

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Arlene Matzkin, Chairperson
Commission Conference Room
Suite 1301, 1401 Arch Street
30 July 1996

Present

Arlene Matzkin, Chairperson
Tony Atkin
Herbert Levy
Suzanne Pentz

Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer
Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Jeffrey Barr, Historical Research Technician
Laura Spina, Historic Preservation Specialist

Also

Bernard Nearey, Rittenhouse-Fitler District
Jane Jacobs
Lenore Millhollen
Marcus Goldberg, Universal Christian Gnostic Movement of the USA
Sam Fadullon, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
James Cho, 2131-2133 Pine Street
Rudy D'Alessandro, 1834-1836 Delancey Street
Dana Reed, First Presbyterian Church
Ann Agee, 257 South 24th Street
Warren Huff, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Marcia Karasek, 2024 Locust Street
Pat Dewey, 125 North 2nd Street
Milton Marks, Preservation Alliance
William Kerr, Moore College of Art, Blank Rome Comisky & McCauley
Joseph Lisa, Moore College of Art
Rich Silvesti, Moore College of Art
Michael Corenwit, Cast Iron Building
Jeff Wyant, Cast Iron Building
Judith Eden, Center City Residents Association
Joel Spivak
Randall Cotton, Preservation Alliance
Jim Burton, 5201 Vicaris Street

Ms. Matzkin called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

2051 Walnut Street AKA 119 South 21st Street

Sheldon Kauffman, Applicant
PROPOSAL: Visible ductwork

Mr. Kauffman was not present. Mr. Baron described the exhaust

fan and ductwork required for the restaurant. The ductwork must be ten feet high and will be highly visible. Ms. Matzkin noted that a fire-escape and tower rise in the same location. Mr. Baron stated that the ductwork might be situated to the west of the fire-escape. The Committee wanted more information on the location of the fire-escape and its relation to the ductwork.

The Committee voted to defer a decision until the Committee receives more information, including a scaled north elevation and floor plan with the fire tower. The Committee noted that the application is not complete.

133 South 23rd Street

Marcus Goldberg, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Sign

Mr. Baron described the sign for the Universal Christian Gnostic Movement of the USA, which will be located next to the window on the first floor. Ms. Matzkin stated that the sign would look better next to the door, but having the sign located between the two doors would be confusing. Mr. Levy asked for the sign to be dropped so that the top of the sign was level with the top of the windows. Mr. Goldberg stated that would not be a problem.

The Committee voted to recommend approval on the condition that the top of the sign be made flush with the top of the window.

7 Boathouse Row, University Barge Club

Jeffrey Walker, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Shingles, repointing, balcony

Mr. Baron described the three parts to the proposal. First, the proposal includes the replacement of the rounded shingles on the north, west and south sides of the building. The shingles on the east (river) side were replaced previously. Second, the serpentine walls were repointed with Portland cement many years ago which is now damaging the serpentine. The proposal calls for the replacement of the cement mortar with a high lime-based mortar in a ribbon joint. Mr. Levy asked how the cement will be removed without further damaging the serpentine. Mr. Baron noted that they have started removing the cement with little damage. The Committee stated that staff should review a sample. Third, the Barge Club wants to replace the missing balcony on the river side. The original balcony was very narrow and stretched the entire length of the building. The new design is for a twelve-foot wide balcony that is only the width of the gable. The engineering to support the balcony still needs to be determined. Mr. Levy stated that the stone plinth on the new columns look too big. The Committee agreed that the plinth should be lower.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the shingles, the repointing and the balcony, but with a lower plinth; staff to give final approval.

2131-2133 Pine Street

James Cho, Applicant

PROPOSAL: New storefront, roll-down gate

Mr. Baron summarized the activity at the property. Mr. Cho, the contractor, received two permits from the Department of Licenses and Inspections without referral to the Historical Commission for approval. The first permit allowed new storefront windows and the second allowed exterior, solid, roll-down gates. Many neighbors contacted the Historic Commission staff which investigated the permits. The permits issued in error and subsequently revoked, but after completion of the work.

In the past, the store windows had been made smaller. The new windows, though metal, are more appropriate historically. The Committee decided to recommend approval of the windows. Ms. Matzkin questioned the solid grates. Mr. Cho stated that the owner chose the grates. Ms. Matzkin suggested installing awnings to hide the exterior housing for the grates.

Jane Jacobs, a neighbor, testified that the grates are unsightly. To install the grates, the contractor removed historic fabric, metal panels which said "Delancey Pharmacy". Ms. Jacobs emphasized the desire of the community to have see-through grates instead of the present solid ones. She also noted that the panels on the corner pillar are in disrepair.

Mr. Atkin asked about the legal ramifications of the situation since the work was done with a permit. The Committee discussed the problems that have resulted from mistakes made by some of the employees at the Department of Licenses and Inspections. The Committee's recommendation is based on architectural design only. The Commission itself will have to explore the legal question that arose owing to the issuance of a permit in error.

Bernard Nearey, an area resident, testified that the requirement of an awning to cover the exterior housing may not be enforceable in the future. What are the ramifications if a future owner removes the awnings and does not replace them? The housing for the grates would then be visible again.

Lenore Millhollen, a resident, stated that the community opposes the exterior housing and the solid roll-down gates.

The Committee decided to recommend denial of the roll-down gates. However, the Committee proposed three options for which it would recommend approval: complete removal of the gates; changing the solid gates to open grills, with the condition of the addition and maintenance of awnings; or open grills on the interior of the glass windows. Any changes should return to the Architectural Committee for review. The Committee noted that the corner pillar is in need of repair.

Again the Committee questioned the communication between the Historical Commission and the Department of Licenses and

Inspections. Mr. Tyler noted that the staff at the Department rarely miss an historic building. Considering the volume of permits processed, the Department has a good record. However, the number of permits that have been issued without Historical Commission approval has increased in the last few months. The Committee also noted that the letter announcing the revocation of the permit did not have a date.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the new windows and denial of the roll-down gates.

2411 Spruce Street

Zvi Barzilay, Applicant
PROPOSAL: New windows

Mr. Baron stated that the owner proposes to remove the vinyl replacement windows and install wood sash into the existing wood frames, with no cladding on the frames.

The Committee voted to recommend approval.

2024 Locust Street

Marcia Karasek, Applicant
PROPOSAL: Minor facade restoration

Mr. Baron described the changes proposed to the facade including removal of paint from the stone, cleaning of the brick and the replacement of the 1960s window with a single pane of glass, leaving the metal horizontal bar. Mr. Levy asked for more specifics regarding the epoxy to be used for the metal components. The Committee decided that staff should have final approval on the specifics. Mr. Atkin stated that the metal horizontal transom bar should be replaced with a heavier wood bar. The Committee agreed that the heavier look of a wood transom bar would be more appropriate. Other changes include the addition of a kickplate and door hardware.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the facade restoration and the replacement of the window with the addition of a heavy wood transom bar. Final details are to be approved by staff.

1834-1836 Delancey Street

Rudy D'Alessandro, Applicant
PROPOSAL: Clean, repoint, partial re-paint

Mr. Baron explained that the proposal includes two residences, 183,4 which is not painted, and 1836, which is painted. The owner proposes to clean the brick (paint will not be removed from 1836) and repoint the failed joints of both buildings. 1836 will be repainted. Mr. D'Alessandro testified that some of the bricks and mortar need to be replaced at the sills of some of the windows in 1836.

The Committee voted to recommend approval with staff to approve the replacement bricks and repointing.

2034-2050 Walnut Street, First Presbyterian Church

Dana Reed, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Stone repair

Ms. Reed described the proposal for repointing and stone repair and replacement. Years ago the church had been repointed with Portland cement which is dark grey in color. The new mortar matches the original much lighter high-lime mortar. Only some of the joints will be repointed and an organic color will be added to the lime mortar to match the extant joints. Five stones will be replaced with new stone that matches the existing masonry.

The Committee voted to recommend approval with staff to make final approval of patching and repointing.

162 North 3rd Street

Seth Carter, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Paint masonry storefront

Mr. Baron explained that the group of buildings had been painted on the first floor. The proposal calls for the group to be painted a light beige color. The Committee noted that the lighter color is more appropriate for the design of the building. The tenant of one of the buildings, Mr. Carter, wants to add stencils to the pilasters and above the door. The Committee decided that the stencils were not appropriate for the style of the building; the large solid pilasters are a significant feature. The Committee suggested that the stencil design, for the capitals of the pilasters only, be painted onto flat signs that are hung in place.

The Committee voted to recommend denial. The Committee had no problem with painting the columns a light color but objected to the stencils painted directly on the stone.

257 South 24th Street

Ann Agee, Owner

PROPOSAL: New windows

Mr. Baron explained that when the windows had been replaced several years ago, the openings had been widened and shortened. Ms Agee proposes to install wood six-over-six true muntin windows that would return the openings to the original length. The project will replace the missing stone sills and lintels and install a window in a basement opening that was originally a door.

The Committee voted to recommend approval with staff to review shop drawings.

305 Market Street

Stephen Pollack, Applicant
PROPOSAL: Roll-down gate

Mr. Baron described the proposal. The area directly above the storefront is stuccoed and is not historic fabric. The owner wants to install an exterior, open grill, roll-down gate.

Warren Huff, City Planning Commission, testified that grates in Center City are required by ordinance to be 75% open. The boundaries for the ordinance are Vine to Pine Streets, and 2nd to 18th Streets.

The Committee voted to recommend approval with the condition of the addition and maintenance of an awning to cover the housing, to be approved by staff.

145 North 2nd Street

Patrick Dewey, Applicant
PROPOSAL: Awnings

Mr. Baron described the building in Old City. The owner wants a single awning to span the entire facade, covering the door and two flanking windows. Staff recommends having three individual awnings, one over each opening. The awning would be made of a matte finish fabric. The awning proposed is three feet deep and at least 10 feet above the ground. To meet the height requirement, the bottom of the awning would hang above the top of the windows. The Committee voted to recommend approval of a single awning subject to approval by the Art Commission. Alternatively, the Committee voted to recommend approval of the three individual awnings, narrowed to the width of each opening and lowered to cover the top of the windows as allowed by zoning.

The Committee voted to recommend a single awning of the shed type, with canvas fabric. If the Art Commission requires individual awnings, the Committee voted to recommend approval of three awnings of the same shape and material, matching the width of the windows and door, lowered to cover the top of the openings.

700-724 Arch Street, Cast Iron Building

Jeff Wyant, Architect
PROPOSAL: Sign, utilities enclosure, steel and glass canopy at the entrance; paint facade

The entrance to the office is on the side of the building. The proposal asks for a sign to be hung on the side at the corner with the end wrapping around the front of the building. The sign will be perforated metal with raised metal lettering. A utilities enclosure will be installed under the sign, again using the perforated metal. The metal will be painted green, but the color of the lettering for the sign has not been chosen.

The side entrance is farther from the street. A steel and glass canopy will be installed over a new door. Again, the steel will be painted green.

Michael Corenwit, one of the owners, testified that the purpose of the sign is to give emphasis to the side entrance of the building. The sign would also create an identity for the building.

Mr. Corenwit stated that the Preservation Alliance holds a facade easement for the building. The architect has been working with the staff of Preservation Alliance to create an appropriate sign and entrance. Also, the owners want to paint the facade again with the same colors it is painted now.

The Committee voted to recommend approval.

220 West Rittenhouse Square

T. Douglas Culbertson, Contractor

PROPOSAL: Replace flashing and some brick; clean and paint aluminum panels

Mr. Baron stated that the building has some internal flashing that needs replacement. The contractor must remove some of the bricks to get to the flashing. Staff recommends approval with staff to approve the replacement brick and pointing.

Mr. Baron explained that aluminum panels are between the windows. The proposal is for cleaning and painting the panels because they have become pitted. The Committee stated that painting should not be necessary.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the replacement flashing and brick, with staff approval; approval of cleaning the aluminum panels; and denial of painting the aluminum panels.

1035-1037 Spruce Street

Marty Fricko, Contractor

PROPOSAL: Brownstone repair, facade coating

Mr. Baron described the building as a brownstone residence that had been coated with a Thorocoat system several years ago. That system has now failed in several areas. The contractor wants to patch the coating with wire lath and quick-set mortar with the color to match existing. The entire facade would then be coated with Thoroseal.

Mr. Fricko was not present at the meeting and the Committee had several questions that could not be addressed in the submitted proposal. For example, why was the building covered with Thorocoat without Commission approval? Mr. Baron stated that several years ago the owner installed square storm windows in the arched window openings. Recently, the bottom floor windows were replaced with a type that divided them in half and a violation has been requested.

The Committee voted to defer a decision for all work until they have more information and a complete application.

2039 Cherry Street, Moore College of Art

William Kerr, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Legalize 153 vinyl replacement windows

William Kerr, Esq., Joe Lisa, Director of Operations of Moore College of Art, and Rich Silvesti, Windoor Home Improvement, came to testify to the Committee. Ms. Matzkin explained that the contractor had not obtained a permit to replace the windows. When the College had removed and replaced a number of windows it received a violation. The College then obtained a fast-form permit, in error, and completed the project. The project included the installation of 153 vinyl replacement windows, with flat, applied grills, and panning of the existing frames. Mr. Baron noted that the Building Inspector quickly rescinded the permit.

Mr. Kerr stated that before the work began the contractor was told by the city that the project would not need a permit because only the sash were being replaced. During the meeting, Mr. Tyler contacted the Department of Licenses and Inspections. Since February 1994, all buildings with two or more dwelling units are required to have a permit for replacement of sash only and for replacement of sash and frames. Mr. Tyler explained that he had been to the building in years past to discuss pointing with a contractor and members of the College's administration. Mr. Silvesti stated that he did not know that the building is historic. Mr. Lisa also claimed that neither he nor the College administration, which is entirely new, knew that the building is historic. Several years ago the college had installed a few metal storm windows without a permit. The Committee asserted that the College should know its complex and the law governing it and the change in administration is not an excuse. Mr. Tyler stated that several neighbors had called the Commission and he went to the site to investigate. At that time only the top floor windows had been replaced and Mr. Tyler contacted the Department of Licenses and Inspections. Mr. Baron spoke with the Building Inspector and when the inspector investigated the violation, many of the windows had been replaced.

Mr. Lisa stated that the College had hired a consultant last year to examine the windows. The consultant told the College that the windows were beyond repair and should be replaced. Mr. Silvesti claimed that to replace the windows with wood sash would cost the College over \$1 million. Ms. Matzkin rejected that claim. The project would have cost more than the \$37,000 spent by the college, but wood sash would not have cost more than \$100,000 installed.

Mr. Lisa stated that the College had chosen the applied grills to mimic the original six-over-six sash. The Committee explained that the applied grills did not have the same exterior profile or weight as true-muntin sash. The reflection of light seen over the

solid glass sash is not historically accurate. The applied grills simply do not have the same look or any historic basis.

Ms. Matzkin explained that the Committee and Commission require replacement sash to be wood with true muntins. In some cases involving large buildings, aluminum windows have been approved, but only if the muntins have thickness and depth to match the originals. Mr. Levy suggested, as a compromise, requiring the college to change the first floor windows to wood, true-muntin sash.

The Committee voted to recommend denial.

1109 Spruce Street

Joel Spivak, Applicant

PROPOSAL: New dormer windows

Mr. Baron explained that the building had a fire. The owner received a fast-form permit, without Commission approval, to replace the windows in the dormer. The permit has been rescinded. The dormer consists of a double-hung window flanked by two casement windows. Previously the casement windows were replaced with jalousy windows. The owner has agreed to repair and reinstall the existing wood sash. The proposal before the committee is the replacement of the non-original jalousy windows with three-pane wood casement windows that match the originals.

The Committee voted to recommend approval.

917 South 2nd Street

Charles Langley, Owner

PROPOSAL: Restore, rebuild front facade

Mr. Baron stated that this building is one of the few wood-frame residences in Southwark. The owner's proposal includes: a rear addition which cannot be seen by the public; new clapboarding on the front facade, without a bead; a hanging gutter to replace the pole gutter, and expanding the dormer for more light. Mr. Baron explained that clapboarding in Philadelphia during the period of the house typically had beading. The lower clapboards now on the facade are replacement boards and do not have a bead, but boards on the upper story seem, from the ground, to have a bead. Staff recommends beaded clapboards, if evidence proves that they existed. Also, the drawings do not reflect the existing fascia board, behind the gutter, which does have a bead. Staff believes that this feature should be kept. The Committee agreed.

The Committee recommended that the gutter, though not historic, be allowed. The gutter can be aluminum, but should be painted to match the facade.

The dormer window should be an historically accurate three-over-six window, as shown in a photograph in the Commission's

archives. The Committee decided that the dormer should not be expanded because it is an historic and unique feature very typical of the building's period.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the addition; approval of the clapboarding, with a bead if evidence proves it existed, and with a fascia board with a bead; a metal hanging gutter, but painted to match the facade. Approval of a three-over-six window in the dormer, but denial of the expansion of the dormer. Details should be approved by staff.

William Penn Statue - City Hall Tower

Randall Cotton, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Re-waxing

Randall Cotton of the Preservation Alliance explained that a campaign to restore the William Penn statue was launched in 1987. At that time the statue was cleaned, re-patinated and waxed. Money was left from the fundraising efforts and put into a special fund with the Preservation Alliance for further repairs. The statue was inspected twice in the last nine years and it was determined that it now needs re-waxing.

Scaffolding, which is kept in the tower, will be set up for workers to do the re-waxing. The entire project will take about six weeks to complete. The only cost to the city will be to run the elevator in the tower. The fund will cover all other costs.

A conditions survey will be conducted by Andrew Lins, a conservator from the Philadelphia Museum of Art, Margo Burke, from the Art Commission, Randall Cotton, and Connie Bassett and David Cann from Moreland Studios, who will be doing the work. Mr. Tyler asked that Andrew Lins review the final report written by Moreland Studios.

The Committee voted to recommend approval.

5201 Vicaris Street, William Paine House

Jim Burton, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Facade restoration, rear addition

Mr. Baron explained that this property was recently sold by the Fairmount Park Commission to Mr. Burton. He proposes an addition over the rear porch, flush with the side facades, and includes a balcony. The Committee asked that the addition be set back six inches from the side facades of the existing building for demarcation. The Committee also voted to recommend approval if the owner wants to close-up the existing rear porch to create more living space, with details to be approved by staff.

The project also includes stucco and facade repair. The stucco will be removed and reapplied on the front facade. The side facades will be screened and new stucco will be applied over the

existing stucco. The Committee requested that Mr. Burton modify the drawing to show the porch as it exists in the photos and they asked that staff inspect shop drawings for woodwork and window details.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the rear addition with a slight set-back on the side facades, approval of closing the rear porch, approval of the facade restoration.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura M. Spina

Laura M. Spina
Historic Preservation Specialist