

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Room 578, City Hall
22 February 2005**

Present

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Herbert Levy, FAIA
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Suzanne Pentz
Robert Thomas, AIA
Daniela Voith, AIA

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary
Jonathan Farnham, Historic Preservation Planner
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Also

Haleh Kadkhoda, 668 North 19th Street
Kathleen Jordan, 1930 A Green Street
Rosina Feldman, 1926 Green Street
Amy Talvacchia, 4301 Main Street
Patty Perlstein, 4301 Main Street
George Thomas
Timothy Trzaska, Philadelphia School Improvement Team
Jessica P. Margulies, USA Architects Planners Interior Designers
Paul R. Swartz, USA Architects Planners Interior Designers
David O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighbors' Association
Maria Buczek, Queen Village Neighbors' Association
Don Ventresca, 238 Christian Street
Alexandra Buczek, 900 Bodine Street
Craig Deutsch, 226 Fitzwater Street
Daniel Mehan, Mehan Builders
Bill Murphy, 2019-23 Green Street
Joe Duffy, 2019-23 Green Street
Diane Fink, 903 Bodine Street
Christina Carter, AIA, 235 South Camac Street
Charles Evers, AIA, 213 Catharine Street
Hugh Zimmers, 1514 Waverly Street
Martin McNamara, Owner, 339 South 21st Street
Kevin Angstadt, AIA, 339 South 21st Street
Stephen Mileto, AIA, 339 South 21st Street
Fred Maurer, 5165 D Street
Eagan Lakhmna, 120-30 New Street
Wayne Davis, 2008 Chancellor Street
Jan Rubin, Owner, 2026-30 Chancellor Street
Frank Kakos, Kakos Architects, 1525 Pine Street
Chris Tranchetti, 113-33 Bread Street
Inga Saffron, Philadelphia Inquirer
Tom Barton, Barton and Associates, 113-33 Bread Street
Karen Borski, Fairmount Park Commission

Todd Lean, Boathouse Row
Hilary Langer, 223 Monastery Street
Shannon Yott, Boathouse Row

Vincent Rivera, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

668 North 19th Street

Haleh Kadkhoda, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1885

PROPOSAL: Legalize vinyl windows

This application calls for legalizing vinyl windows that were installed by Ms. Kadkhoda in this corner rowhouse. The houses of this development row originally featured wood windows with a Queen Anne design of small panes around a single central pane in the top sash and a single sash in the bottom. The staff recommends the installation of one-over-one windows in the bay and windows with small panes over a single pane on the front façade.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron presented the application and noted the receipt of a letter from the Spring Garden Civic Association urging the Committee to recommend denial of the proposal.

Haleh Kadkhoda, the owner, acknowledged her mistake in not acquiring a building permit. She asked that the Committee consider the approval of the 2nd floor bay since they would be one-over-one and of the second floor front windows since owing to the trees they have less visibility. Ms. Kadkhoda offered her willingness to install the correct windows on the first floor. She said that the cost of correcting all the windows would present a burden.

Ms. Pentz commented that this is a clear cut situation, noting the importance in consistency and that the principal façade should receive the Queen Ann windows and the bay windows should be one-over-one wood windows.

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

1930 B Green Street

C. Kathleen Jordan, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Legalize vinyl windows

This application calls for legalizing vinyl windows in the front façade of this row-house second-floor condominium unit. The owner's contractor installed the windows without a permit. Multi-unit buildings require permits for windows even when they are not listed as historic. The window should be a segmental arch two-over-two design instead of the flat head one-over-one vinyl sash that the contractor installed. A violation has been requested for another unit in the building as well. The staff recommends a window with a two-over-two configuration and an arch head.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron presented the application.

Kathleen Jordan, the owner, apologized for not acquiring a permit. She explained her long commitment to the community. She stressed that the installed vinyl windows are more efficient and easier to maintain. Ms. Jordan commented on her interaction with the Spring Garden Civic Association. She pointed out that new construction in the district does not receive historic wood windows. Mr. Thomas responded that with new construction you have more freedom and concluded that the vinyl windows in this property do not meet the *Standards for Rehabilitation* and that it is important to be consistent.

Ms. Voith suggested wood thermal windows and that the windows should be arched instead of square. She also emphasized that the property has an easement, which requires the retention of historic integrity. A photograph of the property with round head windows at the time of designation was shown to the applicant.

Randy Cotton of the Preservation Alliance explained that he sent the applicant a letter which gave her notice of the need for review before working.

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

4301 Main Street

R. Talvacchia, Owner

Patty Perlstein, Applicant

DATE: c. 1845

PROPOSAL: Legalize vinyl windows

This application calls for legalizing vinyl windows installed without a permit. The windows were installed several years ago, but they did not come to our attention until very recently when a building inspector undertook review of other work. The windows should be wood two-over-two sash instead of one-over-one vinyl.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal and noted that the owner provided information on the cost difference between the vinyl and the correct two-over-two wood windows. Ms. Voith remarked that the historically correct windows would be a huge benefit to Main Street. Additionally, she encouraged the restoration of the brackets to the cornice.

Amy Talvacchia, the owner, and Patty Perlstein attended the meeting. Ms. Talvacchia explained that the former owner changed the windows immediately before the transfer of the property. She is willing to replace the windows in segments over time.

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

2136 Ritner Street, Edgar Allen Poe School

School District of Philadelphia, Owner
Armand Christopher, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1913

PROPOSAL: Auditorium and gymnasium additions on the rear

This proposal calls for adding an auditorium and a school lunch room/gymnasium onto this school building. The new construction with a curved form and green and blue masonry panels attaches to a red brick and cream stone Jacobean Revival building. The staff recommends that the separation between the new and old building be accentuated by pulling the link back several feet to expose the wrap around cornices of the older building. If the doors are being replaced on the old building, they should be modeled on the historic doors.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and 10

Mr. Baron explained the proposal to create a school specializing in music with the addition of an auditorium, and lunchroom and gymnasium. Mr. Tyler expressed his enthusiasm for the proposed design. Ms. Voith inquired about the historic entrances to the existing building as a part of this project with a new design. Mr. Baron said that the historic doors have been replaced in the past and the applicant would like to install modern doors. He said the staff thought that the replacement doors should match the historic doors.

Timothy Trzaska, Paul Swartz, and Jessica Margulies attended the meeting.

Ms. Margulies said that they have the plans showing the original doors, but that students are rough on doors and so they would like to replace them with something simple and durable. She said that they do intend to hold the link to new construction back from the face of the old building allowing the belt-courses to remain entirely exposed.

Ms. Voith expressed concern about the previous reduction in the window size and suggested that as a remediation for the historic façade they should restore the historic doors. She said that students should be treated with the respect implied by the correct historic type door.

George Thomas said that the use of the building has shifted to the end doors, and he believes that the proposed addition will add life to the historic building.

Mr. Thomas pointed out that the window alterations occurred prior to the creation of the district: however, he agreed that the three sets of doors should regain their historic integrity since they are being replaced. He cited the wooden doors installed at a PHA project he worked on in 1992 as examples of doors that have survived over time even in a situation that requires durability.

Ms. Voith and Mr. Rivera expressed concern about the landscaping and fencing around the building which are important to the pedestrian experience in the district. These details were missing from the plans and indeed not yet entirely designed. In addition, they found it difficult to assess the coloration of the materials without a rendering showing the color of the existing building as well as the proposed. They noted that even window placement differed from one set of the applicants drawings to another and that the drawings presented to the Commission should be accurate. They asked for

elevations and site plan drawings showing the fencing and the treatment including the Ritner Street façade.

The Committee recommended an approval in concept with restoration of the doors and the presentation to the Committee of details for the doors, fencing and landscaping as well as coloration of materials 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 maintained].

238 Christian Street

Green Park Properties, Owner

Don Ventresca, Applicant

DATE: c. 1825

PROPOSAL: New wall and fence with rolling gate; install three HVAC units in the yard.

Mr. Ventresca re-applies for a stuccoed cinder block fence wall along the eastern edge of his property, allowing a ten foot wide opening for vehicle parking off of Bodine Street. The Commission granted Mr. Ventresca this approval before. In the course of lowering the existing cinder block wall several courses, Mr. Ventresca found that it lacked a foundation and was unstable. He had it taken down to rebuild it with a foundation. The Commission revoked its approval of the alterations to the east wall, because the work exceeded the permit, and directed Mr. Ventresca to reapply.

Mr. Ventresca also seeks approval of the installation of three HVAC units in the yard.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 & 10

The Committee members asked for clarification as to whether the Commission wanted the project reviewed as if it were a new application or whether they should take into account the fact that it had already been approved and permitted before.

Mr. Thomas and Ms. Pentz looked at the engineers report saying that the wall should be rebuilt for safety reasons and agreed that it needed to be rebuilt. They also thought that because it was more expensive to rebuild it, this was not a case of an applicant taking a short cut for financial gain. Mr. Thomas said that the look had not really changed since the last approval.

Neighbors spoke about the narrowness of the street and concerns about possible damage to the historic street and houses when a new owner backs a car out into Bodine Street. Ms. Pentz had a concern that the Committee did not know it was an historic street when it was first reviewed.

The applicant said that he is not making application to change the curb or any other physical aspect of the street. It was noted that the Street Paving district does not in any case include curbs.

David O'Donnell of the Queen Village Neighbors Association pointed out that the previous approval allowed the car to park perpendicular to the street, whereas the

current design shows the car parked on a diagonal pad. The wall is also now shown lower than previously approved.

Diane Fink said that she appreciates that Mr. Ventresca is improving the site; her only issue is the parking and its negative impact on the street and her adjacent house.

Daniella Voith had concerns that the proposed wall is no longer high enough to shield the view of the car from the public.

Mr. Ventresca explained that he had originally applied for a wall reduced to four feet six inches. He was informed at L&I that on street edges he would only be allowed a wall of 42 inches and so he reduced it to comply with the City's requirements.

Mr. Riviera explained that the Commission has approved similar gates in walls previously.

Mr. Thomas had to leave before the vote.

All three Committee members recommended approval of the H.V.A.C. units in the yard.

The three Committee members were split in their recommendation regarding the alteration to the east wall. Daniella Voith recommended denial based on the loss of fabric and view of the parking. Suzanne Pentz recommended approval subject to the design going back to the height of the formerly approved wall. Vincent Riviera recommended approval as submitted.

900 Bodine Street aka 238 Christian Street

Green Park Properties, Owner

Don Ventresca, Applicant

DATE: c. 1825

PROPOSAL: New construction of 3-story house

This application involves the construction of a new house on the rear portion of the 238 Christian Street lot. Mr. Ventresca is sub-dividing a very long lot, which historically extended the depth of the block from Christian to Montrose Streets with east frontage along Bodine Street. Atlases reveal a carriage house formerly sat on the rear portion of the site about ten feet north of Montrose Street. The proposed pseudo-traditional house would have a garage on Montrose Street and a front door on Bodine Street.

Staff Recommendation: The Commission must first decide if it will exercise jurisdiction over the rear portion of the lot. If it finds that it has jurisdiction, the staff recommends that the architect revise the design of the new house to take into account the scale and rhythm of construction on Bodine Street and adopt a more contemporary building vocabulary, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron explained that the subdivision of a lot involves both a change in the deed and the zoning. In this case Mr. Ventresca represents a group that has split the lot on the deed, but owns both portions of the lot. The subdivision has not yet gone through zoning. Committee members thought that perhaps the Law department could weigh in on the jurisdiction question. They agreed to comment on the new design.

Committee members liked the fact that the garage faced onto Montrose rather than Bodine Street. They thought that the applicant should reduce the garage to the width of

a single car and add an entrance door to the house on the Montrose Street façade to respect the residential aspect of that street. They agreed that the east façade should respect the rhythm of Bodine Street, but said that the house is already broken up into reasonable size parts along that façade. None of the Committee members objected to the vocabulary of the house; in fact they thought it clear that the house was new.

The Committee unanimously recommended approval subject to the alteration of the Montrose Street façade to include a narrower garage and a pedestrian door with staff to review details pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize 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.].

213 Catharine Street

Edwin Rivera, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830, addition 1923

PROPOSAL: Legalize partial demolition and new windows, new shed roof on rear

This application involves creating a car port by demolishing the first floor of a 1923 addition on the back of this house. The parking area would face a street which includes garages as well as house fronts. The application is a modification of a proposal for work done without a permit, which was previously denied by the Commission. The applicant would like to remove the first-floor rear wall and support the second floor on a beam which they have already installed spanning the width of the lot. They propose to build a pent awning to hide the horizontal support beam over the new parking area.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. The staff would support a garage cut into the rear wall of the addition, which preserves the side walls of the addition, and does not take up the whole width of the lot. The side courtyard should be preserved as an open feature and the second floor should not appear to be cantilevered out from the house.

Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Amy and Edwin Rivera, the owners, and Charles Evers, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Rivera said that he is a strong advocate of Preservation as evinced by his consulting a preservation architect. He also did research on the property which showed that the property had an addition. Mr. Rivera stressed the importance of parking and a play area. He emphasize that cost is also an issue. Mr. Evers presented photographs to show the context of the block as well as shed roofs in the neighborhood. He said that the proposed roof is a traditional type. He believes that the rear has no relationship to the rest of the house. He proposes to cover the beams with a wrap around porch with lattice work. Mr. Rivera disclosed that the proposed alterations have received the support of the neighbors.

Ms. Voith noted that the two-car parking would eliminate the play area.

Committee members concluded that since the property has been greatly altered the proposed alterations are appropriate.

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

226 Fitzwater Street

Dawn and Steve Levi, Owners

Craig Deutsch, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1807

PROPOSAL: Construct rear addition

This application proposes a third-story addition at the rear of the rear ell of this brick rowhouse. Most of the rear ell is already three stories in height. The addition would bring the rear section of the ell, which is currently two stories in height, up to three stories. The addition would include a hipped roof, large windows and doors, and a balcony. Also, the roof of the historic section of the ell would be raised and a skylight added. This section of the ell roof retains its historic half-gable shape. The ell is visible from Fitzwater and Fulton Streets as well as Concordia Place, a small alley with four historic houses.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Craig Deutsch, the architect, said that he proposes to raise the roofline and add skylights at the historic rear ell roof and add an entirely new master bedroom at the third-story rear of the rear ell. Mr. Deutsch expressed the need for additional ceiling height in the master bedroom. He explained that the ceiling height at the eastern edge of the historic ell is only 6'-6". He stated that he could not continue the historic roofline out onto the new addition, especially since the existing two-story rear section of the rear ell is wider than the historic ell. Committee members asked about the extant alterations to the rear ell. Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission had recently approved an application to add new doors and windows to the two-story non-historic section of the ell.

Ms. Voith thought that a substantial amount of historic fabric still remains at the ell. Mr. Rivera remarked that the historic roofline should be preserved. Ms. Pentz suggested a flat roof instead of a hipped roof to provide extra ceiling height without overwhelming the historic ell. Committee members agreed that they could not recommend approval of the current design. They suggested that the architect redesign the project, limiting the height of the addition to the height of the peak of the historic ell roof. They also suggested that any skylights or clerestories added to the historic roof not extend above the peak. They advised the architect to consider their guidance and redesign the addition.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; and the Roofs Guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights 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.].

327 South 2nd Street

Beverly Blynn, Owner
Daniel Mehan, Applicant
DATE: 1965 Contributing to Society Hill Historic District
PROPOSAL: Enclose roof deck – final approval

This application proposes enclosing a roof deck at the rear of this Contributing, redevelopment-era building. The Commission reviewed an application for the project at its January 2005 meeting; it granted conceptual but not final approval because the architectural plans were incomplete. The current application requests final approval and includes complete, architect-drawn plans.

Staff Recommendation: This proposal complies with the requirements of the Historical Commission's January 2005 in-concept approval.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal and the Committee concurred that the plans reflect the Commission's approval.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend final approval.

2019-23 Green Street

Green Street Collaborative, LP, Owner
Joseph Duffy, Applicant
DATE: 1860, significantly altered 1922 and 1959
Non-contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District
PROPOSAL: Demolish building, construct 3-story multi-unit building with parking

This application proposes demolishing a Non-contributing building and constructing a multi-unit residential building with basement-level parking.

The extant building, a mere fragment, has a long history. About 1860, three rowhouses like those to the east were constructed on the three parcels. About 1922, the rowhouses were consolidated into a single apartment building. At that time, a Classical Revival-style limestone facing was applied to the first-story front façade to tie the three buildings into one. In 1959, the apartment building was converted into a social club. For the conversion, the entirety of the building except the lower two stories of the front façade was demolished and a one-story masonry block building was erected behind the façade. The front façade openings were infilled and a new entranceway added. The building has long been vacant and has fallen into disrepair. At its April 2004 meeting, the Commission reclassified the property from Contributing to Non-contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District.

The proposed building would house nine residential units and nine basement-level parking spaces. The parking area would be entered from Green Street, the only street bounding the property. The building would be compatible in materials, size, scale, massing, and proportion with the surrounding historic buildings. Some of the details, for example the cornice and door surrounds, would emulate, perhaps too closely, their Italianate neighbors. Other details, for example the nine-over-nine windows, which might be appropriate for pre-Italianate styles, would further blur the lines between historic and contemporary architecture.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the demolition and new construction, provided the keystones at the door surrounds and garage jack arch are deleted, one-over-one windows are substituted for the nine-over-nine windows, and the cornice is simplified,

with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Before presenting the application, Mr. Farnham apprised the applicants of the absence of a quorum. Developers Joseph Duffy and William Murphy, who represented the proposal, elected to proceed without a quorum. No one in the audience objected to proceeding without a quorum.

The Committee reviewed the plans and concurred with the Staff Recommendation.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the demolition and new construction, provided the keystones at the door surrounds and garage jack arch are deleted, one-over-one windows are substituted for the nine-over-nine windows, and the cornice is simplified, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new 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.].

235 South Camac Street

Philadelphia Sketch Club, Owner

Christina Carter, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1825, converted to clubhouse 1902

PROPOSAL: Add fire escape, cut window into door

This application proposes the addition of a fire escape at the rear of the rowhouse housing the Philadelphia Sketch Club. The fire escape is part of a larger project to improve safety and security at the club. The fire escape would be attached to an early twentieth century addition at the rear. The new metal balcony and stairs would necessitate the enlargement of a window opening (both height and width) to create a door opening. The new door would be a metal six-panel door. The fire escape would be visible over a tall brick wall from Fawn and Latimer Streets.

The east or rear elevation drawing depicts louvers in two of the three dormers. These louvers, which are extant, were not in place at the time of designation and were not approved by the Commission. The current application does not request the legalization of these louvers. If the fire escape is approved, the approval should not be construed as an implicit legalization of the louvers.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, provided the door design is predicated on the historic window, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Before presenting the application, Mr. Farnham apprised the applicant of the absence of a quorum. Christina Carter, the architect representing the proposal, elected to proceed without a quorum. No one in the audience objected to proceeding without a quorum.

The Committee reviewed the proposal and agreed with the staff that the new door should reflect the replaced window. Ms. Carter stated that the club had security concerns about the fire escape door; she added that the proposed six-panel metal door was based on others in the building.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, provided the door design is predicated on the historic window, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9

[New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new 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.]

120-30 New Street

Eagan Lakhmna, Owner

Hugh Zimmers, Architect/Applicant

DATE: Vacant lot at time of designation

PROPOSAL: Construct 6-story building on vacant lot – 45 day review and comment

This application proposes the construction of a large residential building on a vacant lot at 120-130 New Street in the Old City Historic District. The Commission's jurisdiction is limited to 45 days of review and comment.

The 6-story building would stand on piers, with an open first story dedicated to parking and five upper stories occupied by residences. The deep building would stretch south from New Street between a row of historic buildings on N. 2nd Street at the west and the I-95 corridor at the east. It would be faced with limestone and include small balconies on the New Street facade.

Staff Comment: The proposed building is not compatible with the surrounding historic buildings on 2nd and New Streets. Several features including the ground-level parking, balconies, materials, size, scale, proportion, and massing are all incompatible with the surrounding, smaller, brick buildings, including one that dates to the eighteenth century. Direction for a compatible design is offered by Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Eagan Lakhmna, the developer, and Hugh Zimmers, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Zimmers described the proposal, noting that Interstate 95 is a mere 25 feet to the east of the proposed building site. He also reported that three-story buildings stand to the west of the building site. He explained that the new building would be clad with Kasota stone, the gold-yellow stone used for the Philadelphia Museum of Art. Mr. Zimmers asserted that the building would only be visible from New Street. He noted that his proposal includes balconies on the New Street façade, but not on the I-95 façade because of the high noise levels. The building would be setback 14 feet from the sidewalk at New Street. The area between a wrought iron fence at the sidewalk and building would be landscaped.

Ms. Pentz inquired about the building's visibility from the Benjamin Franklin Bridge. Mr. Zimmers responded that it would not be visible. Some Committee members doubted this claim. Mr. McCoubrey thought that the building should better relate to its context, which includes the bridge and the surrounding former manufacturing and warehouse buildings. Mr. Rivera expressed concern about the Kasota Stone, which will show dirt quickly. He also contended that the proposed design does respond to the industrial buildings in the area. Mr. Rivera deemed the use of glass excessive and suggested that the glass railings be replaced with metal pipe rails, which better relate to the context.

Mr. Zimmers assured the Committee that he would look to its comments for guidance while revising his design.

The Architectural Committee commented that the design should be revised to respond better to its context, which includes the Benjamin Franklin Bridge and several historic warehouse and manufacturing buildings.

339 South 21st Street

Tom Callan and Martin McNamara, Owners

Stephen Mileto, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1860; garage added 1921; storefront added 1926; third story removed, 1939
PROPOSAL: Demolish garage, construct new garage with rooftop terrace, add skylights, railings and grates

This application proposes the demolition of a brick garage addition to a building at the northeast corner of 21st and Pine Streets and the construction of a two-story garage and terrace addition in its place. It also proposes the addition of a skylight, basement window grates, and railings to the extant building. This building was constructed in the 1860s as a three-story structure. The rear bay with porch predates 1895, when it was depicted on the Baist map. The garage was added in 1921. The building was cut down from three to two stories in 1939.

The neo-Modern garage and terrace addition would be clad with stone and finished with doors and railings of stainless steel and glass. At its February 2004 meeting, the Commission approved an application to renovate this building that included the faithful reconstruction of the historic bay and porch. The current application proposes encasing the rear bay and porch, which was to be clad in wood siding, with anodized aluminum panels; metal screens would cover the historic windows.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the skylight, basement grates, and railings. Denial of the garage with terrace, which would encase the historic bay with porch, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Stephen Mileto and Kevin Angstadt, the architects, and Martin McNamara, the owner, attended the meeting.

Mr. Mileto explained that he had originally intended to retain the garage. However, he later discovered that its condition precluded retention. He therefore viewed the need to replace the garage as an opportunity to erect a much better addition to the historic building. Mr. Angstadt noted that the brick walls of the garage addition were cracked; the three-foot landing and door, which needed to be moved, are not code compliant. Mr. Mileto said that the rear bay and porch were reconstructed ten years ago and therefore are not historic. Mr. Farnham noted that the Commission's earlier approval was predicated on the restoration of the bay and rear porch. He also stated that his research shows that there was a wood structure of the same size and configuration as the bay and porch stood at the rear of this building as early as 1895.

Committee members asked the applicants to comment on the cladding on the addition. Mr. Mileto said that Vermont slate is proposed. Mr. Thomas remarked that the use of slate would be an enhancement over the extant brick. He voiced his general support for the project, contending that it respects the streetscape. Mr. Rivera reported his support of the project because of the change in use; once a pharmacy and soda fountain, the building will now be used as a photography gallery. He also noted the owners' efforts to restore the main building. Mr. McCoubrey deemed an addition acceptable in general, but suggested more of a dialogue between the old and new. He also rejected the enclosed

terrace at the second-story, contending that the enclosing wall was too assertive. Mr. Mileto countered that the second-story street façade at the terrace allowed for a more refined transition between the four-story building to the east and the building in question. Mr. McNamara stated that he had charged the architects with creating an addition that related to the old building. Mr. McCoubrey replied that he discerned no conversation between the old and new. He suggested using some material from the old building on the addition. Ms. Pentz expressed concern over the loss of the bay and porch. Mr. McCoubrey suggested to his fellow Committee members that they recommend approval, provided the connection between the old and the new is further articulated. He also suggested that the massing of the new addition relate to the massing of the garage and bay with porch.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the connection between the old and the new is better articulated, with staff to review details.

2008 Chancellor Street

Michael Murtha, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1860 – contributing to Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District

PROPOSAL: Legalize rooftop penthouse and deck

When the applicant came to the Commission for work to this building, the staff approved the rehabilitation of the front and rear facades and interior renovations, but told the owner that the rooftop penthouse and deck needed to be approved by the Commission, owing to their visibility. When the owner performed the work, he exceeded the permit and built the penthouse and deck; the Department of Licenses and Inspections has issued a stop work order. He now comes before the Committee and Commission to legalize the work.

The stuccoed penthouse measures ten feet by seventeen feet and abuts a penthouse on 2006 Chancellor Street, previously approved by the Historical Commission. The roof deck has a set back of five feet from the front façade and thirteen and one-half feet from the rear façade, and has a metal picket railing with wood planters. (The deck approved by the Commission on 2006 Chancellor Street in January 2000 has a setback of 22 feet from the front façade and 4-½ feet from the rear façade, with a setback from the side façade as well because it is on the end of the row.)

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the penthouse and roof deck with a much more substantial setback from the front facade, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Architectural Committee, which was composed of Mr. Rivera in the chair, Mr. McCoubrey, Ms. Pentz, and Mr. Thomas. Wayne Davis of Rittenhouse Developers represented the project. Ms. Spina explained that the contractor had begun construction of the penthouse and deck without a permit or Commission approval. She noted that the Commission had approved a penthouse and deck on the neighboring carriage house to the east at 2006 Chancellor Street, but that the design of the penthouse and deck in question differed significantly from the approved project on the neighboring building. She reported that the penthouse in question is slightly larger and, more significantly, the deck in question is positioned much closer to the front façade than the neighboring, approved deck. She stated that the approved deck is set back 22 feet from the Chancellor Street façade; the deck in question is set back only five feet.

Mr. Davis clarified that the deck is not yet built, but the penthouse is completed. He stated that he would like the penthouse to be legalized as built, but would be willing to redesign the deck. He showed photographs of the penthouse to the Committee, which shows it slightly larger than its approved neighbor.

Mr. Thomas asked for further explanation about the penthouse, which extends north toward Chancellor Street two or three feet more than the neighboring penthouse. Mr. Thomas concluded that the penthouse was acceptable as built.

Mr. Tyler suggested that the applicant relocate his deck, which is not yet built, to mirror the approved deck next door. The applicant agreed to revise his plans for the deck with front and rear setbacks matching the neighbor.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend legalization of the penthouse and deck, provided the deck is relocated with front and rear setbacks matching the neighboring deck at 2006 Chancellor Street, with staff to review details.

2026-30 Chancellor Street

Jan Rubin, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1895 – contributing to Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District

PROPOSAL: Cut windows and garage door on rear

This building historically was a carriage house; the original vehicular opening exists on the front façade, though it is now enclosed in a storefront. In January 2001, the Commission approved the cutting of a garage door and moving an entrance door on the rear façade of this property, though not with the exterior housing that now exists. The owner returns, requesting approval to cut a second garage door, a new window, and reopening an historic window, all on the rear façade. Also, the front of the building was painted a teal color, without Historical Commission approval.

The frame of the historic window remains and has a square head. The proposed windows have a two-over-two configuration.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of reopening the historic window, with staff to review shop drawings, pursuant to Standard 6; and denial of cutting the garage door and new window, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10. The front should be painted a brick red color instead of the teal and the illegal housing on the approved garage door should be removed.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Architectural Committee, which was composed of Mr. Rivera in the chair, Mr. McCoubrey, Ms. Pentz, and Mr. McCoubrey. Jan Rubin of Jan Rubin Associates Inc., a real estate development company, represented the project. She reported that her garage proposal had been approved by the Center City Residents Association, the Streets Department, and Zoning. In response to Ms. Spina's note that she had painted the front, brick façade without Commission review, Ms. Rubin reported that it had been painted an unattractive beige and grey and that she had improved its appearance with the addition of the teal and crème colors. Ms. Rubin acknowledged that she already had one garage in the rear, but she said that she was subdividing the property into two condominium units and wanted one garage per unit. She also stated that she needed the garage because she is physically disabled. She offered to provide a physician's letter attesting to her disability. Ms. Spina reported to the Committee that first garage added to the rear had not been executed as shown in the plans approved by the Commission. She pointed especially to the protruding garage

door opening machinery. Ms. Rubin explained that the first garage door system was not built to her specifications. Attempting to rectify the problems with the garage door, she is currently involved in litigation with the contractor.

Mr. McCoubrey returned to the question of the number of garages at the rear of this building. He stated that the subdivision alone did not justify the addition of the second garage and the concomitant removal of historic fabric. He reiterated that the rear façade is historic. Ms. Rubin countered that the rear façade has been altered significantly at the second-story level. Ms. Pentz noted that the window that would be lost for the new garage opening is one of the two surviving original masonry openings on the rear façade. Mr. Rivera added that the Historical Commission's charge is to improve buildings incrementally, not allow further degradation simply because a building has been altered in the past. The Committee deemed the reopening of the historic window appropriate, but the cutting of a new garage inappropriate.

Ms. Rubin accused the Committee and Commission of inconsistency. She claimed that her neighbor at 2020 Chancellor Street had recently received the Commission's approval to cut a new garage opening at the rear of his building and close off a garage opening at the front. Committee and staff members could not recall that particular application, but Ms. Spina noted that some of the buildings on the street historically had rear as well as front carriage openings and offered to provide Ms. Rubin with information on any Commission decisions including those for 2020 Chancellor Street.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of reopening the historic window, with staff to review shop drawings, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old in design, texture, and where possible, materials.]; and denial of cutting the garage door and new window, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and 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.].

1525 Pine Street

Frank Kakos, Architect/Applicant

Driscoll and Greene, Ltd, Owner

DATE: 1865-66, Charles MacAlester, developer; 5th floor added, c. 1870 – contributing to Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District

PROPOSAL: Deck on rear ell with trellis

This house has a fifth-floor mansard addition on the main section of the house, which was added soon after the construction of the row. The rear of the addition already has a door for access to the roof. The application proposes adding a deck on the roof of the fourth floor. The deck will have a wood, picket railing and a wood pergola at the north end of the house.

The proposal also includes the rehabilitation of the front and rear façades, much of which has already been approved by the staff. One new piece is the proposed new basement door. The plans call for a new six-panel basement door with the upper lights

glazed.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the roof deck and a four-panel basement door, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Frank Kakos represented the project. Mr. Kakos asked Ms. Spina to explain the staff's recommendation for the basement door. After she clarified that the historically appropriate basement door would be a four-panel, not a six-panel, door, Mr. Kakos noted that the four-panel door was acceptable and stated that he would update his design.

Mr. Kakos explained to the Committee that the deck would not be visible from the public right-of-way except at a great distance to the east along Pine Street. The Committee agreed that the deck would be, at most, minimally visible from about one block to the east.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the roof deck and a four-panel basement door, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old in design, texture, and where possible, materials.]; Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or 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 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 Roofs Guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as decks so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

113-33 Bread Street

K. Hovnanian@Philadelphia I, LLC, Owner

Tom Barton, Architect/Applicant

PROPOSAL: Revised design of 10-story tower – new construction- 45-day review and Comment

The Commission previously approved a design for a 10-story mid-rise building for this site, which is a part of the west parcel of the National Products Building development. This building will be constructed on land which was vacant when the Commission designated the district, so the design is before the Commission for the 45-day Review and Comment. Now that the project is in construction, the building's design has been changed from what the Commission saw previously. Other pieces of the project, such as the two buildings on 2nd Street and the townhouses, remain the same and the staff is working with the architect to expedite the permits.

The new design for the 10-story building now has a symmetrical composition and features a brick façade with cast stone cornice and beltcourses. Two entrances at the center of the building have single-leaf doors, with one leading to the condominiums on the upper floors and one to the retail space on the first floor. The southern half of the first floor holds the new PECO electrical transformer. PECO requires that this area be open, but secure, so the plans show metal picket gates at the openings. Windows

penetrate the east, west and north façades and are a mix of single, coupled and triple windows. The south façade is a series of solid stucco panels with brick and cast-stone bands with windows at the uppermost floors only.

Staff Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Thomas Barton and Chris Tranchetti of K. Hovnanian, the developer, represented the project. Ms. Spina reminded the Committee that the Commission has 45-day review-and-comment jurisdiction, not full jurisdiction, in this case.

Mr. Barton presented to the Committee an overview of the changes to the previously approved design. Mr. Rivera asserted that the designs of the facades, especially the colors of the materials, are too complicated. Mr. Tranchetti explained that the new facades were designed in response to community input. Mr. Barton added that the color contrasts will not be as dramatic or dynamic as they appear in the renderings.

Ms. Pentz offered her approval of the proposal. Mr. McCoubrey opined that the current design is better than the earlier design, but added that he agrees with Mr. Rivera that the color contrasts should be minimized. He suggested more red brick and less gold brick.

The Architectural Committee commented that the color contrasts on the facades should be moderated and that some of the gold brick should be replaced with red brick.

213 Chestnut Street

Eli Gabay, Owner

Todd Lean, Applicant

DATE: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: Legalize kitchen fan

In 1993, the Historical Commission approved ductwork and an interior fan with a grill that would be flush with the window frame. This application calls for legalizing a new, projecting dome and fan for the kitchen ductwork. The tenant claims that a pre-existing projecting fan was damaged by a truck and he simply replaced it.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9. The fan should be installed to match what the Commission approved in 1993.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Restaurant owner Todd Lean represented the project. Attorney Eli Gabay arrived at the end of the review, while the Committee issued its recommendation.

Mr. Lean stated that he replaced the mechanical equipment after it was damaged by a truck. He explained that the building inspector for the Old City area had informed him of the violations.

Mr. Rivera asked if the upper floors were occupied by residences. Mr. Lean answered in the affirmative.

Ms. Pentz and Mr. McCoubrey stated that they could not recommend approval to legalize the equipment without further information. They asked the restaurateur to investigate moving the fan inside behind a flush louver or running the exhaust up

through the building to the roof. They also asked him to determine precisely the code requirements for this type of ventilation equipment.

Mr. Lean pointed to a similar fan on a neighboring building. Ms. Spina affirmed that it had not been installed legally. Mr. Lean reported that the Health Department had approved his kitchen.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend tabling the application for a period not to exceed six months to allow for an assessment of the code requirements and options.

Boathouse Row

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Karen Borski, Applicant

DATE: # 2 Fairmount Boat Club: 1904, Walter Smedley, architect

3 Quaker City Barge Club: 1860; rear addition, 1874

4 Pennsylvania Barge Club: 1892, Louis Hickman, architect; addition, 1912, C. E. Schermerhorn

5 Crescent Boat Club: 1869-71; addition, 1891, Charles Balderston, architect

6 Bachelors Barge Club: 1893-94, Hazelhurst & Huckle, architects

7 & #8 University Barge Club: 1870; enlarged, 1893

9 Malta Boat Club: 1873; enlarged 1901, Hewitt Bros., architects

#10 Vesper Boat Club: 1873; addition, 1898, Howard Hagar, architect

#11 College Boat Club: 1874-75, addition, 1920; addition 1938

#12 West Philadelphia Rowing Club: 1878, addition 1968

#13 Undine Barge Club: 1882-83, Furness & Evans, architects

#14 Philadelphia Skating Club: 1860, James Sidney, architect

#15 The Sedgeley Club: 1902-03, Arthur Brockie, architect

PROPOSAL: Attachment details of re-lighting the boathouses with LED lights for Committee review only

This application calls for replacing the incandescent lights that outline the boathouses with LED lights.

Equipment: The information says that the nodes will be of the dome type, .74" in height. For every 100 nodes a junction box is required. These junction boxes range in size from one-foot square to two-feet by two-and-one-half feet. The specifications do not note which size is required in each location. The cables come in several colors to match the background, but the application does not specify that this will be done.

Mounting: The cables will be laid with clips, which occur at every node. With this application, it would be every 8 inches on center. It is unclear how many, if any, of the existing holes from the existing lighting can be reused for the new clips.

The new detail cuts explain how the cables will be affixed to various materials, including stone and brick façades and slate, cedar and asphalt shingle roofs. All of the mounting hardware will be stainless steel. For uneven surfaces, rubber shims will be used to level the cables. For the slate and cedar roofs, straps will slide over the shingles to avoid penetration of the roofing material. For the stone and brick facades, instead of prescribing the mounting in the mortar joints, the plans call for mounting in the masonry. None of the details mention reusing the existing holes.

The application does not specify the mounting for the junction boxes.

Patching: The patching details only say that epoxies are to be used; however, these do not detail which epoxies except for concrete/stucco. For stucco, the epoxy stipulated is a concrete based product that does not have lime.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of drilling or gluing onto the brick or stone, pursuant to Standard 7. All attachment of the lights should occur in either the mortar joints of the masonry or utilize existing holes. More repair details should be submitted, including an approximate estimation of repairs that will need to be done and in what type of materials. All patching materials for masonry should have lime, pursuant to Masonry Guidelines.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Architectural Committee. She reminded the Committee it was reviewing details only and that the application would not proceed on to the Commission. Karen Borski, Interim Director of the Fairmount Park Commission, Hillary Langer of the Vesper Rowing Club, and lighting engineer Shannon Yott represented the project.

Ms. Pentz asked about mounting the lighting equipment on the historic buildings. Mr. Langer, an architect, replied that they would not be able to use many of the existing mounting holes. He asserted that the chances for the reuse of the holes are “bleak.”

Mr. McCoubrey asked how the installation job would be bid with so many aspects of the project remaining undefined. Mr. Langer explained that 80% of the attachments would be straightforward, but that 20% would be complicated. Ms. Yott added that they would not know the scope of the complexities until the contractors were in the field to perform the work. Mr. Tyler suggested one simple rule to guide the attachments: no attachments to brick or stone, only to mortar joints. Ms. Spina inquired into the spacing of the attachments. Mr. Langer replied that they would typically be 16 inches on center, but would be less on the roof. Ms. Spina inquired about the junction boxes. Mr. Langer replied that 99% of the boxes would be out of view under the eaves. Ms. Yott added that there would be, on average, 12 junction boxes placed on each boathouse. The Committee reviewed that attachment details. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that stainless steel fasteners be used on wood roofs, rather than the proposed copper.

The Committee asked what type of contractors would install the lighting equipment. Mr. Tyler suggested that they be highly qualified. Ms. Yott explained that the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 98 would install the equipment. She added that Local 98 business manager John Dougherty had taken a personal interest in the project. Committee members asked Ms. Yott who would repair the historic buildings after the old lighting was removed. She replied that the electricians would repair the buildings including patching the historic masonry. Mr. Langer interjected that he would meet with the contractors and review masonry patching procedures. Mr. Tyler suggested that a qualified member of the Fairmount Park Commission staff or Capital Programs Office monitor the masonry and carpentry work by the electricians.

The Architectural Committee voted to approve the attachment details, provided the drawings and specification are revised as noted, with the staff to review further details.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron
Jonathan Farnham
Diane M. Hughes