

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

**Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Commission Offices, Room 576, City Hall
27 August 2002**

Present

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Rudolph D'Alessandro
Suzanne Pentz

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

Also

Daniel Mehan, Mehan Builders
Lanny Leibowitz
Eileen McGowan, 220 West Washington Square, owner
Steven Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
John Cluver, Voith and Mactavish Architects
Eric Rymshaw, Fury Design
Rebecca Stoloff, Society Hill Civic Association
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance
Nicholas Aloï, Mainline Construction
Winchell Carroll, American Revolution Patriot's Fund
Shannon Fitzpatrick, 615 Lombard Street
Theresa Stuhlman, Fairmount Park Commission
Neil Sandvold, Sandvold Blanda Architecture and Interiors
Arlene Matzkin, Friday Architects
Liz Zimmers, Zimmers Associates
Hyman Myers, Vitetta Group
Richard Wesley, Wesley Architects
Sara Sweeney, Blackney Hayes Architects
William Carlucci, Duling Restoration
Joel Maruchek
Joseph Spina, Duling Restoration
Frank Ermilio, Esq.

Vincent Rivera, Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:40 a.m.

1127 Pine Street, NW corner of Quince Street

Paul Bouikidis, Owner
Daniel Mehan, Contractor
DATE: c. 1827
PROPOSAL: New windows with applied muntins

This application reviewed and rejected last month by both the Committee and Commission for replacement of sash returns now as a total window replacement. The work will require the removal of the historic windows and the new design features applied muntins rather than true divided lights.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 6.

Daniel Mehan, the contractor, attended the meeting and stated that the need for replacement is prompted by the deteriorated condition, which does not allow the adherence of paint. He said that he proposes to duplicate the existing glass size and noted that the drawings show a half-inch gain because the frame is smaller. Mr. Mehan cited the existence of Pella windows at 1129 Pine Street. Ms. Pentz questioned the frame's deterioration since the previous meeting, and Mr. D'Alessandro thought that the existing frames should be restored.

Mr. Mehan said that the existing windows are single-paned and do not protect against air infiltration. The Committee also noted that triple track storms could be approved as a treatment instead of the removal of historic fabric, which would resolve the air infiltration problem. Committee members thought they should be consistent and deny the proposal on the basis of the removal of historic fabric. Mr. Rivera said that if the applicant could replicate the exact proportions and design of the original windows, then a replacement could be allowed. Mr. Baron noted that windows are made that have true divided light and fit into existing frames.

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

724-26 Pine Street, and 721-23 Addison Street

Lisa Roberts, Owner

John Cluver, Architect

DATE: c. 1810, 726 refaced mid 20th century

PROPOSAL: Partial demolition, reconstruct façade and new construction

This proposal seen in May 2001 in concept involves combining several properties into a single house. The house facade at 724 Pine Street will be restored and that at 726 Pine Street reconstructed. The plans call for the demolition of the rear ell portions of both houses and a new rear ell built on 726 Pine Street. The brick rears of both houses will receive zinc metal cladding. On Addison Street, the applicant proposes the construction of a new one and a half story garage at 721 and the rehabilitation of the existing house/garage at 723. The main change to 723 Addison Street involves reversing the door and garage opening.

Staff recommendation: The submission for the restoration of facades is incomplete. It lacks information on existing conditions and research basis for the proposed design of the front facades. Denial of the covering of the rears with zinc, pursuant to Standard.9. Approval of the work on Addison Street pursuant to Standard 9.

John Cluver, the architect, and Eric Rymshaw attended the meeting. Mr. Cluver agreed to withdraw the restoration of the front facades pending the procurement of additional information.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal and explained that much of the work had approval in concept at an earlier meeting. He explained that he made a site visit to the existing Addison Street house to determine the historic location of the front door. Normally the door sits on the side opposite the chimney. The Committee thought the Addison Street construction appropriate; however, it had issue with the zinc cladding on the rears of both houses. Mr. Cluver stated that the zinc would have minimal impact on the rear streetscape and that the zinc is removable and does not destroy the historic character of the houses. In response to Mr. Rivera's question, Mr. Cluver responded that furring strips would be added at the masonry joints to which the zinc would be applied. The

Committee agreed that the brick should remain exposed. The applicant argued that the brick is hidden by the new construction and that even with the addition of the zinc, the historic fabric is preserved.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the demolition and new construction on the rear of the houses facing Spruce Street as well as the new construction and alteration to Addison Street 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 work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials to protect the integrity of the property.] They recommended denial covering the rears of the Spruce Street houses with zinc pursuant to Standard 5 [Distinctive materials and finishes that characterize a property will be preserved.]. The Committee said that the application for the work to the front of the Spruce Street houses is incomplete and welcomed Mr. Cluver's withdrawal of that portion of the application.

The applicant is not in agreement with the rejection of the zinc on the rears of the property.

216-220 West Washington Square, NW corner of 7th and Locust Streets

T. McGowan, Owner

Lanny Leibowitz, Applicant

DATE: c. 1911 for W.B. Saunders Publishing Company

PROPOSAL: Deck on north facade

The proposal involves constructing a patio and railing on top of a two-story roof on the north façade of the building. The elaborate brick railing has the appearance of a freestanding ornamental wall.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 9.

Lanny Leibowitz, the architect, and Eileen McGowan, the owner attended the meeting.

Mr. Baron noted a future proposal for a deck one level above this location which proposes a rail of chrome and blue glass. He stressed that any consideration for decks on this building, should have uniformity in their design. Committee members thought the design should be simplified with a black metal railing. Mr. Rivera said that it is structurally important that the railing on top of the brick wall be substantially constructed. Mr. Tyler commented that the more decorative design is appropriate for the ground level and that the proposed design is not compatible with this building. He suggested an all-metal treatment with simplified ornamentation. The Committee recommended a simplified design that is broken up with iron, which relates to the building as a whole.

Mr. Liebowitz asked about the possibility of an all brick railing, reusing the existing stone coping.

The Committee responded positively to that idea with staff to review the brick for a good match.

Steve Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association, stated that owing to visibility, it is important that the material is compatible with the building. He concurred with the idea of raising the brick wall and reusing the coping.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal as submitted pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new

work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] but the approval of the raising of the brick wall with a coping at the top, with the staff to review details. The applicant was in agreement with the recommendation.

340-42 South 5th Street, NW corner of Pine Streets

Richard and Margaret Ullman, Owners

Nicholas Aloï, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1972

PROPOSAL: Deck railing

The application calls for a new railing on top of a brick wall surrounding the roof top deck on this modern row house.

Staff recommendation: Approval pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Margaret and Richard Ullman, the owners, and Nicholas Aloï, the contractor, attended the meeting. Mr. Aloï stated that the brick parapet is not high enough and proposes to add additional height with this new railing.

Committee members questioned the railing detail and thought that a simplified design is more appropriate. The applicant said that the details follow the design in the garden gate; however, she does not take issue with a simplified design.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of a railing with a simplified design pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.]. The applicants concur with the recommendation.

Washington Square, 600 Walnut Street

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Winchell S. Carroll, Applicant

DATE: 1683, designed by Thomas Holme

PROPOSAL: Plaques

This application calls for installing plaques in the walkway in front of the Monument to the Unknown Soldier of the Revolution to acknowledge the organizations that paid for the rebuilding of the monument and the Square. The plaques made of carved granite would be imbedded flush with the slate walkway.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 9. The plaques which are too numerous and large should be consolidated and placed in a more appropriate area away from the main memorial.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal and noted that the existing plaques in the square were installed before the inception of the district.

Winchell Carroll, The American Revolution Patriot's Fund, attended the meeting and gave a brief history of those buried at Washington Square. He believes that the plaques do not detract from the area. He also said that both the Fairmount Park Commission and the National Park Service denied his request for an dedicated area for plaques behind the monument. In addition, he said that the National Park Service, which is slated to take jurisdictional control over Washington Square in November, has not reviewed the proposal. Mr. Carroll would like to see this proposal instituted before that time, owing to the National Park Service's rules disallowing the installation of the plaques. He said that similar proposal are being duplicated in many areas of the country.

Mr. Tyler argued against the proposal because the plaques would not be approved by the National Park Service and said that the Committee's concern should be the preservation of cultural landscapes. He also believes that the plaques will be an intrusion on designated historical space. Mr. Baron apprised the Committee on an upcoming proposal of a similar nature.

Steve Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association, expressed his opposition to any alterations or additions to the Square, and emphasized that the Civic Association had no advanced knowledge of the proposal.

Rebecca Stoloff, Society Hill Civic Association, stated that she supports the staff's recommendation for denial, and believes that the existing plaques are also inappropriate. In addition, she said that she could not support a proposal that the National Park Service does not support.

Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance, stated that the proposed location is hollowed ground, and enough is enough regarding more plaques

Ms. Pentz said that she believes that additional plaques will be a distraction to pedestrians. Committee members thought that more study should be done about placement because the location is the issue. Some Committee members asked if the plaques could be combined into one plaque, but Mr. Rivera disagreed with the consolidation. All members thought an alternative location, such as the fountain area should be investigated.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]. The Committee recommended that the applicant return to the Committee after investigating alternative locations, more details about the proposed design and specific drawings of each plaque. The applicant was not in agreement with the Committee's recommendation.

615 Lombard Street

Shannon Fitzpatrick, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Two-story rear addition

This application calls for building a two-story rear addition to the property, which will have limited

visibility from 6th Street.

Staff recommendation: Approval pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal and the Committee concurred with the staff's recommendation. The Committee emphasized that if code necessitates a variation in the height of the railing, then the staff can review the details.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired], with the staff to review details.

340-42 South 6th Street aka 601-03 Pine Street

Rick Jay, Owner

Neil Sandvold, Architect

DATE: 340-c. 1825; 342-vacant lot

PROPOSAL: One-story side addition

During the redevelopment period of Society Hill, the original c. 1825 residence at 340 South 6th Street was restored and the late 19th-century building at the corner (342 South 6th Street) was demolished to create a yard for 340. A brick wall surrounds the yard and has painted wood gates. This proposal is for a small (approximately 14 feet x 14 feet), one-story dining room addition at the rear of the yard. It will have brick façades, simulated divided-light wood windows and a standing-seam copper roof.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Rick and Roslyn Jay, the owners, and Neil Sandvold, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Sandvold said the proposed addition will have minimal impact on the garden space.

Committee members thought the proposal appropriate and concurred with the staff's recommendation.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment] and 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.]. The applicants agreed with the recommendation.

Rockland Mansion, Fairmount Park

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Arlene Matzkin, Architect

DATE: 1810

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation, new parking lot

This proposal is for the rehabilitation of this significant park mansion for a new use as the Psychoanalytic Center of Philadelphia. The rehabilitation includes new paneled, single-leaf doors to the side entrances, one of which will become the handicapped access for the property; a replacement wood staircase with lattice cheeks to the rear porch; new retaining walls at the side entrance; new light fixtures at the side entrances and lighting boxes in the roofs of the porches, with the fixtures to come for approval at a later time; replacing one basement window to match the existing; and stucco repair. The new mechanical system requires two vents. The proposal calls for turning existing window openings in the stone foundation of the rear porch to louvers, with stone infill.

The project includes a new 31-car parking lot to the north of the building. The lot will have crushed stone paving and two driveways leading onto Mount Pleasant Drive. One path will lead to the handicapped entrance and one to the original brick walkway to the front door. The plans also include a crushed-stone turnaround directly in front of the house, which lies on an historic path.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the rehabilitation, pursuant to Standards 2 and 6 as well as the mechanical systems guideline, with staff to review details. One change: staff thought that the vents in the rear porch should match the size of the original openings and painted to match the stone. Approval of the parking lot and the turnaround, pursuant to the site guideline, but details of the lighting, the gate in the wrought-iron fence and any landscaping should be included.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal and said that the replacement of the existing front door and the installation of a vent in the dormer cheek are no longer a part of the application.

Arlene Matzkin, the architect, attended the meeting and said that the concrete block on the side porch was installed in 1976. She also said that the proposed lights around the parking lot and walkways would be two different heights and that the walkway gate leading to the handicapped entrance currently exists in a fence built in 1976.

Committee members discussed the proposal and the vents in the porch. After learning that the porch is 1976 fabric, they agreed to reduced openings, but the vents should be painted to match the stucco.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment] and 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.] as well as the mechanical systems guideline [Recommended: installing a completely new mechanical system if required for the new use so that it causes the least alteration possible to the building's exterior elevations.]. It also recommended approval of the parking lot, the turnaround and lighting, pursuant to the site guideline [Recommended: designing new onsite parking when required by the new use so that they are as unobtrusive as possible and assure the preservation of the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape.], with staff to review details.

231-35 North 2nd Street

PTM Group Corporation, Owner

Liz Zimmers, Applicant

PROPOSAL: New garage structure, mural

This proposal for a six-story parking garage returns for final approval. Staff, along with Suzanne Pentz, a structural engineer, inspected the remaining cast iron pieces salvaged from 233 North 2nd Street. Only three fluted pilasters with Corinthian columns, three consoles, and twelve pieces of various sizes of the other pilasters remain. The proposal now calls for the same design for the front façade as previously seen by the Committee and Commission and four options for recognizing the earlier buildings on the south facade. The first calls for a plaque describing the demolished buildings; the second, a plaque installed in a small-scale mural of the buildings; third, a full-size mural of the demolished 233 North 2nd Street, but no integration of the salvaged pieces, and the fourth is a full-sized mural incorporating the salvaged pieces.

At the site visit by staff, it was noted that the sidewalk in front of 233 North 2nd consisted of three carved granite slabs. The proposal also includes moving these slabs to the south façade.

The design for the front of the building has remained the same from the previous application. The staff recommended this design when it was believed that more pieces of the salvaged cast-iron existed and could be integrated into the design. However, since so few pieces remain, the staff prefers incorporating them into the mural on the south façade.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the fourth option of a full-scale mural of 233 North 2nd Street, with the salvaged cast-iron pieces affixed to the façade and the granite sidewalk and stoops at grade.

Denial of the design on the 2nd Street façade as proposed. The scale of this building is quite large and the pilasters that cut the building visually should be emphasized, perhaps by breaking through cornices at each floor. Also, the first floor should carry the tripartite pattern, with the pilasters extending down through the first floor, instead of the positioning as shown.

Rob Leavitt and Mike Rigolizzo, the owners, and Liz Zimmers attended the meeting.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal and said that a site visit by herself and Ms. Pentz determined that only a small amount of the salvaged cast iron pieces still remain. The current design of the front facades of the buildings is based on the incorporation of the salvaged cast iron pieces. The Committee thought that the applicant could consider different designs, but that this facade could be acceptable since a wire and mesh garage would not be mistaken for historic and that cast iron facades vary in size. Mr. Tyler commented that a garage by any other name is still a garage. He suggested shifting the center opening and have one pier extend all the way down. Ms. Zimmers stated that a five-foot difference already exists with the design currently off-centered at the first floor and the interior floor space would be impacted by a shift. In addition, an interior stair from the roof, which is a requirement for exit and the ADA issues within the building, would also be impacted by a shift in the driveways. Ms. Spina said that since the cast iron won't be integrated, the overall design could be more simplified and also noted that symmetry on the top floors is an issue. The Committee also thought that there is a need for the vertical piers to break through the cornice lines at each floor, to reduce the massive look of the buildings as a whole.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the design as submitted for the front façade with the pilasters breaking the cornice lines and approval of option #4 for the mural with the integrated cast iron pieces, with the staff to review details. The applicants are in agreement

with the recommendation.

100-04 Market Street, SW corner of Front and Market Streets

Michael Yaron, Owner

Richard Wesley, Architect

DATE: 1882 for George and Albert Ulrich; Colonial Revival storefront, c. 1905

PROPOSAL: New operable café windows

Although the plans show the elevations of 100-04 Market, the present proposal is simply for the storefront at 100 Market Street. The proposal calls for removing the wood covering the cast-iron façade and restoring the cast-iron pieces; removing the windows and installing new operable casements; replacing the wood panels below the windows, and replacing the storefront doors. However, the drawings lack details, including materials, sections, and molding details. Also, the dimensions of the café windows are short and squat compared to the existing windows.

Staff recommendation: Approval of storefront with café windows if details match the dimensions of the existing, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal and suggested elongating the casements to get a vertical orientation.

Richard Wesley and Robert Trempe, architects, attended the meeting. Mr. Wesley said that two previous attempts for a viable restaurant have failed. He said that owing to the footprint of the building the height of the windows is an important aspect of the proposal. He said that originally the façade was cast iron but only the cast iron columns remain, which he proposes to keep. He proposes to restore the cast iron and install café windows with transoms and panels below to relate to the cast iron. The transoms bars, which are seven inches, will have a substantially reduced width with simple cove molding and lower inset casements, which will swing inward. He noted that the panels below need to be high enough so that the windows are high enough to clear the tables to open. Committee members asked if the lower panel could be shorter and the applicant questioned the basis for a thin panel. He also said that the transom bar is thinner than the exposed column proportions, which he believes is appropriate. Ms. Pentz inquired about the present condition of the property. The applicant said that the building and the next door are being rehabbed for new uses. The applicant stressed the need for the café windows to make the restaurant viable. Mr. Rivera thought that the proportions of the windows should read more vertical and the applicant said that he would make every attempt to elongate the windows.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval as submitted, but if possible create a more vertical orientation of the café windows, with the staff to review details.

742-52 South Front Street, between Pemberton and Fitzwater Streets, Workman Place

Octavia Hill Association, Owner

Sara Sweeney, Architect

DATE: 7 rear court houses- 1748 by George Mifflin; 742-46 South Front Street- 1812-13 by John Workman; 748 S. Front- c. 1775; 750 S. Front- c. 1769; 752 S. Front- 1751; 101-25 Fitzwater Street- c. 1815

PROPOSAL: New gates, cardreader

This application is for the installation of three security gates at the entrances leading into the rear court, with one on Pemberton Street, one on South Front Street and one on Fitzwater Street. The gates have simple metal pickets and posts. The Pemberton Street and Front Street gates will have metal disks with cutouts saying “W P 1748”. The gates will be freestanding, not attached to the buildings. There will be card readers installed to unlock the gates.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. The Committee concurred with the staff’s recommendation.

Sara Sweeney, the architect, attended the meeting and noted that the front gate will be replaced.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval pursuant to Standards 9 [New additions will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

245 South 17th Street

Ithaca Partnership, Owner

Lauren Weinstock, Applicant

DATE: 1888, Frank Miles Day, architect; alterations: storefront, c. 1960; garage opening, 2001

PROPOSAL: Garage door

This application for a garage door returns yet again, but this time it includes the necessary information. The proposed overhead door has a triple configuration. Each vertical “panel” has a transom with applied leading above three recessed vertical panels. The bottom third of the door is solid wood with no ornamentation. The drawings also include sections of the garage door, details of the new stone surround and the wood brick mold. One new detail in this proposal is the repair of the front door, with a pane removed for an air-intake vent for the garage. This door will become fixed, with all hardware removed and a black-painted board installed behind it.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the garage door, but it should have a dark stain. Staff questioned the need for fresh air intake and if the vent could be installed in a different location. The staff also wondered where the exhaust will vent. In the meetings back in 1997, the architect stated that the upper floors of the façade would be restored as a trade-off for the garage; however, the restoration work has not been submitted for approval.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal and Committee members reiterated that the allowance of the garage door was a trade off for the façade’s restoration.

Hyman Myers, the architect, and Lauren Weinstock attended the meeting. Mr. Myers said that he investigated putting the louver on the inside. He said that an exhaust system exists from the roof; however, the intake cannot be done from the roof. Ms. Spina inquired if the proposed vent could be lowered to the bottom and also about the brick removal when the gates are installed. Mr. Myers said that the restoration of the three window transoms with the curved pieces will happen, but without restoration to the damaged pieces. In addition, the Jahn method would be used to restore the front façade in the repair and replacement of the damaged masonry and that there is enough salvaged brick to complete the restoration. He also said that the dark painting of the panels will

minimize the visibility of the vent and presented a sample of the glass that will be used in the proposed garage door. It is Mr. Myers belief that the revised drawings address the Committee and Commission's concerns.

Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance inquired when the surround of the garage doors would be completed and also if a permit was obtained for the sidewalk replacement. Ms. Weinstock responded that the surround work would be completed as soon as approval is given for the proposal.

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

2134 St. James Street, English Village

Nikki Marx, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1923, Spencer Roberts, architect

PROPOSAL: New windows

This application proposes the replacement of the windows on the front façade of 2134 St. James Street, a townhouse in the English Village, one of the city's most unique residential developments. It prescribes replacing the 8-light casement windows on the first floor with 4/4, true divided light, wooden windows; installing 6/6 wooden sash to match existing and repairing or replacing the frames to match existing on the second floor; and installing 6-light wooden casement windows as evidenced by an early photograph on the third floor.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the concept of replacing the first-floor casement windows with double hung windows. Approval of the replacement of the second floor windows with new windows to match existing; and the installation of 6-light wooden casement windows to match original on the third floor, with staff to approve details. Both denial and approval pursuant to Standard 6.

Nikki Marx, owner of the property, attended the meeting. Mr. Farnham explained the proposal. The house currently has the original, triple, 8-light casement windows on the first floor and six-over-six double-hung windows on the second floor. Replacement jalousie windows appear on the third. Ms. Marx originally proposed new four-over-four double-hung windows on the first floor, replacement in kind on the second and 6-light casements on the third floor. At the meeting she asked to change the third floor to double-hung windows as well.

The Committee members looked at several photographs of the development, including one in a news article from 1928. They concluded that the casement windows constitute an important design element of the façade of the house. Members stated that the casements should not be changed to double-hung windows because of the difference in appearance. Ms. Marx stated that she was concerned about security and, at times, only wanted air circulation at the bottom of the window and not at the top. Mr. Tyler noted that interior bars would provide security.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of new six-over-six double-hung windows on the second floor to exactly match the original windows in size and detail, approval of 6-light casement windows on the third floor, but denial of the double-hung windows on the first and third floors, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials.], with staff to review details. Ms. Marx does not agree with the recommendation.

108 Fairmount Avenue, SE corner of Hope Street

John McIntyre, Owner

Anthony Johnson, Applicant

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: Cut garage door in side wall

The application proposes the cutting of an opening and the installation of a garage door in the secondary, Hope Street, façade of the rowhouse at 108 Fairmount Avenue. The garage would be cut in the later addition to the rowhouse that runs along Hope Street to the west of the original rear ell. The creation of the opening would require the removal of a window and door as well as some brick. Hope Street is a narrow alleyway. Presently, garages but no houses front on Hope Street.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

John McIntyre, owner, and Anthony Johnson, the contractor, attended the meeting. Mr. Farnham described the proposal for a new garage in a rear addition to the west of the original rear ell on the Hope Street façade. No houses face Hope Street. Mr. McIntyre stated that there is evidence that the area of the proposed garage served as a parking space previously because the concrete floor slopes down towards the street. The proposed door is a raised panel, steel door in a deep brown color with a simple 2-3/8 inch brick mold.

The Committee voted to recommend approval pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.], with staff to review details.

2214 Brandywine Street

Fred Duling, Owner

Liz Zimmers, Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Legalize and Paint decks on rear and main building

This application proposes legalizing and painting three decks at 2214 Brandywine Street, one at the first floor level behind the rear ell, one at the third floor level on the rear ell, and one atop the main body of the rowhouse. The upper deck, which dwarfs the building and its neighbors, is highly visible from Spring Garden Street. In July 2002, the Historical Commission denied a marginally different proposal to legalize these three decks.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the first floor and rear ell decks, pursuant to Standard 9. Denial of the main roof deck, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Rehabilitation Building Exterior Roofs guideline.

Frank Ermilio, Esquire, counsel for the owner; Bill Carlucci, contractor; Liz Zimmers, architect; and Joe Spina, partner of Fred Duling, attended the meeting. Mr. Farnham explained that the proposal to legalize the three decks was denied by the Commission, but no one representing the project attended the meeting. The proposal returns to Committee with a minor modification of painting the decks.

Mr. Carlucci stated that he and Mr. Duling have a petition with signatures of neighbors who

support their application to legalize the decks. He noted that the deck on the main roof of the building is not visible from Brandywine Street, and its visibility from Spring Garden Street occurs only because a low-lying gas station is at the corner. He opined that the rears of the properties along that block do not have any historical character. Mr. Ermilio noted that his clients would do what they can to mitigate the problem, including painting the decks.

Ms. Spina stated that the Commission discussed two major points. One, the work, which requires a building permit regardless of the historic status of the building, was performed without the necessary permits. Two, the historical precedent for roof decks is on the rear ells only, not on the main buildings. Mr. Rivera noted that both the Committee and Commission feel undue pressure to legalize work after the fact, when they may not have approved the work in the first place.

Mr. Ermilio reiterated that the deck is only visible from Spring Garden Street and that the rears of the properties have been changed. He noted that the homeowners purchased the property with the three decks and would be upset at losing the deck on the main roof. Mr. Carlucci explained that the house sold to Eric Hanson and Celia Cruz on 5 June 2002. A violation for the three decks issued on 17 May 2002. Mr. Ermilio presented a letter from Mr. Hanson and Ms. Cruz authorizing him to proceed with the application. He then asked the Committee if there was anything that could be done to mitigate the proposal. Ms. Pentz noted that if they remove the deck on the main roof, the Commission may approve a larger deck on the rear ell. However, that would have to come back as a new application with the proper drawings.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the decks on the first floor and rear ell, and denial of the deck on the main building 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.]. The applicant did not agree with the Committee's recommendation.

1903-05 Green Street

Loonstyn and Duling, Owners

Liz Zimmers, Applicant

DATE: c. 1859, refaced with Roman brick façade, c. 1895; one-story addition, c. 1935

PROPOSAL: Demolition of 1905 and partial demolition and rehabilitation of 1903, new construction of four-story building, roof decks

This application proposes the demolition of a rear ell and a non-historic addition at 1903-1905 Green Street, the rehabilitation of the remaining building, and the construction of a four-story building. The new complex will house 12 condominiums and 12 parking spaces.

Staff Recommendation: Approval in concept of the demolition of the rear ell and addition as well as the construction of the new building, pursuant to Standard 9. Denial of final approval of the new design, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Rehabilitation Building Exterior Roof guideline.

The scale, height, symmetry, and materials of the proposed façade on Green Street as well as some of the details, including the cornice line, lintels, wrought iron, and watertable, are all appropriate and sympathetic to their Spring Garden neighborhood context, but other aspects of the design are not. Curb cuts and garage doors on front façades, including those proposed in this application, should not be approved on this residential street. The balconies, which provide too much depth and shadow to the front façade, do not harmonize with the generally flat facades of the surrounding buildings. The stair and elevator towers and decks should be set further back to ensure that they

are not visible from the street, including 19th Street. In addition to questions of context, the project raises design questions as well. The overall composition of the front façade, with the garage doors and balconies pushed to the outer edges away from the narrow, vertical column of doorway and windows in the center, is awkward. The multi-paned arched transom light in the central doorway as well as the multi-paned arched transom lights in the garage doors, which mimic a Federal past rather than referring to the Italianate neighborhood, are inappropriate. The project, which offers a unique opportunity to enrich rather than detract from this important residential street, should be reevaluated and reconceived.

John Loonstyn, Liz Zimmers and Joseph Spina attended the meeting to represent the proposal. Ms. Zimmers said that it is her hope that the Committee will resolve issues regarding the proposed façade. She stated that the proposed construction would consist of two garage doors; one for a twelve-car parking area and the other for the accessibility parking, which will be closest to the elevator. She said that the Spring Garden Civic Association supports the proposal. Mr. Loonstyn stressed that the proposed project would give way to twelve parking spaces on the street. In addition, he pointed out the existence of curb cuts on Green Street and believes that the proposal will be an improvement for the neighborhood. He cited the new houses at 19th and Fairmount as the criteria for his design. Mr. Baron reiterated that the cited properties were review and comment only by Committee and Commission, owing to the new construction on a vacant lot within an historical district. Ms. Zimmers emphasized the need for light into the units, which is the reason that the stair and elevator core is in the center. The applicant thought that the Committee could give conceptual approval to the project owing to time constraints, but the Committee said that it did not have enough information.

Committee members discussed the proposal at length and all were in agreement that owing to the absence of structural information as well as floor plans, it could not give any consideration to the proposal with so little information. Mr. D'Alessandro questioned extending of the balconies past the property line. Ms. Pentz thought that the Committee should see photographs showing the context of the neighborhood in regards to the garage doors. Mr. Tyler suggested the possibility of an internal drive-in courtyard for parking and a redesigned front façade with a large center opening and a door to each side with gating giving the carriage appearance. Members also thought a gate more appropriate. It also suggested the elimination of the balconies but retention of large windows, if code permits. In the discussion about the roof decks, the Committee said that the deck on the rear ell and the one on the new construction are appropriate, but deck on the main building of the existing structure is questionable owing to visibility. Mr. Farnham reiterated that the Commission does not typically approve roof decks on the main building. Members suggested that the applicant do a mock-up on the roof with two by fours to illustrate visibility. The Committee's overall conclusion was that the applicant should provide more information with detailed drawings. It made the applicant aware that the charge of the Committee is not to design the proposal but review and give guidance to the proposal. The Committee recommended that the applicant use the staff recommendation as well as the informal comments for guidance in the designing of the proposal. *The Architectural Committee recommended denial, 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.] and the Rehabilitation Building Exterior 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.]*

Joel Maruchek and Helena Grady, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c 1859

PROPOSAL: Rear deck

This application proposes constructing a rear deck, cutting an opening in an exterior brick wall, and installing a deck access door at the rowhouse at the southeast corner of N. 22nd and Brandywine Streets. The deck will be built at the second floor level behind the rear ell above the rear yard. The deck, which is set back 4 feet from the building line on Brandywine Street, will be highly visible. A "shadow box" fence will stand 4 feet-5 inches above the deck floor. A second floor window will be removed and the hole in the brick wall enlarged to accommodate a door leading to the deck. In June 2002, the Architectural Committee recommended approval of a deck in this location, provided that the fence be simplified and its height reduced. In July 2002, the Historical Commission denied the application. The applicant was not present at the meeting to accept the Committee's compromise design. The applicant has since redesigned the deck to meet the Committee's original height recommendation.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Rehabilitation Building Exterior Roofs guideline.

Joel Maruchek, the owner attended the meeting. The applicant submitted revised drawings to reflect the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Baron showed an L&I handout which says that a railing's height should be a of minimum of 36 inches but not exceed 42 inches. The Committee gave the staff the authority to approve a railing for the project, which conforms to code.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize 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 Rehabilitation Building Exterior 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.], with the railing's height not to exceed 42 inches and the staff to review details. Mr. Maruchek agreed to the recommendation.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary