

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

**Robert Thomas, Chair
Commission Offices, One Parkway, 13th Floor, 1515 Arch Street
27 March 2001**

Present

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

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

Also

Lawrence Gilbert, Architect
Sam Olshin, Atkin Olshin Lawson-Bell Architects
Andrea Johnson, Tenant and Condominium Board
Gail Chapman, Friends of Mario Lanza Park
Elizabeth Armour, 222 Delancey Street
Joseph P. Romano, 419 South 3rd Street
Chris Knight, 419 South 3rd Street
Rebecca Stoloff, Society Hill Civic Association
Christopher Beardsley, Architect
Isabelle D. Murray, 524 Lombard Street
Melissa Z. Age, 228 Stamper Street
Deborah Robinson, 6 Blackwell Place
Sabrina Soong, Architect
Michael Bitny
Nicholas Woloshyn
Sean K. McMonagle, Councilman DiCicco's Office
Neil Sandvold
Diane Siegel Danoff, 2428 Spruce Street
Daniel Simcox, 2428 Spruce Street
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance
Michael Bannerman, 1708 Addison Street
Charles Datner, Architect
Robert Graves, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
D. Bruce
Sally Smith, 332 South Front Street
Carol Raviola, 103 Pine Street
Jean Bryan, 316 South Front Street
Roger Doherty, Owner, 100 Delancey Street
Randy Cotton, Preservation Alliance
Gray Smith, RE: 100 Delancey Street

Stanley Krakower, Esq., 100 Delancey Street
John Farrell, 4000 Woodland Avenue
Elizabeth Graf, 4000 Woodland Avenue
J. Sands Wandelt, Philadelphia Water Works Restaurant
John Gibbons, Logan House
Theresa Stuhlman, Fairmount Park Commission

Herbert Levy, Vice-Chair, called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m.

**232-54 Philip Place; 233-55 South 3rd Street;
284-92 St. James Place; 281-93 Locust Street
Society Hill Townhouses Common Area**

Washington Square Townhouse Council, James Cooke, President, Owners
Sam Olshin, Applicant
DATE: 1962
PROPOSAL: Common area renovation

Mr. Baron summarized the proposal which represents a change from the landscape plan approved for this courtyard at a previous Committee and Commission meeting. The new plan calls for a larger central pedestrian area and new trees as well as a reduced planter around the statue. Staff did not register a recommendation for or against the project.

The architect, Sam Olshin, informed the Committee that the neighborhood group fueled this second submission by requesting more trees and planting in the courtyard. He presented a design showing a lowered planter with a 10-foot radius, relocated bollards, and increased plantings. While Mr. Olshin showed the Committee brick paver samples, he stated his goal to reuse a majority of salvaged brick in the project.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the courtyard landscape proposal.

700-712 Locust Street, SW corner of Washington Square West

Locust Condominium Association, Owner
Dave Terrell, Applicant
DATE: 1818-1823
PROPOSAL: Fence, gate and dumpster enclosure.

The proposal involves constructing a fence with two gates and a dumpster enclosure at the rear of the building at the corner of Locust Street and Washington Square West. The staff recommended approval of the fence but denial of the dumpster enclosure.

Larry Gilbert and Andrea Johnson, of the Tenant and Condominium Board attended the meeting to explain the proposal and answer questions. She expressed the need for enclosing the dumpster owing to public usage.

Mr. Levy questioned the possibility of moving the parking spaces forward and putting the dumpster against the wall. Mr. McCoubrey suggested having the fence die into the chimney eliminating the return and turning the dumpster in the opposite direction with an adjustment to the gate. In addition, he recommended putting a corner guard on the exposed brick of the building.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of modified fence and gate with the placement of the dumpster at the edge of the projecting pier.

235 Queen Street

Octavia Hill Association Incorporated, Owner

Ariel Bierbaum, Applicant

DATE: c. 1815

PROPOSAL: Mural

This proposal involves painting a mural on the stuccoed side wall and brick fence of a remarkable set of houses with rear courtyard. The staff recommended approval of painting a mural on a reduced area that preserves the sense of the double chimney shape without visual interference and also the staff recommended painting within a rectangle below the roof gable eave as well as the rear ell.

Mr. Baron stated that a sense of architecture would be lost if the shape of the house's wall is not maintained.

Sam Olshin, Gail Chapman, and David Guinn, the mural painter, attended the meeting to explain and answer questions about the proposal. Mr. Olshin said that the Southwest corner of the park would be an area for dogs and that the profile of the building is included in the design of the mural with only the retainer wall being painted. And also stated that the Octavia Hill Association has given its approval of the mural. Mr. Guinn presented renderings of the proposed mural.

Some members questioned the windows in the party wall and also thought the outline of the building would not be disturbed if the mural extended the entire height of the building.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with the retention of the brick coping unpainted at the top.

302 South Front Street

Ellen and Philip Baer, Owners

Christopher Beardsley, Architect

DATE: c. 1970

PROPOSAL: Façade and porch alteration

This proposal calls for altering the front façade of this rowhouse. The house features a beveled or diagonal façade setback within a porch. The plans show rebuilding the porch wall parallel to the street and replacing a glass railing with a mesh design. The staff recommended denial per Standards 2 and 9.

Christopher Beardsley, the architect, presented the proposal, which extends a floor out to the front with new mesh railing recessed four inches and stated that three owners have already modified their facades.

Some Committee members thought that although this alters the front of an historic building, the rhythm of the facades owing to previous modifications are disrupted but stressed the importance of a consistency of the proposed materials. In addition, the detailing is an important element; therefore the floor slab should consist of the same material as the other porches and with a glass railing for continuity.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of a modified design with glass railings and the

staff to review details.

238 Stamper Street

Geno Sena, Owner

Sabrina Soong, Architect

DATE: 1785-94; altered 1970

PROPOSAL: Substantial demolition and rear addition

This proposal involves demolishing these two 18th century houses except for the front wall and constructing a new house that will reach much further south towards Lombard Street. The applicant proposes to demolish the roof and the original visible rear wall. An engineering report by Robert Rosen as well as an L&I violation cites structural problems with the roof. The plans no longer show the addition of front dormers; however, the applicant proposes to remove the chimney and rebuild it supported on steel joists.

The staff recommended denial and thought the designers should find a way to reinforce the roof structure and retain the original rear wall. They could cut down windows to connect to the addition. The staff recommends approval of the chimney, constructed of modern brick, supported with steel and reconstructed in brick.

Sabrina Soong and Geno Sena attended the meeting. Ms. Soong stated that in a letter from the Department of Licenses and Inspections the property is in an unsafe condition. The staff explained that the letter does not say Dangerous or Imminently Dangerous. In addition, the engineer's report stated that the front wall is salvageable.

Ms. Pentz believed that the shell of the building can be saved and the same method of bracing for the front façade can be used to brace the rear façade as well. Other members of the Committee also thought the basic framework of the front and rear façade should remain owing to the building dating back to the 1780s.

Elizabeth Armour stated that the inventory of this Historic District describes this property although rehabilitated in 1970 as one of the few Significant properties and also that the issue of the building's footprint is an important element.

Joseph Romano, a neighbor, asked that the easement on the property be respected with the retention of the front façade and that the new addition not extend further than the neighboring houses.

Rebecca Stoloff, Society Hill Civic Association, questioned the Lombard Street façade and stressed the importance of the maintenance of the rear streetscape.

Ms. Soong stated that the applicant proposes to keep the front wall, take down the roof and rebuild with the same profile. The top two floors will line up with the neighboring houses; however the first floor will extend out further. The addition will not extend above the eave. The Committee believed that the integrity of visible rear wall should not be compromised owing to its being a major fragment of an 18th century house.

Mr. Tyler stated that upon his site visit he saw little evidence of cracking on the rear wall. He recommended the removal of plaster for the determination of what previously existed. Committee members also recommended the documentation with photographs of the rear wall.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the following:

1. *Retention of the front and rear walls;*
 2. *The removal of plaster from the rear wall for a determination of what openings previously existed with the idea that existing historic openings could be cut down into doors to connect the old and new sections of the house;*
 3. *An addition extending to the south;*
 4. *Rebuild the roof to match the original roofline, and*
 5. *Rebuild the exterior chimney supported on steel joists.*
- With the staff to review all details.*

208 Fitzwater Street

Michele Armstrong, Owner

Nicholas Woloshyn, Contractor

DATE: 1790

PROPOSAL: Substantial demolition and new construction

This proposal originally called for demolishing the front wall and roof of this 18th century brick house. Licenses and Inspections has cited the house as Imminently Dangerous for its partially collapsed rear roof slope and dormer. The applicant seeks to rebuild the roof and front wall, adding another floor and changing the location of the window openings to match the neighboring house. The applicant owns that house and wants to combine the two.

The staff recommended that the applicant immediately brace the dangerous walls and either repair/restore the existing front wall if that is possible or rebuild it to match the original. A new taller structure could set behind the ridgepole. The window locations should follow their historic placement, clearly visible inside the house.

The Committee favored allowing the immediate demolition of the property and then reconstructing a structure to look like the historic house.

Mr. Tyler stated that owing to the imminently dangerous condition the structure can be demolished with approval at staff level; however, the design as submitted resembles an 18th century house and he thought the design should reflect the 21st century but fitting the streetscape. Mr. Baron did not agree and thought this would create incentives to demolish historic buildings. He favored asking the applicant to preserve as much of the existing building as possible and rebuild it with enlargement at the rear.

The Architectural Committee recommended demolition owing to the imminently dangerous status but referred the new construction's design back to the Architectural Committee.

2428 Spruce Street

Diane and Theodore Danoff, Owners

Daniel W. Simcox, Applicant

DATE: 1893-94

PROPOSAL: Replacement door

The applicant seeks to replace a non-original front door with a new door. As best we can deduce from looking at matching houses on the block, the house probably had an open vestibule without a door at the outside face of the building. The staff recommended approval owing to the lack of historical information and the need for a front door.

Committee members thought that since this is not a restoration and absent historic documentation the proposed door appropriate. However, typically historic doors were painted and not stained but since this is not the original, the Committee said it could be painted or stained.

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

1708 Addison Street

Emily W. Bandera, Owner
Michael Bannerman, Applicant
DATE: c. 1850
PROPOSAL: Storm door

This proposal calls for adding a wooden storm door at the front door of this rowhouse. The applicant has shown two door variations neither with a full glass panel. The staff recommended approval of a full light door only. The door should be painted to match the door color. The specific circumstances of this being a replacement door and a house with a non-original door and no vestibule contributed to this recommendation.

Michael Bannerman attended the meeting and expressed the owner's preference for the #1 or #2 door option and presented photographs of doors of some of the neighboring houses. However, the Committee's preference is a full light door because the door of the house should be fully visible in its correct plane.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of a full light door with the staff to review details.

106, 108 North 2nd Street

205 Arch Street Associates, L.P., Owners
Charles Datner, Applicant
DATE: c. 1830
PROPOSAL: Storefront alterations

This application involves work to the storefronts of these commercial buildings. Through an error on the part of the applicant, a permit issued on these properties and the contractor removed a cornice from 106 North 2nd Street. The applicant now seeks to reconstruct a new cornice on that property. In addition, he proposes to construct new versions of the current non-original doors and to add a glass door in place of a window. The staff recommended approval of the cornice restoration, but if the applicant is remaking the doors, they should match the original as shown in the historic image in our file.

The Committee thought it important treat 106 and 108 differently because 106 formerly received a Victorian storefront and removal of the original Greek Revival North 2nd Street columns. On 106 the Committee thought the applicant should put back the Italianate cornice, remake the existing wood doors and reinstall the glass in the existing transoms. On 108 the Committee thought the applicant should restore the door and transom to the Greek Revival period as per the picture in the file and retain the glass center window.

Charles Datner attended the meeting and stated that 104 North 2nd Street is the main entrance to fifteen apartments and two large stores. In addition, he stated that he would like to retain and repair the existing storefront.

The Architectural Committee recommended for 106 North 2nd Street, the restoration of the cornice and the doors with glass above the door per the drawings.

The Architectural Committee recommended for 108 North 2nd Street denial as submitted but approval of a modified drawing with the two end bays restored based on the historic image in the Philadelphia Historical Commission file, with the middle bay window to remain.

The Committee stated that the granite piers on 104 were painted green but the applicant requested to paint the piers a granite color and preferred restoring the door.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval for 104 North 2nd Street the painting of the piers a granite color.

1600 Arch Street, SW corner of South 16th Street

SAS-1600 Arch Street, LP, Owner

Robert Graves, Architect

DATE: 1925

PROPOSAL: Illuminated signage pylons

The proposal involves a new design for signage pylons rejected by the Committee at the last meeting. The new pylons, though lower, still rise 12 feet and feature backlit plastic faces. The staff recommended denial, the architect should avoid backlighting and overscale signage on this building.

Robert Graves explained the revised proposal for the pylons which intergrates with the planter with a granite base. He stated that the actual height of the signage is 7½ feet with stone at the bottom to match the existing and set back parallel to the building. The backlit lights will now show through only at the cut out letters.

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

100 Delancey Street

Roger and Jeanne Doherty, Owners

Christopher Beardsley, Architect

DATE: c. 1970

PROPOSAL: Rear addition with elevator

This elevator addition, seen several times in the past, has now shifted northward to the Delancey Street property line as agreed in the last Committee meeting. The remaining issues include the height of the roofline, which has again exceeded the eave line of the existing house, and the materials.

The staff recommended approval of the placement of the addition; however, the brick of the exposed rear wall, the existing fence gate and metal work should remain. The new addition should again sit lower than the eave line of the existing house. The cladding of the new construction should have a matte or burnished finish to avoid clashing with the existing construction.

In attendance for the meeting were Roger Doherty, Christopher Beardsley, and Ronald Patterson.

Having seen this proposal previously, the Committee focused on the issue of the height, the proposed materials, the existing metal work atop the brick and the design of the gate. They determined that the elevator components necessitate the need for the additional height. Some Committee members recommended developing a detail at the joint of the existing house roof and the elevator tower. The Committee also discussed the issue of the proposed Rheinzink material, which it thought appropriate owing to its non-glossy finish. The Committee recommended the retention of the existing metal work design on the wall and at the gate.

Stanley Krakower, Esq., counsel for neighbor Sally Smith, had three concerns; the height of the elevator, the proposed materials and the windows in the addition. He questioned whether the height of the addition needs to extend over the elevator landing portion of the structure. Mr. Thomas stated that different heights would make the addition more visible. Mr. Krakower questioned the use of Rheinzink instead of bricks for consistency and the size of the windows in the addition. Again the Committee determined that many Society Hill buildings consist of a varying degree of metal materials, and that the windows are only seen from the courtyard and in any case seem compatible with the existing.

Gray Smith questioned the visibility of the window and the dimensions of the its edges proximity to the adjacent property.

Carol Raviola expressed her concern about the loss of light and air as a result of the addition.

Jean Bryan expressed concern about the compatibility of the materials in regards to the Society Hill neighborhood.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the following:

1. *The revised version of the addition with the mass abutting Delancey Street;*
2. *Rheinzink material for the addition with its height as submitted.*
Subject to:
3. *Retention of the design of the metal on the top of existing brick wall and the gate;*
4. *Retention of the west wall in brick;*
With the staff to review all details.

1705 North 7th Street, New Greater Straightway Baptist Church

New Greater Straightway Baptist Church, Owner

Reverend William Pinkney, Applicant

DATE: 1886

PROPOSAL: New glass doors

Mr. Baron described the proposal which involves legalizing glass front doors installed without a permit. Staff recommended the applicant model the new doors on the historic design.

Mr. Baron presented a 1907 view of the building to the Committee and determined that double doors extended the full height of the door frame instead of stopping at the current glass transom. Mr. Levy stated that glass doors which front historic doors, such as at the Athenaeum, are generally acceptable. In this case, however, the Committee agreed not to grant approval to plain glass entry doors since they do not front historic or historically inspired doors. Mr. Levy suggested the applicant research historic documentation of the original doors.

The Architectural Committee deemed the application incomplete owing to the lack of information on historic doors. The Architectural Committee recommended that the applicant submit a design for doors, based on a historic design if possible, that extend the full length of the door frame.

4000 Woodland Avenue, Woodlands Cemetery

Woodland Cemetery Corporation, Owner

Elizabeth Graf, Applicant

DATE: 1748-1786

PROPOSAL: Railings on stairs of Woodland Mansion

The proposal involves installing metal railings on the north façade steps of the Woodlands Mansion. The staff recommended approval although the design needs refinement.

Elizabeth Graf and John Farrell attended the meeting to explain and answer questions. Ms. Graf stated that this installation is only temporary, when funding is in place, a permanent installation will take place.

The Committee thought that a square post railing more appropriate. It questioned its placement into the asphalt below and stated that owing to the symmetry of the building, two railings would be more appropriate. However, if for financial reasons this is not possible, then the Committee could approve only one railing.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of two railings with an open design painted black with square posts and molded top with the staff to review details.

Waterworks Engine House, Fairmount Park

City of Philadelphia, Owner

J. Sands Wandelt, Applicant

DATE: 1812 and 1822

PROPOSAL: Awnings and cooler box in concept

This proposal in concept involves several awning alternatives for the riverside porch. One of these alternatives involves smaller individual awnings and umbrellas at the outside tables. The second alternative which the applicant prefers involves a much larger full width single piece awning. On the opposite façade, the applicant seeks an awning over the door to mark the entrance. On a brick platform facing the south garden, the applicant wishes to install a freezer box covered with canvas to look like a tent.

The staff recommends using umbrellas but no awnings on this signature façade. The staff also thought the tent acceptable in concept, but not an attached awning at the front door.

J. Sandy Wandelt attended the meeting to answer questions and explain the needs of the proposed restaurant in regards to seating and inclement weather conditions and covered seating. He also stated that the covering could be temporary and removed off-season. He also expressed the need for a duct from the lower louver window to allow for cooking downstairs.

Committee members believed this to be an important façade from across the river and the proposal should respect and not hide the architecture of the building. Some members thought the awnings take away from the building and that the visibility of the columns must be maintained. The Committee was sympathetic to the applicant and brainstormed in an effort to come up with a solution to the proposal and suggested

various options such as separate awnings that are clear in the column area, or a lower type awning which keeps the top of the columns visible with a minimal pitch and a free-standing structure which would be less visible. It therefore asked that the applicant research possible options. In regards to the awning over the door entrance it believed that it should be minimal, step away from the building with a low arch at the height above the transom area.

Theresa Stulhman, Fairmount Park Commission, expressed the importance of the restaurant succeeding.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept the following:

1. *The cooler box tent;*
2. *a simple canopy type awning over the door entrance above the transom area with a low arch, and*
3. *Conceptual approval of some type of covering separate from the building that is seasonal and does not hide the major elements with its design referred back to the Committee. It was stressed that this approval is contingent upon finding an acceptable final design.*

4101 Old York Road, Logan House

Fairmount Park Commission, Owner

John Gibbons, Architect

DATE: c. 1775

PROPOSAL: Renovations porch ramp

This proposal involves the renovation of a very dilapidated house which had a later porch around it which has since fallen off. The proposal is the restoration of the façades with a deck with a railing and a ramp for handicapped accessibility.

John Gibbons, Theresa Stulhman and Freda Lippes, Capital Programs Office attended the meeting to explain the project. Mr. Gibbons stated that the porch would be rebuilt with a painted wood railing with 2 x 2 wood spindles also a steel railing down the front steps which does not join the building.

The Committee established that the HVAC compressors' location will switch to the other side of the building and be masked with bushes.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of a modified placement for the compressors and also the railing with half posts on the top with the staff to review details.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary