

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

**Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Commission Offices, Room 578, City Hall
29 October 2002**

Present

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

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

Also

Selma Baratz, 637 Spruce Street
Ellen Miller, 310 Cypress Street
Marguerite Bishop Lane, 314 South 2nd Street, Society Hill Civic Association
Robert Powers, Powers and Company
M. Delrose, Jr., 421 North 7th Street
Rebecca Stoloff, 234 Spruce Street, Society Hill Civic Association
Bernice Hamel, 302 South 2nd Street, Society Hill Civic Association
Mike Wass, 7 Bells Court
Lorna Katz Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association
Shannon Fitzpatrick, 615 Lombard Street
Adam Laver, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers
Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association
Diane Stevens-Tucker, Old City Civic Association
Richard Tucker, Old City Civic Association
Rene Wilson, Old City Civic Association
Mort Altshuler, Old City Civic Association
Joshua L. Grimes, Esq., K/K Enterprises
Marc D. Brookman, Esq., Duane Morris LLP
Richard Wesley, Wesley Architects
Lisa Newcomer, Wesley Architects
Charles Loomis, Loomis McAfee Architects
Michael Sparano, 1822 Spruce Street
Ann Gitter, 2040 Rittenhouse Square
Vittorio Gitter, 2040 Rittenhouse Square
John Loonstyn, 1903 Green Street
Allen W. Rubin, 1903 Green Street
Fredrick Duling, 1903 Green Street
Robert N. Poston, Local Union #98, 540-50 North 17th Street
Craig Boon, 649 North 16th Street
Alan Metcalfe, 2024 Brandywine Street
Miranda Hitzemann, 2024 Brandywine Street

Janice Woodcock, 3299 Girard Avenue, 7303 Woodland Avenue, 2100 West River Drive
 Fredda Lippes, Capital Programs Office
 Toni Vellucci-DiBattista, 2411 South 21st Street
 Rocco DiBattista, 2411 South 21st Street
 Christian Busch, The Sullivan Company, 925 Chestnut Street
 Jeffrey Fisher, 925 Chestnut Street

Mr. Rivera, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

637 Spruce Street, NE corner of 7th Street

Selma Zellis Baratz, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1970, Stonorov & Haws, architects

PROPOSAL: New design for rear doors

This application calls for replacing the large, two-leaf sliding aluminum doors and transoms on the first and second floors with three-leaf, aluminum-clad wood doors and transoms. Some of these doors on other houses of similar design were altered prior to designation, but all of the houses on this particular row remain intact.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and the window guideline. Oskar Stonorov (1905-1970) is especially known for his housing designs, including Carl Mackley Apartments, Schuylkill Falls and several developments in Society Hill. The large, industrial aluminum windows are typical of Stonorov's designs.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal. Selma Zellis Baratz stated that five of the rears of houses along 7th Street have been altered. However, four of these were changed prior to designation and the owners of the fifth made the changes without a permit or Historical Commission approval. A violation has issued.

Ms. Baratz stated that the aluminum-clad wood windows from Pella cost \$8,500 and the aluminum two-leaf windows from Graboyes would cost over \$14,000. Mr. Rivera offered another company in Philadelphia that could produce the aluminum windows.

Committee members discussed the design of the building and noted that the large, aluminum windows are an important feature of the house. Also, the rear is highly visible from 7th Street.

Bernice Hamel of the Society Hill Civic Association supported the Architectural Committee's recommendation and stated that Stonorov's design should be retained.

The Committee voted to recommend denial pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials.] and the window guideline [Not recommended: Removing a character-defining window and replacing it with a new window that does not convey the same visual appearance.]

lms

400-14 Walnut Street, SW corner of 4th Street

John Turchi, Owner

Robert Powers, Applicant

DATE: 400-02: 1906, Watson & Huckel, architects; 404-14: 1923, Frank Watson, architect

PROPOSAL: Cut windows into doors, legalize replacement doors

This owner wishes to divide the expansive first floor into several commercial units, necessitating individual entrances. The proposal calls for removing the stone steps at one of the bays and cutting the storefront windows into a double-leaf, frame-less glazed door. The bay that has a single-leaf door would be redesigned with a new double-leaf frame-less, glazed door. Lastly, the owner wishes to legalize the replacement frame-less glazed door in the original entrance at 414.

Staff recommendation: Approval in concept of the new entrance, pursuant to Standard 9; however, more research should be conducted to determine the historic doors and windows. The historic doors would have a smaller scale, possibly with small panes in the transoms and doors. Denial of the frame-less replacement doors, pursuant to Standard 6.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Robert Powers stated that all of the openings in the first floor were changed previously and that the new frame-less doors have a simple design. He searched for historic photographs showing the original windows and doors but could not find any.

Rebecca Stoloff of the Society Hill Civic Association asked the Committee to defer judgement until the civic association has seen the application. Mr. Turchi stated that he will lose the tenant for the space if there is an undue delay.

The Committee members noted that since no historic photographs appear to exist, any new design would be conjectural. They preferred the modern design rather than a conjectural historic design.

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

lms

615 Lombard Street

Shannon Fitzpatrick, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1820; alterations, c. 1966, Montgomery, Bishop & Arnold, architects

PROPOSAL: Revision to rear addition design

At its September 2002 meeting, the Historical Commission voted to approve an application for the construction of a two-story rear addition as well as the repointing of the front façade. Since the meeting, the applicant has decided to amend the design of the addition. The design now proposed is identical to the approved design with the exception that the plan of the second-story segment has been reversed. The second-story door and deck, which previously appeared to the west, have been moved to the east. The added second-story room, which appeared to the east in the approved design, has been moved to the west. Like the old application, the new application proposes the repointing of the front façade.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the repointing, with PHC staff to review a pointing sample in the field, pursuant to masonry guideline, and approval of the addition, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal for reversing the second floor of the previously approved rear addition. Rebecca Stoloff stated that the Society Hill Civic Association approves the proposal.

The Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and the Masonry Guideline [Recommended: Repairing masonry walls and other masonry features by repointing masonry joints where there is evidence of deterioration such as disintegrating mortar, cracks in mortar joints, loose bricks, damp walls, or damaged plasterwork; Removing deteriorated mortar by carefully hand-raking the joints to avoid damaging the masonry; Duplicating old mortar in strength, composition, color, and texture; Duplicating old mortar joints in width and in joint profile.], with staff to review a pointing sample.

lms

632 Spruce Street

Aaron and Francine Beyer, Owners

Lorna Katz, architect/applicant

DATE: 1805-06 by Caleb Lowens, house carpenter; Alterations: c. 1850; new façade, 1883; renovations, 1961, Robert Trump, architect; interior renovations, 1977, A. Hinkey

PROPOSAL: Rear two-story addition and deck

This application proposes an addition and deck at the rear of this brick rowhouse. It stipulates removing the existing deck atop the 1-story section of the rear ell; constructing a 2nd-story brick addition with copper-clad bay window atop 1-story section of the rear ell and new brick piers; constructing a 3rd-story deck with wood board parapet wall on rear ell; enlarging a 3rd-story rear window opening and installing a fully glazed wood door for deck access; and installing exterior lighting at the addition and deck.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the addition, deck, and lighting, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the roofing guideline. However, a true-divided-light wood door corresponding to the historical windows should be substituted for the fully-glazed deck door proposed in the application.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Lorna Katz, architect for the project, apologized that the owners could not attend the meeting. She explained that the rear of the property has visibility from 7th Street as well as Addison Street. Currently, excessive vine growth from a neighboring yard obliterates any details of the rear façade, but Ms. Katz presented an older photograph of the existing deck.

Committee members discussed the proposed changes and questioned the need for the soldier-coursing on the façade and jack arch over the garage opening. Ms. Katz stated that the interior of the house was changed extensively in the 1880s and that the owners wanted the exterior to reflect those Victorian changes.

The Committee recommended approval of the proposal, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize 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 Roofing Guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as decks and terraces so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.], with the following conditions:

The windows in the bay should have a 2/1 configuration;

The door leading to the deck should have an eight- or ten-light configuration; and

The soldier-coursing above the bay at the second floor should be eliminated.

lms

308 Cypress Street

R. Barlow, Owner

Henry W. Heist, Applicant

DATE: c. 1809; alterations, c. 1964, Joseph Praissman architect

PROPOSAL: Rear greenhouse addition

This application proposes erecting a 1½-story copper, wood, and glass greenhouse addition at the rear of the brick rowhouse at 308 Cypress Street. The addition would be built in a garden area at the rear of the house. Excepting the removal of a storm door and storm window, the historic rear façade would not be altered, making the modification reversible. The clerestory windows on the greenhouse's west façade, which would appear above an existing garden wall, would be minimally visible from Cypress Street down a narrow, gated alley that runs along the house from Cypress to Delancy Street.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the addition, pursuant to Standard 9.

Neither the applicant nor a representative appeared.

Mr. Farnham introduced the submission. Ellen Miller, a neighbor, opposed the proposed construction, claiming it would violate the Zoning Code.

The Committee voted three to two to recommend approval, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] Mr. Rivera and Mr. Levy voted nay owing to the project's impact on the historic open space at the rear of the house.

RT

309-11 South Street

Axelrod Giannascoli Realty Group, Owner

Adam E. Laver, Esq., Applicant

DATE: c. 1895

PROPOSAL: Legalize windows

This application proposes to legalize the 1/1 PVC windows installed without a permit on the second and third floors of the building at 309-311 South Street. Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the illegal windows on 20 May 2002. The illegal vinyl windows should be replaced with the historically appropriate 1/1 wood windows, as seen in a PHC photograph dated 23 January 1963. It should also be noted that an illegal roll-down gate and sign hang over the storefront. On 10 April 1999 the Commission unanimously voted to deny a proposal for such a gate and sign. No subsequent proposal for a gate and sign has been approved. The applicant should also come before the Commission to legalize the storefront modifications.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the legalization of the vinyl windows, pursuant to Standard 2.

Mr. Farnham introduced the application.

Adam E. Laver, Esq., informed the Committee that he had no awareness of the gate and sign issue and that his client did not know the window replacement required a building permit. He also noted the very poor condition of the old windows, the visual similarity of the 1/1 PVC windows to 1/1 wooden windows, and offered to paint the PVC windows. He drew the attention of the Committee to the very mixed character of this block of South Street.

Mr. Tyler asked Mr. Laver how long his client had owned the building and the uses contained in it. Mr. Laver responded to the first question approximately ten years and to the second commercial with four residential units. Mr. Tyler observed that, in view of previous applications, the owner should have known of the Commission's jurisdiction; moreover, the Building Code requires a permit for window replacement in any property with more than two units whether it appears on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places or not.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of this application pursuant to Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.]; 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 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.].

RT

277 South 3rd Street aka 241 Spruce Street

Stephen Fox, Owner

Yishai Kedar, Applicant

DATE: c. 1963, Wright, Andrade, Ament & Gane, architects

PROPOSAL: Legalize windows and doors

This application proposes legalizing the seven 6/6 windows and three multi-light, sliding doors installed without a permit at 277 S. 3rd Street. Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the illegal windows and doors on 18 September 2002. The illegal windows and doors should be replaced with the historically appropriate 1/1 windows and fully-glazed doors.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 2.

Neither the applicant nor a representative appeared.

Mr. Farnham described the application.

Rebecca Stoloff, Society Hill Civic Association, also noted an illegal sign on the building and urged the Committee to deny the present application.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the application pursuant to Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.]; 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 to Standard 9 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.].

RT

228-30 Arch Street

K/K Enterprises, Owner

Joshua Grimes, Esq., Applicant

DATE: 228: c. 1890; 230: c. 1840, mansard added c. 1880

PROPOSAL: Complete demolition

This application proposes the complete demolition of the buildings at 228 and 230 Arch Street. The properties have been declared imminently dangerous by Licenses and Inspections on three occasions, 6 April 2000, 9 March 2001, and 1 May 2002. After the owner failed to rectify the violations, the Court of Common Pleas issued an injunction on 26 June 2002 ordering the owner to correct all violations and maintain the properties. The owner began the work mandated by the court order, but, after removing the roof, abruptly terminated the repairs, leaving the buildings further exposed to the elements and hastening their deterioration. Currently, the buildings are rapidly disintegrating. The actions of the owner are precipitating demolition by neglect. The Historical Commission's ordinance and Rules and Regulations allow for demolition of buildings on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places under two conditions: public interest and financial hardship. Although this application does not explicitly request to be considered on the grounds of financial hardship, it does make a case for demolition on those grounds. The Commission's ordinance and Rules and Regulations definitively delineate the requirements for a demolition application predicated on financial hardship. This application does not meet those requirements. First, Section 14-2007 (7) (f) prescribes that the facts demonstrating financial hardship will be submitted "by affidavit." It was not. The application provides no assessed value as required by Section 14-2007 (7) (f) (.2). The application states that the assessed value is unknown; however, the Board of Revision of Taxes records for 2002 indicate an assessed value of \$4,752 and \$9,648 for the land and building at 228 Arch and indicate an assessed value of \$5,808 and \$11,792 for the land and building at 230 Arch. The application provides only vague information, without dates, regarding a marketing of the property by Plumer Levitt. Section 14-2007 (7) (f) (.5) requires that the applicant submit "all listings of property for sale or rent, price asked, offers received, if any." Most importantly, the application merely asserts that there "are no profitable adaptive uses for the properties." Section 7.5.a of the Rules and Regulations asserts that the owner "has an affirmative obligation in good faith to attempt the sale of the property, to seek tenants for it, and to explore potential reuses for it." The owner and applicant have not met this crucial requirement.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the demolition, pursuant to Standard 2, and rejection of this incomplete application for failing to meet the requirements set forth by the Historical Commission's ordinance and Rules and Regulations.

Mr. Tyler presented the application to demolish the buildings at 228 and 230 Arch Street.

Joshua Grimes, the counsel for the applicant, addressed Mr. Tyler's remarks. He noted that the court had not yet issued a permanent injunction as Mr. Tyler had asserted. It was an ongoing action and, in fact, a hearing had been held earlier in the day. Continuing, Mr. Grimes made a case for demolition. As evidence for his claim that no new uses existed for the buildings, he stated that they had been vacant for more than 20 years. He further stated that the owner had marketed the properties but found no interest because their small size precluded profitable redevelopment. If redeveloped, the small apartments would only generate a yearly income of \$70,000, which would not be enough to justify the \$1 million renovation cost. He then summarized that the buildings should be demolished because they are a blight to the neighborhood; imminently dangerous according to L&I; unable to be stabilized for the long-term; and unable to be adapted for productive uses. He concluded by stating that he would update his application to comply with the Commission's Rules and Regulations.

Mr. Tyler explained that the owner had begun the process of stabilizing the buildings earlier this year, but abruptly terminated the work after removing the roofs as well as the mansard on 230 Arch. By opening the buildings to the elements, the owner has hastened the deterioration, not promoted the stabilization.

Clarifying the marketing of the properties, Mr. Grimes stated that his client had had an agreement of sale for the buildings about two years ago, but that the transaction was not completed. He then submitted for the record a letter from Mercantile Capital stating that “the cost of renovation would far exceed any resulting value.”

Rich Thom, who represents the Old City Civic Association, asked if the properties were considered to be part of the parcel that includes the neighboring parking lot. Mr. Tyler stated that according to BRT they were not. Mr. Grimes stated that it was one parcel.

Mr. Thom then submitted for the record a set of recent photos of the properties to support his contention that the owner had deliberately destabilized the buildings. Therefore, he claimed, the hardship was a direct result of the owner’s actions. Mr. Grimes countered that L&I was satisfied with the stabilization.

Mr. Levy asked why the owner had ignored the repeated L&I violations. He asked how the owner could justify her actions. He compared the situation to the story of the child who kills his parents and then pleads for mercy as an orphan. Mr. Grimes answered that the owner ignored the violations because she planned to sell the properties.

Mr. D’Alessandro inquired about the intent of the stabilization work. Mr. Grimes answered that he was not an engineer and would therefore have to direct the Committee to the L&I report. He added that the owner had hired the Proud Company to do the work. Mr. D’Alessandro asserted that the stabilization plans should have been presented to the Committee for review.

Ted Newbold of the Old City Civic Association contended that the owner was determined to demolish the buildings. Committee members agreed that they were being demolished by neglect. Rich Tucker, the owner of the adjacent buildings, likewise asserted that the owner was determined to demolish the buildings. Countering Mr. Grimes’ claim that no buyer could be found, he declared that he would be willing to purchase the buildings today. Mort Altshuler of the Old City Civic Association asserted that the owner had precluded any possibility of a sale because her asking price was unreasonable.

Discussion turned to the adjacent parking lot, which is also owned by the owner of 228-230 Arch Street. Mr. Tyler asserted that the parking lot did not have the proper licenses and was therefore illegal. Mr. Grimes disagreed.

The Architectural Committee concurred with the staff recommendation and voted unanimously to recommend denial of the demolition, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]. The Committee also recommended that the Commission insist that the owner continue with the stabilization as defined by the stabilization plans formulated by the Court and the City of Philadelphia.

100-04 Market Street, SW corner of Front Street

Michael Yaron, Owner

Richard Wesley, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 100-02: 1882, 104: c. 1790

PROPOSAL: New storefront, windows, doors, cornice and columns, new elevator penthouse on 102

This application proposes several alterations to a Queen Anne commercial building and a Federal building at the southwest corner of Front and Market Streets. Most of the alterations impact the three storefronts. The storefronts at 100 and 102 Market date to the earlier twentieth century; the storefront at 104 Market was recently erected. The design stipulates that the new storefront proposed for 102 Market harmonize with the historical storefront at 100 Market. It also stipulates that the new storefront at 104 Market be differentiated from the other two. The application specifies the addition of a new wood storefront cornice at 102 Market to match the existing storefront cornice at 100 Market; a new wood storefront with cornice at 104 Market; new wood storefront doors, windows (some of which are café windows), and panels at all three addresses; and new wood pilasters (noted as columns on plans) at 102-104 Market. Details of the doors were not submitted with this application, but should be reviewed. In addition to the storefront alterations, the plans specify a new elevator penthouse on 102 Market, which will be 1'-0" tall and will be set back 1'-10" from cornice. Finally, the application proposes the cleaning and repointing of all masonry and the repainting of trim.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the storefront alterations, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 and Standard 9. Approval of the elevator penthouse, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline. Approval of the repointing, with PHC staff to review pointing samples in the field, pursuant to Masonry Rehabilitation Guideline. No review of the repainting of the trim.

Richard Wesley explained the project including the doors, windows, cornices, storefronts and elevator penthouse. The Committee discussed visibility of the elevator shaft and penthouse as well as the character of the new storefront on 104 Market Street. Mr. McCoubrey recommended differentiating the new storefront even more from the storefronts on 100-102 Market Street.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the repointing pursuant to Masonry Rehabilitation Guideline [Recommended: Cleaning masonry surfaces with the gentlest possible method, such as low pressure water and detergents...; Repairing masonry walls and other masonry features by repointing masonry joints where there is evidence of deterioration such as disintegrating mortar, cracks in mortar joints, loose bricks, damp walls, or damaged plasterwork; Removing deteriorated mortar by carefully hand-raking the joints to avoid damaging the masonry; Duplicating old mortar in strength, composition, color, and texture; Duplicating old mortar joints in width and in joint profile] Approval of the storefront alterations, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]. Approval of the elevator penthouse, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline: [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as ... elevator housing ... when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

R.B.

313-15 North 3rd Street, SE corner of 3rd and Wood Streets

Wade Properties, Owner

Charles Loomis, Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Two roof decks

This application proposes the construction of two roof decks on the nineteenth-century commercial building at 313 N. 3rd Street, which, together with 315 N. 3rd Street, has recently been redeveloped as residences. The 16' x 17' decks would be accessed via an existing stairway with rooftop bulkhead. The decks would be enclosed by Sterope steel fencing. Any view of the rear deck would be obscured by an existing elevator tower. The front deck would be visible from N. 3rd Street as well as Wood Street west of 3rd Street.

Staff Recommendation: Staff members generally agree on a recommendation of approval for the two decks, but some staff members contend that the front deck should be set further back from the front façade of the building. Both the approval and the setback recommendation are pursuant to Standard 9.

Charles Loomis showed photographs of a mockup for the deck railing set at the location proposed in the drawings and at a location set back a further three feet. He also submitted updated drawings with the three-foot setback. Both locations will have some visibility from Wood Street; however, the architect noted that a billboard, that is not part of this building, looms in this view behind the deck.

The Committee unanimously recommended approval of the two decks pursuant to Standard 9 [New editions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The New work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] provided that the deck nearer the front façade of the building be set back an additional three feet from the location specified in the original proposal.

R.B.

1822 Spruce Street

Michael Sparano, Owner

Joshua Grimes, Esq., Applicant

DATE: 1895, T. Roney Williamson, architect

PROPOSAL: Cover brick façade with stucco at rear

The rear of this house has a brick façade with ornate metal bays. The owner started to stucco the entire façade, but was stopped by Licenses and Inspections and told to seek a permit. The stucco would be a brick-red color and have scoring to mimic stone, with jack-arches over the windows.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 2, Standard 6, Standard 9 and the masonry guideline. If the owner is experiencing water infiltration, the brick should be re-pointed rather than covered with stucco.

Attorney Josh Grimes presented the case that although the back of this building has some visibility from 18th and 19th Streets, Cypress Street in this block is an alley. He showed pictures of the block and explained that the work was not out of character with other buildings.

The owner, Michael Sparano, explained that he did not know he needed a permit. He saw other work on Cypress and he himself worked on the front of his house, installing flower boxes and a railing and had not been stopped. He explained that the stucco when completed would have a brick red color finish coat.

Staff explained that Mr. Sparano had himself come to the Commission for an earlier permit for interior work and should, therefore, have known about the historic designation. In addition Licenses and Inspections requires a permit for stucco work and asks to inspect the wall before work begins to make sure the stucco does not hide structural deficiencies in the wall.

Suzanne Pentz asked the applicant why he wished to stucco the wall and why he installed scoring bars to create a rusticated stone pattern if he wished to color it brick red. He answered that the wall had a partial coat of paint and he thought it more expensive to remove the paint and repoint than to stucco. Also he wished to mimic the detail of the front façade. He explained that he will stucco only the first and second floors.

Rudy D'Alessandro thought that the stucco should be removed; however, Ms. Pentz expressed a concern that removal of the mesh might damage the brick, depending on the placement of the nails. Mr. Baron noted that many of the houses in Society Hill including Otto Haas' house had a covering of stucco and had a successful restoration of the brickwork.

Committee members thought there should be mitigation for the work and suggested restoration of the rear first floor, segmentally-arched window, with the removal of the air-conditioner and installation of the historic sash. They also explained that the owner should seek a permit for his front façade work as well.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the stucco to the extent that the façade had received wire mesh; however, the areas that had received mesh but no stucco should receive a smooth coat of stucco rather than rusticated. The approval would be subject to the stucco colored red, presentation of scale drawings showing the extent of work, and the restoration of the rear first floor window with detail drawings to be approved by the staff.

R.B.

2040 Rittenhouse Square

Ann and Stephen Gitter, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1890

PROPOSAL: New carriage house doors

The original carriage door openings currently have non-historic infill pedestrian doors and glazing. The proposal calls for new wood carriage doors with a cross-buck and bead-board design. One bay would have a double-leaf door with fixed side panels. The other would have an overhead garage door.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the entrance guideline. However, the bottom pieces should be rails, not panels.

Mr. Ginsberg explained that he would modify the design if necessary but thought it important to have the horizontal lines of the panels align. Committee members agreed.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended approval of the proposal as submitted, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize 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 entrance guideline [Recommended: Designing and constructing a new entrance when the historic entrance is completely missing. It may be a restoration based on historical, pictorial, and physical documentation or a new design that is compatible with the historic character of the building.].

R.B.

1903-05 Green Street

John Loonstyn and Fred Duling, Owners

Liz Zimmers, Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Partial demolition of 1903, demolition of 1905, new construction, roof decks, parking

This application returns to the Committee and Commission with a new design. The proposal calls for the demolition of the entire rear of 1903 Green Street and for the complete demolition of 1905. Two new rear-ells would be constructed on the rear of 1903 and a new four-story main building with two rear-ells at 1905. The proposal now has a single vehicular entrance with a metal picket gate in the center of the entire development.

The front building of 1903 would be partially restored with a new double-leaf door and transom. The new façade of 1905 would have stucco; tripartite windows, with fixed central, 6-pane windows flanked by three-pane casements, in the end bays; and central four-pane windows. The new entrance would have a single-leaf, glazed door and segmental arched transom.

Both 1903 and 1905 would have roof decks, set back 11-½ feet from the front façade, with wrought-iron railings.

Staff recommendation: Approval in concept of the demolition. Only one staff member recommends approval in concept of the parking. Others thought that a driveway on this block of Green Street interrupted the streetscape and negatively impacted the block. The proposal lacks details of the windows, cornice and door, including materials and profiles. One drawing shows details of flower boxes, but they do not appear on the elevation drawing. Staff thought that the windows should have a more vertical orientation and the door should have more presence on the façade to balance the large opening for parking. Also, the stucco façade will require control joints. These should be integrated into the design. The roof decks and stair house on 1903 should be pulled back to the rear ells. The Commission has consistently denied roof decks on the main buildings of houses that have rear ells.

Ms. Spina presented the project. Mr. Zimmers, the architect, spoke about the status of the project, the approvals his clients were seeking, the reasons for the demolition, the position of the Civic Association, the need for including parking, and the locations of the roof decks.

Mr. Duling, one of the developers, stated that the roof decks were not visible from the street and explained that they were important for the marketing of the condominium units on the upper floor. Ms. Spina explained that the Commission not only bases its decision on roof decks on their visibility, but also the historical precedence of having decks on the rear ells only, not the main buildings. Mr. Zimmers agreed.

Allen W. Rubin, representing the Spring Garden Civic Association, explained that his organization supported the demolition, curb cut, and off-street parking.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend final approval of the demolition and approval in concept of the project with the parking.

JF

540-50 North 17th Street

Local Union #98 IBEW, Owner

Robert N. Poston, Applicant

DATE: c. 1922

PROPOSAL: New garage, expanded parking, parking lot fence, rear addition to office building

This project includes several parts. The last remaining rowhouse in this block was demolished last year. The union would like to build a two-story garage that would mimic the existing building, with entrances from 17th Street and Brandywine Street.

The union proposes to build a second-story, glazed addition on the rear of the union building, set on Doric columns.

Lastly, the newly expanded parking lot would have a brick and wrought-iron fence.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and Standard 10, with staff to review a brick match.

Ms. Spina presented the project. Mr. Levy questioned the recommendation of approval for a garage building that mimicked the Colonial Revival style of the early twentieth-century union hall. Ms. Spina replied that the new garage was consistent with the ersatz Colonial architecture of the union hall, which mimicked Philadelphia's Georgian architecture.

Mr. Levy then suggested that instead of using brick for the new construction that matched the existing building, the architect should specify a different brick to differentiate the new from the old. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that a bond other than Flemish, which was used for the original construction, be employed to mark the difference. Mr. Levy stated that he was unsure whether to recommend a different brick or bond for the new construction. Mr. Poston noted that the garage would be topped with a slate roof.

Mr. Rivera asked if the planters encroached on the sidewalk. Mr. Poston, the union's representative, stated that the planters had been deleted from the design. Mr. Rivera stated that he did not approve of the pediment on the solarium or the cupola on the garage. The other Committee members concurred.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.] and Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.] with the following conditions:

The pediment must be removed from the addition;

The garage cupola design must be amended to make the cupola look less like the cupola on the union hall and more like a functional ventilator; and

The brick color and bond must be reviewed and approved by the Committee.

JF

649 North 16th Street

Angelo Tartaglini, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1875

PROPOSAL: Reconstruction of rear ell

This proposal calls for removing the severely damaged addition to the rear ell and rebuilding it. The three-story addition includes brick-colored stucco and vinyl one-over-one windows.

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

Ms. Spina presented the project. Craig Boon represented Mr. Tartaglini, the owner and applicant. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the contractor employ some sort of articulation such as a bead or a reveal at the meeting point of new and existing construction to differentiate the new stucco wall from the existing brick wall. Mr. Boon agreed to add the articulation to the design.

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

JF

2024 Brandywine Street

Mark Liddy and Susan Green, Owners

Miranda Hitzemann, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: 2nd and 3rd-floor additions, deck on rear ell, and roof deck on main building

This proposal consists of additions at the second and third floor rear as well as rear deck and roof decks at this 19th-century rowhouse. The roof deck is set well back from Brandywine Street.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the additions and rear deck, denial of the roof deck with privacy wall, pursuant to Standard 9 and Standard 10.

Mr. Baron presented the project. Architects Alan Metcalfe and Miranda Hitzemann arrived during Mr. Baron's presentation. Mr. Baron informed the architects that the staff recommended approval of all construction below the upper roofline, but not the roof deck and privacy wall. Mr. Metcalfe claimed that the roof deck would not be visible from the street and then inquired about the process to appeal Historical Commission decisions. Although the Committee is advisory and the Commission had not yet rendered its opinion, Mr. Baron explained the appeal process to the L&I Review Board to Mr. Metcalfe. Mr. Baron also explained that visibility was only one variable considered when reviewing a roof deck proposal. He further clarified that historical precedent must also be considered for deck applications. There is historical precedent for decks on rear ells, but not for decks on the main bodies of row houses. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the applicant relocate the roof deck to a position above the rear ell. Mr. Metcalfe asked if such a deck would be approved. Mr. Baron suggested that he prepare a sight-line study from Spring Garden Street looking north to determine if such a deck would be visible. Mr. Metcalfe then asked if positioning the top deck above the third-story deck would be approved.

Mr. Rivera and Mr. Levy interjected that such a deck configuration might not comply with zoning regulations. Mr. Rivera added that he also believed that the third-story addition, which would hang over the side yard, would not comply with zoning regulations. Mr. Metcalfe contended that he was

seeking the appropriate zoning approvals and that any review of his project by the Committee that was based of zoning exceeded the Committee's authority. He asserted that the Committee must predicate its decisions on the Rules and Regulations of the Historical Commission, not on an imprecise and incomplete understanding of zoning regulations. Mr. Rivera countered that he believed that it was possible that the project might violate zoning regulations. To break the impasse, Mr. Baron suggested that Mr. Rivera might reformulate his concerns about the third-story addition in terms of the alteration to the historical character of the building. Mr. McCoubrey reminded his fellow Committee members not to exceed their purview; questions of zoning, he declared, must be left to the appropriate regulatory agency.

Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the applicants develop a new scheme for a roof deck above the rear ell and then return to the Committee.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the third-story deck and denial of the roof deck. Ms. Pentz, Mr. McCoubrey, Mr. D'Alessandro, and Mr. Levy voted to recommend approval of both additions. Mr. Rivera voted to recommend denial of the additions because he believed that the third-floor addition might possibly violate zoning regulations.

JF

3299 Girard Avenue, NE corner of 33rd Street, Hatfield House

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Janice Woodcock, Applicant

DATE: c. 1760, altered c. 1835

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation, remove shutters

The Fairmount Park Commission proposes repairs to this historically significant wood house, including, paint removal, sanding, limited replacement of exterior siding and windows, installing new window grills, and restoration of the front entry cornice. The shutters will be removed from the oldest façade of the building because of their poor condition and lack of funds to repair them.

Staff recommendation: Approval per Standard 6. The approval should be conditioned, however, on the shutters being stored in the house with a requirement that they be restored and reinstalled within two years.

Janice Woodcock, architect for the project, and Theresa Stuhlman, Historic Preservation Specialist for the Fairmount Park Commission, attended the meeting to represent the project. Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Ms. Woodcock and Ms. Stuhlman stated that there is money in the budget to repair and re-install the existing shutters. Mr. Baron observed that all of the proposed work, therefore, can be considered "restoration" and could be reviewed and approved at the staff level.

The Committee agreed that the proposed restoration work could be reviewed at the staff level.

JRB

7303 Woodland Avenue, Blue Bell Tavern

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Janice Woodcock, Applicant

DATE: 1766, modified c. 1860 and c. 1970

PROPOSAL: Reconstruct porch, vents, HVAC units

This historic tavern will receive a reconstruction of its mid 19th century porch as well as a new main roof vent on the rear slope of the roof and a condensing unit mounted at the rear wall.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standard 3. Staff thought the 1766 appearance should be the goal of the restoration. The porch did not exist with the current window configuration except with a large addition, now demolished, seen in an enclosed photograph. Staff thought the AC unit should be placed on the ground behind the building.

Ms. Woodcock, Ms. Stuhlman and Fredda Lippes, of the City Capital Program Office, attended the meeting to represent the project. Mr. Baron presented the proposal. The Committee discussed placement of the condenser. Ms. Stuhlman stated her concerns regarding vandalism and flooding on the site. Mr. Rivera suggested locating the condenser away from the building on a platform enclosure or “crib”.

Ms. Woodcock stated that she had relocated the proposed roof vent for the lower roof on the rear ell to the opposite slope away from the street. She added that the mechanical engineer had not yet determined exact locations of the plumbing vents for the rear slope of the main roof and will submit a revised drawing to staff when available. Three exhaust vents for two bathrooms and a dryer are proposed for the rear vertical face of the reconstructed porch roof. Mr. Levy suggested a wall louver for the plumbing vent. Other Committee members favored the proposed roof vents as less destructive to the original stonework and pointing.

Mr. Baron summarized the evolution of the structure. Several years ago, the Fairmount Park Commission restored the windows to their original 18th century appearance. The porch is not original to the structure. The building has been altered many times and there is no evidence that the existing structure ever stood with the multi-paned windows and porch without the much larger c. 1805 addition. There are images documenting that, after removal of the c. 1805 addition, the existing structure stood with a porch and two over two windows. The existing projections in the stonework and exterior joist pockets, described by Ms. Stuhlman, may be evidence of an original pent eave that would be appropriate for the period of construction.

Richard Tyler questioned the logic of reconstructing a 19th century porch on a 1766 structure. He thought that the Park Commission should work towards restoration of this significant 18th century resource and not confuse the appearance of the building. To address the open exterior joist pockets and missing mortar he suggested either reconstructing an appropriate pent eave or repairing the missing stonework with matching stone and compatible mortar. Ms. Stuhlman described the drainage problems on the site. The grade and existing brick porch floor are below the level of the street. The proposed porch roof, she asserted, would protect the first floor walls and window wells and control and contain water runoff. Ms. Woodcock described the proposed porch posts and acknowledged that they were not based on the photo-documentation.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the re-roofing of the rear ell with wood shingles, the reconstruction of the porch with posts based on the photo-documentation and a free-standing enclosure for the condenser in the rear yard with staff to review details. The Committee voted to recommend approval of the vents in the new porch roof and on the rear slopes of the roofs, with staff to review details.

JRB

2100 West River Drive, Boelson Cottage
City of Philadelphia, Owner

Janice Woodcock, Applicant

DATE: c. 1678 and 1684

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation, replace wood elements

The proposal involves rehabilitation work to the interior and exterior. The applicant proposes to modify the entry porch.

Staff recommendation: Approval with staff to review details.

Ms. Woodcock, Ms. Stuhlman and Ms. Lippe attended the meeting to represent the project. Ms. Woodcock presented the project. She stated that the wood-framed shed additions date to a rehabilitation in the 1930's or 1940's. She proposes to modify the enclosed shed-roofed entry and remove the siding to match the appearance of the other open, shed-roofed entry. The proposed work to the cellar bulkhead will raise it to a slightly steeper angle for improved water run-off. They propose a simulated wood door fabricated with Trex or a similar recycled wood/plastic product for weather resistance.

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

JRB

2411 South 21st Street

Toni Vellucci-DiBattista, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1913, John and James Windrim, architects

PROPOSAL: Legalize vinyl windows

This proposal calls for legalizing vinyl windows installed on the front and sides of the building without a permit.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 6. It should also be noted that the drawings do not meet the standards for a final submission.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal and informed the Committee that a violation has been issued and the applicants have a court hearing set for 1 November 2002. Committee members inquired why the hearing date is slated before the Commission meeting and Mr. Baron explained that the court had granted two continuances for the Historical Commission to hear the matter but the applicants did not submit the application until recently. Committee members agreed that the use of vinyl for the windows was the issue.

Rocco DiBattista and Toni Vellucci-DiBattista, the owners, attended the meeting and argued ignorance of the historic status of the property. Ms. Hughes had sent the applicants copies of the notice letters, which were sent to the previous owner. Mr. and Mrs. DiBattista objected to the issuance of the violation and of the burden put upon them to attend the court hearings as well as the Committee and Commission meetings. They stated that the denial of the proposal would put a financial burden on them as well. Mr. DiBattista asked the Committee for suggestions to cure the violation. Mr. Baron said that the applicants could proceed to the Commission meeting and ask to have the installed windows legalized, or they could apply for a permit and install the correct wood windows. Ms. Pentz noted that the applicants could apply to the Historical Commission based on financial hardship. Mr. Baron gave the applicants written information on the procedures for filing a hardship application.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial 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.]

DMH

818-20 Chestnut Street

Historic Property Holdings, Owner

David Amburn, Architect/Applicant

DATE:

PROPOSAL: New door opening, door, and rebuild and glaze 2nd and 3rd floor niche

This proposal in concept involves cutting a door into the right side of the Art Deco storefront of the former Horn and Hardart restaurant on Chestnut Street. The vacant building would be converted into apartments above and a store below. The doorway to the upper floors would be placed at the right side of the façade to preserve the use of the storefront for the first floor tenant. The new doorway would be wider than the spacing of the existing vertical mullion in order to meet code, but would otherwise mimic the existing window design with bronze and marble. On the second and third floors, the niche composed of painted enameled panels would be reconstructed to contain glazing of an opaque nature to mimic the former panels.

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

Mr. Baron presented the proposal, which is key to salvaging a very deteriorated building. No one was present to represent the project. The proposal would re-use the marble base fitted to a new bronze door swinging on piano hinges. In reference to the installation of a door, Committee members asked if it were possible to acquire a variance to have a narrower door. Mr. Rivera suggested a wider door, set back into a vestibule, leaving the mullion in place, creating a void on the façade. Mr. Baron said that this treatment would require even more historic fabric to be removed, including the elimination of the marble base. Mr. D'Alessandro thought that a Plans Examiner from Licenses and Inspections should be contacted to determine the dimensions needed for a single door. Committee members agreed with the proposed removal of the panels and their replacement with opaque glass in the upper floor niche.

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

DMH

925 Chestnut Street, NE corner of 10th Street, Federal Reserve Bank

Jefferson Hospital, Owner

Christian Busch, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1921, 1931-35, Paul Cret, architect

PROPOSAL: Signage, new gate on 10th Street

The proposal involves modifications to an approved gate design, signage and a railing. The Commission approved modifications to the gate at Kelly Street to separate pedestrian and vehicular

traffic into the medical center in a previous submission. That design proved very expensive and the applicant now seeks to modify the northernmost section of the gate for the pedestrian entrance. It will not shorten the existing gate leaves, but will weld them into place in a fixed, open position.

The signage proposal involves a vehicular sign on Tenth Street mounted on a post. The large sign resembles another reviewed and rejected by the Commission in February 2000. The Commission urged the applicant to consider a sign mounted in the sidewalk.

The third piece of the application involves two simple railings for the stairs on Chestnut Street.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the gate, denial of the sign pursuant to Standard 9 and 10 with staff to review details. The new sign should be smaller.

Mr. Baron presented the application and noted that a major portion of the signage has already been approved.

Christian Busch, the architect, and Jeffrey Fisher, the building manager, attended the meeting. Mr. Busch explained that the proposed gate, which was previously approved, has been redesigned to mimic the original gate. In addition, he said that the approved plaques on either side of the front entrance have not been installed but have been redesigned with an additional six inches to each plaque, which now include directions at the bottom to the accessible entrance around the corner. Each sign will have a directional arrow, which will be installed at the Chestnut Street entrance. Mr. Levy thought one arrow sufficient and noted that the second arrow points to the wrong door, which would confuse pedestrians. Additionally, a large sign attached to the building to direct drivers to turn left was denied by the Commission. Now the proposed 9½ x 4½-foot sign would be installed on a pole within the property line. Mr. Levy thought that the south side of the sign should be reworded because it is only seen from one direction. In addition, he objected to the sign reading “925 Chestnut Street” on the 10th Street façade. Mr. Rivera thought that the top portion of the sign, which is repetitious, could be eliminated and this would decrease the length of the sign by a foot.

The Committee thought the railing appropriate; however, Mr. Levy inquired if a splay railing would meet code.

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

1. *The revised plaques on either side of the entrance;*
2. *The revised design of the gate;*
3. *The large sign on 10th Street to direct drivers attached on a pole within the property line, and*
4. *The splay railing for Chestnut Street.*

With the staff to review the revised changes.

DMH

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary