

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

**22 APRIL 2008
9:00 A.M.
CITY HALL, ROOM 578
DAVID AMBURN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

David Amburn, Chair
John Cluver
Rudy D'Alessandro
Shawn Evans
Daniel McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner I
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician

ALSO PRESENT

Mark D'Alonzo, D'Alonzo & Associates, Architects
Christina Carter, John Milner Architects
Jim Kaufmann, Kaufmann Associates
Brad Roeder, John Milner Architects
Jean Wolf, Woodlands
Morris Chomitz, Society Hill Civic Association
Myra Eskin, Society Hill Civic Association
Jane Ahn, Society Hill Civic Association
Ronald J. Gelegonya
Victor Gargano, Cash Construction, Inc.
Robert and Cynthia Roth
Spence Kass, Kass & Associates
Steve Pollack, Esq., Montgomery McCracken
Sueyun Locks
Casey Parker
Susan Shimp, Manayunk Neighborhood Council
Bruce Cooper
Doug Grainge, Architect
Paul Miller
Kevin Angstadt, Qb3
Tim Peters

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Amburn called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Ms. Pentz and Messrs. Cluver and Evans joined him. Messrs. D'Alessandro and McCoubrey joined the meeting later in the day.

226-30 N. 2ND STREET

Owner: Power Plant Productions, L.P.

Applicant: Jim Graham

History: c. 1920; contributing to Old City Historic District, 12/13/2003

Project: Enlarge front façade windows, signage on smoke stack

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to lower the window sills at ground floor. The existing sills sit six feet above the sidewalk. The building has retail space at the ground floor; visibility into the space is impossible from the sidewalk. The owner would like to lower the sill two feet, which would allow pedestrians to look into the sales room. The applicant proposes new display windows for the enlarged openings. The building does not retain its original windows. The applicant also proposes signage on the smoke stack. The signs would be painted onto the surface of the stack.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the enlargement of the windows, pursuant to Standard 9. Approval of the signage on the smokestack.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Architect Mark D'Alonzo and property owner Jim Kaufman represented the application.

Mr. D'Alonzo distributed additional information to the Committee. Mr. Kaufman stated that he has had difficulty renting the first floor as retail space owing to the lack of visibility from the street. He noted that he has signed Poggenpohl, a high-end kitchen company, as a contingent tenant with the provision that the ground floor windows be slightly altered to accommodate more visibility from the street.

Mr. Danta noted that the existing windows are not original, but most likely date to the late 1950s. He also reported that the building is listed as a contributing resource to Old City Historic District. He added that the building was individually listed in 1984, when the new preservation ordinance was adopted. The owner asked for further clarification on the district listing. Mr. Danta explained that the 1984 designation date most likely stems from the designation of the larger Wilbur Chocolate Factory. The 31 December 1984 date was assigned to any address that was on the Register without an earlier designation date at the time the new ordinance was enacted. He clarified that the building was also designated as part of the Old City Historic District. The owner noted that he had purchased the property in 1997 and had conducted research and concluded that this property was not designated. Mr. Danta contended that, regardless of the validity of the 1984 designation, the building was undeniably designated in 2003 as a contributing resource in the Old City Historic District.

Mr. Cluver opined that he found the enlargement of the windows an acceptable change. However, he was concerned with the scale of the new windows. Mr. D'Alonzo stated that he was trying to allude to the original window pattern. He also stated that the tenant did not want a muntin system that would obstruct visibility. Mr. Cluver acknowledged the tenant's concerns and agreed that a plate glass system would be desirable. However, he noted that the ground floor windows should respond to the proportions and scale of the building.

The owner stated that he intends to replace all the windows on the front façade at some future date. Mr. Cluver suggested that the new ground floor windows should establish the standard for the restoration of the upper windows. He suggested a restoration of the transoms of the ground-floor windows with divided-light windows, but non-historic, unobstructed plate glass windows below the transoms.

Ms. Pentz stated that the Commission's policy is to require a restoration of the historic windows when work is proposed. She stated, however, that Mr. Cluver's suggestion was a reasonable compromise that addressed both the needs of the tenant and the Commission's standards. She also noted that these changes would set the tone for the future changes.

Mr. Evans objected to the billboard-like appearance of the proposed sign. He stated that he thought it was too large and inappropriate for this location. He inquired whether the proposed sign was permitted by the zoning regulations. Mr. Danta encouraged the Committee to review the sign on its preservation merits only. He also noted that the staff had discussed the sign at length and decided that the proposed painted sign was completely reversible and would not damage the historic fabric. Mr. Baron expressed his concern about the preservation of the original Wilbur Chocolate Factory sign on the smokestack. Mr. Kaufman explained that the painting of the new sign would not negatively impact the original sign. He acknowledged that part of the new sign will be painted over the Wilbur sign, but the Wilbur sign could be repainted in the future. Mr. Evans disagreed with the rest of the Committee and stated that he could not recommend approval of a 52-foot sign.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the signage on the smokestack and the window alterations with an aluminum window system in the historic dark brown color, provided the new windows have the historic pane pattern above the door head, with the staff to review details.

22 S. 3RD STREET

Owner: Darren & Jason Hill

Applicant: Nathan Flanigan

History: 1837, William Strickland, architect; alterations and addition by John T. Windrim, 1897, two-story rear addition by Edwards & Green; individually designated June 1956, significant in Old City District, 12/13/2003

Project: Construct rear balcony

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear balcony. The Historical Commission granted a conceptual approval for this balcony as part of a larger review for this building in May 2007. The applicant proposes the balcony in the same location and of the same dimensions as previously approved in concept.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Commission's May 2007 approval in concept.

DISCUSSION: Mr. McCoubrey arrived to join the Committee. Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. No one represented the application.

Mr. Danta explained that all but the top of the French doors would be invisible to the public. Mr. Evans noted that the application does not provide details for the balusters on the railing. Ms. Pentz and Messrs. Evans and Cluver suggested that the railing should be metal, not wood. Ms. Pentz suggested that both the structure and railing should be metal, not wood, because the structural members can be much slimmer if implemented in metal.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the balcony, provided the structure and railings are metal, with the staff to review details.

3900 WOODLANDS AVENUE

Owner: The Woodlands Cemetery Company

Applicant: Brad Roeder

History: c. 1787, Designated in June 1956

Project: Install ADA ramp, restore windows and masonry

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore second-floor windows to their original six-over-six light configuration, and restoration of masonry facades. The applicant proposes to install an ADA lift on the main facade. The owners seek a permanent Certificate of Occupancy, and ADA accessibility is one of the requirements. The applicant proposes the lift to be located on the side of the front façade. The lift would discharge onto a ramp that would sit on an existing terrace. The change in elevation would be minimal. The ramp would access the house through an existing French door; no penetrations to masonry are necessary.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff offers no recommendation on the lift pending a full discussion of the alternatives at the Architectural Committee meeting. Approval of the windows and masonry restoration, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Architects Brad Roeder and Christina Carter and cemetery agent Jean Wolf represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked about the material of the proposed replacement windows. Mr. Roeder answered that they would be custom-made, painted, wood units. Mr. Danta asked if the application proposes true-divided or simulated-divided-light windows. Mr. Roeder clarified that the proposed windows would be true-divided-light windows.

Ms. Pentz asked about the proposed masonry repairs. Mr. Roeder explained that application proposed repairs to the seals between the wood pilasters and masonry along the south façade.

Ms. Carter stated that she had significantly changed the design of the ADA lift since submitting the application. She presented revised plans for the ADA lift to the Committee. She stated that the lift had been relocated to the opposite side of the building from the position initially proposed. The new position was more appropriate than the old because the lift would be moved around the corner from the front of the façade to the side facade. She explained that a ramp would be built of wood on the terrace and stained to match the surrounding concrete. The ramp would allow entrance into a door on the terrace without alterations to the sill.

Mr. Danta asked if the railing that would be removed for the lift was an original element or a later addition. Ms. Carter replied that the railing is a nineteenth-century addition. She is proposing to remove and replace it with a new to match the railings previously approved for the south portico.

Ms. Carter stated that she is proposing to raise the grade at the front of the house to avoid having to install railings across the front of the porch to meet the building code.

Mr. Cluver expressed his hesitation to recommend approval of a proposed lift of this size. He noted that it may be too large for its setting. He asked the applicants if they had explored all

options to avoid installing the lift and ramp. Ms. Carter explained that the rear elevation was less appropriate for a lift because the rear terrace stands much higher above the surrounding ground. She also reported that they considered a ramp instead of a lift, but it would have been more intrusive. Mr. Evans asked again if the proposed scheme would not require alterations to the door or threshold. Ms. Carter confirmed that no door alterations are proposed or would be required. Mr. Cluver asked if they could hide the lift. Ms. Carter stated that they could soften its appearance with plantings. Mr. Amburn commented that the new location for the ramp is preferable to the location originally proposed. He asked whether the proposed platform would be a removable or permanent alteration. Mr. Roeder answered that the platform would be removable and that it would sit on the existing terrace. Mr. Carter stated that the edge of the platform would be covered by a fascia board painted to match the color of the terrace.

Mr. Danta asked the applicants if they would retain the nineteenth-century railing slated for removal. Ms. Carter stated that it would be catalogued and retained on site.

Mr. Cluver asked about the proposed planters at the front of the terrace. Ms. Carter stated that they need to raise the grade at the front 8 inches to avoid having to install railings to meet the building code. She stated that the brick arches at the front of the terrace would remain visible.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application as revised, with the staff to review the details.

231 CHRISTIAN STREET

Owner: Greg Summers

Applicant: Victor Gargano

History: c. 1825; individually designated

Project: Legalize alterations

OVERVIEW: This application proposes legalizing work done by the applicant several years ago, when he owned the building. After the completion of the work, the current owner purchased the building with a violation for the illegal work in place. The illegal work includes installing vinyl four-over-four windows, a door and frame, railing, and exterior light fixture, and a new roof. The roofing material is a very light brown, inappropriate shingle. Vinyl capping installed on the dormer hides the wood molding and shape of the dormer and its window. Paint was removed and the front façade was pointed without the Commission's approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and the Roofs and Windows Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Attorney Vito Canuso and the former property owner, Victor Gargano, represented the application.

Mr. Canuso showed a photograph of the property taken prior to his client's purchase in 2004. He stated that his client obtained a City Certification for the property, which did not indicate the historic designation. The staff noted that the designation status is not indicated on the Certification. Mr. Canuso acknowledged that his client made many modifications to the building. He explained that his client obtained a second Certification when he was selling the building to the current owner. That Certification included violations for work without Historical Commission approvals. He claimed that his client only learned of the designation with the second Certification. He stated that his client is seeking "some understanding and courtesy" from the

Commission. He also claimed that other buildings in the row are not in compliance. He concluded that his client was not aware of the Commission's requirements and proceeded with the work without a review. Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Canuso if his client had obtained any building permits. Mr. Canuso replied that he had not obtained any building permits for the work. Mr. Baron contradicted Mr. Canuso's claims and stated that he had informed the contractor on numerous occasions while the work was underway that the approval of the Historical Commission and a building permit was required for the alterations. He explained that he was conducting an extended review with a contractor on a house across the street at the time and was in the area often. Mr. Baron also stated that violations were issued while the work was ongoing. Responding to Mr. Canuso's claim that nearby houses were not in compliance, Mr. Baron stated that many of the conditions existed at the time of designation and are therefore grandfathered. Other alterations are illegal, have been cited, and enforcement is ongoing.

Ms. Pentz and Mr. Amburn listed the inappropriate alterations, which include aluminum capping and vinyl windows. Mr. Cluver noted that the dormer alterations are particularly egregious because they significantly alter the shape of the dormer. Mr. Canuso asked what his client would need to do to bring the building into compliance. Mr. Baron stated that he had explained the requisite restoration to Mr. Gargano. The restoration would include removing the capping from the dormer; installing the correct, arched top, wood six over six sash in the dormer; replacing the front façade windows with the appropriate wood windows; replacing the door; fixing the door frame with the appropriate transom bar with a three step design; and replacing the roof.

Greg Summers, the current property owner, introduced himself and said that, although he bought the property with these conditions, he bought it with understanding that the builder would remedy the violations. He stated that he wanted to comply with the Commission, but that he did not want his family to be disrupted.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application, pursuant to Standard 6 and the Roofs and Windows Guidelines.

2237 BRANDYWINE STREET

Owner/Applicant: Ronald Gelegonya

History: c. 1859, contributing to Spring Garden Historic District

Project: Legalize windows

OVERVIEW: This proposal calls for legalizing the installation of six-over-six, simulated-divided-light windows in this Italianate rowhouse. The wood bracketed cornice indicates that this Italianate building would have originally featured two-over-two windows. A former owner installed the windows without a permit after discussing the application procedures and appropriate windows with the Commission's staff. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a violation for the illegal windows to the former owner. The current owner purchased the building with the violation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Property owner Ronald Gelegonya represented the application.

Mr. Gelegonya stated that the previous owner had installed windows like those in neighboring houses. He also stated that he was aware of the violation when he purchased his property.

Mr. Amburn asked if six-over-six windows are appropriate for the front façade of this building. Mr. Baron explained that the staff considers wood, true-divided-light, two-over-two windows to be appropriate. Mr. Baron explained that the photographs of six-over-six windows in neighboring properties are not expository. Some of the buildings in the photographs are Colonial Revival buildings and the six-over-six windows are appropriate. Some have inappropriate replacement windows installed before the creation of the historic district. The building next door has six-over-six sash on the side façade, which is appropriate. Typically, Italianate buildings had two-over-two sash at the front facades with thin frames and six-over-six sash at the side and rear facades with plank frames. Mr. Gelegonya stated that his neighbors on both sides have six-over-six sash. He posited that his building had six-over-six sash originally as well. Mr. Baron reported that one neighboring façade is a side façade, not a front façade; it has six-over-six sash in plank frames. The other neighboring façade has inappropriate, replacement six-over-six sash.

Mr. Baron noted that the shutter hardware has been removed from Mr. Gelegonya's building. He displayed older photographs showing the presence of the hardware. He noted that the shutter hardware was installed between the brick and the wood frame, which indicates an Italianate two-over-two window with an ogee molding. If it had been a six-over-six with a plank frame, the shutter hardware would have been driven like a spike directly into the plank frame.

Mr. Cluver noted that the lack of solid evidence regarding the historic window type. He suggested that an appropriate six-over-six window with the appropriate frame might be acceptable if the shutter hardware was replaced. Mr. Baron noted that the correct frame could not be installed with the existing windows. The Committee asked Mr. Baron if he had ever seen original six-over-six windows in the front façade of an Italianate building with a bracketed cornice. He replied that he had not.

Ms. Pentz and Mr. Amburn agreed with the staff that the two-over-two is appropriate. The owner stated that his research has not revealed any conclusive evidence. Mr. Cluver suggested that the applicant make his plea to the Commission, which has greater discretion.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application, pursuant to Standard 6.

700 S. WASHINGTON SQUARE

Owner: Gene Locks

Applicant: Mitch Handman

History: 1818; individually designated; Significant to Society Hill Historic District

Project: Install elevator at rear

OVERVIEW: The plans propose the construction of an elevator at the rear of the property. Most of it would be concealed on the interior, but it would project above the rear porch at the upper floor. The architect has shown it clad in wood or stucco. HVAC units would have to be relocated onto the rear slope of the roof behind a dormer. The owner should explore an interior solution given the high visibility of this significant rear façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Attorney Steve Pollack, architect Spence Kass, and property owner Sueyun Locks represented the application.

Mr. Pollack explained that his clients need to install the elevator to allow one resident to access the upper floors. Without the elevator, he cannot stay in the house. Mr. Kass distributed drawings and contended that the elevator has been located to avoid disturbing important historic fabric with the house. Mr. Pollack stated that his clients would adjust the cladding materials of the shaft based on the recommendation of the Committee. He stated that they are open to wood or stucco. Mr. Kass stated that the house currently has some wood sided additions, but no stucco except at portions of the party wall. He also agreed to install a mock up to test the proposed placement of the mechanical equipment for visibility.

Mr. Cluver stated that the mechanical equipment is a major concern. He also stated that he is opposed to the elevator shaft protruding through the roof. He scrutinized the interior plan and if the bedroom could be relocated from the third floor to the second floor to allow the elevator to be limited to the first and second floors. Ms. Locks responded, claiming that the bedroom could not be relocated to the second floor because it would be expensive to move the bathrooms would. Mr. Pollack stated that the interior of the house is historically significant. It was once the home of the British embassy. Ms. Locks stated that they could not install a chair lift on the stair because the stair is highly significant. Ms. Pentz stated that she remembered an earlier application for an elevator in this building and had been convinced at that time that there was no better location for the shaft than the one proposed today. She also stated that she respected the desire for access to all floors.

Mr. Culver asked about the elevator shaft and its relation to the third-floor rear window that would be blocked. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the elevator shaft could be moved slightly to align with the window opening. Mr. Kass stated that it could not be moved, but the shaft could be enlarged slightly to encompass the entire window opening. The Committee members agreed that it should be enlarged. Mr. Evans suggested adding a window to the shaft at the third floor. He also suggested retaining the historic window, sill, and brick that would be removed for the elevator. Mr. Baron agreed and warned that the window frame may support the brick above it.

Morris Chomitz of Society Hill Civic Association stated that the applicants should have presented their project to the civic association before appearing before the Architectural Committee. He stated that he had no official position on the project, but shared the concerns of the Committee. He suggested stair lifts as an option to elevators.

Ms. Locks replied the spiral staircase is so elegant, it would destroy the fabric.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the elevator, provided the shaft is dark red in color and encompasses the entire historic window opening at the third floor, and provided that the removed window, sill, and brick is salvaged and stored on site.

611 LOMBARD STREET

Owner/Applicant: Robert Roth, AIA

History: c. 1810; individually designated; contributing to Society Hill Historic District

Project: Legalize rear addition facing residential courtyard constructed without a permit

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the construction of a third story on the rear ell of this rowhouse. The owner, who was himself the architect for the addition, claims that an unnamed City official told him he could build it without a permit.

The windows at both the front and rear facades of this building are vinyl. The owner claims he bought the property with these windows. The application does not address the windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the addition, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. D'Alessandro arrived to join the Committee. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Property owners Robert and Cynthia Roth represented the application.

Mr. Baron noted that the addition did not displace an ornate cornice as originally thought. He also explained that the applicants presented photographs of the framing of the single-story rear ell, which indicated that it was a later addition to the original house.

A representative of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that the association would have appreciated an opportunity to review this proposal before it was submitted to the Commission.

The Committee members expressed surprise that an architect had constructed a large addition on his own house without any permits or approvals, but they noted that the addition did not impact the public's perception of the historic building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the addition, pursuant to Standard 9.

309 PINE STREET

Owner: Michael Saponara and Christopher Ferenac

Applicant: Thom Krupa

History: Built circa 1808; Individually designated 30 April 1957; Designated within the Society Hill Historic District as contributing.

Project: Legalize roof deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of a wood deck with a solid rail and removable wood privacy panels.

At a meeting in November 2006, the Commission approved an application to install roof deck on the rear ell. The approved plans depicted a four-foot, open, balustrade railing.

In January 2008, the staff observed a solid railing with a high wall at the northwest corner of the deck. A violation was subsequently issued. In February 2008, the higher portion of the wall was lowered; however, the solid railing remains.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and Roofs Guideline. Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as . . . decks and terraces . . . when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Committee. Designer Tom Krupa represented the application.

Mr. Krupa stated that the architect had proposed an open railing in the plans that were presented to the Commission in 2006 even though the property owners wanted a solid railing. He claimed that the owners did not catch the error in the drawings until after they had been approved. He stated that the railing was built to the owners' wishes, not the approved plans. He added that the solid railing hides an ugly wall on a neighboring property. He also noted that the open railing would not provide the privacy sought by the owners. Mr. Krupa explained that a hot tub will be installed at the northwest corner of the deck and would be visible through an open railing. Mr. Amburn advised the Committee that it should not recommend approval of the higher enclosure that was illegally installed and then removed. Mr. Culver stated that the solid railing would be perceived as an enclosed addition and therefore changes the massing of the rear ell; the railing should be open. He added the hot tub should be relocated to a less prominent part of the deck.

Mr. Krupa displayed photographs of decks on nearby buildings. Mr. Cluver asserted that they provided no evidence of precedent because it was not known if they were legal or illegal or if they predated the designation of the district.

Ms. Pentz and Messrs. Amburn and Cluver all objected to the solid railing, which they contended was tantamount to adding a story to the rear ell. Mr. Krupa noted that the structure for the hot tub has not yet been approved. Mr. Cluver suggested that he relocate the hot tub away from the railing . Mr. Evans suggested an open railing around the entire perimeter of the deck.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and Roofs Guideline.

4365-4367 MAIN STREET

Owner: Bruce Cooper

Applicant: William O'Brien

History: c. 1890; in Manayunk Historic District, 12/14/1983

Project: Façade Alterations

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to combine this building with its neighbor to expand Jake's Restaurant. The applicant wishes to demolish a recessed storefront and install a new storefront. The new storefront would be flush with the street and have operable café windows with large mullions and tempered glass to mimic the design of its neighbor.

An earlier iteration of this project was presented to Commission in November 2007. The proposal depicted an open, clear glass window system without mullions. The Commission approved in concept the demolition of the existing storefront and installation of a non-historic storefront. However, the storefront proposed in the current application is very different from the storefront approved in concept.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to PM-704.2.6 "Storefronts: Original existing storefronts contributing to the character of the district shall be retained and repaired. New storefronts shall be compatible with the proportion, form and materials of the original building."

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Committee. Bruce Cooper, the owner of the restaurant, and attorney William O'Brien represented the application.

Mr. O'Brien asked the staff to clarify its recommendation of denial, which was offered pursuant to the Storefronts section of the Manayunk Ordinance. He asked if the staff found the proportion, form, or materials objectionable. He stated that the law only allows objections on those grounds.

Mr. Baron explained that the storefront would have historically had a transom above and large windows below with a central vestibule and a solid base. The previous in-concept submission was closer to a historically appropriate design than the current proposal. Mr. O'Brien again asked the staff if it objected to the proportion, form, or materials of the proposed storefront. Mr. Farnham replied that the staff is objecting to all three, the proportion, form, and materials. Some Committee members suggested that the current storefront should be retained. Mr. Baron explained that the Commission had approved the removal of that storefront because it is not original to the building. Mr. O'Brien stated that the Ordinance is specific. It states that "Original existing storefronts contributing to the character of the district shall be retained and repaired." He argued that the current storefront is not original and therefore need not be retained. Mr. Baron explained that the Commission voted to approve the removal of the storefront in concept because it is a later, not original. However, the Manayunk Ordinance does require replacement storefronts to be compatible with the proportion, form and materials of the original building and also to preserve the historical character of the district. Mr. Baron contended that the proposed storefront is not compatible with the historical character of the original building or the district.

Mr. Culver asked the applicants why they had abandoned the original design. Mr. Cooper stated that he did not like the detailing of the design, especially the stone cladding. He also explained that he is adding this building to his existing building next door to expand his restaurant and he wants the two buildings to look alike. The Committee members responded that the buildings are very different and should not look alike.

Mr. O'Brien stated that he surveyed buildings on Main Street between Green Lane and Cotton Street and noted that many included stucco on their facades. He asked how the Committee could reject the proposed materials when they are used in the district. Mr. Cluver responded that the Committee is not objecting to stucco in general, but how it would be used in this design. He stated that the two buildings should retain their historic identities, not be joined. The buildings are from two different time periods and represent two different architectural styles. It would be inappropriate for the buildings to be made identical. Mr. Amburn stated that he did not object to the materials in general, but did object to the notion of joining the two storefronts into one large storefront. He agreed with his colleagues that the proposed design is inappropriate.

Mr. Evans asked if the Manayunk Ordinance mandates the employment of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards when reviewing proposals. Mr. Farnham replied that the Manayunk Ordinance does not explicitly reference the Standards, but it does require that the proposed work will preserve the historical character of the district. He advised that the Committee could apply the Standards when determining whether the proposed work would preserve the historical character of the district. Mr. Cluver stated that linking the two buildings across their storefronts

does not preserve the character of the district. Mr. McCoubrey suggested the rhythms of the storefronts could be the similar, but not identical.

Mr. Cooper stated that the neighbors do not want another old storefront. Susan Shimp of the Manayunk Neighborhood Council stated that she is strongly opposed to identical storefronts. The buildings are different architecturally and should retain their differences.

Mr. O'Brien explained that the storefronts in Manayunk are too narrow for contemporary uses and therefore must be combined to be functional. He asserted that the Manayunk Ordinance does not indicate that the Commission must encourage, require, or mandate architectural diversity. He stated that no one has discovered an original photograph that could be used for guidance. He stated that, without a photograph, no one knows what is appropriate. He stated that their proposal must be considered appropriate. He noted that the second-floor façade would be maintained.

The Committee members decided to adopt the staff recommendation and recommend denial of the application. Mr. Farnham asked the Committee to confirm that it was not recommending denial because the current application is unlike the in-concept application. The Committee members stated that they were not recommending denial simply because the design had changed. The applicants are under no obligation to retain their in-concept design. Mr. Farnham asked the Committee to confirm that it was not recommending denial because the current application proposes the removal of the extant storefront. The Committee members stated that they were not recommending denial because the current application proposes the removal of the extant storefront; the Commission has already determined that the extant storefront may be removed because it is not an original storefront. Mr. Farnham asked the Committee to confirm that it is recommending denial because the proposed storefront is not compatible with the proportion and form of the original building. The Committee members agreed that they were recommending denial because the proposed storefront is not compatible with the proportion and form of the original building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to PM-704.2.6.

263 S. 15TH STREET

Owner: David Blumenfield

Applicant: Joe Gunn

History: 1922; contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Legalize façade alterations

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the removal of a metal covering and installation of stucco on the first-story façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and Storefront Guideline: "Recommended: Re-creating a missing storefront or storefront feature that existed during the restoration period based on physical or documentary evidence."

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Committee. Casey Parker represented the application.

Mr. Parker acknowledged that he and his partner depended on their contractor to obtain the necessary approvals and permits for the project. The contractor did not. He claimed that the vestibule had become dangerous and they made the necessary repairs. He stated that no existing brick was disturbed and they only replaced the 1980s corrugated metal with stucco.

Mr. Baron stated that he spoke with the applicant's architect prior to the work being undertaken and, in fact, supplied the photograph now being introduced. He stated that he believes that a white marble storefront exists beneath the outer storefront. He noted that the Commission typically requires a restoration when work is undertaken. The applicant should have explored a restoration of the storefront. Mr. Parker stated that he has had several problems with this contractor, who did not obtain the proper permits. He is no longer working with him. He stated that some underlying ceramic tile was shattered when the work was done.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and Storefront Guideline.

2123 SPRING GARDEN STREET

Owner: 2123 Partners LP

Applicant: Michael Mattioni, Esq.

History: c. 1875

individually designated 2/7/1974; contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Legalize windows and siding

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of four-over-four wood windows in the façade. The windows should be two-over-two, wood, true-divided-light, double-hung sash windows.

The application proposes to legalize the installation of aluminum siding on the rear bay.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of windows, pursuant to Standard 6; approval of siding, provided the historically appropriate windows are installed.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Committee. No one represented the application.

The Committee members discussed the proposal and agreed with the staff's recommendation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of windows, pursuant to Standard 6; approval of siding, provided the historically appropriate windows are installed.

2125 SPRING GARDEN STREET

Owner: 2123 Partners LP

Applicant: Michael Mattioni, Esq.

History: c. 1875; Individually designated 2/7/1974; contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Legalize windows and siding

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of four-over-four wood windows in the façade. The windows should be one-over-one, wood, double-hung sash windows.

The application proposes to legalize the installation of aluminum siding on the rear of the first and second stories.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of windows, pursuant to Standard 6; approval of siding, provided the historically appropriate windows are installed.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Committee. No one represented the application.

The Committee members discussed the proposal and agreed with the staff's recommendation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of windows, pursuant to Standard 6; approval of siding, provided the historically appropriate windows are installed.

152-154 N. 3RD STREET

Owner: O.L.C.

Applicant: Kevin Angstadt

History: 152: c. 1950; non-contributing to Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

154: c. 1845; contributing to Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Construct three-story addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story addition on a two-story non-contributing building in Old City at 152 N. 3rd Street. The addition would match the height of the adjacent existing five-story building at 154 N. 3rd Street. The addition would be constructed mostly of brick but the front façade would be clad flat-locked pre-weathered zinc siding. This application also proposes to install new windows on the fourth and fifth floors of 154. Details are not provided. The staff could approve the windows provided they were wood, true-divided-light windows and shop drawings were submitted

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the windows in the front façade of the contributing building are wood, true-divided-light, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. Architect Kevin Angstadt and developer Tim Peters represented the application.

Mr. Angstadt stated that the intention was to use wood true-divided-light windows and that shop drawings will be submitted to the staff. He described the property and stated that their proposal is to erect a three story-residential addition on the 1950s building. He noted that the new party

wall will be exposed matching brick, and the front would be clad with zinc, which would turn around the corner to allude to Old City buildings. The windows on each floor are set back thirty inches with balconies that view 3rd Street. He added that the height was determined by carrying the cornice line across from the historic building at 154 N. 3rd Street.

Mr. Evans asked if the roof deck could be encroached upon because it sits on the party wall. Mr. Angstadt replied that the owners hope to purchase the neighboring property in the future to avoid that situation.

Mr. Cluver opined that the design is not similar to the massing and depth of Old City buildings; the third floor is out of scale. He asked the Committee members if they should comment on the depth and set-back of the windows. Mr. Angstadt responded by presenting photographs of properties in the area and saying that he felt that the deep set windows are reminiscent of Old City's cast iron buildings. Mr. Evans opined that this is a great contemporary interpretation of the surrounding historic buildings.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the fourth-floor connections between the new and old buildings. Mr. Angstadt replied that, owing to the strange structure of the fourth and fifth floors in the 154 building, which have 7'-6" high ceilings, they are linking the old building to the new, open space.

Mr. Cluver disagreed with the size, scale, and proportion of the proposed addition, but, due to the fact that the building is non-contributing, he said he would vote to adopt the staff recommendation.

Mr. Angstadt asked for comments on the existing galvanized awning on the 152 building. He stated that it dates from the 1980s and he would like to remove it. The Committee members concurred that the awning is non-historic and does not warrant retention.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the windows in the front façade of the contributing building are wood, true-divided-light, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

4205-4207 WALNUT STREET

Owner: Daniel Liberatoscioli, Liberatoscioli, Inc., The Restaurant School

Applicant: Paul Miller

History: c. 1860; individually designated, 5/25/1965

Project: Replace porch flooring

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove the exiting wood porch floor and steps and replace them with a new floor and steps composed of bluestone pavers on a concrete base.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. Paul Miller and architect Doug Grainge represented the application.

Mr. Grange explained that the proposed work is seeking to correct maintenance and safety problems. He stated that the existing porch floor material is a pressure treated wood and not original. Mr. Miller added that there are rodent problems because the porch is open underneath.

In response to Ms. Pentz asking if there is crawl space beneath the porch, Mr. Miller stated that there is very little space between the porch and the earth. An in-filled basement window indicates that there may have been more space originally. Ms. Pentz noted this small space could put the building at risk for termites.

Mr. D'Alessandro suggested using Trex or a similar product that replicates wood plank but is not susceptible to rot. The masonry proposal is not appropriate. Ms. Pentz stated that that would not solve the structural issue. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested keeping the tongue-and-groove board look for the porch floor with concrete underneath. Mr. Baron mentioned that Trex and similar products come in colors that do not have to be repainted. They also come textured to provide a no-skid surface.

Mr. Evans opined that the stone floor would be incongruous with the historic wood elements above. Mr. D'Alessandro concurred and added that the porch would look more like a patio than a porch.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

2137 ST. JAMES STREET

Owner: Michael & Heather Ascher

Applicant: Timothy Kerner

History: 1923, Spencer Roberts, architect; significant to Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Construct rear addition and alter second floor rear

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a one-story addition at the rear of this property along Chancellor Street. The addition would be enclosed by a glass roof and wall set over a masonry wall and doorway. This application also proposes to construct a roof deck on the rear ell. The deck would be accessed by a door cut into the mansard roof and would have metal railing with obscure glass panels.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the door cut, but denial of the railing and addition as submitted, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. The staff suggests a metal picket railing at the deck and a revised roof line at the addition to shed water away from the building.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. Architect Timothy Kerner represented the application.

Ms. Cote asked if the roof of the addition would adequately shed water or would it direct it to the neighboring building. Mr. Kerner stated that the neighboring building would be protected from storm water.

Mr. Kerner provided an overview of the project.

Mr. Kerner explained the proposal to add a door in the dormer. Mr. Evans asked how the sides of the new door dormer would be sided. Mr. Kerner described the steep pitch of the mansard and stated that the door would project eight inches off roof, and would be sided with aluminum with a cooper roof. Mr. McCoubrey suggested the dormer door cut should be joined to the existing dormer or placed further away to avoid drainage and cladding issues. Mr. Kerner stated

that the dormer door cut would have to be joined with the existing dormer because of the layout of the interior.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the addition would be heated. Mr. Kerner replied that it would be and that a ventilation fan would be installed. Ms. Pentz commented that, when the addition is constructed, the window at the rear will no longer be able wrap around the side of the building. Mr. Kerner agreed and stated that he is also proposing to raise the sill height of the window eight inches. He noted that this is the rear of the building, not the side facing the courtyard. He noted that other buildings in the row have additions at the rears.

Mr. Cluver opined that mansard door cut must be well designed to prevent water and snow collection; however, he asserted that it does not impact the historical nature of the building.

Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Pentz suggested that the railing for the small deck should be open with metal pickets, not glass. Mr. Cluver concurred, stating it should not look like a glass parapet. Mr. Kerner stated that his client was hoping to gain privacy and picket style railing felt too open and exposing. Mr. Evans found the proposed railing acceptable and stated that the details could match those of the greenhouse addition.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application, provided the new dormer for the door to the deck is joined with the existing dormer.

1410 CHESTNUT STREET, AKA 100 S. BROAD STREET

Owner: LTB Limited

Applicant: John Lepone

History: Designated: 8/2/1973

Project: Install internally illuminated sign

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install an internally illuminated sign to the storefront. The sign would be a dark bronze aluminum extrusion box with a lexan and vinyl face.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. No one represented the application.

The Committee members agreed that the proposed sign does not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

343 S. 5TH STREET

Owner: Tara Lamont

Applicant: Andrew Barrios

History: c. 1970, Stephen Mark Goldner, architect; contributing to Society Hill Historic District

Project: Replace windows

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install new windows at the front and the rear of this building. The original windows are metal, bronze in color, and the proposed are wood aluminum clad windows, brown in color. On the front, the meeting rail of the proposed windows is $\frac{3}{4}$ " wider than the existing. Also the drawings show a 50/50 double-hung window whereas the existing is closer to 60/40 sash configuration. At the rear, the vertical window separator and frames of the proposed measure $1\frac{1}{4}$ " wider than the existing and the drawings show a two step profile as opposed to the single step of the existing. Lastly, fixed windows are proposed in place of the small sliders. The proposed changes to the rear windows are acceptable because the façade is minimally visible.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the front windows, but approval of the rear windows, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Committee. No one represented the application.

Mr. Amburn observed that this house is part of a coherent row of houses. Any alterations not in compatible with the original design and neighboring buildings would be obvious. Mr. Evans was concerned that approving the proposal would set a negative precedent. The Committee members agreed that the proposed windows do not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application, pursuant to Standard 6.

239 DELANCEY STREET

Owners: Jeannette and Oliver Boulind

Applicant: Rachel Simmons Shade, AIA

History: c. 1811; wagon works c. 1890; first floor rebuilt 1962

Contributing to Society Hill Historic District

Project: Install six-over-six simulated-divided-light windows, roofing, and skylights, demolish and enlarge rear dormer

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the demolition of a rear dormer and its replacement with a larger dormer. The windows on the front façade will be replaced with six-over-six simulated light windows. The applicant asks for the optional replacement of the frames however the proposed details do not match historic plank frames. The proposed shutters also seem inappropriate to the façade because they do not match the historic photos and are paneled where historic photos show louvered. The applicant asks to install a new roof without specifying color or shape of the shingles and an enlarged front skylight that will be visible from Delancey Street

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the demolition of the rear dormer, the proposed windows and shutters and the new front skylight pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Approval of the ground-

floor rear alterations and rear skylights. Approval of a new roof with Timberline shape and weathered wood color shingles with staff to review details.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Property owner Oliver Boulind and architect Rachel Schade represented the application.

Mr. Baron stated that the applicant's drawing of the proposed window details do not match the catalogue details of the Marvin windows submitted as part of the application. He also noted that the Marvin catalogue details showed many different muntin options, all of which are curved and do not have the appropriate beveled putty slope. The Marvin catalogue details also included many different muntin widths. Mr. Baron stated that 7/8" muntins would be appropriate.

The Committee members asked Mr. Baron for his advice on true and simulated-divided-light windows. He stated that windows in Society Hill should be true-divided-light. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that he favored true-divided-light windows from a construction point. He asserted that the traditional means and methods of construction have historic significance. He said that there is nothing simpler than a pulley system and added it is easy to maintain repair and replace parts.

Ms. Schade noted the current windows are not original, but date from the restoration of 1961. She cited the price differences between custom-made and factory-produced windows. Mr. Baron commented that although some simulated-divided-light windows are cheaper, this Marvin window is not.

Mr. Boulind stated that the entire façade was replaced in 1962, when his in-laws returned the structure back to its original configuration. Mr. Baron suggested a simulated-divided-light window may be appropriate in this particular instance because the façade was reconstructed in the 1960s.

Mr. Amburn recalled that the Commission approved simulated-divided-light windows for a building in Society Hill that was built in 1970, but denied simulated-divided-light windows for another around the corner because it was an original eighteenth-century building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the simulated light windows, provided the muntins 7/8 inches wide and have a beveled putty slope; the first-floor rear alterations; the installation of a new skylight in the existing size and location; a new roof with Timberline shape, weathered-wood color shingles; and shutters, provided they are paneled at the first floor and louvered above; with the staff to review details. The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the new rear dormer and enlarged skylight, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

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. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

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.

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

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.

Windows Guideline: Not Recommended: Changing the historic appearance of windows through the use of inappropriate designs, materials, finishes, or colors which noticeably change the sash, depth of reveal, and muntin configuration; the reflectivity and color of glazing; or the appearance of the frame.

PM-704.2.6: Storefronts: Original existing storefronts contributing to the character of the district shall be retained and repaired. New storefronts shall be compatible with the proportion, form and materials of the original building.