

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

**Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Commission Offices, Room 578, City Hall
24 September 2002**

Present

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Tony Atkin, AIA
Suzanne Pentz

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

Also

John Sabatino, Perks Reutter Associates
Harry Perks, Perks Reutter Associates
Nan Gutterman, Vitetta Group
Emanuel Kelly, Kelly/Maiello Incorporated
Jim Hanson, Vitetta Group
Jim Karmolinski, Kelly/Maiello Incorporated
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Tony Forte, Saul Ewing
Ursinio Nunez
Frank Cawley, Philadelphia Sign Company
Robert Shamble, Kelly/Maiello Incorporated
Michael Stern, Center City Residents' Association
Allen Jeter, Citizens Bank
Andrew Zellers-Frederick, Historic RittenhouseTown
Richard Waldron, American Swedish Historical Museum
Robert P. Thomas, Campbell Thomas and Company
Brett Powell, Brawer and Hauptman Architects
Kevin Angstant
James Wiesenhutter, Unkefer Brothers Construction
Jennifer Myers, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
John F. Tucker, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Anthony Tarcelli, The Philadelphia Club
Kenneth Mitchell, The Philadelphia Club
Jeffrey Hadzima
Robert W. Denious, Esq., The Philadelphia Club
Lanny Leibowitz, Architect
Philip Steel, Jr., Society of the Descendants of Washington's Army at Valley Forge
Steven A. Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
Winchell S. Carroll, American Revolution Patriot's Fund
James D. Grange, Architect
David Wheadon
Chris Harrelson, Brand and Allen Architects

Robert Cheetham
 Rachel Cheetham
 Margaret Pentz
 Bill Keenan, Kiehl's
 Peter F. Iacovoni, Commerce Department
 Hether Smith
 Peter Goldring

Ms. Pentz, acting-chair, called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

1328-32 Race Street, Fire Station

City of Philadelphia, Owner
 Harry Perks, Applicant
 DATE: 1925, architect, John Molitor
 PROPOSAL: Complete demolition for Convention Center expansion in concept

Mr. Baron apprised the applicants of the absence of a quorum and the applicants agreed to proceed. John Gallery, Preservation Alliance, said that, owing to the importance of the issue, he objected to the review without a quorum present. Mr. Tyler informed the applicants that a special meeting of the Architectural Committee would be scheduled to review the proposal.

1801 West Diamond Street, NW corner of 18th Street

Church of the Advocate, Owner
 Bob Shamble, Architect/Applicant
 DATE: 1891-97, Charles M. Burns, architect
 PROPOSAL: New construction for community center

This application calls for constructing a new community center on the ruins of the former chapel building. The new structure will incorporate existing fabric on the south and west facades and will salvage stone at the base of the east façade. Plans call for building most of the new structure out of grey brick.

Staff recommendation: Approval pursuant to Standard 9. Two members of staff thought the east façade should have a more symmetrical design.

Mr. Tyler informed the applicants that Ms. Pentz, the only Committee member present, must recuse herself, owing to her firm's involvement in the project. This left no Committee members to review the application. Mr. Tyler informed the applicants that absent the Committee's recommendation, the Commission would receive the staff's recommendation as well as the minutes of the meeting explaining the proposal. The applicants agreed to proceed and there were no objections by the public.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal and showed pictures of the former chapel, which is the location of the new construction.

Emanuel Kelly, the architect, gave the presentation and explained that the interior basketball courts dictate the asymmetrical design of the east facade. He said that the west wall would be reconstructed in stone to match the existing in the same pattern, but reassembled to give support to the backboard of the basketball courts on the interior. The north wall will consist of a cinder block base and brick, turning the corner with stone and the east façade will have gray brick and a stone

base. Mr. Kelly said that the original wall, which ties into the church property, would be repaired, bracing the columns, re-pointing the tracery and repairing the stucco. He said the interior wall will clearly read as old and new fabric. The front wall will be built to its original height. He presented samples and described the various materials proposed for the construction. Cast stone elements would be used in the sills. The east wall at the property line near the gates would be of salvaged stone or new stone to match. The gate would be a vertical steel picket with a simple contemporary design. A standing seam roof in a slate color would be installed, although he believes that the original roof was slate. Mr. Tyler thought the standing seam roof appropriate because it compliments the sanctuary.

Father Isaac Miller, rector of the Church of the Advocate, said the congregation supports the project.

The staff recommended approval of the proposal, 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.*], and the public did not raise any issues.

1643 West Diamond Street, NE corner of 17th Street

Ursino Nunez, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1887, architect Frank Furness

PROPOSAL: New storefront

This proposal calls for the demolition of a partially existing c. 1900 storefront and its replacement with a new aluminum storefront. The owner's drawing shows a base constructed alternatively from wood or brick. The existing transom system with its decorative paneled mullions exists.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. The applicant should seek architectural help both for the drawing and the structure. The new storefront system should be constructed with wood to match the design of the existing pieces and should retain the existing transom.

Ursino Nunez, the owner, did not object to the lack of a quorum. Mr. Baron explained the proposal and stated that he had performed a site visit. Currently the building is boarded up. He noted that the base of the building is brick and that the transoms are intact and original. He also said that the south side of the storefront is deteriorated. Mr. Baron thought that one solution would be to rebuild the area under the transoms with metal covered by wood.

Mr. Nunez stated that the neighboring house is in a state of collapse. In addition, he stated that he was unaware that the property was historic and that all his finances have been used to open this business. He proposes to add new bricks and a new aluminum storefront. He said that the existing transoms and framework are original.

Ms. Pentz said that is important that the storefront relates to the architect's intention and is sympathetic to the original design. She asked if any documentation existed of the Furness design. She stressed the importance of having an architect review the proposal to ensure that the design is structurally sound. She considered the proposal and believed that the proposed aluminum storefront is not an appropriate alteration to this property.

Mr. Nunez inquired if he could stabilize the property and proceed with the storefront alterations at a later date. He said that signage and a awning would be required as well as the installation of a new front door. Mr. Baron noted that the awning and door could be approved at staff level as long as they are historically correct. Mr. Baron suggested a wood-framed door with large glass at the top and panels at the bottom with interior gates for security. Ms. Pentz thought the wrap-around awning below the cornice with a cloth-like material as shown on his drawings was acceptable.

Ms. Pentz recommended denial of the proposal as submitted 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.] and 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.]

Mr. Nunez decided that, for economic reasons, he would withdraw the storefront proposal and have the staff approve an awning and a door. He will return with an architect's drawing for a new storefront at a later date.

5500-06 Germantown Avenue, NW corner of Schoolhouse Lane

Citizens Bank, Owner

Frank Cawley, Applicant

DATE: c. 1868, mid 20th century addition, architect James Sidney

PROPOSAL: Illuminated signage

The proposal calls for replacing four existing signs with four new signs for the new owner. Sign A, a pylon sign in the parking lot will change to a slightly curved sign face and a single support post. Signs C and D involve refacing illuminated box signs on the mid 20th century addition. Sign B in the entablature over the Germantown Avenue door replaces an existing sign that unfortunately covers original architectural stonework.

Staff recommendation: Approval pursuant to Standard 9 and 10 with the exception that Sign B should be reduced in size to expose the projecting stone features.

Mr. Baron informed the applicant about the absence of a quorum and gave the option of proceeding or being heard at a future date. Frank Cawley and Allen Jeter attended the meeting and agreed to proceed. After speaking with staff, the applicant had reduced the sign. Mr. Baron believed that a further reduction of the sign would enhance the exposed stone features even more.

Ms. Pentz recommended the approval of all the signs as revised, 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] 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.], with the staff to review details.

207 Lincoln Drive, Rittenhouse Town

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Andrew Zellers-Frederick, Applicant

DATE: 1707

PROPOSAL: New wood fence around Rittenhouse homestead

This proposal calls for replacement of a portion of fence surrounding the David Rittenhouse homestead with a wood fence taken from a Carpenter Company pattern book.

Staff recommendation: Approval pursuant to Standard 9.

Andrew Zellers-Frederick, the director of Rittenhouse Town, did not object to the absence of a quorum.

Mr. Zellers-Frederick said that the existing aluminum fence is deteriorated and inappropriate for the site. In addition, the chain-link fence in the rear, which has been damaged by inclement weather, will be repaired. Mr. Baron suggested the re-use of the aluminum fence in the location of the chain-link fence. Mr. Zellers-Frederick responded that the chain-link fence is a deterrent for animals. Ms. Pentz commented that the wood should not be in contact with the soil; it should have some type of concrete base. Mr. Zellers-Frederick said that precautions would be taken to prevent the rotting of the base of the fence. He also said that the WPA floodwall would not be touched, the post would be cut off and the new fence would be installed in front of the wall. The applicant said that owing to the safety of school children, the pickets would be rounded. He thought staining the fence more appropriate than painting, owing to the natural state of the site. He noted that a removable section of the fence is needed for deliveries.

Ms. Pentz recommended that a cap be put on the top of the posts to prevent water infiltration.

Ms. Pentz recommended approval 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], with the staff to review details.

2100 Porter Street, aka 2101 Shunk Street, Gentilhommiere

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Brett Powell, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1760, east wing; 1798-1803, central portion; c. 1825, west wing; c.1810, auxiliary buildings

PROPOSAL: New roof

This application returns to the Committee and Commission with one major change. Originally, the proposal called for metal shingles. Now the application is for asphalt-fiberglass shingles in a weathered-wood color. The box and pole gutters will be rehabilitated.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 6 and the roofing guideline. However, the notes on the plans specify replacing a roof hatch and HVAC unit, but these do not appear on the plans. Staff notes that box gutters require additional maintenance.

Brett Powell, the architect, agreed to proceed without a quorum. Ms. Spina explained that the proposed location was the home of Stephen Girard. She stated that, although an 1872 photograph shows that the eastern portion of the house with a standing seam roof, the dates of construction dictate that the roof originally had cedar shakes.

Mr. Powell said that the notations on the plans for the roof hatch and HVAC unit were from a different project and will be removed. Mr. Powell said that owing to the steep roof pitch, the roof is difficult to maintain. He noted that the original building had a box gutter incorporated into the cornice as well as a later pole gutter. The proposal calls for re-lining the existing wood gutter with stainless steel flashing and the removing the later pole gutter. In addition, the cornice will be repaired and the pole gutters on the auxiliary buildings will be rehabilitated.

Ms. Pentz recommended approval 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.] and the roofing guideline [Recommended: Replacing in kind an entire feature of the roof that is too deteriorated to repair. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.], with the removal of the notes for the roof hatch and HVAC unit on the plans and the staff to review details.

1900 Pattison Avenue, American Swedish Historical Museum

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Robert Thomas, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1926, John Nyden, architect

PROPOSAL: Elevator tower, final approval

This application returns to Committee and Commission for final approval, but with some modifications. The elevator tower will stand on the north side of the building tucked into the corner of the cross gable. Originally the proposed addition extended beyond the projecting area, but now it will be flush with the northernmost wall. The new tower will have a stucco finish, simplified cast stone pilasters at the corner and pieces of decorative stone now found at the bays that will be covered. The primary path to the elevator will lead directly from Pattison Avenue, eliminating the ramp previously proposed. The current path will be regraded and repaved in concrete.

Staff recommendation: Approval pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the accessibility guideline, with staff to review details.

Before explaining the proposal, Ms. Spina informed Robert Thomas, the architect, and Richard Waldron, Executive Director of the American Swedish Historical Museum, of the absence of a quorum, and they agreed to proceed.

Mr. Thomas explained that two chimneys exist to give the building symmetry, but only one actually functions. The proposal includes keeping the unused chimney above the roof, but removing the interior portion to create an opening for the elevator. This allowed the entire addition to be pushed further into the corner of the building. Ms. Pentz inquired if the proposed elevator shaft would impact the foundation. Mr. Thomas noted the importance of the confirmation from the elevator company that this is a viable solution. Mr. Thomas explained that the revised proposal includes restoring the deteriorated walkway, which will be used for the ADA requirement.

Ms. Pentz recommended approval of the proposal 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.], 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.] and the accessibility guideline [Recommended: Designing new or additional means of access that are compatible with the historic building and its setting.], with the staff to review details.

47-49 North 2nd Street, aka 128 Cuthbert Street

Daryl Rothman, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation of Cuthbert Street façade

The application includes reestablishing the first floor openings to the original lintel heights, with a large single-light transom over the front door and a six-pane fixed transom over the double-hung 6/6 window on the first floor. New true-divided light, 6/6 windows will be installed on the second and third floors.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the windows in the upper floors, door and single-light transom, pursuant to Standard 2, but denial of the window on the first floor. The original sill height should be reestablished and a double-hung 6/6 window installed with the opening toothed-in, pursuant to Standard 6, with staff to review details, including a brick match.

Before explaining the proposal, Ms. Spina informed Kevin Angstandt, representing the owner, of the absence of a quorum. He agreed to proceed.

Mr. Angstandt said that he believes that the proposed proportions of the first floor window are original because the sill heights remain constant on the façade continuing along Cuthbert Street and pintles for the shutters show a larger window. Ms. Pentz inquired if the floor level had been changed, and Mr. Angstandt said that the floor consisted of brick vaults with steel beams running north and south. Ms. Pentz said that 1835 was too early for that kind of structural system. Ms. Pentz and staff reviewed additional photographs of the existing condition and agreed that the present sill height for the first floor remains unchanged. Mr. Baron suggested a larger double-hung window, perhaps a 9 over 9 rather than the two windows in the single opening. Mr. Angstandt stated that the owners are elderly and cannot open a larger sash. Ms. Pentz thought the proposed 1st floor windows appropriate. Ms. Pentz inquired about the light fixtures on the side of door and recommended that the lights not look historic. She also noted that the proposed stairs do not match the existing; however, the applicant said that he proposes to install bluestone stairs with three risers and bluestone cheeks. Ms. Pentz asked about a railing, and said that a simple railing design is more appropriate.

Ms. Pentz recommended the approval of the proposal 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.], with the staff to review details.

102-106 Arch Street

Brown Hill, Incorporated, Owner

Jennifer Myers, Architect

DATE: 1743, Thomas Green, carpenter

PROPOSAL: New condenser platform, new front gate and steps

The original alleyway entrance now has a taller lintel, an infilled upper portion and a six-panel wood door. The application is for the installation of a platform at the visible rear of the property at the first floor to support new HVAC condensers, and a new painted wood screen to hide them. On the front of the building, the application is for the removal of the wood door and infill, and the installation of a wrought-iron gate. The proposal also includes the installation of three brick steps.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the removal of the infill and installation of condensers and fence, pursuant to Standard 9 and mechanical systems guideline. Denial of the wrought-iron gate and steps, pursuant to Standard 9. The opening should have a simple, painted batten door. Installation of the steps would obscure the historic stone tread at the opening.

Before presenting the proposal, Ms. Spina informed Jennifer Myers, the architect, and John Tucker about the absence of a quorum and they agreed to proceed.

Ms. Myers said that the proposed location of the gate is the entryway to the second floor apartment and the egress for the back alley. She also said that they proposed an open gate for visibility and security rather than a solid door. In addition, two additional risers are needed to meet code. Ms. Pentz stated that the proposed wrought iron gate is too fancy and it should be a simple metal gate with pickets.

Ms. Pentz recommended approval of the removal of the infill, the condenser platform and fence, the addition of two stone treads with the retention of the existing stone and a simplified wrought-iron gate design 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] and mechanical systems guideline [Recommended: Installing air conditioning units in such a manner that historic features are not damaged or obscured.], with the staff to review details.

1301-03 Walnut Street, NW corner of 13th Street, Philadelphia Club

Philadelphia Club, Owner

James Wiesenhutter, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: 1837, attributed to William Strickland, architect, 1888, addition, Frank Furness, architect, 1904-5, bay on rear, Horace Trambauer, architect

PROPOSAL: Legalize windows

This application calls for legalizing the replacement of sash in three windows on the second floor, north facade. The new Pella sash have their own sub-frames, resulting in windows that have lost approximately 3 inches of glazing.

Staff recommendation: Denial 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.]*.

Anthony Tarcelli, Ken Mitchell, James Wiesenhutter and Robert Denious, Esq., did not object to

the lack of a quorum. Mr. Denious stated that he believes that it is purely speculation about the historic window proportions owing to the absence of documentation. He inquired about the date of designation and Ms. Spina responded that this building was one of the first to be designated in 1956. He also said that he believes that the replaced windows were not original. All the parties representing the proposal agreed that absent documentation, the proposed windows are appropriate.

Ms. Pentz reiterated the criteria for window replacement and that it is important to replicate the historic proportions. She said that the styles could vary, but the Commission takes issue with the approval of adding a frame within a frame. Ms. Spina showed photographs of the replacement windows, noting the new sub-frame. Mr. Baron stated that a permit was required for the window replacement, even if the building was not on the Philadelphia Register.

Mr. Baron noted newly installed air conditioning units and inquired if the Club had received a permit for the work. Mr. Denious did not answer the question, stating that he was only prepared to discuss the windows.

Ms. Pentz recommended denial of the legalization of the windows, 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].

421 South Iseminger Street

Jeffrey Hadzima, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1830

PROPOSAL: New dormer

This proposal calls for the installation of a shed dormer in the front gable. The dormer would have four, 4/4 wood windows.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 9 and roofing guidelines. However, the Commission approved similar applications in the past for two other houses.

Ms. Spina apprised Jeffrey Hadzima, the owner, of the absence of a quorum; he agreed to continue. Ms. Spina then presented the proposal.

Mr. Hadzima said that the need for additional space prompted this proposal. He cited previously approved dormers on Camac Street as well as neighboring houses on his block.

Ms. Pentz believes that the Committee denied proposals for dormers; however, some shed dormers with a tripartite configuration were grandfathered when the properties were designated and some on the block were constructed illegally. She also believes that large dormers overwhelm the streetscape, but did concede that the houses are extremely small.

Mr. Hadzima inquired that if the Commission would approve a smaller dormer. Ms. Pentz responded that visibility would remain, regardless of the dormer's size.

Ms. Pentz recommended denial of the proposal 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 roofing guidelines [Not Recommended: Introducing a new roof feature that is incompatible in size, scale, material and color. Not Recommended: Radically changing a character-defining roof shape.]

Policy for Slate Roofs

Mr. Tyler introduced the issue of slate roofs and their replacement. He noted that the Commission needs to address the economics of slate replacement and the emergency nature of many roof repairs

In his remarks, Mr. Tyler noted that often a property owner cannot afford to replace an existing slate roof in the same material. This frequently applies to the Girard Estate Municipal Historic District. In Girard Estate, many of the houses originally had -- and some still have -- slate roofs. Now approximately 100 years old, these roofs have reached the end of their life expectancy; indeed, most dwellings now have asphalt and fiber glass shingles. Although Girard Estate is a solid middle-class neighborhood, its population contains many retirees on fixed incomes. For them in particular, replacement in slate may prove extremely burdensome. He cited a recent application to replace the deteriorating slate on a roof with asphalt/fiber glass shingles. The Architectural Committee and staff recommended denial under *The Secretary's Standards*; the Committee urged the applicant's representative, their daughter, to seek relief under the unnecessary hardship. They chose to withdraw the application and attempt repair of the existing slate. This proved ineffective. The owners decline to exercise the unnecessary hardship option. Mr. Tyler also reported that these owners had secured cost estimates to reroof their house. Slate would cost \$14,000, simulated slate \$12,000, asphalt/fiber glass \$2,400. Either of these two larger sums could easily equal a person's Social Security benefit for a year.

This issue extends beyond Girard Estate. As the Commission designates other districts that include buildings with elaborate millwork, slate or tile roofs and other features costly to replicate, the problem will grow and could inundate the Commission and the Committee on Financial Hardship with applications for relief. Randal Baron and Laura Spina mentioned the compromise solution already employed of allowing asphalt/fiber glass shingles on rear roof slopes with slate salvaged from those rears for reuse on front slopes. Mr. Baron also thought the hardship procedure provided relief. The salvage solution requires much more extensive labor at, of course, a commensurately higher cost. Unfortunately, roof repair is frequently undertaken upon the discovery of water penetration, and resort to the hardship process can consume several weeks or even months. Mr. Tyler also saw an analogy between a substitute material in a neighborhood such as Girard Estate and the routine approval of asphalt/fiber glass shingles rather than cedar, the historic material, in Society Hill.

Following the discussion, the Committee recommended the adoption of the following policy: The staff may approve the replacement of slate with a substitute material that approximates the color and shape of the historic slate where such replacement has already occurred on a substantial number of properties on the block. This policy does not apply to turrets and mansards.

600 Walnut Street, Washington Square

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Philip Steel, Jr., Applicant

DATE: 1682, Thomas Holme

PROPOSAL: Plaque mounted on base

This proposal, from the Society of the Descendants of Washington's Army at Valley Forge, calls for a plaque measuring 16 x 24 inches on a granite base 20 x 28 x 10 inches. The proposed location is along the southwest path of the square just before the central circular area. The plaque commemorates the soldiers encamped at Valley Forge.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 2 and Standard 9. The addition of plaques, commemorative or otherwise, is out of character with the cultural landscape of Washington Square. Also, no documentation has been found to substantiate a relationship between the troops at Valley Forge and Washington Square.

Philip Steel, the applicant, did not object to the lack of a quorum. Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Mr. Tyler stated that soldiers from Germantown were probably buried in Washington Square, but it's highly unlikely that any soldiers from Valley Forge are there. Mr. Steel agreed, saying that most records show the dead from Valley Forge were buried in area church yards or hospitals.

Mr. Steel noted that the organization would like to have a plaque in the city commemorating Valley Forge. They thought Washington Square was a logical location. The National Park Service will not allow a plaque in Valley Forge National Historical Park. Mr. Tyler and Ms. Pentz offered several other possible locations for a plaque. Ms. Pentz agreed with the staff, that a three-dimensional plaque is inconsistent with the cultural landscape of Washington Square.

Ms. Pentz recommended denial of the application, 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.] and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property].

600 Walnut Street, Washington Square

City of Philadelphia, Owner
Winchell S. Carroll, Applicant
DATE: 1681, Thomas Holme
PROPOSAL: Plaques

At the last Historical Commission meeting, Commission members informally stated that they only would consider an application for a single plaque installed away from the Tomb.

This application returns with changes that reflect the Commission's comments. It now calls for a single plaque set in the ground either between the Tomb and fountain or just north of the fountain.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 2 and Standard 9. The addition of plaques, commemorative or otherwise, is out of character with the cultural landscape of Washington Square.

Winchell Carroll attended the meeting to represent the project and agreed to proceed without a quorum. Ms. Spina explained that although the Commission denied the proposal for plaques last month, Commission members provided guidance to the applicant. He stated that one condition of the Fairmount Park Commission approval required that the plaque match the dimension of the existing pavers. Ms. Pentz recalled that the Committee suggested a modest, single plaque located away from the Tomb and agreed that the new plaque should fit into the existing paving pattern. Steven Weixler, representing the Society Hill Civic Association, stated that the National Park

Service assumes control of Washington Square on November 11th and asked that any alterations to Washington Square, in advance of that date, conform to the National Park Service Standards. Ms. Pentz observed that no representatives of the Park Service were present.

Ms. Pentz recommended approval of either revised scheme, as submitted, provided the plaque matches the dimension of, and fits into, the existing paving pattern.

220 West Washington Square, aka 701 Locust Street, 2nd floor

T. McGowan, Owner

Lanny Leibowitz, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1911, John T. Windrim, architect

PROPOSAL: New balcony on north side

This application proposes constructing a patio at the 2nd-floor level of the W.B. Saunders building at 220 W. Washington Square. The patio would be built on a 1-story projection in the middle of the north façade. It would be enclosed by a metal perimeter railing with sections of simple metal pickets alternating with heavier metal piers. The railing would be attached to the inside vertical surface with L-brackets, not to the coping. It would be minimally visible from Washington Square down an opening separating the building from the N.W. Ayer building to the north.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the roofing guideline.

Lanny Leibowitz, architect, attended the meeting to represent the project and agreed to proceed without a quorum. Mr. Farnham explained the revised proposal. Mr. Leibowitz stated that the door and window alterations are not part of his application, which only includes the metal railing. The contractor will submit the window alteration as a separate application. Mr. Leibowitz stated that the owners preferred a simple metal railing instead of the solid masonry fence wall, as discussed at the previous Committee meeting. He asked about the addition of small circular ornamentation at the top of the simple straight black metal railing.

Ms. Pentz voted to recommend approval of the straight black metal railing as revised with a row of circular ornamentation beneath the top rail, 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] and roofing 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.].

Mr. Atkin arrived.

220 West Washington Square, aka 701 Locust Street, 3rd floor

David Wheadon, Owner

James Grainge, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1911, John T. Windrim, architect

PROPOSAL: New door and deck on north side

This application proposes cutting an opening, installing a door, and constructing a deck at the 3rd-

floor level of the W.B. Saunders building at 220 W. Washington Square. The installation of a 4-light, steel door, painted black, would require the infilling of a large, partially-boarded, segmental-arched window in a service tower with brick to match existing in material and pattern. The deck would be built on a small, 2-story projection housing mechanical equipment at the rear of the north façade. It would be enclosed by a 42-inch tall, perimeter, metal railing. The railing would be minimally visible from Washington Square down a narrow opening separating the building from the N.W. Ayer building to the north. Low-watt lights would be flush-mounted in the deck.

Staff Recommendation: Although the staff would recommend approval of a deck at this location, pursuant to the roofing guideline, it must recommend denial of this particular design, pursuant to Standard 9. The staff recommends denial for two reasons: the overly ornate railing design and, more importantly, the loss of historic features and fabric. The railing design should be simplified; the diagonal and circular members should be deleted, leaving a simple railing of vertical and horizontal members similar to that proposed for the 2nd-story level of the north façade of this building. More importantly, the door opening should be repositioned to coincide with the existing window opening. The traces of the former window opening should not be eradicated; the relieving arch should be left in place and any brick infill should be inset to create a reveal.

Prior to explaining the proposal, Mr. Farnham explained the lack of quorum. James Grainge, architect, and David Wheaton, owner, agreed to proceed. Mr. Grainge stated that the interior conditions prohibit shifting the door over as staff suggests. He has located the proposed door between a concrete structural column and a freight elevator shaft. He added that the former window opening is currently infilled with masonry on the inside at the elevator shaft. Mr. Wheaton stated that the former window opening cannot be seen from the street. The Committee discussed the retention of the window opening, the limitations of the door location and access to the outdoor space. Mr. Atkin suggested retaining the segmentally-arched lintel and continuing the new door lintel across the window opening to “read” as a window sill. The Committee discussed infilling the window with compatible brick, recessed slightly from the face of the wall. Mr. Grainge will provide a revised drawing prior to the Commission meeting.

Ms. Pentz and Mr. Atkin recommended approval of a simplified straight black metal railing with circular ornamentation similar to that recommended for the 2nd floor railing considering in the previous application and the door as proposed with a new brick lintel that extends to the right side of the former window opening, retention of the arched brickwork; infilling the window opening above the new lintel with compatible brick recessed from the face of the wall; and infilling the window below the new lintel with compatible brick flush with the face of the wall.

1600 Arch Street, SW corner of 16th Street

SAS-1600 Arch Street, LLP, Owner

Robert Graves, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1927, Stewardson and Page, architects

PROPOSAL: Awnings, signage and clock for restaurant

This application proposes to add awnings, ornaments, signage, lighting, street furniture, and a clock to the Insurance Company of North America building for a new restaurant at the corner of 16th and Cuthbert Streets.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, with staff to review details, provided that the half dome entrance

canopy, which is out of character with the building and existing window treatments, is redesigned to harmonize with the existing canopies, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. The staff also recommends that the light poles, globes, and bulbs conform to the standard for light poles set by the CCD.

Before explaining the proposal, Mr. Farnham informed Robert Graves, the architect, of the absence of a quorum. Mr. Graves chose to proceed and presented drawings with a revised design for the awnings and the clock. He explained that the light pole currently exists and that the signage and clock would be attached to it.

Mr. Atkin inquired about the need for the clock. Mr. Graves said the clock is a request of the tenant. It was noted that the building would maintain the lamppost, therefore the Streets Department approves of the installation. Mr. Tyler commented that many alterations have already occurred to the building, which makes it very diverse.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with revised designs for the clock and awnings, pursuant to Standards 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 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.] .

Mr. Rivera arrived, creating a quorum.

1911 Brandywine Street

Robert and Rachel Cheetham, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Legalize roof deck

This application proposes to legalize a roof deck and access stairway on the rowhouse at 1911 Brandywine Street. The roof deck sits on the main body of the rowhouse; the stairway rises from the roof of the 2-story rear ell to roof-level of the 3-story main body of the rowhouse. Without a building permit, the owner removed an earlier deck, repaired the roof, and constructed the new deck. L&I issued a violation on 2 August 2002. The new deck is set back 4 feet from the front or Brandywine façade. In an attempt to reduce the visibility of the deck, the owner recently dismantled the front railing, but not the deck itself. This work was also done without a permit.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the roofing guideline. The staff would recommend approval of a deck on the rear ell.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal. Robert and Rachel Cheetham attended meeting. Mr. Cheetham said he set back the railing by 4 feet and took pictures to show its visibility. And to further demonstrate the visibility, he removed the railings and his wife stood with an arm extended outward, which was not visible.

Mr. Tyler said that the deck is highly visible. He suggested that a site-line study from further down the block should be done. In addition, he suggested that the applicants erect a mock-up with painted 2 by 4s at the location to determine visibility.

Mr. Cheetham asked that his proposal be tabled until the November Commission meeting at which time the tree foliage will be less to further demonstrate visibility. Mr. Tyler granted the applicant a one-month continuance.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval subject to a mock-up for a determination of visibility.

135 South 18th Street, aka 1737 Walnut Street

Rittenhouse Management Company, Owner

Chris Harrelson, Applicant

DATE: 1913, McIlvaine and Roberts, architects

PROPOSAL: Re-open windows, signage at storefront

The application proposes the rehabilitation of a corner storefront at 18th and Walnut Streets. It stipulates removing the existing awnings, security grilles, grille frames, and aluminum storefront as well as the infill in two 18th-Street openings. The original bronze surround would remain and a wood storefront frame with glazing and stainless steel stops as well as a recessed, single-leaf, glazed, brushed stainless steel door would be installed in the existing opening. The sign panel above the storefront would have glazed brick tile topped by pin-mounted, brushed stainless steel letters. A 4-foot long brushed stainless steel banner pole with hanging blade sign would be mounted at the corner, projecting diagonally out over the sidewalk.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 4, 9 and Standard 10. The staff recommends that the design of the storefront be a bronze-colored metal. The staff also recommends against drilling into the limestone façade to mount the banner pole.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal as well as newly discovered photographs, which show that storefronts did not exist on the Walnut Street façade prior to 1935.

Bill Keenan and Chris Harrelson proposed a revised drawing because the Department of Licenses and Inspections would not approve a wood storefront. The revised storefront retains the existing metal frame and stone base. The reopened windows will have painted aluminum frames. Mr. Keenan said that the blade sign in the application has been withdrawn. Mr. Atkin recommended that the applicant clean the existing bronze surround.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the revised design, 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.]

2226 Pine Street

Donald Smith, Owner

Perry Benson, Jr., Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: New front windows and door

This application proposes the replacement of an inappropriate fluted wood door on the front façade of this Italianate rowhouse with a 4-panel wood door with bolection molding to match the original door, which is documented by the original door still hanging at the neighboring 2223 Pine Street. It

also proposes to replace the two inappropriate fixed, single-light windows in enlarged openings at the 1-story of the front façade with 2/2, double-hung wood windows over two-light awning windows.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the door, pursuant to Restoration Standard 9. Denial of the windows, pursuant to Restoration Standard 9. The staff recommends that simple 1/1 windows be installed in the openings, which were unfortunately enlarged.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal. Hether Smith, the owner, stated that the door represented in the drawings is not the door of her choice. She prefers an eight-raised panel Colonial door. She presented drawings.

Mr. Baron explained that he worked with the architect using historic photographs and evidence on the buildings of the same row to develop the proposal, which restores the jambs, transom and door. He stated that he favors the window proposal as submitted because it restores the windows in so far as possible and the new lower pieces will not be confused as original. Mr. Atkin and Ms. Pentz said that absent documentation, to the contrary, the proposed door is appropriate.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal as originally submitted, pursuant to Restoration Standard 9 [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...or by combining features that never existed together historically.], with the staff to review details.

Mr. Atkin left the meeting, so a quorum no longer existed.

2028 Pine Street, SW corner of Capitol Street

Stuart Ford, Owner

Peter Goldring, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850, refaced c. 1900

PROPOSAL: New front and side windows, new rear balcony, new roof deck with penthouse

In addition to numerous interior alterations, this application proposes myriad exterior alterations. It proposes to remove glass block infill in some window openings in a large bay and install new windows in those openings as well as other openings at the 2nd and 3rd stories. The plans call for the new windows to match the existing, but no details have been provided. The application also proposes to rebuild the railing and decking on an existing deck at 2nd-story rear along Capitol Street and to replace the existing single-leaf, deck access door with French doors and a segmental-arched transom. No details have been provided for the French doors and transom. Although the plans stipulate that the French doors would be installed in the existing opening, photographs of the existing conditions reveal that the proposed doors would require that the opening be enlarged. The application also proposes to build a deck at 3rd-story rear along Capitol Street and to remove a window at 3rd-story rear, enlarge the window opening, and install a single-leaf, fully-glazed door with segmental-arched transom. No details have been provided for the door and transom. It also proposes the removal of the existing, sloped roof, the lowering of the roofline, and the construction of a new, flat roof. It also proposes to build a large roof deck with hot tub and stuccoed pilothouse with stairs. Finally, it proposes to raise the height of a chimney and vent stack and remove another vent stack.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the window opening restoration and window replacement, contingent on receipt of complete details including shop drawings, with staff to review details.

Approval of the 2nd-story deck rehabilitation and the installation of the French doors and transom in the existing opening, contingent on receipt of complete details including shop drawings, with staff to review details. Approval of the 3rd-story deck, removal of the window, enlargement of the window opening, and installation of the door and transom, contingent on receipt of complete details including shop drawings, with staff to review details. Denial of the reconstruction of the roof, construction of the roof deck and pilothouse, and alterations to the chimney, pursuant to Standard 9 and the roofing guideline.

Before presenting the proposal, Mr. Farnham informed Peter Goldring of the absence of a quorum. Mr. Goldring agreed to proceed.

Mr. Goldring said that the proposed application would retain the existing masonry openings and that the third floor door would be custom made or a standard door with infill around it. He said that the third floor deck is the size of a balcony and that he proposes to change the roofline and an extension of the chimney. Mr. Goldring believes new construction on Capitol Street will minimize the visibility of the third floor deck. In addition, the building has a bay, which he believes will block the view from Capitol Street. The applicant also proposes to replace the current windows in kind, if replacement is necessary.

Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance, said that she opposes the roof deck, owing to its visibility; however, she does not object to the lower decks. She inquired about the height of the building with the incorporation of the roof deck. The applicant responded that the height will be thirty-eight feet with an additional three or four feet for the pilot house.

Mr. Baron reiterated that the visibility of the deck is an important issue, and the Commission has consistently denied roof decks on main buildings but approved them on the rear ells. Mr. Rivera said that the window restoration and the two lower decks are appropriate. He believes that the front roof slope should be retained.

Mr. Rivera and Ms. Pentz recommended approval of the window opening restoration and window replacement, contingent on receipt of complete details including shop drawings, with staff to review details. Approval of the 2nd-story deck rehabilitation and the installation of the French doors and transom in the existing opening, contingent on receipt of complete details including shop drawings, with staff to review details. Approval of the 3rd-story deck, removal of the window, enlargement of the window opening, and installation of the door and transom, contingent on receipt of complete details including shop drawings, with staff to review details. Denial of the reconstruction of the roof, construction of the roof deck and pilothouse, and alterations to the chimney, 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 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 roofing 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.].

2110 Chancellor Street

Ara Chalian, Owner

Michael Hauptman, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1867

PROPOSAL: Rooftop addition with deck in concept

This application for approval in concept proposes the restoration of the historical facades including masonry cleaning and painting of trim and doors and the construction of a 1-story addition atop a 2-story carriage house at 2110 Chancellor Street.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the façade cleaning, with staff to review details; no jurisdiction on the painting of trim and doors. Denial in concept of the addition, pursuant to Standard 9.

Before presenting the proposal, Mr. Farnham informed Michael Hauptman, the architect, about the absence of a quorum. Mr. Hauptman agreed to proceed. Mr. Baron reiterated the importance of massing and spacial relations. He said that because the building is only two stories, the one-story addition adds greatly to its height.

Mr. Hauptman said this property is uniquely located at the end of Chancellor Street and that a small portion of the property faces Van Pelt Street. The proposal would consist of a small addition of steel and glass which would be set back on both Van Pelt and Chancellor Streets. It would have the appearance of a separate addition with a jewel box look, but will be highly visible.

Ms. Pentz said that the proposed addition has no relation to the character of a carriage house and inquired about how the addition relates to the existing property. Mr. Hauptman responded that the new fabric would be clearly differentiated from the historic building.

Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance, speaking as a resident of the neighborhood, opposed the addition, which would disrupt the character of the streetscape.

Mr. Rivera thought the addition had character and would not be intrusive, but he believes that the deck should be eliminated and that the design should be scaled down. He cited prominent buildings such as those on Washington Square, where additions have been approved. The Committee members were divided in the recommendation and thought that the neighborhood association should be given the courtesy of reviewing the proposal.

Mr. Rivera recommended approval of the proposal, while Ms. Pentz recommended denial.

2119 Delancey Street

Harriet Berneman, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1845

PROPOSAL: New wood windows and door

This application calls for replacing the windows and front door of this mid 19th century rowhouse. After research and a site visit, staff advised the owner that the original design consisted of four over four windows on the first, second and third floors, instead of the two over two windows proposed. These windows can be seen in the photograph of her house as well as existing on neighboring houses. Mr. Baron also explained that the door should consist of two vertical panels with a bolection molding as seen on our photographs of 2103, 2117 and 2121 Delancey Street. The owner wishes to install a six-panel door with raised panel molding.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standard 6.

Before presenting the proposal, Mr. Baron apprised the public of the absence of a quorum. No one in attendance objected to proceeding. Mr. Baron read a letter, which was faxed by Harriet Berneman, the applicant, to be read in her absence. Mr. Baron showed photographs of four-over-four windows in 1972. He believed that the mansard should retain its two-over-two windows. The house currently does not have a historic door, but the proposal calls for a six-paneled door. A site visit showed the existence of a two-paneled door with bolelection molding and recessed panels on several houses on this side of the block and staff believes that this was the original door for the house. It was noted that houses on the other side of the street have two-over-two windows, but they are a part of a different development.

Mr. Rivera and Ms. Pentz both recommended denial of the proposed windows and door, 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].

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary