl siding as well as vinyl windows on this wood frame house. The house has had vinyl siding and windows installed previously. The Commission did recommend vinyl cladding for the building in 1971, although though no permit exists in the file. The house had asphalt siding and wood windows at the time of designation. The Historical Commission has since 1971 adopted *The Secretary of the Interior Standards* as the basis for historical review.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standard 6. The Committee might recommend the vinyl in areas not visible to the public, but the front façade should receive wood siding and wood windows. The applicants can make a hardship application if needed.

Barbara and Thomas Holland attended the meeting to explain the mitigating circumstances of the proposal. Ms. Holland stated that there is no insulation beneath the present siding which has resulted in prohibitive oil bills. In addition, the Hollands have contracted Sears to insulate and apply vinyl siding that simulates clapboard to the house. The applicant present cancelled checks for the oil bill and also the check for the \$10,000.00 deposit for Sears.

The Committee thought the front façade should have wood clapboard and wood windows to preserve the historic features. Committee members made the applicant aware that if finances are the issue, it would recommend referral to the Committee on Financial Hardship.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the side and rear proposed alterations, but referral of the front façade to the Committee on Financial Hardship.

51 North 3rd Street

Brandywine Construction, Owner

Theresa Snow, Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Louvers in transoms

This application calls for the installation of two louvers in two different transom lights on the front façade of this ground floor restaurant. Plans show the two vents that remove one light each from two different transoms. The restaurant is currently closed owing to the need for these vents and the owner of the building has expressed hesitation about placing the vents on the building's rear or side, both of which face a residential courtyard. The staff recommended denial of the vents as proposed per Standard 9. Staff recommends exploring additional options for placing the vents on the rear or side of the building.

Mr. Baron stated that he had not yet visited the site to explore alternate placement for the vents. He explained to the Committee that he had been in touch with the applicant regarding a ductless hood that could be used for cooking instead of the proposed vents. He stated that the applicant was aware of this more expensive ductless option, but still requested the Committee hear her proposal for exterior vents. The applicant was not present at the meeting.

Mr. Rivera asked Mr. Baron for clarification on the proposed vents. Mr. Baron explained that one louver vents the cooking while the other draws in fresh air. He added that the proposed vents would be 9-feet and 8-inches above grade and that the Code states vents must be 10-feet from the ground. A discussion among Committee members ensued and the members agreed upon exploring an alternate placement for the vents or the ductless option.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the two proposed vents.

1514 Waverly Street

Hugh Zimmers, Owner/Architect

DATE: c. 1880

PROPOSAL: Cut/reopen doors

The applicant seeks to create parking in a former carriage space. In order to do this he will remove brick infill from the former carriage opening and install a door that mimics carriage doors. He then wishes to cut a new front door into the original brick and window of the front wall. Staff recommendation: Denial per Standard 9 because of the removal of original fabric for the new door. The staff instead recommends cutting a person door into the new carriage doors.

Hugh Zimmers attended the meeting to explain the proposal. He explained that the Sydenham Street door is covered with plywood but the sliding door inside still exists which he plans to restore. In addition, he found within the building an historic door which he plans to reuse in the bricked up portion. He explained that the pedestrian door within the garage opening was not a viable option, for his clients would have to walk through the garage to get to his office and would require reversal of the stair direction. He proposes to restore the former carriage entrance, now

blocked in, and convert the window into an entrance, install the salvaged historic door. The Committee recommended removing the transom to restore the carriage opening.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the restoring of the carriage opening with the removal of the transom and cutting a new door opening to be filled with the salvaged door.

128 Bainbridge Street

Michael Samschick, Owner

Joel Spivack, Architect

DATE: 1771-1792

PROPOSAL: Legalize/cure rear addition, façade restoration

This project, seen several times in the past, involves a plan to modify and legalize work undertaken without a permit. The new drawings reflect the recommendations of the Committee to set the addition back 24-feet behind the front façade subject to the restoration of the front façade in its original plane, with staff to review details. The applicant now shows three windows installed in the side wall of the wood structure rather than the restoration of that facade.

Staff recommendation: Approval. The applicant should show his evidence of former windows in the side wall.

Ms. Pentz questioned the windows on the west wall; and it was determined that they are a building code requirement. Mr. Baron asked whether the piece of wood above the door in the garden should either go all the way up or be broken up with a change of material.

Neighbors in attendance expressed support of the addition with its changes.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the revised submission subject to the restoration of the front façade.

544 Queen Street

Maksym Szpilczak, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: Rebuild front façade, add side addition

This proposal involves rebuilding a dangerously bowed front façade and constructing a side stairhall addition.

Staff recommendation: Approval of façade reconstruction with staff to review details; denial of the side addition as proposed per Standard 9. The staff would support a side addition behind the existing side bay.

Mr. Baron visited the site and at that time made recommendations to the applicant. He also determined that a side addition behind the bay would make it highly visible as well as blocking windows and hiding the side façade.

Maksym Szpilczak, the applicant, was receptive and presented revised plans to reflect the recommendations. The Department of Licenses and Inspection cited the property as unsafe To

correct this, the applicant proposes a bracketed cornice, two-over-two windows, to rebuild the front wall in new but similar brick with saving as much fabric as possible. In addition, he proposes making the basement windows taller to accommodate a basement apartment, the front door will be made wider to comply with code. He will raise the stoop one step to accommodate the taller basement. Regarding the second application for the side stair addition, Mr. Szpilczak believes that the side stairs will help brace the bowing wall. The suggestion of the putting the staircase behind the bay proved a problem as it would be highly visible. Therefore it was thought that behind the bay a better location. The stair would necessitate removing the garden gate. The stairs would come flush to the front façade.

The Committee thought the stair infill should be differentiated from the old with a one over one window and a door different from the front.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the revised submission with the change on the addition, door and windows subject to retention of historic materials where possible with staff to review details.

The applicant requested the removal of the grates on the basement windows.

The Committee approved the removal, but cautioned the applicant, that any ornamentation for security should be attached to the window.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the basement grate removal.

925 Chestnut Street

Thomas Jefferson Hospital, Owner

Michael Prifti, Architect

DATE: c. 1925

PROPOSAL: Rooftop HVAC

This proposal involves adding air-conditioning chillers on the roof of the Jefferson Hospital unit at 925 Chestnut Street. The architect explored several placements of HVAC units with the staff, including on the Cret building facing Chestnut Street. This placement seemed to have the least impact on significant facades.

Staff recommendation: Approval per Standards 9 and 10.

Michael Prifti of Bower Lewis Thrower explained the chiller's location on the loading dock, the piping within the complex and the need for cooling towers on the rooftop. He recommended a grey color for the cooling towers. He further stated that the unit could not be moved farther west because then visibility from the Chestnut Street garden and 10th Street would exist. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the color of the proposed cooling towers and recommended a more neutral color than steel grey.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the cooling towers with staff to review details including color.

JLB

1113-31 Market Street, Reading Terminal Market

Headhouse Realty Associates, Owner

Albert Taus, Architect

DATE: 1891-1893; Francis Kimball and Wilson Brothers

PROPOSAL: Signage

This application calls for the installation of new signage on the Reading Terminal Headhouse Market Street façade. The applicant proposes individual back lit white acrylic letters mounted on grey painted steel with a blue galvanized metal sheet along the base of the letters to mimic the existing Pennsylvania Convention Center signage. At the 13 December 2000 meeting, the Commission recommended approval of a box sign with logo lettering.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the signage as proposed per Standard 9. Staff recommends a box sign with cut out letters. Staff further recommends that all signage along the Market Street façade be consistent in box type, size, letter font and height.

Architect Tina Rocha stated that in its denial, The Zoning Board of Adjustment requested a sign that more closely resembled that of the Pennsylvania Convention Center signage. Mr. Baron commented that the building has apparently already exceeded allowable signage limits. Mr. Baron added that the Commission previously approved two additional illuminated box signs for other retail tenants. He stressed the importance of consistent signage. Committee members discussed the signs and agreed that a size and height envelope must be established for the signage whether the sign is individual letters or a box sign. The Committee suggested using this proposed sign as an example for the size and height, other applicants should adopt.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposed signage and stated that its height and size will serve as the model should any additional applicants appear before the Committee and Commission.

JLB

1830 Shunk Street

Mario Falcione, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1910; James and John Windrim Architects

PROPOSAL: Remove slate roof and install asphalt

This application calls for the replacement of the front portion of the roof with slate colored asphalt shingle. Photographs show that the front portion of the roof, highly visible from Shunk Street, currently retains its original slate. The application estimates slate replacement will cost \$14,000 and asphalt shingle \$2,400.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the application as proposed per Standard 6 and a recommendation for referral to the Committee on Financial Hardship.

Thea Raison, daughter of the applicant, presented the deteriorating state of the roof and stated that her parents' desire a neater, new roof in asphalt. She added that the majority of the roofs on this block of Shunk Street had been redone in asphalt before the district's creation. She shared the roof estimate costs with the Committee and commented that rubber slate offered only \$2,000.00 savings over slate. Mr. Baron questioned whether the applicant had priced the option of removing the existing slate, having the membrane beneath as well as the clasps repaired, and the

slate replaced. Ms. Raison stated she had explored that option and that no roofer would take on such a labor intensive project.

Ms. Pentz stated the need for consistency within the Committee's recommendations and added that in the past, slate has been retained in the most visible roof fronts. She further recommended referral to the Committee on Financial Hardship.

Ms. Raison commented that although she appreciates the goals of the Commission in preservation, she questioned how replacing the roof in asphalt did not meet the "contemporary requirements" referred to in the notice letters sent out in 1999. She added that should the Committee on Financial Hardship reject her parents' application, they will simply patch their roof which will not cure its deterioration.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the asphalt shingle roof as proposed and further recommended referral of the application to the Committee on Financial Hardship.

JLB

2319-2321 South 21st Street

Crisante Ianni, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1911; James and John Windrim Architects

PROPOSAL: Gates between houses

This application calls for the installation of a black iron gate spanning the shared areaway between the two properties. The applicant proposes bolting the gate to each house and placing the gate at the rear of 2319's porch before the brick pier and behind the open window. The staff recommended denial per Standard 9.

Crisante Ianni, co-applicant for the project, told the Committee that no change to the house would occur. He added that the gate would provide needed security for himself as well as his neighbor's young family. Mr. Baron stated that the Commission has received neighborhood complaints about this type of gate being used as storage areas. Mr. McCoubrey commented that without a variance, no gate could be constructed higher than 6-feet. It was also noted that the houses are not secure through the rear areaways. He added that the Committee must evaluate the architectural nature of the gate and not the security issue. A discussion among Committee members ensued regarding the architectural merit of the gate. The members agreed upon denial and recommended additional forms of security to the applicants.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposed gate.

JLB

612 Spruce Street

Rosa Myers, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1804-05; altered 1845, 1854, 1968; George Summers

PROPOSAL: Rubber slate roof

This application calls for a new roof on the front façade and rear of the house. The applicant proposes cedar shingles on the dormer cheeks and a rubber roof imitating slate in shape and color

on both the front sloped roof and the rear roof. The front, sloped roof has visibility from Spruce Street. The applicant also proposes copper flashing on the rear roof. Documentation shows that the original early 19th century roof was cedar, replaced with slate in the 1870s. In the early 20th century, the roof was redone in metal and today is asphalt shingle.

Staff recommendation: Approval of cedar dormer cheeks and copper flashing per Standard 6. Denial of the proposed roofing material per Standard 6. Staff recommends a cedar roof or an asphalt shingle in a weathered wood color to depict the original roofing material.

Rosa Myers, owner and applicant, informed the Committee that she had explored using cedar on the roof but that the fire hazard and maintenance pose as problems. She stated her hesitancy to use asphalt shingle and her desire to use rubber slate. She commented on the advantages of using rubber slate including it being a recycled product and its low maintenance guarantee.

Ms. Pentz stated her belief that the use of rubber slate would look better than asphalt and that there exists a precedent for using a slate on this building. Mr. Baron commented that house originally had a cedar shingle roof. Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Ms. Pentz and favored the use of rubber slate and cedar dormer cheeks.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of rubber slate roofing, copper flashing and cedar dormer cheeks, all with staff to review details.

JLB

2951 Market Street, 30th Street Station

Amtrak, Owner

Michael R. Ytterberg, Architect

DATE: 1929-30

PROPOSAL: Arch Street Pedestrian Bridge

This application involves the construction of a pedestrian bridge over Arch Street between Schuylkill Avenue West and 30th Street. This project was reviewed and approved in concept by both the Committee and Commission in 1999. It is being resubmitted for approval owing to changes in the design. The primary change in the design from the previous submission is the consolidation of the vertical elements, the stair tower and the elevator, into one structure located on the west side of the bridge. This results in less interruption to the north façade of the building and reduces the impact of the new bridge on the historic fabric.

William McDowell, James Price and Michael Ytterberg attended the meeting to explain the project. The development is for a parking garage with a connecting bridge. The proposed permanent bridge would have large glass and metal fenestration with an opening in the first floor to connect to the concourse for suburban trains. In addition there might be a temporary open bridge leading to a new parking garage on the north side of Arch Street.

The Committee believed the color very important. The colors proposed for the garage will be a pre-cast warm gray concrete. The bridge will have metal panels and clear glass, and the roof and mullions and visible structure a green color as in the station. Mr. Rivera had concern about the temporary bridge not being enclosed and that there should be consistency in the design of the permanent and temporary bridge.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the permanent bridge with the staff to review details, and conceptual approval of the temporary bridge and garage subject to review of the design.

The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary