

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

**Daniel McCoubrey, AIA, Acting-Chair
Commission Offices, One Parkway, 13th Floor, 1515 Arch Street
30 April 2002**

Present

Daniel McCoubrey, AIA, Acting-Chair
Tony Atkin, AIA
Rudolph D'Alessandro
Suzanne Pentz

Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Jeffrey Barr, Historical Research Technician
Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Also

Roger Bieberbach, Printcrete Incorporated, The Bourse Project
Edwin Apell, American Swedish Historical Museum
Lenore Millhollen, Preservation Alliance/Center City Residents' Association
Michael Schade, Atkin Olshin Lawson-Bell Architects
Richard Waldron, American Swedish Historical Museum
Robert P. Thomas, Campbell Thomas and Company
Amy Chorey, Campbell Thomas and Company
David W. O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighbors' Association
Robert McCann
Carter R. Buller
Bernice Hamel, Society Hill Civic Association
Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association
James McAndrew, Tague Lumber
Peggy Duckett
Rebecca Stoloff, Society Hill Civic Association
Alden Blyth, Horn Blyth and Partners
George Tait, Tague Lumber
Jay Kotoff, Action Builders
Jim Nolen, Nolen Companies, 116 Fountain Street
Dan Cullen, Nason and Cullen, 116 Fountain Street
Kevin Green, Nason and Cullen, 116 Fountain Street
Jamie J. Kokenberger, 4401 Cresson Street
Bob Hytha, 4401 Cresson Street
Mary Foyle
Elan Prystowsky, Queen Village Development
Otto Wegner, Highway Tabernacle Church
Jeff Brummer, Eric Hafer and Associates
Mike Hardy, 446 South 43rd Street

Eugene McCrystall, 913-15 Watts Street
 Gregory Ott, 1709 North Street
 Bob McCauley, Ueland Junker McCauley Nickolson Architects
 Bill Harkins, IQS
 Alexander Messinger, AIA
 Anthony Imbiscuso, Wells Appel, The Barclay
 Christian Busch, The Sullivan Company
 Brett Webber, Brett Webber Architects
 Shraga Berenfeld
 Harriet Berneman

Daniel McCoubrey, Acting-Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:45 a.m.

City Hall, Broad and Market Streets

City of Philadelphia, Owner
 Dominic Aspite, Architect
 DATE: 1871-1901, John McArthur Jr., Architect
 PROPOSAL: Louvers

This proposal involves adding a louver to a window on the courtyard façade of City Hall to vent HVAC equipment. The drawings and photographs seem to be at odds in terms of design. The photographs and section drawing show windows that have had new smaller sash installed with vents above a new transom bar. The elevation drawing shows a full size window with vents installed in a portion of the top sash and glass below.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the installation of the vent per the elevation drawing with the retention of the historic sash. In lieu of that solution, staff recommends lowering the existing sash and installing the vent above it with as small a transom bar as possible. The staff also recommends that the City develop an overall plan for these louvers for the future.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal and apprized the applicant of the lack of a quorum and gave the applicant the option of returning at a later date to have the proposal heard. Sheth Jones, of the Capital Programs Office, attended the meeting and asked the Committee to proceed without the presence of a quorum. Mr. Baron noted the submission included two options but emphasized the importance of maintaining the historic sash. It was noted that existing window openings with new louvers have windows that are smaller than the original windows. Mr. McCoubrey said that the new louvers should be installed into the existing sash, he also questioned whether other options have been considered. Committee members were in agreement that the Capital Programs Office should make a presentation of an overall HVAC plan for the entire building to the Commission. Mr. Baron commented that eventually space will become an issue for installation of future rooftop equipment as well.

Mr. Jones stated that this is a project for the Court system and the Capital Programs Office did not design the project.

Mr. McCoubrey recommended approval of the installation of the louvers in the top of the existing top sash and asked that an overall plan for the entire building be submitted. Ms. Pentz recused.

13-27 South Independence Mall, aka 13-27 South 5th Street, The Bourse Building

Kenneth Kaiserman, Owner

Roger Bieberbach, Applicant

DATE: 1895, Hewitt Brothers, Architect

PROPOSAL: Terrace paving

This proposal involves removing the brick on the plaza in front of the Bourse building and installing brick-patterned concrete. The existing brick does not appear to be original.

Staff recommendation: Approval per Standard 9 & 10.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal and made the applicant aware of the absence of a quorum. Roger Bieberbach attended the meeting to explain the project and agreed to proceed without a quorum. He said that the proposed grid system would give the building more character, and that the first course of the city sidewalk will also be replaced. The steps that flank the plaza will be replaced in the second phase of the project. Mr. Bieberbach said that the proposed product is very durable and the sizes of the individual bricks won't change. He explained the process in which the concrete will be poured in place and then the design will be imprinted. Mr. Bieberbach said that the owner preferred two colors to break up the massiveness of the plaza and noted that the color will vary slightly with highlights.

Mr. McCoubrey questioned if the grid pattern should be extended into the plaza. The applicant said that the proposed grid around the perimeter emphasizes that the area is not a street. Ms. Pentz inquired about the colors, the applicant responded that the blended custom colors will consist of red within the fields surrounded by brown borders. The current bricks have red and brown tones. Committee members said that they preferred a matte finish, not a shiny finish.

Mr. McCoubrey expressed concern about the red and brown colors, noting that brown brick is out of context with the neighborhood. Mr. Bieberbach said that suggested to use slate in the border and red brick in the fields, but the owner preferred the brown brick borders. He presented a drawing showing this configuration. The Committee thought that slate is a better match with the brick. McCoubrey asked that a mock up be made on site to show the slate and brick combination.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial as submitted but approval of 2-foot by 2-foot slate as the bordering design with a darker red brick in the fields, with the staff to review samples.

1715-1717 Walnut Street

Midwood Management Corporation, Owner

Michael Schade, Architect

DATE: Mid 19th Century; refaced c. 1950

PROPOSAL: Façade alterations

This proposal involves altering the design for new construction previously approved by the Committee and Commission in the past. The façade will be lowered 18 inches to cut costs. The doors will receive single panes of glass.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the new height per Standard 9 & 10. The previous design fit the streetscape better because it respected the cornice line of the neighboring buildings. The staff did not object to the change in the door design.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. He informed the applicant of the absence of a quorum and gave the applicant the option of having the proposal heard at a later time. Michael Schade, the architect, attended the meeting and chose to proceed without a quorum.

The Committee believed that the cornice line is an important feature of the building, which enhances the streetscape. Mr. Baron asked whether the floor height could be raised instead of disrupting the façade. Mr. McCoubrey thought that the façade should remain as approved.

Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance, stated that the 18 inches is a noticeable change, which will damage the streetscape.

Mr. McCoubrey recommended denial of the proposal to change the height, but approval of the removal of the muntins from the doors. Ms. Pentz recused.

1900 Pattison Avenue, American Swedish Historical Museum

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Robert Thomas, Architect

DATE: 1929, John Nyden, Architect

PROPOSAL: Elevator tower and ramp in concept

This proposal involves building an elevator tower addition to provide accessibility. The tower, which will sit next to the central pavilion on the Pattison Avenue side, will unfortunately damage the symmetry of a major façade in spite of the best efforts of the architect to reduce its impact. The work also includes a ramp to the elevator and a fire stair from the basement.

Staff recommendation: Approval per Standards 9 & 10; however, we would prefer to see the elevator placed inside of the building. This avenue should be explored.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal and noted the absence of a quorum and he gave the applicant the option of having the proposal heard at a later time.

Robert Thomas, the architect, Richard Waldron, director of the museum, Erwin Apell and Amy Chorey attended the meeting. Mr. Thomas agreed to proceed with the proposal, absent a quorum. Mr. Thomas gave a detailed presentation and said that in terms of the site, he believed that this is the least intrusive location. He said that the *Secretary's Standards* recognize the need for accessibility, and emphasized a location with the least impact. Mr. Thomas stated that an interior elevator was not an option, owing to spatial considerations and that the rooms were carefully designed. Ms. Pentz, noting that the building sits on pilings, expressed concern that constructing the shaft for the elevator next to the building's foundation could hit the pile cap. Mr. Thomas stated that the shaft would not penetrate the ground past the basement area, so the pile cap would not be affected. Mr. Thomas noted that the proposed location would allow for the retention of windows in the library and allow access to all other parts of the building. The building's roof would be kept at its current level and the corner pilasters, which are very ornate, will be salvaged and reused on the addition. He proposes to retain as much historic fabric as possible.

Ms. Spina requested that photographs of the ornamentation slated for removal be submitted for documentation. Mr. Thomas said that the ramp would be concrete, colored to match the building, with a simple metal picket railing. The handicapped parking spaces will be part of the dedicated on-street parking along Pattison Avenue.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept of the proposal.

1340-48 Arch Street, SE corner of Broad Street, Arch Street Methodist Church

Arch Street Methodist Church, Owner

Martin Fricko, Applicant

DATE: 1864, Addison Hutton, Architect

PROPOSAL: Masonry wall coating

This proposal involves coating a brick wall with a waterproof coating. These coatings are normally discouraged by the Historical Commission because they trap moisture in the masonry, creating more damage.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standard 7. Under the masonry guideline, it is “not recommended to apply waterproof, water repellent coatings as a substitute for repointing and masonry repairs. Coatings are frequently unnecessary and may change the appearance of historic masonry as well as accelerate its deterioration.” We would like to see the wall pointed first and if a water problem persists, look at coating as a last option.

Martin Fricko attended the meeting and said that the wall was previously cleaned and that water gets into the face of the brick. In addition, he said that the brick is changing colors and spalling with the joints popping out.

Mr. D'Alessandro said that work has been done on the wall many times. Committee members thought that the initial cause of the water infiltration should be investigated because the coating could trap the water within the building. They also noted that the wall has two sections which show different amounts of damage. The gabled portion has numerous areas of concrete patching and salmon brick, the wall with the arches and windows seems to have a better brick. The Committee thought the two areas may be treated differently and asked that photographs of the interior damage be presented to give some idea of the extent of damage sustained. Rebuilding the gabled portion with new brick may be required. However, before making any decision on the coating, the Committee thought that more information should be submitted.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the pointing, but denial of the waterproof coating until more information about the sustained damage is submitted.

319-21 South 3rd Street

Lisa Colton, Owner/Applicant

DATE: Addition 1978 Louis Goldberg, architect

PROPOSAL: 2nd floor addition

This proposal involves altering a one-story entrance addition to accommodate another floor. The

Committee and Commission last month approved the design for the front and side façade in concept. The applicant has returned with a design for the rear façade.

Staff recommendation: Approval per Standard 9 & 10

Kurt Clark attended the meeting to represent the proposal. He said that the owner is proposing aluminum or vinyl-clad wood windows in the rear and painted wood windows on the side facade. Committee members thought that the rear windows should be a color other than white; Mr. Clark agreed. He noted that the addition will have a stucco finish that matches the existing. Mr. Baron inquired about the visibility from the rear. A courtyard of houses faces the rear of this building and a neighboring parking lot has minimal visibility.

Steven Wexler, of the Society Hill Civic Association, said that he thought the design's scale and lines do not respect the original building. Paul Boni, also of the Society Hill Civic Association, expressed dismay that the applicant did not present his proposal at a civic association meeting, and requested that the Committee and Commission urge applicants to confer with the civic association for a review of their proposal. He also expressed opposition to the proposal.

The applicant submitted the rear elevations as requested at the previous meeting; therefore, the Committee thought the application complete.

The Architectural Committee recommended final approval of the proposal.

757 South Front Street

Frederick Vidi, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1800

PROPOSAL: Rear addition

This application involves adding a large dining facility to the visible rear of this restaurant on land that the owner has leased from the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDoT). The large wood structure has the look of a barn.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the addition, if the wood is painted. However, the HVAC unit should be placed in a less visible location.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal. There was no one present to represent the project.

Committee members, in reviewing the photographs, thought that the existing air-conditioning unit, if installed without a permit, should be relocated. The current owner took possession of the restaurant from another owner who installed the addition along Front Street. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that one plan shows a standing-seam-metal roof on the addition and another plan shows shingles. Also, the plans show the existing building but the Committee could not determine the location of the proposed ten-foot extension. Members thought that visibility is an important issue and thought that the plans do not show sufficient information.

David O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighborhood Association, asked that the applicant confer with the civic association about the proposal.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal based on insufficient information, but recommended that the air-conditioning unit be relocated and that the proposed structure be painted. They also recommended that the applicant meet with the community association.

129 League Street

Michael Samschick, Owner

Alden Blyth, Owner/Applicant/Under agreement of sale

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Partial demolition

This application in concept calls for hollowing out the area behind the front wall of this rowhouse with garage to create an atrium. The car will park in the atrium which will bring light to the inside of the building. The design also calls for revisions to the garage door.

Staff recommendation: Approval. The public will not see the atrium from a public right of way.

Alden Blyth who has an agreement of sale for the property attended the meeting. Committee members discussed the panel proportions of the door and inquired if there is any flexibility in the height of the door. Mr. Blyth said that flexibility exists only in the operable part of the door, the other portion is fixed. Some members thought that another panel should be added at the bottom of the pedestrian door and the cross-buck design should be eliminated. Mr. McCoubrey recommended adding larger windows at the top of the door to eliminate the large metal fascia. Mr. D'Alessandro asked that the applicant submit detailed drawings of the door sections.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept, but recommended that the applicant work with staff for alternate door options.

314 Catherine Street, Unit 403

Don Foster, Owner

George Tait, Applicant

DATE: 1911, Magaziner & Potter, architects

PROPOSAL: New windows

This proposal calls for replacing windows in one unit of this condominium building with new wood sash.

Staff recommendation: Approval.

George Tait and Jim Mc Andrew, both from Tague Lumber, attended the meeting. Mr. Tait said that a jamb liner will be added to the proposed windows. He noted that the glass loss is only 3/8 of an inch with the difference occurring at the jamb liner. He also said that the windows will be single-hung instead of double-hung, and that the putty slope of the muntins matches the original.

Mr. Baron inquired about the type of glazing proposed, the applicant said that it would be clear glass with no screens. Committee members thought the proposed windows should be a prototype for future windows in the building.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, with the staff to review details, and that this window should be the prototype for the rest of the building.

4401 Cresson Street, SE corner of Carson Street, Manayunk Train Station

Bobby Morganstein, Owner/Under agreement of sale

Jamie J. Kokenberger, Applicant

DATE: c. 1910

PROPOSAL: Addition in concept

This proposal involves adding a large dining area onto the front façade of the building, hiding the façade from public view. The roof of the new area would slope downward from the ridgeline of the train station, eliminating the roof on one side and demolishing the historic dormers.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standards 9 & 10.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal, and clarified the boundaries of the district, which intersect with the building itself. The former owner built one addition without a permit. That owner went bankrupt and the building currently has been taken over by the bank. Several people are considering buying the property. This applicant would like to make it into a venue for large events such as weddings and bar mitzvahs.

Jamie Kokenberger and Bob Hytha attended the meeting. Mr. Hytha stated that the owner needs more dining space for economic reasons and that the applicant's intent is to be sensitive to the characteristics of the original building.

Committee members opposed the proposed addition because it engaged the current building at the roofline. They believe that the original gable and eave should be kept. They thought that the sense of the train station would be lost if the façade is covered. Mr. McCoubrey said that the applicant can accomplish his goal of more space with retaining the historic roofline and constructing a low addition with a flat roof. Mr. D'Alessandro thought the addition should read as an individual unit.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of this proposal. However, Committee members offered suggestions for a possible addition that would not touch the roofline of the existing building.

116 Fountain Street

Nolen Companies, Owner

Daniel F. Cullen, Applicant

DATE: c. 1920, addition 1958

PROPOSAL: Partial demolition

This proposal calls for conversion of this former textile related factory to a storage facility. The applicant wishes to demolish several sections of the structure, including a large 1958 addition, a chimney and a water tank support structure. The applicant also wishes to remove the original factory windows and install mostly metal infill panels and some cinderblock. In several openings the applicant would install aluminum storefront-type windows. The application is reviewed under

the Manayunk ordinance, which makes no distinction in the review of contributing and non-contributing structures.

Staff recommendation: The staff agreed that the cinderblock portion of the structure could be demolished, but disagreed on the issue of the demolition of the other sections and the treatment of the windows. Mr. Tyler thought that all of the demolition was acceptable except the water tower structure. He also thought that the windows could be replaced with panels except in the few windows on the upper floors.

Daniel Cullen, Kevin Green, and Jim Nolen attended the meeting to explain and answer questions about the project. Mr. Cullen said that they wish to demolish the additions at this time since the replacement of a neighboring bridge will necessitate the shutting down of the canal towpath. He noted that the building line coincides with the property line, stressing the limited space. The applicant said that the Department of Licenses and Inspections cited the chimney as Imminently Dangerous and that the water tower is structurally unsound.

Mr. Tyler explained that the property is listed on the National Register and is a non-contributing building in the Manayunk Historic District, and its jurisdiction falls under the Manayunk Commercial Revitalization Ordinance. Committee members thought that additional information about the chimney and water tower is needed. Mr. D'Alessandro believed that the top section of the chimney could be made solid, but better photographs showing the existing conditions should be submitted to make a final determination. Members inquired about the condition of the wall once the additions are removed. Mr. Nolan stated that many of the bays connecting the original building with the additions have been infilled with concrete block and the support piers are in good condition.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked the applicant about the need to change the current glazing of the windows. The applicant said that the windows are very deteriorated. The steel windows are taking in water, which is causing the spalling of the surrounding concrete. Mr. Atkin requested to see samples of the metal infill panels, as well as detailed information about the bays. Committee members asked to see window details for the entire building. Mr. Tyler thought that in the office space area, the windows should be replicated. Committee members concurred that until more information is submitted about the chimney, water tower and window details, they could not make a recommendation.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the demolition of the additions, and denial of the removal of the chimney, water tower structure and windows at this time.

1236 Pine Street

Queen Village Development, LP, Owner

Elan Prystowsky, Applicant

DATE: c. 1830, George Blackford, bricklayer

PROPOSAL: Façade alterations and rear deck

This proposal is for the rehabilitation of the façades of the building and a rear roof deck. The application calls for a new storefront with casement windows flanking a fixed sash, a new four-panel wood door leading to the upper floors and a double-leaf door (each with four panels) leading to the first floor. All three bays of the storefront will have fixed, single-light transoms. A wood

panel will sit below the storefront windows and the cornice will be replaced in kind. The applicant proposes to remove the present signage and air-conditioning unit. The application also includes new 6/6 sash in existing frames on the second story and a new segmental-arched 6/6 sash in the dormer. However, the owner states that evidence on the interior shows the dormer window as square-headed rather than arched. The half-gambrel roof will get new Timberline shingles in a weathered-wood color.

The rear of the building has a glass curtain wall at the third floor. The rear deck is on the two-story rear ell with a door installed at the second floor. The rear is minimally visible from a public right-of-way. Please note that the front elevation has some mistakes: the dormer is curved, not pedimented, and the chimney is shown as missing.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the front façade, per Standard 9, with some changes. On the storefront, the middle transom should have three lights that operate and a single, fixed storefront window; the double-leaf door should have two panels in each leaf, not four. Approval of the rear door and deck, per Standard 9, since the work is on non-historic fabric.

Elan Prystowsky, owner and developer, attended the meeting to represent the project. Ms. Spina explained that the 1961 designation photo shows a single plate glass window below transoms in the storefront as well as a segmentally-arched top sash in the front dormer window. Mr. Prystowsky stated that he was willing to revise the storefront design, per the suggestion of the staff, for a single fixed window and operable transoms. Ms. Spina added that the new double leaf door should have two panels on each leaf, not four panels on each, as drawn. The Committee discussed the dormer window and reviewed photographs of the existing conditions. Mr. Baron stated that many arch-top windows are actually square-top sash with arched glass that fits up behind an arched frame. The Committee agreed that the glass of the top sash should be segmentally-arched to fit the segmentally-arched frame. Ms. Spina added that the proposed changes at the rear have minimal visibility. Mr. Atkin stated that he agreed with the staff recommendations.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the project, with changes as recommended by the staff, with staff to review details.

jrb

1801 Spring Garden Street, NW corner of 18th Street, Highway Tabernacle Church

Highway Tabernacle Church, Owner

Reverend Otto Wegner, Applicant

DATE: 1864, Alfred Biles, architect, sanctuary, 1884, Pursell, architect

PROPOSAL: Handicap access ramp

The church wishes to install a handicap access ramp at the southeast entrance of the building. The ramp will have a simple wrought-iron picket railing. Although on a prominent street, the entrance proposed for the ramp allows access to the main sanctuary of the church, whereas the 18th Street entrances lead to more interior stairs.

Staff recommendation: Approval, per accessibility guidelines.

Otto Wegner, pastor of the Highway Tabernacle Church, attended the meeting to represent the project. Ms. Spina explained the proposal. Mr. Wegner added that he wants to make the church

accessible so elderly neighborhood residents can attend services. Mr. Atkin asked the applicant about the availability of a matching stone. Mr. Wegner responded that they had some original exterior stone on site salvaged from an earlier renovation project. He thought that there was enough to face the walls of the ramp facing Spring Garden Street.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the ramp, with a stone facing to match the original stone of the church.

jrb

1802 Green Street

Fabrize Saadoun, Owner

Jeffrey Brummer, Architect

DATE: c. 1863

PROPOSAL: Façade alterations and roof deck

This proposal includes the rehabilitation of the entire structure. On the front façade the owner proposes to restore the 2/2 windows and match the single-leaf door as found on the neighboring house.

On the rear, the proposal includes rehabilitating the stair-tower with new stucco, restoring the brick three-story rear ell with 6/6 windows and rehabilitating the two-story rear addition with stucco. Two decks will be installed, one on the roof of the three-story rear ell and one extending over the yard at the second story. The existing one-story rear addition will be demolished.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the windows on the front and rear, per window guideline and approval of the decks, per roofing guideline.

Mr. & Mrs. Fabrize Saadoun, owners, and Jeffrey Brummer, architect, attended the meeting to represent the project. Ms. Spina explained the aspects of this major rehabilitation project that are subject to review by the Committee. The new decks at rear will be partially visible from N. 18th Street. Ms. Spina observed that the Committee often recommends approval of decks on rear ells and the staff had no objection to the location and design of the proposed decks.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the project, with staff to review details.

jrb

1818 Fairmount Avenue

Eugene McCrystall, Owner

Larry Persofsky, Applicant

PROPOSAL: New construction on vacant lot

This proposal is for a new rowhouse on a vacant lot. The design calls for the same cornice detailing, window configuration on the upper floors, and entrance detailing as the neighbor's house; however, the first floor has a garage door instead of windows.

Staff recommendation: Denial of design as proposed, per Standards 3 and 9. The house should have a more contemporary design, perhaps a simplified cornice and different door detailing. If the

owner wishes to do a restoration of the building, then the design should not include a garage, but have two windows on the first floor.

Eugene McCrystall, owner and developer, attended the meeting to represent the project. Ms. Spina explained the staff position that the new front wall should either replicate the missing façade within the row or appear compatible but contemporary. The Committee members agreed that if the design was a replication of a missing rowhouse than there would be no garage door on the front façade. Some Committee members thought that some of the new details could be abstracted or simplified to distinguish the new construction from the old. Mr. Atkin stated that the new façade, with a modern brick and mortar joint, would not be confused with the old. Mr. Atkin asked if the applicant had received approval for a curb cut. Mr. McCrystall responded that he had not. Mr. McCoubrey thought that, in general, the Committee should not encourage curb cuts and garage doors in the middle of residential rows. Assuming the applicant receives approval for the curb cut and garage door, the Committee discussed the proposed design of the door. Mr. Atkin suggested a two leaf wood door with recessed panels that would simulate a carriage door. The Committee agreed that a traditional front door with square panels was appropriate.

The Committee suggested a simplified cornice, square panels for the front door and a traditional rail and stile garage door with recessed flat panels.

jrb

1709 North Street

Gregory Ott, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1875, new façade, 1941

PROPOSAL: Legalize rear deck

This proposal calls for legalizing pointing on the front façade and a roof deck on the two-story rear ell. The deck is minimally visible from a side street. In a meeting with staff, the owner agreed to remove the panning on the windows on the front façade as a remediation of the pointing, which cannot be remedied.

Staff recommendation: Approval, per roofing guideline.

Greg Ott, owner, attended the meeting to discuss the project. Ms. Spina reviewed the work that has been completed without a permit or approval by the Commission. The Committee recognized that removing the sloppy Portland cement pointing would only further damage the brick masonry. Ms. Spina explained that although the deck was visible, the staff was not opposed to the location or design. The Committee reviewed letters from the Spring Garden Civic Association objecting to the pointing work and metal front door. The Committee, staff and applicant discussed a compromise that would leave the existing pointing, replace the metal door with a wood paneled door and remove the metal capping from the window frames.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the deck, and legalization of the pointing, subject to the removal of the window capping at front and a new wood four-panel front door, with staff to review details.

jrb

1428-34 Chestnut Street, SE corner of 15th Street, Packard Building

Chest-Pac Associates, LP, Owners

Bill Harkins, Applicant

DATE: 1922-24, Ritter & Shay, architects Built: 1922-24, Ritter & Shay, architects

PROPOSAL: Vents on floors 4 to 12

This proposal calls for new HVAC systems on floors four through twelve. Every even-numbered floor will have a fresh-air-intake vent and exhaust vent in window openings on the east façade of the building. An existing vent on the Sansom Street façade, just above the first floor, will be replaced and a new vent on the 17th floor on the Sansom Street façade will be installed in an existing window opening. Also, two twelve-inch fans to ventilate the bathrooms will penetrate on each floor on the east façade. Please note that the drawing for the east elevation is incorrect and should not have any openings on the first several floors.

Staff recommendation: Denial, per Standard 9 and HVAC guidelines. The architect should devise an overall plan for the entire building, not just the lower floors. All of the exhausts for the bathrooms should be combined in to a ductwork system vented through the roof. All of the HVAC systems should be combined to minimize the number of vents. The staff does recommend approval of the location of the condensing units on the 1-story roof and reusing the existing vent on the Sansom Street façade.

Bill Harkins attended the meeting to represent the contractor. Ms. Spina explained that absent an overall rehabilitation plan, or HVAC plan, for the entire building, the Committee must review pieces of the project over time. The Committee asked about the HVAC and bathroom-venting plan for the rest of the building. Mr. Harkins responded that his company is responsible for work in the office space on floors 4-12 and he did not know about plans for the other floors. He added that the 17th floor is a mechanical floor, which requires fresh air intake. Ms. Spina explained that the new bathroom vents proposed for the east façade penetrate through original stone masonry in two places on every floor. The Committee discussed a central duct that could be vented up to the roof, which could also accommodate future exhaust ducts on the upper floors. Ms. Spina described the location of the louvers for HVAC exhaust and fresh air intake on multiple floors and facades. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested re-using any existing louvers wherever possible. Mr. Atkin stated that there should be no new louvers on the street facades of this very prominent and visible building. Although the east façade may be an acceptable location for some louvers, the Committee agreed that the locations require review as part of a HVAC design for the entire building.

The Committee recommended denial of the multiple bathroom vents on the east façade and suggested a central duct with a rooftop vent. The Committee recommended denial of any new louvers on the Chestnut, Sansom or 15th Street facades. The Committee recommended approval of new vents if located behind existing louvers to maintain the existing appearance. The Committee recognized the need for louvers and would consider locations within the light court on the east façade as part of a HVAC plan for the entire building.

jrb

1526-28 Waverly Street, SE corner of Mole Street

Ursula and Patrick Hobson, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1895; new front wall, 1950

PROPOSAL: 4th floor addition, new fenestration

This late 19th-century building received a new glass curtain wall on the Waverly Street façade in the 1950s. The present owners propose to change the front windows to new units with stucco panels, replace the windows on the side elevation and add a fourth story to the building. The addition will have a gabled roof and rooftop terraces at the front and rear.

Staff recommendation: Denial, per Standards 9 and additions guideline. Any rooftop addition should be set back from the wall plane and as inconspicuous as possible when viewed from the street.

Alexander Messenger, architect, attended the meeting to represent the project and answer questions. Ms. Spina explained the location and orientation of the property and any rooftop addition would be visible from a street. There is an existing pilothouse for a stair tower and a historic chimney on the roof currently. Mr. Messenger distributed copies of a revised design and explained that the Center City Residents Association's Zoning Committee did not object to the project and he has received his zoning approval. Mr. Atkin stated that alterations to the front façade should be compatible with the character of the existing fenestration. The Committee agreed that the stucco was not appropriate at the front and painted panels would better match the character of the existing. Mr. Atkin thought that the existing stair tower and chimney should remain and a modest flat-roofed addition may be acceptable. The Committee objected to the gable roof, trellises and railing locations and agreed that the new construction should be set back from the roof edge.

The Committee recommended denial of the project as proposed and suggested several revisions for the architect to consider for a future application.

jrb

237 South 18th Street, NE corner of Rittenhouse Square Street, The Barclay

Barclay Condominium Owner's Association, Owners

Christian Busch, Architect

DATE: 1928, J.E.R. Carpenter, architect

PROPOSAL: Streetscape alterations

The Commission denied this proposal last month because they wanted more information on the bollards. This returns to the Committee with no changes.

Staff recommendation: Approval.

Christian Busch, architect, and Anthony Imbiscuso, landscape architect, attended the meeting to represent the project. Ms. Spina explained that the submission was identical to the submission the Committee saw previously. Mr. Busch explained that the Rittenhouse Square Street portion of the streetscape work is not funded but, if approved, would occur at a later time. The Committee discussed the 6-foot spacing of the bollards. Mr. Imbiscuso stated that the bollards could be spaced farther apart.

The Committee recommended approval of the project, with the bollards spaced 8 feet apart.

jrb

1616 Walnut Street

Walnut Chancellor Associates, Owners

Brett Webber, Applicant

DATE: 1929-30, Tilden, Register & Pepper, architects

PROPOSAL: Rear windows

This application is for twelve new windows on the Chancellor Street façade of the building at the 7th floor (5th floor according to the drawings). These openings have a metal double-leaf casement window above a fixed, single-light transom. The proposed windows differ subtly from the existing in the dimensions of the glazing. Also, the shape of the hinges differs between the existing and the proposed windows. Since only twelve of the windows on this façade will be changed, the new windows may prove visible.

Staff recommendation: Approval. Although there are slight differences in the measurements between the existing windows and the proposed, it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to get the exact measurements in metal windows currently available on the market. The staff wants these windows to be set as the prototype for any other window replacement on this façade of the building.

Brett Webber attended the meeting, and said that the lack of maintenance to the parapet caused the failing of the windows. Mr. Webber questioned the effect of the Preservation Alliance's façade easement on this property in relation to the proposal. Mr. Spina said that if the Preservation Alliance chooses to change the proposal, then the revised proposal would have to come back to the Committee. The Committee concurred with the staff about the approved windows being a prototype for the rest of the building.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

1911 Spruce Street

Abraham Soidislawsky, Owner

Shraga Berenfeld, Architect

DATE: c. 1875, new façade, 1894

PROPOSAL: Elevator tower at rear

This proposal is for a four-story brick elevator tower tucked into the corner where the rear ell meets the main building. The existing windows on the rear façade will become doors into the tower. The addition is minimally visible from Manning Street.

Staff recommendation: Approval with staff to review details, including a brick match, per Standard 9 and additions guideline.

Shraga Berenfeld, the architect, attended the meeting to explain the proposal. Committee members reviewed the proposal and concurred with the staff.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, with the staff to review details including the brick match.

2119 Delancey Street

Harriet Berneman, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1865, mansard roof, c. 1875

PROPOSAL: Rear parking pad with gate

This proposal calls for removing the non-historic rear garden wall and installing a metal roll-down garage door with a wood surround. This will match the existing wall and gate of the neighboring building.

Staff recommendation: Approval, per Standards 9 and 10.

Harriet Berneman, the owner, attended the meeting. Committee members review the proposal and thought it appropriate; however, they recommended the painting of the garage door to prevent the metal from rusting.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, with the painting of the garage door.

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary