

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

**Herbert Levy, Acting-Chair
Commission Offices, Room 578, City Hall
27 May 2003**

Present

Herbert Levy, FAIA, Acting-Chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
Suzanne Pentz

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jeffrey R. Barr, Historic Research Technician
Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary
Jonathan Farnham, Historic Preservation Planner
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner

Also

Lawrence Gilbert, architect
Charles Hancock, architect
Steve Kuzmicki, GGHDC
Liz Zimmers, Zimmers Associates
Schaunn, McKamey, Woodway Construction Company, Incorporated
Martha Coonley
Robert Powers, Powers and Company
Joseph Vanelli, 114 Levering Street
M. DeRossi, Jr., Grayboyes Company
Stuart Rosenberg, 1010 Arch Street
Saul Shenker, 1010 Arch Street
Israel Shenker, 1010 Arch Street
Dominic Ward, 36 North 3rd Street
Hugh Zimmers, Zimmers Associates, 36 North 3rd Street
Rex Thomson, Superior Projects Incorporated, Carmella's Restaurant
David Matus
Arlene Matzkin, Friday Architects
David Amburn, Amburn/Jarosinski Architects
Denise Friedland Cohen
Michael R. Cohen
Jamin Potamkin
Kiki Bolender, AIA, Schade & Bolender Architects, 1830 Delancey Street
Michael P. Caimi, Gardner/Fox Associates, Incorporated
John A. Eppinger
Meredith Sellinger-Ebizadeh, Valen LLC
Mihoko Samejima, Christopher Beardsley Architects

Herbert Levy, Acting-Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m.

George Mortelliti, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1827

PROPOSAL: Façade alterations, 3-story rear additions

The proposal involves renovating these former houses turned restaurant back into three houses. The structure has been vacant for a number of years and has been the subject of violations from the Department of Licenses and Inspections. The new owner seeks to renovate the front facades, demolish the rear wall, rear roofs and dormers, and add three-story additions. The rear of the building has visibility from St. James Street and minimal visibility from 11th Street. The reason for the demolition of the roof and rear dormer is that the developer has said he can get a higher asking price if the houses have a larger third bedroom and a second bathroom. The applicant also seeks to create parking for three cars in an area formerly occupied by a now demolished back building.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the front renovation with staff to review details. Denial of a three-story rear addition that demolishes the roof and dormer. The siding is also not an appropriate material for the addition, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. The staff would look favorably on a two-story stucco addition that sits below the cornice line.

Mr. Baron explained the project and said that after his site visit, he believes that a two-story addition will not compromise the historic structure, but that the three story plan would demolish a lot of historic fabric.

Shawn Carbone, the contractor, Charles Hancock, Lawrence Gilbert, the architects, and George Mortelliti, the owner attended the meeting. Mr. Gilbert explained that the owner proposes homes with three bedrooms and two baths for economic reasons. The proposed eleven-foot addition with an overhang will allow parking. He remarked that the historic masonry on the front and sides will be retained, but the interior dimension of these properties is only twelve feet. He explained that they would be happy to change the proposed covering of the side of the addition to stucco. Mr. Carbone noted that the properties have been greatly altered inside and that a majority of the party walls have been removed.

Mr. Levy inquired if the rear wall would be demolished. The architects said that they would. Mr. Baron pointed out to the owner that the allowance of the demolition of the rear wall would in itself be a compromise.

Mr. Mortelliti argued in support of his project. He stressed that he proposes to retain 90% of the historic fabric, and to change the roofline is very costly; however, it is needed to acquire the additional living space. He believes that the changed roofline would not be highly visible or seen from Quince Street.

Committee members concurred that the removal of the dormers and the proposed roofline is inappropriate to these properties, which have gabled rooflines. They suggested two-story additions, which would retain the historic roofline and fabric.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the front renovation with staff to review details. Denial of a three-story rear addition that demolishes the roof and dormer, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the

property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

5320 Germantown Avenue, SW corner of Penn Street

Greater Germantown Housing Development Corporation, Owner

Liz Zimmers, Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Legalize vinyl windows

This proposal seeks to legalize a large number of vinyl windows installed without a permit.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standards 2 and 6.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal.

Steve Kuzmicki and Liz Zimmers attended the meeting. Mr. Kuzmicki explained that the building had been rehabilitated two years ago, and that there were problems with the original contractor as well as with funding. The original tenant was lost and the Department of Commerce funded the project with a new contractor, who installed the windows without a permit. Mr. Kuzmicki acknowledged the error, but cited two other properties on Germantown Avenue that do not have historically correct windows.

Committee members pointed out to Mr. Kuzmicki that if these buildings used federal funding an historic review mandated by Federal Law must be performed. They stressed the importance of consistency within governmental agencies and that they use the same standards. The work was done without a permit and incorrect windows were installed.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial per Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]. Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.] and Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and where possible materials.]

103, 105, 107 Church Street

Woodway Construction Company, Owner

Liz Zimmers, Applicant

DATE: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: Façade alterations, rooftop addition, 6-story rear addition, decks in concept

This proposal in concept involves adding a floor and decks on the roof of these warehouse buildings constructed for the Girard Estate. The additions will have visibility from Front Street because 103 Church Street forms the end of the row, leaving a large gap for viewing. The deck railing sits right at the front of the property and will have visibility from Church Street and Front Streets. The staff recommends pulling the roof elements back substantially so that they will not be seen.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standards 9 and 10 and roofing guideline.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal and noted that the staff thought there would be visibility from

Front Street and 2nd Streets. Staff thought that the proposed deck and rooftop additions should be substantially set back. Also it was noted that the application needs drawn elevations in order to be properly reviewed.

Schaunn McKamey, the owner, and Liz Zimmers attended the meeting. Ms. Zimmers commented on a full addition comparable to the proposed addition directly across the street. Mr. McKamey thought that from directly across the street, the fifth-floor addition would have minimal visibility.

Committee members concurred that it could consider the concept of a redesigned addition and a deck with minimal visibility. It suggested that the applicant erect a mock-up for a determination of visibility. Mr. McKamey concluded that he is open to suggestions and guidance.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal in concept as submitted and recommended that the applicant erect a mock-up for a determination of visibility.

36 North 3rd Street, NE corner of Wister Street

Dominic Ward, D&M Realty Group, Owner

Liz Zimmers, Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Façade alterations, rear decks, roof deck and stairtower

The proposal is a scaled back version of a proposal approved by the Historical Commission in the past. The proposal involves rear and rooftop additions and decks as well as façade restoration.

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

Mr. Baron presented the proposal which is a scaled down of version of the previous approval. Dominic Ward, the owner, and Liz Zimmers attended the meeting.

Committee members compared the previous submission to the proposed submission and concurred that it, too, is appropriate.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the revised submission, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the pr and its environment.] and Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

1010 Arch Street

224 East 13th Street Realty Corporation, Owner

Stuart Rosenberg, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1902, William Pritchett, architect

PROPOSAL: New Aluminum windows

This proposal involves restoration of the windows on the front façade of the building and removal and replacement of the sash in the side and rear windows. The proposed windows show a narrow 5/8" applied muntin to replace the existing inch-wide muntin and the subframe reduces the glazed opening by three inches in width.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron presented the application for replacing windows in the building, which is visible from all sides. The existing windows on the side and rear façades are metal. Mr. Baron noted that the applicant proposes to retain the existing frames and has submitted a new wider muntin that is 7/8" in width.

Robert Powers, Stuart Rosenberg, the architect, Israel Shenker, and Saul Shenker, the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Rosenberg said that the metal sills, jambs, and brick mold would be retained, and he believes that the three inch narrower window works out to a loss of ¾ inches of glazing per pane. He thought that this is minimal since the difference in the cost is prohibitive. He thought the Committee could give consideration to this minimal difference since the owner proposes to restore the front façade's wood windows and replace the sash on the south, west and east facades. He also noted that this building consists of varying types of windows.

Mr. Levy expressed concern about the frame. Mr. Rosenberg said that the owner explored the possibility of getting a lighter frame with a narrower jamb; and also modifying the existing proposal by cutting off the inner rear leg and moving it closer to the existing jamb, however, the structural stability of the frame would be undermined. It was noted that new sash within the frame requires a sub-frame, and modification to the existing frames can cause problems. Mr. Baron suggested aluminum-clad wood windows as an alternative and Mr. Levy concurred. Mr. Rosenberg said that owing to the size of the window, the cost is still an issue. Saul Shenker said that the side wood windows are easily replicated and he is considering replacing the small punched side windows with wood. Mr. Baron inquired about the two different muntin widths. It was noted that the 1-5/8" width muntins only occur with the small number of casement windows. The owner proposes to retain the loading dock doors and to use paint finish windows to eliminate the metallic appearance.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the window proposal with restoration of the wood windows on the front, new matching wood windows in the smaller side openings and new aluminum windows with retention of the existing frames and a 7/8-inch muntin on the east west and south facades, with the staff to review details.

114 Levering Street

Joseph Vanelli, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1890

PROPOSAL: Legalize door

The proposal involves legalizing the installation of a door and frame without a permit. The pictures show a door that looks much smaller than the original opening surrounded by brown aluminum.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron presented the application and said that the installed door has a residential quality. The owner explained that the opening had been closed down and covered with aluminum before this

round of work. He said the hinge marks on the door jamb indicate that the doorway previously contained a pair of doors. Committee members thought that since the alterations were done previously, it would recommend legalization, but it thought that the surround should be a painted wood material. It also thought that if ever the air conditioning unit is removed then the transom should be re-installed.

Joseph Vanelli, the owner, only intended was to install a new door, owing to the condition of the previous door. He showed a picture of the new door after painting.

The Architectural Committee recommended legalization of the proposal including the new door and aluminum covered surround.

1 Leverington Avenue, Venice Island

Main Street Restaurant Group, Owner

Rex Thomson, Applicant

DATE: c. 1990

PROPOSAL: Illuminated signage, awnings

This proposal is for legalizing signage and awnings for a new restaurant in a modern building on Venice Island within the Manayunk Neighborhood Commercial Revitalization Zone. The work involves adding an internally illuminated roof sign above the cornice line of the building. The applicant also shows a combination of square and round head awnings.

The staff recommends approval of square head awnings to match the shape of the openings, covered in a canvas like material. The staff notes however that the Manayunk signage controls state“ *Wall signs parallel to the face of the building shall be permitted provided that the aggregate square footage shall be limited to a maximum area of one and a half square feet for each lineal foot of storefront frontage... provided that the top of such signs shall extend no higher than the bottom of the window sills or projected bay located on the second story of the building face or fourteen feet above the streetline, whichever is lower. In no case shall any sign exceed forty square feet in area. ... Internally illuminated box type signs shall not be permitted.*”

Mr. Baron presented the application and noted that the Manayunk ordinance has specific signage requirements with regard to size and placement. Committee members said that it did not object to the appearance of the signage, but it does not meet the requirements put forward in the ordinance. It also recommended that the awnings be a square cut.

Rex Thomson attended the meeting and said that he preferred the plastic face sign because it diffuses light and the LED type of lighting owing to its low voltage. He noted that the owner’s preference is for a large sign.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the arched awnings and signage, but approval of square head canvas type awnings pursuant to the Manayunk Ordinance.

424 Pine Street

Mark Burlingame, Owner

David Matus, Applicant

DATE: c. 1796 and 1801 for David Lapsley, merchant; new façade, c. 1866

Designated: 30 April 1957, 10 Mar 1999 as part of Society Hill Historic District

PROPOSAL: New windows with applied muntins and subframe, new rear doors

The property currently has two-over-two wood windows and fully glazed doors on the front and rear. This application calls for new sash and doors. The existing brick molds and frames would remain. The proposed six-over-six sash would have applied muntins and sub-frames. The proposed dormer would have a four-over-four configuration with fanlight. The proposed multi-light doors for the visible rear façade of the rear ell would also have applied muntins.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the doors, pursuant to Standard 9. Denial of the windows, pursuant to Standard 6. Also, the windows should have true-divided-lights and no subframes. The windows in the rear ell should have ten-over-ten windows at the second floor and three-over-three windows in the third floor and the front dormer should have six-over-six with a fanlight, as described in the insurance survey from 1866.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal and noted that with the sub-frame, 7/8 inch is lost on each sided and at the top.

David Matus attended the meeting and responded favorably to the recommendation of the six-over-six windows with a fanlight in the dormer. He offered to install true-divided-light windows on the front façade and simulated-divided-lights on the rear and side facades for efficiency. He said that a frame within a frame does not have jamb liners and retention of the frames is needed for a customized window. He noted that the difference of the daylight opening is almost two inches. Mr. Matus presented a sample window with simulated-divided-light and a spacer bar to demonstrate the minimal difference. He emphasized the owner's wish for easier cleaning capabilities.

Mr. D'Alessandro said that it is important to preserve as much historic fabric as possible, therefore the original sills should be kept. Mr. Levy expressed concern with the appearance of the first-floor windows as seen from the sidewalk. Committee members emphasized that historically correct windows are available.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the doors, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]. Denial of the windows, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials.].

320 South 4th Street

Herbert Gunther, Owner

Arlene Matzkin, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1783 for Moses Bussey, tallow chandler; restored c. 1967 by Oskar Stonorov, architect

Designated: 30 April 1957; 10 March 1999 as part of Society Hill Historic District

PROPOSAL: New windows, cut new side door

This application has two parts. First, the owners wish to install a single-leaf, multi-light door on the south façade of the main building, cutting the original 18th-century brick wall. Second, the proposal calls for new, true-divided-light insulated windows with 7/8-inch muntins. The current windows, installed in 1967, have only 1/2-inch muntins. The existing brick molds and trim would remain.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the windows, pursuant to Standard 6. Denial of the door,

pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

Ms. Spina explained the application.

Arlene Matzin, the architect, attended the meeting and said that the proposed windows stops line-up with the muntins, and have insulated glass. She pointed out that the existing sash are replacements and the proposed windows are the correct dimensions. She inquired if the wall for the proposed door had been a party wall. Ms. Spina responded that is the original wall and not a party wall.

Committee members denied the proposed door based on the removal of historic fabric. Ms. Matzkin did not challenge the Committee's recommendation.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the windows, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials.]. Denial of the door, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.], Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

104-106 Delancey Street

Denise Friedland, Owner

David Amburn, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1796 for Francis Gurney, merchant; restored 1967 by Curtis Seibert, architect

Designated: 31 Dec 1984; 10 March 1999 as part of Society Hill Historic District

PROPOSAL: Demolish rear dormers, extend rear wall for new shed dormers

The proposal calls for demolishing the visible, rear dormers and extending the rear wall to create a new; full fourth floor at the rear. The roof of the dormers will begin at the historic ridgeline and extend to the rear wall. The new rear wall will break the cornice historic line and have large, coupled casement windows.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the roofing guideline.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. David Amburn, the architect, and Denise Cohen, the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Amburn explained that currently the two houses are three and a half stories with front and rear dormers. He presented photographs to show visibility of the addition. Mr. Amburn remarked that the Society Hill Civic Association supports the project and that his client intends to meet with neighbors from Pine Street prior to the Commission meeting. He also pointed out that the chimney, which has already been altered, would need extending. The Committee asked for the cornice line to be carried across the additions. Mr. Amburn agreed.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal, with the cornice line retained across the addition..

301-05 South 3rd Street, SE corner of Spruce Street

Jeanne Potamkin, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1769 by Joshua Pancost, carpenter; renovated c. 1966 by George Roberts, architect

Designated: 30 April 1957; 10 March 1999 as part of Society Hill Historic District

PROPOSAL: Infill door and window, new window

The visible rear façade of the main building has stucco with a door and window in a brick-surrounded, arched opening on the second floor. The proposal calls for removing the non-historic door, window and brick and installing a new, simulated-divided light, awning window. The rest of the wall would be patched and stuccoed to match.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

Ms. Spina presented the application and noted that the non-historic door was installed during the Redevelopment era.

Jamin Potamkin attended the meeting and said that the proposed window is for ventilation and light into a bathroom. Ms. Levy said that the height of the proposed window should match the height of the existing window. Ms. Spina inquired about the pane configuration and Mr. Potamkin responded that the owner prefers an eight-pane configuration.

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

1830 Delancey Street

Acorn Property Development Incorporated, Owner

Kiki Bolender, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1857-1858, John McCrea, builder

PROPOSAL: Rear addition, elevator tower, roof decks, new garage entrance, windows and doors

This application proposes numerous alterations and additions to the row house at 1830 Delancey Street. Those modifications will include (1) the addition of a basement-level garage on Panama Street with a roll-down metal door; (2) the addition of a ground-level deck along the side of the rear ell with a new access door in the side façade of the ell and a 6-foot tall wood privacy fence to the east; (3) the construction of a one-story brick and stucco addition on the rear ell with 6/6 and paired single-light sliding windows in the side façade; (4) the addition of a roof deck on the rear ell with the conversion of a window to a door in the rear façade of the main section of the building; (5) the addition of a roof deck on the main section of the building with walkway and stairs down to the deck on the rear ell; (6) the addition of an elevator tower rising 9 feet above the roof of the main section; (7) the addition of four HVAC units on the roof of the main section; (8) and the addition of paired single-light sliding windows in the side façade of the rear ell; (9) the addition of louvered shutters on the front façade at the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th stories.

Staff Recommendation: (1) All but one staff member recommends denial of the garage as proposed, pursuant to Standard 9; (2) approval of the deck along the rear ell, but not the proposed access door and privacy fence, pursuant to Standard 9; (3) approval of the addition on the rear ell, provided that the south façade of the addition is articulated with fenestration or reveals,

pursuant to Standard 9; (4) approval of the roof deck on rear ell and conversion of window to door, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline; (5) denial of the main roof deck, walkway, stairs, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline; (6) approval of the elevator tower for mechanical equipment but not roof access, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline; (7) approval of the HVAC units, provided that they will be invisible or minimally visible, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline; (8) approval of the change of the north window in the side of the rear ell, but denial of the change of the south window, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 6; (9) approval of the shutters; all with staff to review details.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal. Ms. Pentz and the Committee took issue with the box above the garage door and inquired if it could be eliminated, owing to its intrusiveness. Ms. Bolender responded that, given the low clearance, the box cannot be mounted in the interior. Mr. Levy suggested a sectional door, but Ms. Bolender replied that it would not provide the needed clearance. Ms. Bolender suggested a black finish to minimize its impact.

Committee members deemed the deck along the rear ell acceptable, but thought that the railing should be replaced with a brick parapet wall extending up from the existing wall. The parapet wall would make the proposed changes to the rear ell less visible. Mr. Farnham reminded the Committee that the south window in the side façade of the rear ell was a historically significant leaded glass window and should not be removed. Committee members agreed that the newly proposed brick parapet wall would obscure any view of the window and it therefore could be replaced. The applicant noted that the leaded glass from the removed window would be used to repair the rear windows on Panama Street. Mr. Farnham informed the applicant that the former owner of the building possessed extra panes of leaded glass for the window repair. The side window did not need to be removed to provide glass to repair the rear windows. Committee members discussed the roof deck on the main section of the building; all but one member thought that it was inappropriate. Mr. Levy supported the deck with a set back to lessen visibility. The Committee members commented that the denial of the roof deck eliminates the need for the elevator tower and stair to the rear ell deck. The Committee members agreed to recommend denial of the roof deck and related alterations.

The Architectural Committee recommended the following, with the staff to review all details:

- 1. The approval of the garage opening painted black to minimize its impact;*
- 2. The approval of a ground-level deck along the rear ell with the construction of a brick parapet wall along Panama Street instead of a railing;*
- 3. The approval of the addition on the rear ell, provided that the south façade of the addition is articulated;*
- 4. The approval of the deck on the rear ell with the conversion of a window to a door, provided that the width of the window is retained;*
- 5. The denial of the main roof deck, walkway, and stairs;*
- 6. The denial of the elevator tower;*
- 7. The approval of the HVAC units with minimal visibility;*
- 8. The approval of the change to both 1st-story side facade windows in the rear ell;*
- 9. The approval of shutters.*

The applicant accepted the Committee's decision and stated that she would submit updated drawings reflecting the recommendation.

1703 Walnut Street

Ilan and Irit Zaken, Owners

Michael Phillips, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1870

PROPOSAL: New storefront, signage and awnings

This application proposes a new storefront, signage, and awnings for the building at 1703 Walnut Street. Excepting the flanking stone pilasters and storefront cornice, the existing storefront was erected in 1994. The pilasters to either side of the storefront remain from the earlier residential design. The architect proposes to cover them in Bomanite and replace the storefront windows and doors with an aluminum and stainless steel storefront. The drainpipe now at the west side of the storefront will be moved to the interior of the building. The storefront cornice, windows, and upper cornice will be painted white; the façade will be painted khaki. A white enamel panel sign with push-through, edge-lit letters will span the storefront above the transoms. Awnings with aprons and open sides will be mounted at the transom level of the storefront and on the 2nd-story windows.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the awnings, signage, and storefront including the relocation of the drainpipe to the interior, provided that the awnings are a Sunbrella-like material, pursuant to Standard 9. Approval of the painting of all wood trim. Approval of the painting of the stucco façade, provided that it is painted a limestone color. Denial of the painting of any stone features including the storefront cornice. Denial of the covering of the pilasters with Bomanite, pursuant to Standards 2 and 5. The staff recommends that the all stone features including the storefront cornice and pilasters be restored, not covered or removed. All with staff to review details.

Mr. Farnham presented the application. Michael Caimi, who represented the applicant, attended the meeting. The discussion centered on whether stone from the original façade had survived along the outer edges of the storefront. For lack of a better name, the pieces along the outer edge were referred to as pilasters. Mr. Farnham showed photographs of the pilasters, which give the appearance of something other than stone. Mr. Caimi asserted that the pilasters are covered with a concrete-like material. Ms. Pentz contended that the original stone exists under coats of paint and perhaps a light coat of stucco. She recommended that the stone around the storefront as well as the stone cornice above the storefront be restored. The other Committee members agreed with her. They also agreed that the remainder of the application was acceptable.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal, provided that the stone pilasters and storefront cornice are restored, not painted or covered, with the staff to review details.

330 South 19th Street aka 1900 Panama Street

Debbie Coppola, Owner

John Eppinger, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1860, Arts & Crafts renovation c. 1910

PROPOSAL: Dormer with door and roof deck

This application proposes adding a roof deck on the rear ell as well as a dormer with deck access door in the rear slope of the main roof of this Arts & Crafts building. The entire ell is visible because the building is situated on the southwest corner of 19th and Panama Streets. The deck would be set behind an existing parapet wall, but the railing would be visible above the wall from both 19th and Panama Streets. The new dormer and door would also be minimally visible. In 1998 the Commission denied an application to construct a deck in the same position because the access door would have been placed on the Panama Street façade with a cantilevered walkway to

the deck.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, provided the design of the dormer is improved, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline. As currently designed, the dormer and door are awkwardly asymmetrical and poorly proportioned. The design should be improved.

John Eppinger, contractor, attended the meeting to represent the project. Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the design of the access dormer. Mr. Eppinger explained that he changed the shape of the dormer roof after constructing the mock-up to reduce visibility. The offset door allows the door to swing and avoid a relocated heat exchanger unit on the interior. The Committee agreed that the awkward design of the dormer was justified if it eliminated visibility from the street.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the project as submitted, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; and the Roofs Guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as ... decks and terraces ... when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features], with the staff to review details.

1522 Locust Street

Tom Holland, Owner

Peter Lynch, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1926

PROPOSAL: Replace balcony

This application proposes replacing a 2nd-story wrought iron balcony on the front façade of the Georgian Revival building. Portions of the existing balcony are rusted beyond repair. Currently, the balcony is cantilevered out of the front façade. The new balcony will be supported with diagonal struts extending out from the façade. The struts will be ornamented with curvilinear pieces. The new panels will not match the original panels, but will be more decorative and curvilinear.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and Restoration Standard 7. The staff recommends that a structural engineer assess the existing balcony and, if possible, its structure be repaired and its decorative panels and brackets be reused. As proposed, the struts supporting the new balcony will disrupt the decorative beltcourse below.

Peter Lynch, contractor, attended the meeting to represent the project. Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Ms. Pentz asked about the construction of the existing balcony. Mr. Lynch stated that they were reluctant to undertake too much investigative work because of potential damage to the interior. Ms. Pentz and Mr. Lynch agreed that the platform returns are most likely bolted through the wall into the floor structure. The Committee all favored restoration of the existing structure. Ms. Pentz thought that the existing structure could be restored and made safe by selective replacement of any deteriorated pieces. The Committee thought the new braces and new railing were unnecessary and inappropriate. Mr. Lynch agreed that the existing sections of railing could be taken down and restored but the new railing had already been purchased. He stated that they only recently learned that the building was historically designated. Mr. Farnham

explained the financial hardship provision of the ordinance. Mr. Levy explained that staff could quickly approve a revised proposal for the restoration of the existing balcony.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the new design as proposed, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials.]; and Restoration Standard 7 [Replacement of missing features from the restoration period will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence. A false sense of history will not be created by adding conjectural features, features from other properties, or by combining features that never existed together historically.].

1832 Delancey Street

Jerry Slipakoff, Owner

Mihoko Samejima, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1857-1858, John McCrea, builder, alterations, 1907, Edgar Seeler, architect

PROPOSAL: Add wood trellis on rear

This application proposes adding a wood trellis on a rear deck. The Commission approved the deck, which sits atop a 3-story rear ell, in June 2002. The 8-foot by 15-foot mahogany trellis will span the deck and be visible from S. 19th Street.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the trellis, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

Mr. Farnham explained the application. Mihoko Samejima, the architect, said that the owner decided on the greenery to complement the previous alterations to the property.

The Committee agreed that the proposed trellis would be too intrusive.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the trellis, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; and the Roofs Guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs ... when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

903-905 Clinton Street

Payam Ebizadeh, Owner

Meredith Sellinger-Ebizadeh, Applicant

DATE: c.1845

PROPOSAL: Install new roofing

This application proposes replacing an existing Modified Bitumin System (MBS) roof with a new MBS roof on the main, front sections of the row houses at 903 and 905 Clinton Street. Weathered wood colored dimensional asphalt shingles would much better approximate the original roofing. Incidentally, famous artist Thornton Oakley added the large dormer on the building at 905 in 1918 to light his studio.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal and noted that the front slopes are very visible.

Meredith Sellinger attended the meeting to represent the owner. She said that the buildings have been refurbished. She commented that the existing roof is in good condition and that the proposed replacement roof would be a preventive measure. Ms. Sellinger thought it difficult to see the roof from street level.

The Committee concurred that when the roof is replaced, it should be replaced with weathered wood asphalt shingles.

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

1227 Pine Street

Robert V. Taglieri, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Demolish rear dormer, new shed dormer and HVAC equipment

This application proposes demolishing the historic rear roof and pedimented dormer and adding a large shed dormer fenestrated with four 6/6 simulated-divided-light windows. It also proposes adding an HVAC unit on the rear slope of the gable roof.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the addition of the HVAC equipment on the rear slope of the gable roof, provided further details verify that the equipment does not protrude above the ridge line of the roof, pursuant to the Roofs Guideline. Denial of the roof and dormer demolition and addition, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9, and the Roofs Guideline.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Cara Carroccia, the architect, noted that this property is situated on the interior of the block and that very little historic fabric remains at the rear. She said that the owner of 1225 Pine Street recently received Commission-approval for very similar alterations and it is the intent, if possible, that the projects at 1225 and 1227 Pine would be executed at the same time by the same contractor.

Mr. Levy thought the proposed alterations appropriate since the property is land locked. The Committee recommended wood six-over-six windows with simulated-divided-light windows in the dormer.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with wood six-over-six windows in the dormer, with the staff to review details.

The meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary