

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Room 578, City Hall
25 October 2005**

Present

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
Suzanne Pentz
Robert Thomas, AIA
Daniela Voith

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Jonathan Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Officer
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner

Also

Andrew Kleeman
David Mercuris
William Vessal
Steven Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
Mark Solden
Michael Skolnick
Stuart Harding, 1010 Race Street
Kevin Rassmussen
Alexander Waddell, Acorn Property Development
Steven Shapiro
Amy Nguyen, Walnut Plaza
Don Ventresca, 900 Bodine
Audrey Jaros
Joseph Brinn, AIA
Thomas E. Beck, Seiler+Drury
Spencer Robinson, Seiler+Drury
Lisa Ricchiuti
Kristina Rogers
Joshua Bent
Carmen Marrone
John Sheridan, J.P. Sheridan, Inc.
Martin Jay Rosenblum
Fred Berg
Boris Cubas
Bill Aumiller
William L. Landsburg

Daniela Voith called the meeting to order at 9:15.m.

2204 Mount Vernon Street

Owner/Applicant: Andrew Kleeman

History: c. 1889 by James H. Windrim, architect, for William Kemble, President of People's Bank. Served as a carriage house for 2205 Green Street.

Project: Install simulated standing-seam roof

This application proposes to install a simulated standing seam roof on the former carriage house of the Bergdoll Mansion. The proposed product is a green rubber material, which adheres directly to the decking. The applicant proposes to remove the existing (non-original) standing seam roof and subsequent layers of roofing, but retain the original standing seam roof layer and apply the new roof on top of it. In addition, the applicant proposes attic vents, none of which would be visible from the street. The roof is partially visible from Mount Vernon Street and highly visible along 22nd Street.

Staff Recommendation: Denial to the green color of the material, given that it is not historically accurate nor it is a shade of green a weathered copper roof would acquire, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Danta explained to Andrew Kleeman, the owner and applicant, that the Committee lacked a quorum. Mr. Kleeman and the audience members agreed to proceed. Mr. Danta described the proposal for the simulated standing-seam metal roof, emphasizing that the staff did not object to the alternate material, but to the proposed green color.

Mr. Kleeman explained that in his work with the companies AMC Delancey and Kleeman Associates he has had experience with many historic properties. He and his wife have spent four years restoring this house, which once served as the carriage house to the Bergdoll Mansion. Presently, the standing-seam metal roof has many leaks and he proposes this particular product because it simulates the look of a standing-seam metal roof. He believes that the carriage house may have had a copper roof at one time. The building cost \$28,000 to build and is in a high architectural style. Mr. Kleeman also said that green color would have less thermal expansion and contraction than the red, owing to its lighter color.

Ms. Voith and Ms. Pentz questioned the green color and also deemed the product's red option too orange. They noted that the product is available in a grey color as well and believed that to be the most appropriate of the three options. Ms. Voith asked about the spacing of the ribs. Mr. Kleeman said that the original roof would determine the spacing, but expected the ribs to be about 14 to 16 inches apart.

The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the simulated standing-seam roof in the grey color, with the staff to review the details for the rib spacing, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old in design, texture, and where possible, materials].

814 Pine Street

Owner/Applicant: William Vessal

History: c. 1860

Project: Construct garage in rear, reconstruct balcony

This application proposes to construct a detached two-car garage at the rear of the property along Addison Street. Currently, there is a non-historic exposed CMU wall with a door and two non-historic piers supporting a historic iron gate. The garage would measure 23' deep by 19' wide and would be constructed of brick with a wood cornice. The garage would have three doors, two car doors and a third pedestrian door in the middle, all of stained wood with glazed panels on the upper portion. The piers would be reconstructed using the same brick as the garage and the historic iron gates would be placed back in the new piers.

In addition, the applicant proposes to reconstruct a balcony that once existed on the property and that would extend most of the length of the rear ell. The historic iron brackets, still in place, would be used to support the new balcony. The new balcony would be made of iron with a new grate and railing decorated with cast iron rose motif medallions. The applicant has chosen the rose motif owing to the abundant use of flowers, specifically roses, used as a decorative motif throughout the property and the organic detailing of the many wrought and cast iron elements found throughout the property.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. However, the piers should terminate with limestone caps, rather than ball finials and the architect should redesign the muntin configuration on the garage doors. In addition, the brick for the garage and piers should be consistent with the Victorian era and not reflect a Colonial era texture or color.

Mr. Danta explained to William Vessal, the owner, that the Committee lacked a quorum. Mr. Vessal and the audience members agreed to proceed. Mr. Danta presented the proposal for constructing the new garage and rebuilding the rear fence along Addison Street and installing a new balcony railing on the rear ell.

Ms. Voith noted that the design for the garage doors seemed to be in an Arts and Crafts style, which is not appropriate for the building. Mr. Vessal suggested a cross-buck design, which Ms. Pentz and Ms. Voith agreed is more appropriate for the period of the house.

For the balcony railing, Ms. Pentz questioned the structural integrity of the historic brackets. Mr. Vessal explained how the brackets tie into the structural system of the house.

Ms. Voith agreed with the staff that the piers for the rebuilt wall at the rear of the property should reflect the house's Victorian alterations. She and Ms. Pentz noted that the cast-stone caps should look like brownstone rather than limestone. Mr. Vessal agreed. Ms. Pentz said that the notations about the piers appear confusing and they should be clarified.

The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the garage, but with a cross-buck design for the doors; approval of the proposed railing on

the balcony; and approval rebuilding the rear fence, but with brownstone capping, without the balls, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or 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 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.].

210 West Washington Square, N.W. Ayer Building

Owner: Washington West Associates

Applicant: Serge Nalbantian

History: 1927-29, Ralph Bencker, architect

Project: Replace windows

This application proposes replacement windows for the N.W. Ayer Building. The Commission reviewed a comprehensive plan to redevelop the building at its September 2005 meeting. The applicant presents two window alternatives: a Traco window and a Graham window. The Graham alternative would replace the historic metal windows with aluminum replicas that match the originals almost exactly, except for a minimal difference of 1/8 of an inch in the muntins and 11/16 of an inch on the top rail. The bottom rail is a perfect match.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of Graham alternative, pursuant to Standard 6.

Michael Skolnick and Mark Solden represented the architectural firm and David Mercuris represented the developer. Mr. Danta told them that the Committee did not have a quorum and they along with the audience members agreed to proceed.

Mr. Skolnick explained that the proposal actually included three different window companies, Graham, Traco, and Peerless. They wished to have all three alternatives approved so that the developer could competitively bid the project. Only Traco and Graham submitted elevation drawings for the windows and all three had section details. Ms. Voith and Ms. Pentz discussed the differences of three companies compared to the original windows. They agreed that the Graham window best approximated the original window details.

Mr. Solden conceded that the Traco window has a very flat profile and differs substantially from the original window.

Ms. Voith and Ms. Pentz stated that they did not have enough information on the Peerless window to make an assessment. Mr. Solden explained that the Peerless window does have a slightly different sill profile because it is made of two parts, rather than a single element like the original. Ms. Voith noted that that the sill profile may be acceptable, if the other profiles and dimensions of the window prove to be close to the original window. Mr. Skolnick agreed to submit more details on the Peerless window for the Committee to review.

The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the

Graham window, denial of the Traco window, and no recommendation on the Peerless window, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old in design, texture, and where possible, materials.].

1700 Delancey Street

Owners/Applicants: William and Eleanor Melton

History: 1895 with later alterations

Proposal: Install gate in parking area

This application proposes to install a gate to secure the parking area adjacent to this property at the corner of 17th Street and Delancey Place. The applicant proposes a metal gate to span from the applicant's property to the neighboring property. The applicant owns most of the space where the gate is proposed, however, there is a 3' easement between the two properties. The owner has received verbal agreement from the next door neighbor to close this area adjacent to their property. The gate's design would mimic the gate across the street and measure 11' by 8' with an arched top design. It would also include a small door on the west side, measuring 2.5' by 4'. The gate would be supported by two piers mounted in the ground, which would hold the hinges. However the final details have not been designed yet.

In addition, the application proposes to add flower boxes below the window sills of three ground-floor windows. These boxes would be made out of copper. The larger box along Delancey Place would measure 8" by 80" and two smaller boxes along 17th Street would measure 10" by 40".

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the gate and flower boxes, with the staff to review attachment details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

No one represented the application before the Committee. Mr. Danta explained that the Committee did not have a quorum; no one in the audience members objected to proceeding. Mr. Danta explained the proposal to the Ms. Voith and Ms. Pentz.

The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the gate and flower boxes, with the staff to review attachment details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and 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.].

Mr. Thomas arrived to join the Architectural Committee.

1010 Race Street

Owner of commercial unit: Lucky 1016-18, LP

Applicant: Sherry Young

History: 1892, Willis Hale, architect for the Heywood Chair Factory

Proposal: Legalize changes to storefront doors

This application proposes to legalize alterations to doors that date to a 1980s restoration of the commercial ground floor of this building. The symmetry of this façade is carried to its ground floor with a monumental arched central entrance and two smaller arched commercial entrances at either side. Each of the commercial entrances has the same double-leaf door and transom configuration. The tenant on the eastern commercial space altered their doors by removing the lower solid panels and replacing them with a single sheet of glass without a permit.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, owing to the historical accuracy of the tax credit restoration, pursuant Standards 5 and 9.

Mr. Danta described the proposal. Stuart Harding, the owner of the condominium unit, represented the project and noted that the Preservation Alliance recently accepted a façade easement on the property, even with the change in the doors. Mr. Thomas said that façade easements have no bearing on Commission's jurisdiction. He explained that the storefront has a large amount of glass and the historically accurate doors have glazing that would allow customers to view into the store.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.]; and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.].

1519 Spruce Street

Owner: Symphony View, LP

Applicant: Robert Boyd

History: 1890

Proposal: Build roof deck on main section

This application proposes a roof deck on the fourth floor of the main roof of the property. The deck would follow the shape of the elliptical rear ell and would measure 20' wide by 35' deep. It would be reached by an existing penthouse stair access. Last month, the Commission approved a second-floor rear deck and legalized new construction and alterations at the rear, but denied a fourth-floor deck for this property. The owner now proposes a revised plan that accounts for the Commission's concerns about the denied fourth-floor deck.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, owing to the lack of visibility and the rear ell qualities of this portion of the building, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Danta presented the proposal, emphasizing the rear-ell nature of this portion of the building. Carl Massara, the architect for the project, and David Merman, the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Merman explained that one of the Commission members suggested this design at the last Commission meeting. Ms. Voith asked about the visibility of the deck from the rear street and Mr. Massara explained that the addition that was recently built blocks any visibility from the rear.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, pursuant to

Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and 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.].

Mr. D'Alessandro arrived to join the Architectural Committee.

2032 Delancey Street

Owner/Applicant: Alexander Waddell

History: c. 1870

Proposal: Build one-story addition, add roof deck on rear ell

This application proposes constructing a one-story addition at the rear of the property. The addition will stretch the full width of the property and house a garage. Its roof will form a terrace with a double-leaf door replacing a non-historic bay as access. The addition will have stucco facing and a wood, overhead garage door. Two rear windows in the side addition, which are currently infilled with brick, will be replaced, one with a two-over-two window to match others on the façade, and the other with a one-over-one window.

On the roof of the rear ell, a stairwell penthouse already exists. The application includes recladding the penthouse with wood clapboarding and building a small roof deck on the rear ell. The penthouse is not visible from the street and the railing for the deck probably would not be visible either.

Staff recommendation: Approval on the condition that the addition has brick facing, with the staff to review window shop drawings, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. The meeting was attended by Alexander Waddell, the owner; Steve Shapiro, the contractor for the project; and Kevin Rasmussen, the project's architect. Mr. Thomas confirmed with the applicants that the rear of the property faces a service alley with only garages. He said that zoning issues are outside the Committee's purview.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval with the rear wall to be made of brick, with the staff to review details pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; and 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.].

2135 Walnut Street – 5th floor

Owner of 5th floor unit: Amy Nguyen

Applicant: Robert Boothroyd

History: 1916, Clinton & Russell, architects

Proposal: Replace windows with vinyl windows

This building currently has non-historic replacement windows in most openings. However, the Commission has been working with individual condominium owners to install the historically correct windows as shown in an older photograph in the Commission's files. A condominium owner on the 7th floor has already installed the historically correct windows on the Walnut Street façade.

This application proposes replacing the windows on the 5th floor with non-historic, white, vinyl, one-over-one windows.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal.

The owner and applicant Ms. Nguyen appeared to make her request for the vinyl windows. She said that another condominium owner in the building had recently installed similar windows. She stated that could not afford the more expensive wood windows. She said that some of her windows faced the side of another building although she had no photographs to demonstrate this situation. She also questioned the age of this building.

Mr. Thomas explained that when individual unit owners were responsible for their own window replacement, that it was important for the Commission to establish a consistent policy for the building. The historical photograph of the building forms the basis for this standard. These other unit owners did not receive permits for vinyl windows and will receive violations. He explained that it is possible to present to the Commission a claim of financial hardship; however, there are other options, such as an interior storm system to remedy the energy efficiency problem, without installing the vinyl windows. The building, constructed about 1916, contributes to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. It was explained that the staff would come out and look at the windows that may not have public visibility and could approve certain options at staff level if this turned out to be the case. Ms. Voith suggested to the owner that she may wish to replace the windows in the bay as a set and retain the other existing windows with interior storms as a way to upgrade without spending the money for all the windows at once.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the proposal, 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.].

Ms. Voith left the meeting.

900 Bodine Street aka 238 Christian Street

Owner/Applicant: Don Ventresca

Proposal: New construction on lot subdivided from 238 Christian Street

The Historical Commission previously approved a single-family house with parking on this lot. The owner has abandoned the earlier, approved proposal and now proposes a four-unit development on the site with no parking. Like the previous proposal, the main door to the property will be on Bodine Street, not Montrose Street. The central entrance will lead to a landing with two units on each side of the central staircase. Each unit will be two stories: two units at the basement and first floor; two units at the second and third floors. The previous proposal was a contemporary version of the Federal style and related to its neighboring houses; this new proposal defies architectural nomenclature.

The drawings only include a colored rendering. No information on materials, dimensions or other necessary details has been provided. However, it appears that the base of the building will be cast-stone and the façade brick. The end registers will have projecting, arched bays, but no information on the materials has been provided. All of the windows will be four-over-four windows, singled, coupled and tripled. The mansard roof will have recessed and projecting bays. The central entrance on Bodine Street will have a monumental arched opening and stacked doorways, the second of which has a balcony, all topped by a large, arched fixed window.

The neighboring buildings date to the early nineteenth century with several on the Philadelphia Register. This proposal combines elements from the late nineteenth and mid-twentieth centuries that do not relate to the surrounding properties. Having a door on Bodine Street recognizes the houses that face this tiny street, but the overall scale of the façade overpowers the small historic houses that face onto this block.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and Setting Guidelines.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal and Donald Ventresca, the applicant, attended the meeting. Committee members looked at pictures of the houses on Bodine and Montrose Streets to understand the context of the new building. It was noted that Bodine Street falls within the Historic Street Paving Thematic District. Mr. Ventresca said that he returned with a revised design because the neighbors opposed the parking in the previous design.

Committee members deemed the mansard and the large dormers inappropriate. They questioned the overhang of the mansard and thought that a section detail was necessary to understand the roof. In addition, they expressed that each of the four units should have doors facing Montrose and Bodine Streets rather than sharing a single large door. This would give the building the scale of the houses on Bodine Street rather than the appearance of a large apartment block. In addition, Mr. Thomas explained that separate doors would make the units more valuable because tenants like to have their own private entrances. The design would also avoid the expense of the maintenance of the common area. The Committee suggested deletion of the mansard but approval of the small-light windows, the stone at the base, and the use of a single color red brick.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the proposal in concept, 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 Settings Guidelines [Not Recommended: Introducing a new building or site feature that is out of scale or an otherwise inappropriate design.]; and [Not Recommended: Introducing new construction which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale design, materials, color and texture; which destroys historic relationships on the site or which destroys important landscape features.].

Mr. Rivera arrived to join the Architectural Committee.

421 Catharine Street

Owners/Applicants: Audrey Jaros and Piers Marchant

History: 1832

Proposal: Build three-story rear addition – in concept

This 2½ -story house, which dates to 1832, retains its original configuration, which includes a main section with a gabled roof and a small rear ell. The house has an arch-head dormer on the front and a pedimented dormer on the rear, typical of the Greek Revival period. A one-story garage sits at the rear of the property along Fulton Street, but the upper stories of the house are visible from the street.

The proposal in concept calls for adding a three-story addition at the rear of the property that would engulf the historic rear ell. The drawings show two schemes for this addition. Scheme A has the three-story addition with a flat roof. The slope of the rear gable of the main section is kicked-up to meet the addition; this would entail the demolition of the historic dormer as shown in the section drawing. However, the axonometric drawing for this scheme shows the dormer rebuilt.

Scheme B calls for a 2½-story addition. Again, the rear slope of the historic gable will be altered to accommodate more room on the third floor, but this time the slope will be changed to a gambrel profile.

The drawings also show a proposed roof deck on the one-story garage with an elevated walkway leading from the deck to a door on the second floor of the house.

The proposal does not include any elevations and only rough schematic drawings. The drawings do not provide information on materials or other details.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9 and 10. This application is analogous to the recent application for 257 South 9th Street. The architect should look at that file for guidance.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. The owner, Audrey Jaros, and the architect, Joseph Brinn, attended the meeting. Mr. Brinn presented the project and stated that the owner is trying to make another bedroom for a new baby. The second scheme provides the owner with more comfortable space. The owner wants to preserve as much of the open yard space as possible. Mr. Thomas described the scheme that was approved on South 9th Street in a similar situation. That project involved adding onto the top of the garage

and connecting to the original house with a link, preserving most of the yard. Committee members opined that the rear ell could be added to at its rear following the width of the existing ell. The applicants asked about preserving the roof, but filling in along side of the rear ell, expanding the building's full width. Committee members believed that this could be done at the first floor, but not at the second level without sacrificing an important original design element. The applicant considered the possibility of withdrawing the application to return to the Committee next month with a revised proposal.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the proposal as presented, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; 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.].

2534 South Lambert Street

Owners/Applicants: Vincent and Lisa Ricchiuti

History: 1912, James and John Windrim, architects

Proposal: Replace hairpin fence with brick wall and gate; install concrete deck; pave garden

This corner property retains its original wrought-iron hairpin fence. A few months ago, a car traveling along Shunk Street struck the fence, damaging a portion of it. The owners now wish to remove the hairpin fence and install a brick wall with a wrought-iron gate at the parking pad. The brick wall will be similar to the one at the neighboring property. The application also proposes extending the porch with a concrete deck with a wrought-iron railing. Except for two small corners, the entire garden area of the house will be paved in concrete. Most of the garden has been paved already for a parking pad that existed prior to designation.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9. The Commission denied the removal of the historic fence at 1713 Porter Street, which did not have the visibility of this property. If the owner wishes to have a gate for the parking pad, the staff believes a simple metal gate would be appropriate.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Ms. Ricchiutti, the owner, spoke on behalf of her application. She explained that a car hit the fence, damaging the historic hairpin fence. She also has concerns about security in the area and wants a more enclosed yard. Mr. Thomas said that restoring the hairpin fence and adding a new matching metal gate would enclose the back yard as the applicant desires without changing the historic appearance of the highly visible corner property. Committee members explained that changing the yard to a deck at this important corner property would set an inappropriate precedent.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the proposal, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; 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.]; and 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.].

33 South 2nd Street and 18-22 Letitia Street

Owner: Sam Bradstreet

Applicant: Doug Seiler, architect

History: 33 South 2nd: c. 1905 (front portion), c. 1850 (rear portion)

18-22 Letitia: c. 1855

Proposal: Rehabilitate first floors with structural repairs of upper floors – in concept

This application in concept proposes the rehabilitation of only the first floors of the rear of 33 South 2nd Street and the front of 18-22 Letitia Street. The rear façade of 33 South 2nd Street has a Greek Revival storefront with stone pilasters and cornice. The upper floors have segmentally-arched stone lintels and stone sills. Most of the windows have been infilled with brick and the storefront windows and doors have been replaced with flush metal doors or brick infill.

On 18-22 Letitia Street, the first floor has ornate cast-iron pilasters and cornice and cast-iron lintels. Almost all of the windows on 18 and 20 Letitia have ornate scrolled cast-iron detailing above the lintels. The first-floor openings have been infilled with brick and contemporary storefronts including pent eaves.

The proposal calls for removing the infill at all of the first-floor openings and restoring the windows and doors. On 33 South 2nd Street, the historic configuration of doors flanking a storefront window will be restored. The outer bays will have double-leaf, half-glazed doors with panels below. The central bay will have a single, plate-glass window with a wood, three-paneled spandrel below a new granite sill. A new concrete stoop will be placed at this bay. Originally, this bay would have had flush grates leading to the basement area, and the spandrel below would have been double-leaf doors leading to the basement. All three bays will have three-light transoms that match the transom that now exists in the middle bay. The proposal also calls for removing the paint from the stone pilasters and cornice and then repainting the stone.

For the Letitia Street properties, the plan also stipulates retaining the historic door-window-door configuration. Here, too, the doors will be of a double-leaf design and the storefront windows will be large, plate-glass. The storefront windows will have a two-panel design to better replicate the historic basement door configuration. All of the window bays will get new granite stoops instead of the historic, flush basement access panels. All of the bays will have two-light transoms, but the southernmost bay will have

louvers for ventilation instead of glass. The cast-iron pilasters and cornice will be refurbished and the one missing corbel will be replicated.

The permit application states that the upper floors will be stabilized, but no details have been included. It should be noted that the proposed plans do not show many of the decorative cast-iron window hoods that now exist.

Staff recommendation: Approval in concept with several conditions:

1. the stone pilasters and cornice are not repainted once the paint is removed;
2. the spandrel under the storefront window of 33 N. 2nd has two panels and all of the spandrels under the windows have a center vertical bead to appear as if they are doors;
3. the storefront windows have casement windows that match the door configurations;
4. the doors in 18-22 Letitia Street have equal-sized panes of glass;
5. the proposed granite stoops under the windows are removed;
6. the louvers in the storefront transom are deleted and the vent is rerouted to the roof, and
7. all of the decorative cast-iron window hoods on 18 and 20 Letitia Street remain.

These recommendations are made pursuant to Standards 2 and 6. When the application returns for final approval, the drawings should include a section to determine the depth of the doors in relation to the cornice and pilasters.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Thomas Beck and Spencer Robinson of Seiler+Drury architects represented the project. The architects said that they appreciated the input and were amenable to these modifications to the proposal. They discussed molding the missing window hoods in fiberglass.

The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to adopt the staff recommendation and recommend approval in concept provided:

- 1. the stone pilasters and cornice are not repainted once the paint is removed;*
- 2. the spandrel under the storefront window of 33 N. 2nd has two panels and all of the spandrels under the windows have a center vertical bead to appear as if they are doors;*
- 3. the storefront windows have casement windows that match the door configurations;*
- 4. the doors in 18-22 Letitia Street have equal-sized panes of glass;*
- 5. the proposed granite stoops under the windows are removed;*
- 6. the louvers in the storefront transom are deleted and the vent is rerouted to the roof, and*
- 7. all of the decorative cast-iron window hoods on 18 and 20 Letitia Street remain;*

pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.] 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].

Mr. Thomas left the meeting.

45 North 3rd Street

Owner: Bedrock Old City Partners

Applicant: Lydia Evans, architect

History: c. 1854 with later nineteenth century rear addition

Proposal: Rehabilitate front façade, cut new windows and doors, add roof deck and lightwell

This nineteenth-century building is joined at the rear to other structures that have frontage on American and Cuthbert Streets and Little Boys Way. The applicant plans to convert this open commercial space into residential units.

On Third Street, the marble façade will be restored with the removal of later windows and doors and the installation of new wood windows and doors based on original designs as demonstrated by photographs, insurance surveys and the Baxter's panoramas.

On the south side, facing Cuthbert Street, the plans show the replacement of the steel industrial sash with thin profile aluminum windows to approximate the configuration of the existing historic windows. A garage and pedestrian door opening will be converted to the main entrance and a window. An additional door will be cut to allow access to the trash room.

On the east façade facing American Street, the first floor now features a door on the right side and a garage door to its left. The plans show a proposal to reverse these elements and convert the garage into a large window to an internal garden that would give open space and light to a lower-level unit.

On Little Boys Way, plans call for adding windows and a door.

At roof level, the applicant is showing two decks. A light well with large glass window would be cut into a south facing wall about in the center of the structures. A series of new windows would also be cut into the south facing wall adjacent to the light court.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the proposal provided window and door details are modified, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

Mr. Baron presented the project. Stewart Rosenberg and Lydia Evans attended the meeting.

Mr. Baron noted that a few incorrect details for the front windows would be resolved by the architect with the staff. Mr. Rosenberg mentioned that they were exploring the possibility of maintaining the existing steel industrial windows on the rear and replacing the panes with insulated glass or maintaining the existing frames and replacing the sash. Mr. Baron noted that the roof decks would be quite inconspicuous and would sit on the equivalent of a rear ell on this building.

The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend approval, with the 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 new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and 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.].

4624-42 Walnut Street

Owner: Winn Development

Applicant: Kristina Rogers

History: 1913, Frederick Michaelson, architect

Proposal: Replace doors and some windows, install metal paneling in storefronts, replace railings

This application involves renovations to a large multi-building apartment complex. The plans show the construction of steel picket fencing at the rear and on first-floor porches as well as new railings on several porches to match the existing railings. Aluminum windows were installed throughout the building during a 1980s renovation. Several matching replacement windows will be installed where the earlier replacement windows have broken. The building masonry will be repaired where needed. On the first floor several storefront windows will be altered to augment privacy by installing a base of either insulated metal panels or opaque glass on the bottom portion where there is currently a large sheet of glass. The applicants also propose to install security cameras, new buzzer intercom systems, and new doors. The new doors will sit within hollow metal frames, which will reduce the existing openings.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the proposal with opaque glass in the storefront windows and the retention of the existing wooden door frames without a metal sub-frame, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

Mr. Baron presented the project. Kristina Rogers and Joshua Bent attended the meeting.

Mr. D'Alessandro inquired whether the existing doors and frames could be retained. Ms. Rogers explained that they were not opposed to maintaining the existing wooden doors, but that they were concerned with security and would like to have a locked front door; currently the front street door is not secured and only the vestibule door locks.

Ms. Rogers noted that their proposal would match the existing doors and details in wood. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the applicant maintain the wooden doors and place a new security lock and security glass that would address their security concerns without sacrificing the historic doors.

Mr. Baron noted that the drawings submitted did not show the existing transoms over the large commercial windows on 47th Street. Mr. Bent clarified that it was a drafting mistake and that they were not proposing to remove those transoms. They also clarified that they intend to retain the existing wood frames behind the panning on the upper floor replacement windows.

Mr. Rivera suggested that the large windows could be made more secure and private by

installing a metal sill behind the existing glass and within the existing width of the jamb without installing new exterior glass or metal panels. This would also allow for the interior to be modified for shelves or other uses. Ms. Rogers accepted the suggestions.

The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend approval of a modified plan that included all aspects of the plans as submitted except retaining the existing wood doors and glazed storefronts windows, modifying the existing wood doors with security glass and new security bolts, altering the store front windows behind existing glass and within existing frame, with the possibility of allowing transoms to be made operable at the discretion of the applicant, with the 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 new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and 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.].

314 South Iseminger Street

Owner: Sonja Neilson

Applicant: John Sheridan, contractor

History: c. 1830

Proposal: Legalize demolition of rear ell, build new two-story rear ell with deck

This application seeks to legalize the demolition of a brick rear ell and construction a two-story structure with third-floor deck in its place. The rear is not visible from a public right of way. Last month, the applicant applied to rebuild the rear in wood with a stucco finish with vinyl windows. The Commission denied this application. The applicant has now submitted photographs and a letter from an engineer describing the poor condition of the rear ell. The applicant now proposes to construct the ell in brick with wood windows.

Staff recommendation: Approval, if constructed in brick with wood windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Mr. John Sheridan attended the meeting.

Mr. Sheridan clarified that the brick veneer would be of true 4" bricks. Mr. Baron noted that given the lack of visibility he thought the wood windows could either be true or simulated divided light.

The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend approval of the proposal as submitted, 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.]; and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial*

relationships that characterize a property.].

327 South 17th Street

Owner: 327 Condo Associates

Applicant: Fred Berg

History: c. 1860

Proposal: Build rear addition

The Architectural Committee reviewed a proposal for this property at its 27 September 2005 meeting, but the applicant then postponed its review by the Commission to allow the Committee to review a revised deck proposal. The applicants propose a mansard-roofed rear addition and deck on an addition to the rear ell. There are many mansards in the area on Chadwick Street including a mansard-roofed addition approved by the Commission for the house next door. The applicant now proposes two schemes to modify the deck discussed at September's Committee meeting. Alternate One shows a narrower deck, set back from the Chadwick Street façade. Alternate Two shows the deck built in to the addition and covered by the mansard roof. Both of these schemes were discussed by the Committee as possible solutions at its September meeting.

In addition, the applicant proposes to reconstruct the original railing on the front stoop, reopen several windows at the rear and cut two windows in the side façade of the garage.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the proposal with the Alternate One deck, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Fred Berg and the architect Uk Gong attended the meeting.

Mr. D'Alessandro inquired on the reasons for the height of the addition. Mr. Gong mentioned that the full length included a parapet. Committee members noted that even with the height of the parapet included it was a substantial height. Mr. Gong agreed to lower the height between 1.5 and 2 feet.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of Alternative One with the height of the mansard lowered by 1.5 to 2 feet, with the 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 new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and 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.].

2500 South Colorado Street

Owner: Carmen Marrone

Applicant: Vincent Novello

History: 1908, James and John Windrim, architects

Proposal: Replace visible side windows with vinyl windows

This application proposes the installation of four, six-over-one, vinyl windows on the visible side and rear of this corner building. The muntins will not be true divided light and the windows will have no putty slope.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Carmen Marrone, owner of the property, attended the meeting.

Mr. Marrone mentioned that the existing windows have been at the property since he purchased the house in 1975. He also mentioned that he was concerned with the cost of wood windows and their thermal capabilities. He noted that all the quotes he had received from contractors would not warranty against drafts.

Ms. Pentz clarified that the Committee could not recommend approval of vinyl windows although she thought that the new windows do provide greater energy efficiency.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the vinyl windows, 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.].

717 Chestnut Street, Integrity Trust Bank

Owner: Del Frisco's of Philadelphia, equitable owner

Applicant: Bill Aumiller, architect

History: 1923, Paul Cret, architect

Proposal: Restore masonry base, cut new door, add ramp and canopy – in concept

This application, in concept, proposes to rehabilitate and alter the front façade of this former bank building on Chestnut Street. At its October 2005 meeting, the Commission reviewed and denied a similar application and suggested that the applicant submit a revised application with additional information and updated designs for the canopy and handicap access. The building was designed by renowned Philadelphia architect Paul Philip Cret in 1923. The ground floor of the building underwent alterations sometime after WWII with the addition of a new store front that protrudes from the historic façade. The applicant proposes to remove this post-war alteration and re-establish the original plane of the façade. In addition the applicant proposes to open a secondary entrance with an A.D.A accessible ramp on the eastern bay of the front façade. This door would be a two-leaf design with transom to match the existing western door. The middle bay would be opened with a fixed insulated glass window. The existing door in the western bay would be replaced with new doors that would match the current. The applicant proposes a new internally illuminated canopy to be placed over this western main

entrance. The three ornately crafted bronze windows in between each pilaster would be cleaned and restored, but a new insulated glass and muntin system would be placed behind the decorative grills. The rest of the application proposes restoration and cleaning of the stone façade, bronze elements, and new fixtures for façade illumination

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the removal of the non-historic addition, new openings, new glass and muntin system, and cleaning/restoration of stone and bronze elements pursuant to Standards 7, 9, and 10; but denial of the canopy, pursuant to Standard 2. The staff agreed unanimously that the canopy should stay within the two pilasters and not exceed that space.

Jorge Danta presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. William Aumiller and Boris Cubas represented the project. Like the previous application, the in-concept plans propose the restoration and cleaning of the façade and the cutting of a new opening on the front façade. The application now stipulates that the ramp will be placed inside the restaurant. The metal canopy over the door, while not narrowed to the width between the columns, had been reduced from the 14 feet of the previous submittal to 11 feet. In addition, the canopy would attach between the columns and project out one and one half feet before widening to its full 11 feet. The canopy would have a bronze finish and a solid ceiling with barrel type down lights. The signage would have cut-out acrylic-faced letters with back-lighting.

The Committee members discussed the possibility of not cutting a second exit on the front facade. They asked if a fire-rated stair could run from the basement to the existing front and rear doors. Martin Rosenblum, a consultant for the applicants, explained that the issue was that with 120 seats in the basement and 176 seats on the first floor, the width of the openings did not meet code. There are simply too many people for the size of the existing exit.

John Gallery spoke on behalf of the approval of the application. He stated that, although it would be preferable to see the restoration of the façade without cutting a second opening, he finds the second opening an acceptable trade-off for the front restoration. The restoration of the façade and the preservation of a magnificent interior space have great value. He said that the intensive use of the basement allows the upper floor spaces to remain undivided. In addition, the second door is essential for safety and the canopy, which was too large, has been much reduced in size. He said that he thinks that the application is appropriately detailed for a final review. He said that the applicant is trying to receive approval before exercising his agreement to buy the property and that the Commission should encourage this opportunity.

Committee members appreciated the changes that had been made. They had questions about whether the applicant might use a soft rather than hard awning and about the large light fixtures shown on the plan. Mr. Cubas explained that the metal canopy is a standard Del Frisco corporate design, but that they are willing to reduce the size of the lights.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval in concept of the proposal, but with smaller light fixtures, pursuant to Standard 7 [Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.]; 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.].

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Jonathan E. Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Officer
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner