

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
Philadelphia Historical Commission

Robert Thomas, Chair
Commission Offices, One Parkway, 13th Floor, 1515 Arch Street
28 November 2000

Present

Robert Thomas, Chair
Tony Atkin
Herb Levy, FAIA
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Suzanne Pentz

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

Also

Roger Zampell, Philadelphia Hotel Partners
Steve Wanta, Pennsylvania Hospital
Kimberly Rest, Pennsylvania Hospital
Marilyn Kutler, Schnader Harrison Segal & Lewis
Lynne Sarta, Graboyes
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance
Mathile Lewis, Albert M. Greenfield and Company Incorporated
David Amburn, Amburn/Jarosinski Architects
Piero Grimaldi, Grimaldi Architecture
Carl Massara, AIA, Carl Massara and Associates
Alson Alston, 2226 Green Street
Loretta Corcoran, 2230 Green Street
Michael Sklaroff, 2223 Green Street
Robert Poston, 1719-29 Spring Garden Street
P. Zysats, 2228 Green Street
A. Ciocca, 10-14 South 2nd Street
Sabrina Soong, 18 North Front Street
T. S. Vanleer, 18 North Front Street
Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association
Joshua Grimes, Esq., 315 Arch Street
Jerry Roller, J.K. Roller Architects
Edward J. Hutch
Kiki Bolender, Schade and Bolender Architects
Ronald Patterson, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg and Ellers
Jeffrey Yablonovitz, 1706 Delancey Street
Judith Eden, Center City Residents' Association
Sam Warshawer, 2114 Delancey Street
David Franke, Agoos/Lovera Architects
Mike Foy

Lance Kraemer, Lance R. Kraemer Associates
Christian A. Busch, The Sullivan Company
Alan Domb,
Belmont Freeman, Belmont Freeman Associates
Neale Quenzel, John Milner Associates
Ed Benfold, University of Pennsylvania
Bob Schoenberg, University of Pennsylvania
Michael Koep, Keating Development Company
Albert Taus
Alfred Borden, The Lighting Practice Incorporation
Nan Gutterman, Vitetta Group
Hy Myers, Vitetta Group
James Bryan, Vitetta Group
Robert Powers, Powers and Company

Robert Thomas, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:35 a.m.

410 South Front Street

Philadelphia Hotel Partners, LLC, Owners
Roger Zampell, Applicant
DATE: c. 1973
PROPOSAL: Demolition and new construction

Mr. Baron summarized the proposal, previously approved in concept, which calls for demolition of the non-contributing glass and steel building in the head house shopping mall development and its replacement with a 10-story brick and stucco clad hotel and residential tower. He explained that the plans show a two-phase entryway from 2nd Street; the first a planted walkway and the second a barrel vaulted covered walkway. He stated that the staff recommended approval of the project. Mr. Baron noted that a previous concern regarding the neighboring building's chimney was resolved. Roger Zampell, the applicant, confirmed that the hotel is in the process of purchasing that building and plans to seal the chimney in question.

Mr. Zampell presented samples of the building materials to the Committee including brick, stucco, limestone trimming, glass, and white and black metal trim for the canopy and mullions, respectively. Some discussion ensued with regard to the color of the stucco. Ultimately, all Committee members agreed that the accent and field colors sufficiently differentiated the new building from surrounding structures. Mr. Thomas questioned whether the canopy extended to the curb line on the 2nd Street facade of the building. He suggested that during the second phase of the construction, the canopy extend no more than four feet over the sidewalk. Mr. Tyler then explained to the Committee that both Section 106 review and archeological work had been performed at the site.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the project, with staff to review the details, contingent upon the canopy not extending more than four feet over the sidewalk.

JLB

800 Spruce Street, Widener Building, Pennsylvania Hospital

Pennsylvania Hospital, Owner
Michael W. Bach, Architect

DATE: 1969; altered 1983
PROPOSAL: Addition

Mr. Baron described the proposal which calls for adding several floors onto an existing modern hospital building at Pennsylvania Hospital. He commented that plans show the penthouse, not the building itself, set back off of the 9th Street side of the building. Staff recommended approval of the project. Mr. Tyler added that he has seen the site and believes that the plans offer a good solution for the hospital's shortage of space.

Mr. Atkin asked the representative from Pennsylvania Hospital, Steve Wanta, about the hospital's future expansion plans. Mr. Wanta commented that while more outpatient visits are common in today's hospitals, there is a greater need for critical care units. This plan would provide more beds on the third floor and step down beds on the fourth floor could be converted to ICU beds. Mr. Baron confirmed with architect Michael Bach that the same brick and mortar used on the older building would be used on the new construction.

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

JLB

100 Leverington Avenue

Flatrock Partners, L.P., Owner

Carl Massara, Architect

DATE: c. 1877

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation and large addition

Mr. Tyler began by stating to the Committee that their basis for review for this project is the Manayunk Ordinance, §§PM-703.1.2 and 704.2 of the Philadelphia Code. He then quoted a portion of the Manayunk Ordinance for the Committee. Mr. Baron then described the proposal to add a large residential wing along the canal behind the historic mill building which faces Leverington Street. He indicated that architect Carl Massara, in consultation with the staff, designed a building inspired by an historic mill building. Mr. Baron pointed out that historically, mill buildings were clustered in groups on a single property and that Mr. Massara's design reflected this trend. The plans for the building show the cutting of a vehicle entrance through the previously altered east end of the façade to allow access to the required parking. In exchange, a number of blocked in openings would receive their historic window treatments. He stated that visibility of the new structure would exist from both the bridge and other nearby buildings. The staff recommended approval of the project.

Mr. Atkin questioned how the look of the new building would distinguish itself from the historic building. Mr. Baron responded that the white color of the new building presents a differentiation from the historical grey stone and brick. Mr. Baron continued his presentation by stating that the applicant desires removal of a cinderblock bridge from the front of the historic building. The staff concluded that since the bridge has no historic value, its removal is appropriate. Mr. Baron then justified the cutting of the building for a new vehicle egress driveway. While historic material would be lost to make room for the driveway's passage, Mr. Baron stated that the applicant agreed to restore the currently bricked up windows. Mr. Tyler commented to the Committee that this proposal has been the best solution offered for this property thus far.

Mr. Thomas questioned whether an ADA accessible entrance existed on the property. Mr. Massara answered that an entrance from the courtyard has an elevator that will access all floors. Mr. Atkin asked for clarification from Mr. Tyler on how the Manayunk Ordinance differed from the Philadelphia Ordinance. After Mr. Tyler explained that under the Manayunk Ordinance new construction is reviewed, Mr. Baron continued to speak on the proposal. He explained that a glass link, set back three feet, six inches from the building facade would connect a space between the new and old building. Mr. Atkin inquired what materials were being used in the construction. Mr. Massara detailed the materials including a steel skeleton, an asphalt shingle roof, a brick veneer placed over the window reveals and open windows that show the underground parking. Mr. Atkin objected to the use of brick veneer over the windows and a discussion with the architect ensued. Mr. Thomas stated his belief that the veneer alluded to, and did not attempt to replicate, the brick on the original structure. Mr. Thomas then suggested to the architect that the open windows be covered with grilles for both safety and aesthetic reasons. Ms. Pentz questioned the architect about the driveway and whether or not creating such an arch through the building would be structurally sound. Mr. Massara answered by explaining the configuration of the arch and showing the plans. Mr. Levy stated his concern regarding the visibility of a car when exiting from the driveway. Owner Albert Greenfield explained that the distance from the street and the timing of the traffic light regulate exit from the building. Mr. Levy suggested to the architect that the top of the elevator shaft be changed from a pediment shape to a flat roof. Mr. Atkin concurred.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the adaptive reuse of the historic building and addition of a large new building with staff to review details. The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the massing of the new building, with staff to review details, contingent upon the recommendation that the elevator shaft have a flat roof and that grillework be placed in the parking lot window openings. The Architectural Committee, with the exception of Mr. Atkin, recommended approval of the windows with real brick arches with staff to review details.

JLB

4129-35 Main Street

Daniel Neducsin, Owner

David Amburn, Architect

DATE: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: Substantial demolition and new construction

Mr. Tyler advised the Committee that its review of this submission occurs pursuant to the Manayunk Ordinance, §§PM-703.1.2 and 704.2 of the Philadelphia Code. Mr. Baron summarized the proposal which involves combining two houses and two open lots into new ground floor commercial space and upper floor residential. The developer seeks to demolish the houses except for the facades. He will construct a new building using the roof ridge to hide several front roof decks. Number 4129 will have a roof slope change while retaining the cornice and number 4135 would retain its current roof slope. The public currently views the rear of the houses from Station Street. The houses would receive display boxes attached to their front facades, new wood windows and the stucco would be removed and repointed. New construction will fill the central vacant lot. The staff recommended denial of the project.

A discussion among Committee members ensued on the visibility of the new construction.

Messrs. Levy and Atkin questioned how the streetscape would be affected by the new construction in-between existing rowhouses. Mr. Baron stated that historically, Manayunk consisted of workers housing for the mills and that the streetscape should continue to reflect this historic appearance. The Committee members then examined the massing of the new construction. Mr. Thomas stated the importance of the scale of the streetscape and the setback of historic buildings. A discussion on the bay windows ensued and the Committee and the architect, David Amburn reached an agreement that the level of the facade windows could be lowered in exchange for no projecting bay windows.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the demolitions and proposed new construction and the project's rear massing, with staff to review all details, with several exceptions including: a wood and glass entrance door, wood true divided light windows on the old buildings and metal windows on the new construction, the existing steps to remain, and a lower window with no projecting bays.

JLB

2226 Green Street

Alson Alston, Owner

Piero Grimaldi, Architect

DATE: c. 1866

PROPOSAL: Development of multi-family dwelling

Mr. Baron described the proposal which calls for development of a multi-family residential structure. After previous review by the Committee and Commission, the applicant returned with a revised final application. The revisions include a façade without a garage, a setback of four feet along the mansard adjoining the western property line, and reduced construction at the rear. Mr. Baron explained that visibility of the rear massing would exist from both 23rd and Brandywine Streets. The rear has both been shortened since the last review and windows have been added. The front berm will be retained with a set of steps to match those adjacent to the west. The staff recommended approval with these changes made.

The neighbors of the property on Green Street spoke to the Committee and requested a stepped down rear L on the building. Piero Grimaldi, the architect, commented that the building has been significantly shortened eliminating a previously designed courtyard and instead creating a larger backyard. Alson Alston, the owner, stated that the rear shrank fourteen feet in plan. A discussion among the neighbors and the owner ensued regarding the rear massing. The neighbor residing at 2228 Green Street raised a concern regarding leakage from the new roof of 2226 onto her property and urged Mr. Alston to lower the new building in height. Mr. Alston responded that number 2228 is one of the smallest properties on the block and his proposed building can not be designed to match number 2228 in size.

Mr. Thomas moved the discussion along by addressing the neighbor at 2228 Green's concerns. He concluded that if the roof is sloped and flashed properly, there would be no leakage into the adjoining house. He also commented on the backyard of the proposed building stating that the rear massing and size of the yard is typical for that neighborhood. A discussion among the neighbors and Mr. Alston continued regarding the rear of the proposed building.

In response to Mr. Atkin's questions regarding the front facade of the proposed building, Mr.

Grimaldi explained that brick and stucco would be used on the facade and that the property would retain the berm and a front, walled yard. Mr. Grimaldi agreed with the Committee that a wall of the existing height would remain and new stairs to access the house would be added.

In an effort to alleviate the neighbors' concerns, Mr. Atkin suggested that the rear third story have a mansard roof that would provide a slight slant to the upper story and let more light through to the neighboring houses. Messrs. Grimaldi and Alston agreed to the mansard roof.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal, with staff to review all details, contingent upon the rear third story having a mansard roof and all windows being 1/1 painted wood. The Architectural Committee recommended staff to review the details of any future proposal regarding the replacement of the front retaining wall.

JLB

1719-29 Spring Garden Street

John J. Dougherty, Owner

Robert N. Poston, Applicant

DATE: 1972

PROPOSAL: Glaze front arcade of non-contributing building

Mr. Baron explained the proposal to glaze the ground floor arcade of this non-contributing structure in the Spring Garden Historic District.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the glazing as shown by the submitted plans. Owing to the non-contributing status of the structure, the Architectural Committee stated that plans can be reviewed at staff level therefore eliminating review at the Commission level.

JLB

1939-41 Spring Garden Street, NE corner of 20th Street

Stanley Skalski, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1875

PROPOSAL: Legalize repointing

Mr. Baron explained the proposal to legalize the repointing of two houses which was completed using an overly hard mortar containing no lime. The pointing has extremely wide and uneven joints. He added that the staff had attempted to stop the work as it happened but was ignored. The owner, Stanley Skalski, claims he did not know the buildings were historic and yet he has received explicit notification letters and has previously applied for permits to the Commission for these properties. Staff recommends approval of the repointing since removal of the mortar would further damage the brick. Staff further recommends that this approval be conditioned upon some additional restoration on the building such as painting the front cornice.

Mr. Skalski said he was already going to paint the front cornice of the building.

The Architectural Committee recommended legalization of the repointing contingent upon the repainting of the front cornice.

JLB

14-18 North Front Street, SW corner of Church Street

Luca Sena, Owner

Sabrina Soong, Architect

DATE: 1828-36

PROPOSAL: Legalize windows and cornices

Mr. Baron described the proposal which involves legalizing work done on properties that comprise a hotel. Some of the work, including changing the windows at 14 N. Front Street and installing a copper cornice at 16 N. Front Street, has no permit. Work on 18 N. Front Street does not follow the approved plans. The approved drawings call for 6/6 true divided light windows with staff to approve shop drawings and a small cornice on the additional floor to minimize its visibility. Instead the contractor built the project with windows that have applied muntins, the wrong light pattern and wide plank frames instead of the thin original clam shell molding that existed at the start of the project. The cornice on the new construction features a foot and a half overhang that calls attention to the new construction. In addition, an area that was to have red brick colored stucco was stuccoed in an orange color. The staff recommends denial of the legalization and would like the applicant to install new windows with the correct frames and light pattern. Mr. Baron stated that the staff would be willing to accept windows with applied muntins owing to the desire for argon gas between the panes to cut down on highway noise. With regard to the cornice, stucco color and overhang, the staff recommends painting of the cornice and stucco and acceptance of the overhang on the basis that it is part of new construction. Mr. Baron added that the staff already intervened and approved a new mortar mixture for a portion of the building where mortar had been cut out and bricks were damaged.

Messrs. Thomas and Levy spoke to Sabrina Soong, the architect and the representative from Tague Lumber, T.S. Vanleer, who supplied the windows, regarding the permit review process. They expressed their frustration with the fact that the approved plans were overlooked and not followed. Ms. Soong stated that she was not aware Tague Lumber was not following the plans when installing the windows. The Committee members continued to reprimand Mr. Vanleer for not submitting a shop drawing of the windows for staff approval and stressed that they must follow protocol and approved plans. Mr. Vanleer offered to replace the sash on the front facade but none of the frames. He said that he would be fired if he had to replace all of the frames.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the windows on 18 N. Front Street. The Architectural Committee recommended that all windows be replaced according to previously approved drawings with staff to review details. The Architectural Committee recommended legalization of the cornice overhang, painting of stucco, and painting of the copper cornice at 16 N. Front Street.

JLB

10 South 2nd Street

Philadelphia Real Estate, Eli Haddad

David Polatnick, Architect

DATE: c. 1785

PROPOSAL: HVAC and façade screen wall

The applicant seeks to legalize a very large and highly visible HVAC unit and ductwork installed without a permit on 10 South 2nd Street. Owing to the expense of moving the unit, the applicant seeks to partially screen the mechanical units by rebuilding a part of the historic façade, now missing from the building. Staff recommended approval per Standard 6.

Mr. Baron described the proposal.

A. Ciocca appeared to respond to any questions from the Committee.

Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association, spoke in favor of the screen wall.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the HVAC unit with the screen wall, and denial of staining the fabric of the store front with staff to review details.

RT

315-19 Arch Street

315 Arch Street Partners, L.P., Ronald Kaplan, Owners

Joshua L. Grimes, Applicant

DATE: 1916

PROPOSAL: Legalize and install windows

The application calls for legalizing work begun without a permit. The applicant seeks to remove the original steel industrial sash from the visible north and west facades of the building and replace them with aluminum sash with applied muntins that do not match the look of the historic sash. The staff recommended denial per Standard 6.

Mr. Baron described the project.

Jerry Roller, architect, and Joshua Grimes, Esq., appeared to represent the owner and to address any questions.

The Committee and Mr. Roller discussed several possible options for the installation of windows that resemble the historic industrial sash and its muntin pattern and that would also comply with the ventilation and other requirements of the Building Code. Mr. Roller agreed to explore these options and to submit revised drawings and material samples before the next Commission meeting.

The Architectural Committee voted to delegate to Mr. Thomas and the staff the review and formulation of a recommendation to the Commission.

RT

1706 Delancey Street

Jeffrey Yablonovitz, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Legalize roof deck

This application calls for the legalization of a roof deck on the row house's top floor, and a circular metal access stair between the decks. Photographs show visibility of the decks from the rear of the building. In addition, a high level of visibility of the roof deck exists from the front and east sides of the building.

The staff recommended denial of the roof deck as shown per Standard i. Staff recommends moving the deck away from the building's east wall until visibility is eliminated. This would also require moving the access stair. Approval of the upper level deck per Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Baron introduced the application

Jeffrey Yablonovitz, owner, and Ronald Patterson, Esq., appeared before the Committee.

The Committee, applicant and staff explored means to eliminate or significantly reduce the visibility from the public-right-of-way. This discussion yielded a solution.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal with the relocation of the railing of the upper deck reduce markedly its visibility from the street with staff to review details and mock-up. The rail can be angled to allow the stair to remain in its present location.

RT

1810 Spruce Street

1810 Spruce Street Incorporated, Richard Woosnam, Owner
Kiki Bolender, Architect
DATE: c. 1910
PROPOSAL: Rear addition

This application calls for the addition of a two-story greenhouse stair structure above a ground floor garage on the rear of this four-story row house. Building of the addition would require the demolition of an existing one-story greenhouse on the second floor. The plans show a new glazed addition. The applicant proposes replacing five windows on the west elevation with 2/2 wood windows. There exists limited visibility of the addition since no properties front on Cypress Street. The staff recommended approval owing to its limited visibility.

Mr. Baron described the submission.

Kiki Bolender, architect, appeared for the applicant.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the plans as submitted.

RT

2114 Delancey Street

Sam and Elizabeth Washawer, Owners
David Franke, Architect
DATE: c. 1860
PROPOSAL: Roof deck and stair house

This application involves the installation of a roof deck and a one-story stair house on top of this row house. The plans call for the location of the roof deck toward the rear portion of the house to decrease visibility from Delancey Street. In addition, the plans show a stair house with several 2/2 windows and a glazed door on the west elevation. The staff recommended approval per Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Baron introduced the proposal.

David Franks, architect. and Sam Washawer, owner, appeared before the Committee.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of this proposal as submitted owing to is minimal visibility.

RT

2223 Spruce Street

Elizabeth Caulk, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1875

PROPOSAL: Legalize rear vinyl windows

The proposal involves legalizing the removing of wood windows and the installation of vinyl windows on the building's rear façade facing Manning Street. Manning Street has houses facing about half the length of the block including a front door facing this window work. The staff recommended denial. The staff also recommended the installation of new wood windows per Standard 6.

Mr. Baron described this application.

Neither the applicant nor a representative of the applicant appeared before the Committee.

The Architectural Committee voted to deny the application pursuant to Standard 6.

RT

237 South 18th Street, The Barclay

Barclay Condominium Owner's Association, Owner

Christian Busch, Architect

DATE: 1928

PROPOSAL: Entries, awnings and marquee

This application calls for restoration of the building's main entry doors, based on the original 1928 design, on the 18th Street façade. In addition, the applicant proposes a canopy above this entrance. The plans show the canopy as a glass and steel structure with a glass lip and letters depicting the building's name. The proposal calls for the removal of a small amount of limestone to attach the canopy. The application shows two proposals for the canopy; one with historically referenced decoration and one with a more simplified design. The application also calls for

canvas awnings and a channel sign band on the two side doors. The staff recommended approval with the simpler doors and the canopy per Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Baron introduced this proposal.

Christian Busch, architect, and Alan Domb, owner, attended the Committee meeting for this project.

Mr. Busch explained the need for a marquee at The Barclay and described his research into canopies in the vicinity of Rittenhouse Square and elsewhere in the city for the proposed design.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend the approval of the simplified design option.

RT

128-32 Christian Street

Charles Burdumy, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1790

PROPOSAL: Rear addition

The application calls for a second story addition on the rear of an existing building. The plans show three, 6/6 double hung, wood windows with true divided light on the west elevation. In addition, the applicant proposes a small deck on the south elevation with a wrought iron railing atop an existing brick pier canopy. The staff recommended approval of the addition per Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Baron described the submission.

Mr. Kraemer, architect, attended the Committee meeting for the applicant.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of this proposal as submitted

RT

3905 Spruce Street, rear carriage house

University of Pennsylvania, Owner

Richard N. Russell, Applicant

DATE: 1850

PROPOSAL: Renovations, new entryways

The application calls for renovations and new entryways to an existing carriage house on the University of Pennsylvania campus. On the south elevation, plans show the removal of a defunct chimney and the glazing of an existing porch. Existing carriage doors will have wood panels removed and additional glazing installed in the bottom panels. The proposal also provides for the restoration of a window opening with 2/2 sash to match others. On the east elevation, the plans indicate the installation of a new wood door and the reopening of three original windows as well as local repointing. The west elevation plans involve the cutting of new glass and metal entry doors, new metal frame windows and a window on the second story. Plans for the north

elevation show the installation of two new windows to match others in existing infilled openings and the conversion of a door into a louvered window. In addition, the applicant proposes replacing a basement window with louvers, the removal of an existing concrete ramp and railing, the restoration of the existing hayloft doors, and local repointing.

Staff recommendation: Denial of several aspects of the plans:

- removal of the chimney per Standards 2 and 5
- glazing of the porch on the south elevation per Standards 2
- the glazing at the bottom of the barn doors on the south and north elevations per Standard 2 and 9
- the new entry and window on the west elevation per Standards 9 and 10

Approval of the remaining work per Standards 6, 9 and 10.

Ed Benfold, Belmont Friedman and Bob Schoenberg attended the meeting to answer questions and explain the project. The Committee questioned the removal of the chimney. Mr. Benfold said that the chimney is no longer needed and its location inconvenient. He also thought the chimney's masonry not original and that a lot of the interior masonry wall has been removed.

The Committee thought the chimney should remain. The removal of the masonry wall could necessitate the use of steel for support. After further analysis by the applicant, if the removal of the chimney is necessary, it should be referred back to the Committee

The Architectural Committee recommended the retention of the chimney pending further investigation.

The porch glazing would leave the roof intact but remove the existing steel doors and replace them with glass to make a vestibule. Mr. Baron raised the question of the glass placement. The applicant said that the glass would be on the face of the brick with a slight return and metal corners.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the glazing with one piece of glass.

The applicant believes the glazing of the carriage doors will give natural light to the lobby.

Mr. Thomas questioned the condition of the existing carriage doors. The applicant stated that these are the original doors and their intent is to replace the door panels with glazing. The Committee asked the applicant to photograph the existing condition for the files and when routing for the glass that the chamfering details be kept.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of glazing the panels of the existing carriage doors.

The new entry and window on the west elevation relate to the proposed development of a garden which is now a derelict playground. The grade will be lowered to floor level with landscaping. The new opening will extend to the stairtower in the corner, the grade will be cut to expose a rubble foundation to get an airy opening to the garden. The window's frame will be black and the lintels will be precast concrete in a buff color.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the new entryway and window with the concrete lintel showing through in a sandstone color with the staff to review and approve the details and color.

In summary, the Committee recommended:

- 1. Retention of the chimney pending further investigation;*
- 2. Approval of the glazing with one piece of glass;*
- 3. Approval of glazing the panels of the existing carriage doors, and*
- 4. Approval of the new entryway and window with the concrete lintel showing through in a sandstone color with staff to review and approve the details and color.*

DMH

1115-1141 Market Street, NE corner of 12th Street, Reading Terminal Headhouse

Headhouse Retail Associates, L.P., Owners

Brian J. Billings, Architect

DATE: 1891-93

PROPOSAL: Market Street doors and signs

The application calls for new entry doors and signage for a bank in the Reading Terminal Headhouse. On the Market Street or south façade, plans show the cutting of new wood double entry doors in a storefront restored in the 1990s and new illuminated signage hanging over the door. The proposal also provides for additional signage inside the storefront.

The staff recommended denial of exterior illuminated signage per Standard 9. However, the staff recommended placing illuminated signage behind glass. Approval of entry doors per Standard 9.

Neal Quenzel attended the meeting representing all three applications for the Reading Terminal Headhouse. Mr. Quenzel came with a revised application for the bank moving the new doors one bay to the east.

The Committee originally noted the importance of symmetry and that the doors on both sides of the front façade should be of the same design and in the same location. They revised their thinking and said that because both ends of the façade are not generally seen together, the doors did not have to sit in the same bay as those in the next applications.

The signage proposed is an illuminated sign hung within the arch set in front of the door entrance. The sign is metal with plastic cut-out letters, the color of the bank's logo. In addition, the applicant proposes to install louvers above the door to match those to the west.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of a new entrance with double doors and signage placed at the rear of the front arches

DMH

1115-1141 Market Street, NE corner of 12th Street, Reading Terminal Headhouse

Headhouse Retail Associates, L.P., Owners

F. Neale Quenzel, Architect

DATE: 1891-93

PROPOSAL: New 12th Street entry

The application calls for a new entry to gain access to a bank machine on the 12th Street façade of this building. The plans show the cutting of an open entryway in an existing three-part window. The proposal to create an lobby area for the ATM machine with no doors but louvers in the upper portion.

The Committee discussed the issue of the door and recommended that a door be installed to replicate the one next door. The door and storefront will be painted. The left window will have paper behind it.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the entry but with a door. The window can be internally covered with paper painted a dark shade of grey with the staff to review all details.

DMH

1115-1141 Market Street, NE corner of 12th Street, Reading Terminal Headhouse

Headhouse Retail Associates, L.P., Owners

Albert Taus, Architect

DATE: 1891-93

PROPOSAL: New Market Street entry and signage

This application calls for a new entrance and signage for a doughnut store on the Market Street façade of the Reading Terminal Headhouse. The plans show a centrally located single door with sidelights. In addition, the applicant proposes exterior illuminated signage.

Neal Quenzel explained that the applicant also proposes a blade sign.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of double doors to match those on the west of the front façade, as well as the illuminated hanging sign at the rear of the loggia arch. It recommended denial of the blade sign because it conflicts with the symmetry and grandeur of the façade.

DMH

1600-18 Arch Street, INA Building, SW corner of 16th Street

Dennis Martin, Quinnco, 1600 Arch Street, L.P., Owner

Robert B. Graves, Architect

DATE: 1925

PROPOSAL: New doors and louvers

This application calls for final review of new entry doors and the addition of louvers to existing windows for the rehabilitation of this office building for residential and retail use. On the Cuthbert Street facade, plans show cutting new metal doors and the installation of metal louvers and roll-up doors. On Arch Street, the applicant proposes new doors in an existing entry and a

new retail entry with glass sidelights, metal infill panels and a glass and metal door. In addition, the new entry will have granite steps and a metal railing to match existing entry rails.

The staff recommended approval. The staff also recommended elimination of the metal infill panels flanking the new Arch Street door. This can be achieved by extending down the thicker vertical muntins from the window above to frame a larger door opening.

Michael Koep, Robert Powers and Robert Graves attended the meeting to answer questions and explain the proposal.

The Committee thought that instead of panels inside the Arch Street door, the vertical mullions should be carried down and the door widened.

The applicant raised concerns about putting a three-foot door into a four-foot opening.

Mr. Baron stated that the door's mullion detail, design and color should be reviewed for final approval including the color of the bronze.

The applicant presented drawings showing the removal of a bridge between Suburban Station and the INA building. The Committee requested a letter and permit application from the adjoining building's owner for the bridge's removal.

On the Cuthbert Street elevation, the applicant seeks to move the doors from the location previously approved to a bay further west. The Committee recommended that the applicant check that the location satisfies ADA requirements. The service entry will have double doors with dark bronze louvers for ventilation. The ornate metal at the bottom of the windows will be stored for future use.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the application with staff to approve the details

DMH

City Hall

City of Philadelphia, Owner

James Bryan, Architect

DATE: 1891-1901

This application in concept calls for the installation of a new lighting scheme to illuminate City Hall. The architects hope to work on the lighting using the scaffolding that exists for the other restoration work. Areas of concern should include visibility of the fixtures and light sources, as well as attachment to the masonry.

The staff recommended approval in concept of lighting; however, the specifics should be determined by arranging for the Committee and Commission to see the mock ups.

Suzanne Pentz recused herself.

Al Boarden, Nan Gutterman, James Bryan and Hyman Myers attended the meeting to answer questions and explain the project. The applicant stated that the lighting should respond to City Hall's character of many facades and show their richness.

Mr. Baron stated that the staff had concerns about exposed lighting elements and the method of attachment. He thought that the applicant should do a mock-up for the Committee and Commission members.

The applicant exhibited a sample of the lighting fixture mounted wherever possible in joints; the contractor will have no discretion in the placement of the lamps. The lighting program will emphasize the corner and center pavilions with a mix of down and up lighting on the building as well as illumination from nearby structures in a warm white color. The applicant informed the Committee that the previous mock-up was more in concept for guidance in cross lighting that design and preceded the current cleaning project. The new program will include dimmers and avoid over-lighting.

Mr. Levy questioned if a maintenance program is in place after the installation and whether weather conditions have been taken into consideration.

DMH

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with a mock-up with staff to review details of the mounting.

530 Walnut Street, SE corner of 6th Street

Lincoln Property Company, Owner

Robert Neas, Applicant

DATE: 1914

PROPOSAL: Masonry repair

This application calls for legalizing the repair and/or replacement of damaged granite on the building's ground floor level. The staff recommended approval per Standard 6 subject to cleaning the granite to match the dutchman.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

DMH

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary