

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Commission Offices, Room 578, City Hall
28 October 2003**

Present

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Suzanne Pentz

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

Also

Robert Hotes, DPK&A Architects
Julie Panassow, The Lighting Practice
M. Alex Haddad, owner, 126 West Penn Street
Peggy MacGregor, 126 West Penn Street
Richard Waldron, American Swedish Historical Museum
Dean Carlson, owner, 919 Clinton Street
Robert Thomas, Campbell Thomas and Company
Jerry Roller, J.K. Roller Architects
Jennifer Bonaccorsi, J.K. Roller Architects
Stephanie Haney, 4643 Hazel Avenue
William G. Schwartz, Esq., 923 South 2nd Street
Samuel S. Hagerman, 923 South 2nd Street
William Alesker, AIA, 923 South 2nd Street
David White, owner, 111 Pensdale Street
David Nelson, owner, 4649 Hazel Avenue
William E. Pryor, owner, 4645 Hazel Avenue
Patricia J. Lavelle, 4645 Hazel Avenue
Charlotte Gottschlich, 4616 Hazel Avenue
Bernice Hamel, Society Hill Civic Association
Steven Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
Andrew Fish, Riverview Condominium Association
Larry Moore, Block President, 4600 Hazel Avenue
David Amburn, Amburn/Jarosinski Architects
John Dogum, 558 North Judson Street
Peter Bloomfield, Bloomfield and Associates
Susan Osborn, 1550 Latimer Street
Douglas Grainge, 558 North Judson Street
Ralph Pungitore, 1627 Wallace Street
Avram Hornik, 128 South 19th Street
Lisa Newcomer, Wesley Architects
Richard Wesley, Wesley Architects
A. A. Blanda, Sandvold Blanda Architects
Beth Richards Elfreth's Alley Association
Ronald Miller, owner, 137 Elfreth's Alley

Norman Swindells, 137 Elfreth's Alley
 Ron Kushner, 114-22 Quarry Street
 Miriam Schaefer, 315 Chestnut Street
 Doug Seiler, 241-43 Chestnut Street
 Kenneth Baritz, Esq., 224 Market Street
 Todd Baritz, Esq., 224 Market Street

Herb Levy, Acting Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

City Hall, 1300 Market Street, 1319-25 Market Street, 21 North Juniper Street

City Hall, City of Philadelphia, Owner
 1300 Market Street, Philadelphia Center Realty, Owner
 1319-25 Market Street, G. Holdings Corporation, Owner
 21 North Juniper Street, CNL Hospitality, Owner
 Robert Hotes, Architect/Applicant
 DATE: City Hall: 1871-1901, Architect, John Mc Arthur Jr
 21 North Juniper Street: 1927, Architect, Philip Johnson
 1319-25 Market Street: 1930, Architect, Ritter & Shay
 1300 Market Street: 1901-07, Architect, Daniel Burnham

PROPOSAL: Lighting for City Hall

This proposal calls for the lighting of City Hall using fixtures mounted on a number of buildings surrounding Penn Square including three historically designated buildings on the east side of the square and possibly a pole-mounted group of lights at Market Street and Penn Square.

The Committee and Commission approved in concept the lighting of City Hall in 2000 and again last month. The 2000 review included a mock up to show the effect of lighting the tower and William Penn statue from the Municipal Services Building. Much of City Hall was to receive new lights attached to its façade. That plan no longer has funding.

The current plan calls for lighting City Hall from surrounding buildings with a scheme that uses the brightest lighting on the center and corner pavilions, less bright lighting on the wings and the lowest lighting on the curtain walls between the center and the corners. The lighting will involve broad beams for overall lighting as well as spotlights for sculptures and highlights. On three sides of the building there will be lighting from non-historically designated buildings, from two locations per side. On the east side however, the application provides for lighting from five locations, all on historically designated buildings. An alternate plan uses a pole-mounted bank of lights on Market Street in place of the lights on the One East Penn Square building.

Staff recommendation: The staff recommends that the number of light locations on the east side be reduced to be more in line with the number found on the other three sides. Mock-ups should be constructed to evaluate the effect of the lighting on the appearance of the historic structures, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron explained the application. Robert Hotes, the architect, and Julie Panassow of The Lighting Practice, a consulting firm, attended the meeting. Ms. Panassow noted that, since the previous meeting, the plans have been revised. The revised drawings from the east side of City Hall show how the angle of the lights impact the sculptures and the rooftop light's impact the sidewalk. She pointed out that if the lights are setback they would not light the bottom of City Hall and that uplighting would create shadows. Ms. Panassow's intention is to create a natural lighting effect.

Mr. Levy thought it important that the lights are balanced. Mr. Tyler suggested that a mock-up is needed to evaluate whether pedestrians would be blinded by light and also to appraise the appearance of the

fixtures on the buildings. He acknowledged that the lighting of City Hall is a challenge; therefore, the erection of a sample is critical to the overall decision on the lighting. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the William Penn statue is only lit at the base and that glare is an important issue. Committee members thought that the lighting on One Penn Square might not be as intrusive with the stepping of the building at the top; however, the mock up should be erected on the most problematic location. Ms. Panassow addressed the glare issue, by interjecting that screens can be added to lessen the glare and that the wattage can be adjusted. She pointed out that the lights of the Criminal Justice Center and the Municipal Services Building do not create significant shadows. Ms. Panassow also noted her receipt of two letters of authorization from building owners for the lighting. Committee members concurred that the proposed pole lighting is inappropriate and should be eliminated.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, subject to review of a mock-up for a determination of glare and the effect of the fixtures on the appearance of the buildings, and subject to the elimination of the pole lighting, 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 historic property and its environment.]; and the Roof Guidelines, with the staff to review details. Ms. Pentz abstained.

126 West Penn Street

M. Alex Haddad and Laura MacGregor, Owners/Applicants

DATE: 1869, by Patrick Connelly

PROPOSAL: Replace slate mansard with asphalt shingle

This application proposes the removal of decorative slate along the mansard of this twin and its replacement with asphalt/fiberglass shingles. The roof has an irregular shape with several protrusions and eight dormers. The light grey slate has a hexagonal shape and would remain on other half of the twin. The proposed asphalt shingle has a different shape and perhaps different dimensions. None of the photographs have a scale to determine measurements. Also, the mansard along the front has no break between the houses; the application does not detail the treatment of the break of materials at this location. The curved roofs of the dormers will have membrane roofing and all flashing and edging will be in copper.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6. The staff may recommend approval of a replacement asphalt shingle with a closer hexagonal shape, if the applicant can make a showing of financial hardship. The staff has agreed to approve a permit for the flat-roof portions of the house.

Mr. Baron presented the application and pointed out that the mansard is not highly visible in its entirety. He offered the suggestion that the Committee might consider an application stipulating replacing the front elevations, which attach to the neighbor's mansard, in slate and replacing the remaining portion in asphalt shingles. Mr. Levy inquired about whether there is enough remaining slate to salvage on the front for consistency. Other members thought that this might not provide a long-term solution. Ms. Pentz asked the applicant if the leakage was occurring at the mansard or on the flat section of the roof. He stressed the importance of repairing quickly, but said that the leaks were largely occurring at the flat-roof sections. It was noted that the proposed shingle is not a hexagonal shape and the applicant was shown an example of a hexagonal type. The applicant noted that the owner of the adjoining twin will also be applying for roofing in the near future. Committee members discussed the application at length. They eventually decided that, if the applicant is willing to modify his application to specify hexagonal shingles in real slate on the front and immediately adjoining side elevations and asphalt shingles in a true hexagonal shape on the remaining elevations and also explore the financial feasibility of slate on the other two side

elevations closest the front, they would recommend that this application be approved without a review by the Committee on Financial Hardship.

Mr. Haddad commented that he proposes a top of the line asphalt shingle, but would be willing to use a hexagonal shape shingle. He asked if copper is appropriate for the rolled corner around the dormer. Committee members agreed that the copper is an appropriate material.

The Architectural Committee recommended that the front and return of the mansard be roofed in slate and the remainder be roofed in hexagonal asphalt shingles, 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.]; and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property]; with staff to review details. They asked that Mr. Haddad look into the feasibility of using real slate on two other visible side elevations.

919 Clinton Street

Rhonda Carlson, Owner

Jennifer Bonaccorsi, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1835

PROPOSAL: Roof deck and stair tower on main section

This application proposes a roof deck and stair house on the main block of this brick row house. The Commission has regularly denied roof decks on the main blocks where suitable rear ells exist. A suitable rear ell exists in this circumstance.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guideline.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal and noted that the property has a rear ell. He also noted the Commission's preference for decks on rear ells instead of the main bodies of rowhouses.

Rhonda Carlson, the owner, Jennifer Bonaccorsi and Jerry Roller, both architects, attended the meeting. Mr. Roller presented photographs of the neighboring house's newly constructed deck; however, this deck is illegal and the Department of Licenses and Inspections is in the process of issuing violations for it. Mr. Roller had other photographs of decks in the area. Mr. Baron said that these decks might have been constructed prior to designation or were erected without the Commission's approval. Mr. Roller argued that the deck would not be visible; that very little historic fabric remains; and that there is no consistency in the rear of these properties. Mr. Baron asserted that this deck would have visibility from 10th street.

Committee members concurred that the proposed deck should be constructed on the rear ell. The applicant was not in agreement.

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 historic property and its environment.]; and the Roof Guideline.

1900 Pattison Avenue, American Swedish Historical Museum

American Swedish Historical Museum, Owner

Robert Thomas, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1929, John Nyden, architect

PROPOSAL: Revised elevator tower

Mr. Baron explained the application, which involves a modification to the formerly approved elevator addition on the north façade of the museum. Excavation for a foundation for the elevator revealed that piling caps and foundations for the museum preclude placing the elevator in the previously proposed corner. The new plan reverses the placement of the elevator and the lobby, bringing the two-story elevator closer to the north pavilion façade.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

Richard Waldron, Museum Director, and Robert Thomas, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Thomas said that before the initial design was conceived, they looked for the plans of the existing building, but did not discover information on the foundation. The discovery of piling caps in the proposed location of the elevator precludes the approved design. The new design would reverse the elevator and lobby, with careful attention paid to the avoidance of the window and the installation of the walkway on the first level. The elevator will also differ as a result of this change with only 3 elevator stops instead of 4 stops. Mr. Thomas also noted that the one-story rear portion will be demolished for the elevator, but that the details will be reused.

Committee members concurred that, given the circumstances, the revised design is appropriate. The applicant was in agreement.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the revised 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 historic property and its environment.]

923 South 2nd Street

Helen Grandella, Owner

William Schwartz, Esq., Applicant

DATE: c. 1840, c. 1870, new storefront and 2 over 2 windows, 1974, storefront removed and residential façade restored with 6 over 6 windows and four-panel door.

PROPOSAL: Replace front steps, remove side door and steps

Mr. Baron explained the proposal, which involves a house that had a late nineteenth-century storefront until the 1970s. In 1974, the Historical Commission approved removing the storefront and restoring the building to its residential configuration; however, since then, many changes have been made to this house without permits or Historical Commission approval. The front marble steps remain from the time of the storefront installation. The owner has difficulty climbing stairs and needs steps that have a shorter rise and a larger landing. The application calls for removing the marble steps and installing new cast-stone steps with metal pipe railings. The proposed steps will project approximately four feet into the sidewalk. The property to the rear of this house is being developed and the developer seeks to widen Salter Street, the side street, to accommodate vehicular traffic. As a result, the owner, with the assistance of the developer, wishes to remove the side door and stairs and install a window in the former door opening. The window would match the others on the façade, all of which were installed without permits. The door is an historic door opening, but the present steps are of non-historic materials. Salter Street is a legally open, public street, but it does not appear on the City Plan.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. The property owner should install painted wood steps and railing over the marble so that they may be removed in the future. The non-

historic side steps may be removed, but the historic door opening should remain with a false door. The door should be either a wood, four-panel or a glazed and paneled door.

William G. Schwartz, Esq., William Alesker, and Samuel Hageman attended the meeting. Mr. Schwartz said that the owner requests the proposed alterations. He said that four buildings to the south of this property are being demolished for a new development. The sidewalks on Salter Street, to the side of this property, are being lowered. Mr. Schwartz pointed out the existing side steps are not original and that a faux door on the side is inappropriate. He noted that the cartway comes to the wall and the sidewalk is flush with the cartway with the curb cutback.

Committee members thought that the original steps on the front facade should be retained. It believed that the owner's wishes could be accomplished with the installation of a wooden ramp or wooden steps placed over the original steps. Committee members concurred that the side opening could be closed but it should read as a door. They recommended that it be converted to a window with a reveal in the original opening.

The applicant was in agreement.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the following:

1. *The installation of a wooden ramp or steps over the original steps;*
2. *The removal of the side steps, and*
3. *The retention of the side masonry opening as a reveal with a window.*

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

4643 Hazel Avenue

Stephanie Haney, Owner

Alex Abdalla, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: 1910

PROPOSAL: Remove pitched roof and cornice and install flat roof

This application proposes the installation of a flat roof and parapet to replace the fourth floor hipped attic that has collapsed. This house has had a troubled history with long periods when the building sat without care to its roof and other elements. Ms. Haney recently purchased the property in deplorable condition and is attempting to renovate it with limited funds. This row of houses follows a pattern. This building is unlike its immediate neighbor; this building and the other at the opposite end of the row make up architectural "bookends." It had a cornice that sat lower than its attached neighbor and rose an extra story. The drawing by the engineer for the applicant shows only a flat roof and parapet without a fourth floor.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 2 and Standard 6. The staff thinks contends that the applicant may well have grounds for an approval based on financial hardship and should pursue that avenue. If a flat roof is approved, the cornice should match the original and the roof should be framed to allow the later addition of the fourth floor.

Mr. Baron presented the application. He noted that, although the simple drawing does not call for restoration of a cornice, Ms. Haney has stated that it is her intention to restore the cornice. He also noted

that the upper portions of the side wall would be rebuilt in iron spot brown brick should; they should be constructed of red brick like the remainder of the side wall. Mr. Baron noted that he met with Ms. Haney at the site and discussed the possibility of rebuilding the dormer face at the fourth floor without rebuilding the whole floor. This would give the appearance of the upper story, since very little other than that is visible from the street. They also discussed framing the roof such that the fourth floor could be more easily added later.

Stephanie Haney, the owner, and Brem Moldovsky, counsel for the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Moldovsky said that the property is open to the elements, which is the reason for the request for the flat roof. He noted that the restoration of the fourth floor would be a burden on the owner. He also stated that the side wall would be rebuilt in iron spot brick; much of it would be hidden by a side cornice. Ms. Haney commented that the fourth floor collapsed after she purchased the property.

Mr. Tyler asserted that in view of the long history of neglect by previous owners, the alterations should occur in a phased way, with the installation of a flat roof, pitched for draining, and designed to allow a fourth floor to be added in a future phase.

Mr. Levy thought that the applicant should submit drawings showing the fourth floor as part of the application for future reference. He acknowledged that the applicant purchased a distressed property, but he believes that a compromise can be reached that will preserve this historic property and facilitate its later restoration. Committee members thought that the historic cornice should be restored at this time and that the roofing system be constructed in such a way as to allow for the restoration of the fourth floor in the future.

Patricia Lavelle of 4645 Hazel Avenue, whose home attaches to the property under consideration, sustained a collapsed roof, which has rendered her house uninhabitable. She believes that the collapse of the fourth floor at 4643 is a result of inappropriate construction work. Ms. Lavelle argued that the applicant purchased the house with a historic fourth floor and should therefore be required to restore the property to its historical condition. Larry Moore the block captain and a resident of Hazel Avenue concurred with Ms. Lavelle.

William Pryor of 4645 Hazel Avenue said that he questioned the appropriateness of the work occurring at his neighbor's. He noticed that studs had been removed from the fourth floor. A few days later the collapse occurred.

Mr. Moldovsky said that the collapse was due to inclement weather and the deteriorated condition of the property.

Mr. Tyler pointed out that the engineer's report disclosed that a rotted joist precipitated the collapse. He thought that the Committee should accept the building without the fourth floor as an existing condition and should not require the rebuilding of the fourth floor. Neighbors disagreed and alleged that the current owner's former contractor caused the collapse. They asserted that the property should be completely restored. Committee members maintained that an engineer should have surveyed the property prior to the collapse. They questioned the rebuilding of the party wall and stated that structural plans should be submitted to show the rebuilding of the parapet wall between the two buildings.

David Nelson of 4649 Hazel Avenue attended the meeting to support the neighbors with regards to the restoration of the entirety of this property.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the flat roof, subject to drawings which depict the restoration of the side walls and cornice as well as framing that allows for the later installation of a fourth floor, with staff to review details. They thought the drawing should also depict an outline for the fourth floor restoration even if this work is not required.

111 Pensdale Street

David White, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Rear rooftop addition and deck

Mr. Baron presented this proposal. The applicant seeks to raise the rear roof to add third-floor space and construct an addition and deck at the rear.

Staff recommendation: Approval with the rooftop addition constructed as a dormer, pursuant to Standard 9.

David White, the contractor, attended the meeting. Committee members concurred that the proposed alterations are appropriate; however, they thought that the addition should be set back 18 to 24 inches from the side elevation. Mr. White concurred with the idea.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, subject to a set back of the new dormer at the side elevation of 18 to 24 inches, 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 historic property and its environment.].

627 Pine Street

John Infante, Owner

Robert Boyd, Applicant

DATE: 1807, John Warner, carpenter

PROPOSAL: New door, skylights, roof deck

Mr. Baron explained the application, which calls for alterations at the visible rear of the house including the construction of a deck over the rear ell, and new skylights on the rear slope of the main roof as well as the single-story rear addition. The applicant also proposes moving the rear door in that same addition.

Staff recommendation: Approval, subject to the rear deck being lowered as close to the top of the roof as possible, pursuant to Standard 9.

Robert Boyd, who works for the developer, attended the meeting and explained the proposed alterations. He said that rear of this property has visibility owing to frontages of neighboring houses. He proposes to replace the deck on the rear ell and install a skylight. He will lower the deck six inches and remove the chimney flue. Mr. Boyd explained that the fireplace on the first floor will be removed and the roof load transferred to the second floor. Additionally, he said that the fire issues have been addressed.

The Committee and applicant concurred on the alterations.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, subject to the rear deck being lowered as close to the top of the roof as possible, 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 historic property and its environment.].

101-15 Lombard Street

Riverview Condominium Association, Owner

Andrew Fish, Applicant

DATE: 1978

PROPOSAL: Replace steps with alternate material

Mr. Baron presented this proposal, which involves eight rowhouses. They all have large staircases with landings. All of the risers are brick; some of the landings are brick; others are terra cotta. All of the stair treads are terra cotta. Because some of the terra cotta pavers have cracked, the condominium owners would like to replace them with flagstone. The original sills on the houses are flagstone. However, the change in material will result in a change color from orange to gray as well as a change in pattern.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

Andrew Fish, the applicant, said that the material to be replaced is terra cotta tile, which he believes is not very durable. He asserted that the proposed flagstone is more appropriate because it will match the slate at the sill.

Committee members agreed that the proposed material is inappropriate. They thought that an appropriate substitute might be a pre-cast red paver or other material, such as red granite, in a color to match. Mr. McCoubrey recommended that the new material be slightly thicker for durability. Some members recommended Missouri red granite with a non-slip surface, a natural stone, or a pre-cast stone.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the replacement of the pavers with masonry of a similar color, with the staff to review the details, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and where possible material.].

600 South Washington Square, Lea and Febiger Building

Gene and Sueyuh Locks, Owners

David Amburn, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1923. Architect, Earle Nelson Edwards

PROPOSAL: Extend rooftop addition

In July, the Commission previously approved a 27½-foot long penthouse addition on the roof of this building. The owners wish to extend it another nine feet for a total of 36'6" along the western side. This is highly visible from South Washington Square.

Staff recommendation: The staff recommended denial of the original application and it recommends denial of the extension as well, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofing Guideline.

The applicant explained that the enlargement of the storage area is due to a need for more space for a landscaper to store tools and to store sculpture for the roof garden.

The Committee thought that the applicant should not enlarge the formerly approved addition. Committee members said that this addition was large and highly visible from Washington Square. They noticed that the drawings called for stuccoing the light court on the west wall, an area for which glazing had been approved. Mr. Amburn explained that light well opening is currently infilled with open blocks that allow water and bird infiltration. Committee members thought that it could be glazed as previously approved or infilled with panels of a different material so long as that entire area is recessed several inches. They did

not want to see the area covered with stucco, EIFS, or paint. Mr. Amburn stated that the owner would, in all likelihood, proceed with the approved scheme.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the enlargement of the roof top addition, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; and Roofing Guideline [Introducing a new roof feature that is incompatible in size, scale, material and color.]. They recommended approval of using a metal panel system recessed several inches on both the vertical and horizontal infill areas at the roof and light well section of the west façade.

326 Lawrence Court

Peter Bloomfield, Owner

Susan Osborn, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1970, Fradley Architects

PROPOSAL: Cut new windows, doors, rebuild roof decks, new pergola at rear

The proposal calls for installing new windows in the side and rear facades of this corner building as well as adding a rear pergola or trellis. It also proposes reducing the sizes of the windows on the east façade porch and reconfiguring the entrance.

Staff recommendation: Denial of new windows on the side façade. Approval of windows on the rear and the new deck pergola, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron presented the application and noted that this property is contributing to the district.

Peter Bloomfield, the owner, and Susan Osborn, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Bloomfield presented photographs to show similar alterations done to neighboring houses. He believes that the proposed alterations are sensitive to the historic fabric.

Mr. Levy said that he thought the proposed window alterations are appropriate; other members concurred. Committee members agreed that the doors are suitable, provided the masonry openings are not altered. They questioned the visual appearance of the two new openings and thought that the new windows should match the existing. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the rear windows be dropped to flank the lintels of the higher window and that the pergola be freestanding, keeping it as a garden element with the 6-foot opening towards the back.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, subject to revised drawings showing the existing single light door, with the 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, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the historic property and its environment.].

558 Judson Street

John Dogum, Owner

J. Douglas Grainge, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1861, Colonial-Revival façade alterations, c. 1920

PROPOSAL: Legalize door alterations

This house, like others on this tiny block, had a 30-inch door. In the 1920s, Colonial Revival-style 6-panel doors and pent eaves were added to 556 and 558 Judson Street, eliminating the transoms. Without a permit or Historical Commission approval, the owner of 558 has removed the pent eave, installed a large transom, cut the brick to widen the opening to 36 inches, and installed a 6-panel metal door. As shown in the photograph, the door is now wider than the existing steps and out of proportion with the narrow house.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.

Mr. Baron presented the application and disclosed that a permit was issued for rear alterations, no work to front façade, in August 2002. Mr. Baron noted a letter from the Spring Garden Civic Association recommending denial of the application.

Douglas Grainge, the architect, and John Dogum, the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Dogum said that the replacement door is for construction and that the pent eve was removed owing to its deteriorated condition. He says that he still has the original door. Mr. Grainge pointed out that owing to the party wall directly behind the door, there is limited interior space, which does not allow for deliveries through the front door. He acknowledged that narrower doors are a significant feature to these properties. Mr. Dogum offered to widen the steps, if the larger width door is approved.

Ms. Pentz thought that the door is out of proportion with the rest of the house; however, she thought the transom appropriate, provided that the masonry opening is restored. Mr. Levy asked if the pent eve would be replaced, he thought that it should mimic the neighboring house. Committee members thought that the applicant should revise the drawing and return to the Committee.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.]; Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; 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.].

250 Delancey Street

Owner: Thomas Kang

Applicant: Raymond Rola, architect

History: c. 1785

Project: Move skylight, remove false chimney, install HVAC

This application proposes the relocation of a large, low-profile skylight on the east slope of the gable roof, the removal of a false chimney covering a light well on the same east slope, and the installation of HVAC equipment adjacent to the chimney on the west slope of the gable roof. At some point after 1957, the large historic chimney on the west slope was removed. At some point before 1999, a slender brick chimney was constructed where the historic chimney once stood. Both slopes of the roof are highly visible owing to the property's corner location. The building occupies 100% of the site; therefore, the roof is the only possible location for the HVAC equipment.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the relocation of the low-profile skylight; approval of the removal of the false chimney, provided that the area under the false chimney is appropriately reroofed; and approval of the installation of the HVAC equipment behind the west chimney, provided that it is screened with a

brick addition to the existing chimney replicating the size and position of the historic chimney, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

Mr. Farnham presented the project to the Architectural Committee. Agnes Kan, an architect from the Civitas Architects, represented the application at the meeting. Committee members agreed with Ms. Kan that moving the skylight away from the street facade would reduce its visibility. Mr. Farnham explained the history of the two chimneys, one real and the other false. Members also agreed that the removal of the false chimney was appropriate. Most of the discussion centered on the air conditioning condenser, a single 2-foot cube. Committee members acknowledged that there is no place on the ground for the equipment. They rejected the idea of placing it behind the chimney in a chimney extension because it requires room around it for airflow, it needs to be accessible for maintenance, and there is no structure to support an addition to the chimney. They then considered other locations. They rejected placing it under the front steps or in the basement bulkhead for airflow and noise reasons. They decided that the east slope of the roof, as near as possible to the south party wall, would be the best location. They also decided that the unit should be placed on a small platform without any screening. They noted that the platform should be restricted to the size of the HVAC unit; it should not be used for any other purposes. They further decided that the HVAC equipment should be accessible for maintenance through either the skylight or a small hatch installed where the false chimney once stood.

The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend approval of the relocation of the low-profile skylight, which may open to access the HVAC equipment; the removal of the false chimney; the installation of the HVAC equipment on a 2-foot by 2-foot platform on the east slope of the roof near the south party wall; and, if necessary, a low-profile hatch where the false chimney once stood to access the HVAC equipment; with staff to review details.

1627 Wallace Street

Owner: Ralph Pungitore

Applicant: Eugene J. Yanelli, realtor

History: c. 1859

Project: Legalize stucco on rear ell, legalize windows

This application proposes legalizing vinyl windows as well as stucco at the rowhouse at 1627 Wallace Street. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a violation for the unpermitted windows and stucco in July 2003.

At its August 2003 meeting, the Commission reviewed and denied an application to legalize the stucco. At that time, it also decided that the application was incomplete because it did not address the illegal windows. Subsequent to the Commission's decision, the applicant requested new hearings before the Architectural Committee and Commission because he did not receive proper notice of the original Architectural Committee meeting. His letter from the Commission informing him of the time and place of the original Architectural Committee meeting contained a typographical error. Lawrence Copeland, counsel for the Commission, has decided that a new review of the application is the best remedy for this situation.

Stucco was applied without a building permit to large segments of the brick facades of the rear ell. The stuccoing remains incomplete. An L&I inspector stopped the unpermitted work while it was underway. Because it is often used to hide structural defects, the application of stucco requires a building permit whether or not a building is designated historic. The applicant has not presented any evidence to justify the stucco; repointing, not stuccoing, is almost always the appropriate remedy for failing brick. The rear ell is highly visible from N. 17th and North Streets.

With the exception of a few photographs, no information has been provided about the illegal vinyl

windows. This portion of the application should be deemed incomplete. The designation photograph shows that the historic wood windows were in place on the front façade as recently as 16 April 2001. Since that date, all windows in the building have been replaced with vinyl windows without a permit. The current owner claims that the previous owner replaced the windows. The current owner purchased the property on 27 September 2002.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the legalization of the windows and stucco, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 6.

Mr. Farnham presented the project to the Architectural Committee. Real estate agent Eugene Yanelli and Ralph Pungitore, the owner, represented the application at the meeting. Mr. Yanelli claimed that the vinyl windows had been installed to Mr. Pungitore's purchase of the property and that at the time of the purchase there were no outstanding violations for the windows. Mr. Farnham explained that the Department of Licenses & Inspections had inspected the property in July 2003 at the request of the Commission staff, which had received a complaint about the illegal stucco work from the Spring Garden Civic Association. While the inspector was looking at the stucco, he noticed the vinyl windows and included them in the violation.

Committee members asked the applicants about the stucco and the condition of the brick walls it covered. Ms. Pentz, the Committee's structural engineer, asserted several times that stucco merely covers and hides defects, but does not correct them. She stated that repointing would have been the appropriate remedy for water penetration problems at the rear ell. She also stated that missing or defective bricks should have been replaced, not covered with stucco. Mr. Yanelli presented a report by a structural engineer about the walls of the rear ell. The Department of Licenses & Inspections required the report. Ms. Pentz scanned the report and concluded that it did not justify the stucco. After looking at photographs of the partially completed stuccoing, Committee members determined that the walls needed repairs that the stucco would hide, but not correct.

Mr. Farnham presented a letter from the Spring Garden Civic Association urging the denial of the application. Mr. Yanelli disputed some of the claims made in the letter. He denied that the illegal work was performed on the weekend.

The discussion turned to the vinyl windows. Mr. D'Alessandro contended that the Committee could not recommend approval of the windows. He asserted that all windows visible from the street should be replaced with historically appropriate windows. The applicants asked why other buildings on the block had vinyl windows at the rear. Mr. Farnham offered to determine whether the Commission had approved the other windows. Committee members again stated that they could not recommend approval of vinyl windows. They also noted that the applicant had not provided any information about the windows, including their locations.

Ms. Pentz stated that the applicants had provided no more information than had been provided when the application was first presented. Mr. Rivera agreed, stating that the applicants had not made a convincing case. He contended that they should have provided details about both the stucco and the windows. He suggested hiring an architect. Other Committee members noted that the applicants simply asked for legalization, but provided no rationale for legalization.

The Architectural Committee concurred with the staff recommendation and voted unanimously to recommend the denial of the legalization of the windows and stucco, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.]; and 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.].

1924 Spring Garden Street

Owner: Pennsylvania Social Services Union

Applicant: Cathy Harris, Director of Community Murals, Mural Arts Program

History: 1960-1962

Project: Mural on side facade

This application proposes the painting of a mural on the east façade of the Pennsylvania Social Services Union building in the Spring Garden Historic District. Erected between 1960 and 1962, the building is listed as non-contributing in the district. The east façade faces a parking lot. It is constructed of CMU with a brick return at the front. No details have been provided about the location, size, color, or content of the mural. The staff informed the applicant that an application for a mural on this façade of this non-contributing building could be approved at the staff-level with sufficient documentation.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the project to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application at the meeting. Mr. Farnham presented a letter from the Spring Garden Civic Association opposing this and all murals within the Spring Garden Historic District. The Committee discussed the proposal and determined that the application was incomplete. Committee members suggested that the applicant submit a new and complete application for a later Commission agenda.

The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend denial of the application without prejudice on the grounds that it is incomplete. It suggests that the applicant submit a new and complete application.

128 South 19th Street

Applicant: Avram Hornick

History: 1921, Herman Wetherell, architect

Project: Ductwork and exhaust fan

This building stands at the northwest corner of 19th and Moravian Streets. Currently, the mushroom vent for the restaurant's kitchen protrudes from a first-floor opening. In response to neighbors' complaints and a violation notice from the Health Department, the owner of the restaurant wishes to move the vent to the roof of the building. Because he does not own the upper floors, the restaurant owner proposes installing ductwork on the outside of the building to the roof. The plans show two options: the first routes the ductwork flat against the exterior wall of the main section of the building adjacent to the current opening up to and across the roof. The second routes the ductwork out the rear of a one-story section, through the metal balconies in the middle section of the building, and up to and across the roof.

The staff would like to note that work has been performed at this building that has not been approved by the Commission. Also, other work recently performed does not comply with a December 2002 Commission approval. First, work has been done on the Moravian Street façade without Commission approval, including the installation of a duct and the addition of lattice on the third-floor balcony. Second, the Commission approved single-pane windows at the storefront; the installed windows have muntins. The muntins should be removed and the windows painted to match the transoms. Third, the Commission approved the removal of the large projecting sign; instead, it has been refaced.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of second duct option, on the condition that the ductwork is painted to match the brick and the application is reviewed by an architect and/or engineer to guarantee that it meets fire and safety codes as it penetrates the metal balconies, with staff to review details. The staff suggests that applicant legalize and/or correct the noted illegal and non-compliant work.

Mr. Farnham presented the project to the Architectural Committee. Avram Hornick, the business owner, represented the application at the meeting. Mr. Hornick stated that he had inherited the ventilation equipment from an earlier restaurant that occupied the location. He added that his restaurant does much more business than the earlier establishment. He acknowledged the complaints of neighbors and stated that he wanted to correct the problem. The Committee noted its preference for the second scheme and asked the applicant to explain it. Mr. Hornick corrected that the ductwork would not penetrate the fire balconies, but would attach to existing brackets on the façade near the balconies. Mr. McCoubrey inquired into the possibility of treating the exhaust inside the restaurant. The applicant explained that he had investigated such a system, but that it would be too large and too expensive for his operation.

The Committee inquired about the unpermitted alterations as well as the work that does not comply with the Commission's past approval. Mr. Hornick stated that he would prepare an application to legalize the sign and storefront windows. The staff agreed to help determine what work was performed on the Moravian Street façade without permits.

The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend approval of the second ventilation scheme, which routes the ductwork out the rear of a one-story section, up the façade near the metal balconies in the middle section of the building, and up to and across the roof, provided that the ductwork is painted to match the brick.

1908-1914 Delancey Street

Owners: Albert and Rosa Esquenazi

Applicant: Richard Wesley, associated architect; Isaac Broid, architect

History: c. 1880

Project: Side additions, front façade restoration

This application proposes the construction of additions to the carriage house at 1912-1914 Delancey Street. Richard Wesley is the local architect. Isaac Broid, an internationally renowned Mexican architect, originally formulated the plans. The Commission approved the proposal in concept at its September 2003 meeting. This application for final approval complies with the conceptual approval.

The additions would extend out from the east façade into the side yard. The east façade is a stucco former party wall; a carriage house once stood to the east. An existing brick wall topped by a fence runs along the side yard at Delancey Street, obscuring the view of much of this facade. The additions to the carriage house would include a 2-story stair tower clad in slate nearest Delancey Street, a shallow 2-story glass and aluminum projection in the center of the façade, and a large 1-story glass and aluminum projection with rooftop terrace at the rear of the façade. The historic front façade would be restored.

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

Mr. Farnham presented the project to the Architectural Committee. Richard Wesley and Lisa Newcomer represented the application at the meeting. The Committee noted that the current design complies completely with the conceptual approval granted by the Commission. They also noted that the design proposed is both creative and respectful of the historic fabric. Committee members asked about the plans for the garage, which is within the residential space. Mr. Wesley stated that the plan, which includes fire-rated walls, meets all building codes. Members also inquired into the restoration of the front façade, especially the carriage doors. Mr. Wesley agreed to work with the staff on the details of the restoration of

the carriage doors.

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

2020 Chancellor Street

History: 1880

Applicant: Neil Sanvold, architect

Project: Final approval of windows

At its September 2003 meeting, the Commission approved in concept the two-light casement windows for this 1880s carriage house. As the Committee requested, the architect has supplied additional information on the windows and is seeking their final approval.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Window Guideline.

Mr. Farnham presented the project to the Architectural Committee. Neil Sanvold represented the application at the meeting. The Committee determined that the configuration of the windows was appropriate, but questioned some of the design details. The applicant agreed to rework the flashing design to preclude water penetration.

The Architectural Committee concurred with the staff recommendation and voted unanimously 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.]; and the Window Guideline [Recommended: Designing and installing new windows when the historic windows are completely missing. The replacement windows may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the window openings and the historic character of the building.].

100-Block of Quarry Street

Applicant: Ron Kushner

Project: Regrade street, replace fence, add street lights

The 100-block of Quarry Street runs from Front to Second Streets. It is paved with granite block and includes a central granite block gutter running from approximately the midpoint west to Second Street. The eastern end of the street is bordered by a parking lot with a chain-link fence to the north and vacant lots to the south. The developer of the properties began constructing five townhouses on the vacant lot to the south prior to the consideration of the Old City Historic District. In order to facilitate access to the five new garages on the south side, the developer proposes raising the street at this location to the same level as the sidewalk. The granite block will be removed, the street re-graded, and the block replaced. New concrete sidewalks and streetlights will be installed. On the north side, the developer proposes replacing the chain-link fence with a new eight-foot, metal picket fence.

Staff recommendation: Approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Farnham presented the application. Ron Kushner, representing the development on the south side of the block, attended the meeting. Committee members asked about details for the lights and fence. Mr. Kushner noted that he had provided them to Ms. Spina. Mr. Farnham showed the recently received details to Committee members, which they approved. Mr. Kushner explained that he does not own the property where the new fence would be erected, but that he hopes to enter into an agreement with the property owner. If an agreement is reached, he would remove the existing chain link and razor wire fence and erect a new black metal picket or estate fence at his expense. The applicant and the Committee as well as Beth Richards of the Old City Civic Association discussed the regrading. Mr. Kushner explained his plan to regrade and repave the street with the historic paving materials. The Committee inquired about a bollard standing in the center of the street near the Fire Museum. No one knew whether the Streets Department had approved its installation or who was responsible for it, but all agreed that it should be removed. Mr. Levy asked the applicant to consider laying the center gutter at the eastern end of the street like that at the west. The staff asked if Mr. Levy would condone the removal of historic fabric to install a new conjectural gutter. He asserted that it would improve the look of the narrow street. Mr. McCoubrey also questioned the appropriateness of removing existing historic paving stones to install a gutter that had not existed historically. He also asked Mr. Levy how he had decided on the 50-foot length for the gutter. Mr. Levy responded that the 50-foot length was arbitrary; he again insisted that the new gutter would make the street more attractive and that it would be worth the loss of historic fabric. Committee members agreed that the regrading and repaving plan was appropriate and eventually consented to Mr. Levy's intractable petition for a new center gutter.

The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend approval, provided a granite gutter matching the existing gutter is installed in the easternmost 50 feet of the block, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; 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.].

137 Elfreth's Alley

Ronald Miller, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1789

PROPOSAL: Legalize new roof and dormer alterations

This application proposes the legalization of roof work undertaken without a building permit and the approval of proposed dormer work at 137 Elfreth's Alley. The building was re-roofed without a permit even though roofing requires a building permit whether or not a property is listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The color and shape of the asphalt shingles used is not appropriate for this significant eighteenth-century building.

The proposed alterations to the dormer would substantially change its original, eighteenth-century shape and proportions. The existing dormer window was installed in the wrong plane. It sits on the face of the dormer, rather than within the historic window opening. The proposed alterations would attempt to remedy the improper window installation without removing and reinstalling the window correctly. New wood pieces, referred to as the "dormer face" in the drawings, would be affixed to the front of the dormer, widening it beyond its historic proportions. Also, a piece of wood, like a small shed roof, would be added above the protruding window to prevent further water penetration. The "roof" is not depicted in

the drawings, but is shown in two of the three photo mock-ups. A 1931 HABS drawing as well as a Commission photograph document the original dormer. The window should be correctly reset and the dormer appropriately restored.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the inappropriate roofing if the dormer is fully restored, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 2.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Ron Miller, the owner, and Norman Swindells, the contractor, attended the meeting. Mr. Miller read a written statement about the illegal roof and the proposed dormer work. The Committee and applicants then discussed the proposal. The discussion centered on the location and size of the existing dormer window. The Committee and staff agreed that the historically inappropriate window, which was installed decades ago, renders any true restoration impossible. They inspected a HABS drawing and old photograph to better understand the original appearance of the dormer. The owner had been unaware that the window was both too small and in the wrong plane. The Committee decided that it could not require the owner to remove and replace the window, but it suggested that he consider replacing it with an appropriate window. The Committee also decided that the alterations proposed in the application were not appropriate because they would further change the proportions of the dormer to accommodate the incorrect window, making it look original. Committee members asserted that a new face should not be applied to the dormer. The Committee suggested that the owner and contractor investigate further to determine if the original dormer framing still exists beneath later additions. Mr. Swindells showed Committee members a sample of the new dormer cornice, which replicates the original cornice. The Committee stated that it was acceptable. Committee members also noted that the asphalt shingles should be removed from the dormer cheeks and replaced with diagonal boards as shown in the HABS drawing. They further agreed that, although the shingles were not historically correct, the roof, which is not visible, ought to be legalized in exchange for the true restoration of the dormer. The owner stated that he would like to restore the dormer correctly if feasible. The staff informed him that a true restoration of the dormer could be approved immediately at the staff level.

The Architectural Committee concurred with the staff recommendation and voted unanimously to approve the legalization of the inappropriate roofing if the dormer is fully restored, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.].

327 Race Street

Aris Kartoutsidis, Owner

Charles Datner, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Legalize basement entrance

This application proposes the legalization of a basement entrance recently added to the building at 327 Race Street. The entrance was added without a building permit or Commission approval, despite the fact that the Commission denied a proposal for a basement entrance in May 2003. On 5 September 2003, members of the Commission's staff happened upon a contractor completing the basement entrance work. An attached photograph shows that contractor working illegally. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a violation on 23 September 2003.

The May 2003 application proposed an open stairway to the basement that would have run parallel to the front façade. It would have required the removal of an historic stone step. The Commission denied that application. The current application proposes an open stairway running perpendicular to the front façade into the center bay of the storefront. According to the application, a brick spandrel in the center bay would be removed and paneled doors added in its place. Matching wood panels would be added to cover the brick spandrel in the west bay. Metal pipe railings flanking the opening and extending 4'-6" out onto

the sidewalk would be added. The drawings included with the application are inadequate. They do not include details of the basement doors. Also, they do not locate the doors precisely; it would be important to know if the doors stand in the plane of the front façade or are set back from the façade. Finally, the drawings do not represent the entrance as built. For instance, the drawings depict wood doors that occupy the entirety of the bay below the windows. As built, the basement entryway consists of a single-leaf metal door set far back from the façade with some brick and wood at the storefront spandrel.

The Greek Revival building was constructed about 1830 as a residence. Before the Civil War, probably in the 1840s, a 3-bay storefront with doors in the outer bays was added to the building. This storefront, which is documented in a 1908 photograph, included bulkhead doors below the window in the center bay. The old storefront was replaced with a new storefront about 1920. The new storefront, which survived intact until September 2003, included industrial windows over brick spandrels in the two west bays and doors in the east bay. It did not include basement access. The current application proposes to legalize an inaccurate replication of the 1840s basement doors in the 1920s storefront. A single restoration period, for example 1845 or 1925, should be defined and the storefront accurately restored to that period.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Restoration Standard 7 and the Storefronts Guideline.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one was in attendance to represent the proposal. The Committee reviewed the plans and concurred with the staff recommendation. Committee members were indignant that the work had been done without Commission approval or a permit, despite the Commission's earlier denial, and that the drawings submitted for the legalization did not match the illegal work.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Restoration Standard 7 [Replacement of missing features from the restoration period will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence. A false sense of history will not be created by adding conjectural features, features from other properties, or by combining features that never existed together historically.]; and the Storefronts Guideline [Recommended, Re-creating a missing storefront or storefront feature that existed during the restoration period based on physical or documentary evidence; for example, duplicating a display window or transom.].

36 South 3rd Street

Chemical Heritage Foundation, Owner

Miriam Schaefer, Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Mural on side façade

This application proposes a mural for the Chemical Heritage Foundation on a building on North 3rd Street. The mural would be added to a former party wall that has a painted stucco finish and faces a parking lot. If approved by the Commission, the Foundation will apply to the Mural Arts Program for the painting of a mural depicting the history of chemistry. The mural will educate the public about the history of chemistry in Philadelphia. It will not obscure any architectural details of the building.

Staff Recommendation: 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.]; 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.]; however, one staff member objects to any murals on historic buildings, regardless of location or lack of architectural details.

Mr. Farnham presented this application to the Architectural Committee. Miriam Schaefer and Robert Hicks of the Chemical Heritage Foundation attended the meeting. Mr. Hicks described the proposed mural. Beth Richards of the Old City Civic Association noted that the Association had not been informed about the proposed mural. She stated that community involvement was necessary for successful murals and she asked that the Foundation consult with the community. Ms. Schaefer stated that she had been in touch with Old City Civic Association board members, but not with the Association officially. Ms. Richards asked that the Foundation formally involve the Association in the mural process. Mr. Farnham noted that the National Park Service would also like more information about the mural.

Committee members agreed that the applicant should meet with the community. They also agreed that more information about the mural should be provided before the Commission renders a final decision on the proposal. They therefore decided to treat this application as a review in concept.

The Architectural Committee recommends conceptual approval of the mural. It suggests that the applicant provide more information about the proposed mural when seeking final Commission approval.

241-43 Chestnut Street

William Caton, Owner

Doug Seiler, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 241, c. 1857, Stephen Button architect, 243, c. 1897, Wilson Eyre, architect

PROPOSAL: Rooftop addition, façade alterations

This application proposes additional pieces of the ongoing rehabilitation at 241-243 Chestnut Street. The Commission has reviewed and approved several aspects of this renovation during the past several months. This application includes three segments, labeled Areas A to C on Sheet C-1 of the plans.

The work labeled Area A consists of the construction of an addition on the terrace atop the 2-story addition that has been approved but not yet built at the rear of 243 Chestnut Street, along S. 3rd Street. The U-shaped addition would include mechanical and storage rooms as well as roofs over the entrances to the terrace. The addition would connect to the historic Wilson Eyre building as well as new construction and would be visible from S. 3rd Street.

The work labeled Area B consists of the installation of double-leaf doors, a transom, a bullet glass panel, and a sidewalk grate at the entrance to the apartment complex at 241 Chestnut. At its August 2003 meeting, the Commission approved the restoration of the westernmost bay of the storefront at 241 Chestnut Street to its original appearance. Since that meeting, the Board of Building Standards rejected the approved plan because of the existing concrete step at the entrance. This new proposal, which meets ADA requirements, stipulates the removal of the step and the addition of double-leaf door and second transom. The door will not be detailed as an historic door, but will allude to the historic door. The second transom will attest to the non-historic nature of the doorway.

The work labeled Area C consists of the addition of a pool in the basement. The Commission's jurisdiction does not extend to the interior, but it may extend to the pool design because a faulty design might lead to the accretion of excessive moisture and the decay of the exterior. Plans for the vapor barrier but not the ventilation system are provided.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the storage and mechanical room sections of the addition at the north but not the south arm, which connects to the historic building; approval of the doors, transom, bullet glass panel, and sidewalk grate; approval of the pool, provided sufficient details about the ventilation system are provided; with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Accessibility Guideline.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. William Caton, the owner's son, and Douglas Seiler, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Seiler presented site line studies showing that the rooftop addition proposed as Area A would be, at most, minimally visible. He noted that metal is the preferred roofing material for the addition. Committee members reviewed each portion of the application individually. They deemed the Area A work, the rooftop addition, appropriate with the metal roof because it will only impact the new construction and a portion of the Wilson Eyre building already altered by the restaurant addition. They likewise deemed the Area B work acceptable given the ADA requirements and the alterations already approved for the three eastern bays of this storefront. They did think that the new doors should be painted. Finally, they decided that the pool, the Area C work, was properly ventilated and isolated from the remainder of the building.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposal as submitted, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; 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.]; and the Accessibility Guideline [Recommended: Providing barrier-free access that promotes independence for the disabled person to the highest degree practicable, while preserving significant historic features.].

224 Market Street

Scott Stein, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1920

PROPOSAL: Storefront alterations

This application proposes the renovation of the two outer bays of the four-bay storefront at 224 Market Street. The pre-designation aluminum windows in the two inner bays will be replaced in the future.

At its February 2003 meeting, the Architectural Committee reviewed and recommended denial of a proposal for this storefront. The application was withdrawn before the Commission meeting. In July and August 2003, the Committee and Commission reviewed and denied a second proposal for this storefront. After that denial, the applicant illegally installed aluminum doors in the outer bays, removed and discarded a historic marble step in the east bay, and added emergency lights. In response to the illegal work, the Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a Stop Work/Cease Operations Order. The current proposal results from a series of negotiations with the staff following the cessation of all work at the site.

The proposal stipulates the replacement of the illegal aluminum doors with single-leaf wood doors that mimic the historic double-leaf doors. It also stipulates the restoration of the original transoms above the doors and the fluted pilasters flanking the doors. A marble step like that removed from the east doorway will be installed in the west doorway. The storefront cornice, which is now covered with plywood, will be uncovered and repaired or replaced.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, provided that the wood and pressed metal portions of the storefront are painted, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and the Storefronts Guideline.

Committee members reviewed the proposal and concurred with the staff's recommendation on the proposed alterations, but added the "staff to review details" clause. Kenneth Baritz, Esq. and Todd Baritz, Esq., who represent the restaurant owners, attended the meeting and stated that their client agreed

with the recommendation of the Committee.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, provided that the wood and pressed metal portions of the storefront are painted, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement 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.]; and the Storefronts Guideline [Recommended, Re-creating a missing storefront or storefront feature that existed during the restoration period based on physical or documentary evidence; for example, duplicating a display window or transom.].

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary