

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Commission Offices, Room 578, City Hall
26 August 2003**

Present

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

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

Also

Gregory M. Harvey, Esq.
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance
Robert Powers, Powers and Company
David Blumenfeld, The Grande
John A. Wolf
Jean Wolf
Jay Borish, 2020 Chancellor Street
Victor Antes, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Dominic Lance Muscara, Nelson
Howard Dorf, Nelson
Sheila Shapira
Gerhard Mayer
John Mitkus, Smith Mack Company
Jeffrey Hawver, Agoos/Lovera Architects
Arlene Matzkin, Friday Architects
Salvatore D'Angelo
Lisa Newcomer, Wesley Architects
Rosa Esquenazi, Wesley Architects
Jason Beccaris, 508 South 3rd Street
Roger Moss, Athenaeum
Patrick Hauck, Powers and Company
Bernice Hamel, Society Hill Civic Association
Rebecca Stoloff, Society Hill Civic Association
Tuong Huynh, Partridge Architects
Steve Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
Jeff Morgan, Cubellis Association
Paul Schmidt, 224 St. Marks Square
Mark Brodsky, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Robert Acosta, HSBC Bank
Albert G. Weiss, Esq., Binder and Weiss
Kenny Phung, 1105 Ridge Avenue
Jong Kai Chin, 941 Race Street
Stacy Gao, 941 Race Street

Ruo Wu Zhang, Owner, 941 Race Street
 Marianna Thomas, AIA, 1253 South 19th Street
 Kevin Rasmussen, AIA, 1923 Brandywine Street
 Geoffrey Posner, Owner, 1923 Brandywine Street
 Allaire Wohlgemuth, Owner, 2028 Latimer Street

Daniel McCoubrey, Acting-Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:45 a.m.

1917 Panama Street

Michele Williams, Owner/Applicant
 DATE: c. 1920, W.F.B. Koelle, architect
 PROPOSAL: Legalize window alterations

This application is for the legalization of the front windows and light. The owner without a permit or Historical Commission approval enlarged the first floor window opening and installed large, casement windows. All of the front windows now have ornate wrought-iron grilles, also installed without a permit. Lastly, the owner installed an ornate light-fixture that has wrought-iron detailing. The owner has received numerous violations over the last few years for this work.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the window enlargement and bi-fold windows, pursuant to Standards 2, 6 and 9. Approval of the wrought-iron and light, though the wrought-iron on the first floor will have to be altered to accommodate a restored window, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina apprised the applicant of the lack of a quorum and Michele Williams, the owner, agreed to move forward. Ms. Spina presented the proposal, noting that Ms. Williams performed the work without building permits. Ms. Williams told the Committee that she was unaware of historical status of the property. She noted that the window prior to its enlargement did not match a neighbor's house. In addition, she said that the enlargement was done to attain additional light and that the grates on the window were installed for security. Ms. Spina emphasized that any alterations to a window opening require a permit, regardless of whether the building has been declared historic.

Gregory Harvey, Esq., expressed dismay about misplaced files, which included notes regarding the violations issued by the Department of Licenses and Inspections. He pointed out that this is a significant block of Arts and Craft style houses by George Pepper and stressed his and other residents' opposition to the alterations.

Mr. McCoubrey emphasized that the Committee could not support the removal of historical fabric. He believed that an approval would set a precedent. Mr. D'Alessandro concurred and additionally thought the grates inappropriate. He also noted the changes in the star bolts. Ms. Williams said that she is trying to sell the property and does not have the money to restore the windows. Ms. Spina gave the applicant information about the Financial Hardship Committee and her options in regards to an appeal.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal, pursuant to Standards 2, 6 and 9.

2401 Spruce Street

John Wolf, Owner

Jean Wolf, Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Demolish rear shed, new garden fence

This proposal calls for demolishing a non-historic garden shed and installing a wrought-iron garden fence and gate. The rear yard will be used for parking. The proposed gate has arrow-topped pickets and heart-shaped scrolls – a sharp contrast to the simple picket pedestrian gate also on the property. The historic brick sidewalk and patio will be re-installed with a gravel and sand bed, but some patching is required.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the demolition and a simplified gate, with staff to review a brick match, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Jean and John Wolf attended the meeting. Ms. Wolf believed the proposed scrolled garden fence a little excessive and thought that a simple-picket fence more appropriate. In response to the Committee's concern about the stucco on the neighboring house, Ms. Wolf said that she proposes to repair the stucco once the shed is removed.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with a simplified picket gate, with the staff to review details including a brick match, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

1428-32 Chestnut Street aka 111 South 15th Street, Packard Building

111 South 15th Street Associates, Owners

David Blumenfeld, Esq., Applicant

DATE: 1922, Ritter & Shay, architects

PROPOSAL: Enlarge windows on the 25th floor, signage, alter Chestnut Street storefront

This application has several parts. First, the windows on the 25th floor are long and narrow. The application calls for cutting the four windows in the light-well on the east side of the building to install larger one-over-one, double-hung windows that match others on the façade. The SHPO has already approved this scope of work.

Second, without a permit or Historical Commission approval the owner installed three large signs on the limestone façade, two on Chestnut Street and one on 15th Street. The signs, measuring 9'6" x 21'0", have aluminum frames. They were attached using screws, but the application does not specify the number of penetrations into the stone. The owner claims that the signs are temporary.

Third, also without a permit, the owner removed the non-historic doors in the Chestnut Street storefront and installed a large, single-light window flanked by single-leaf doors. Again, this may be a temporary change.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the windows, pursuant to Standard 9 and window guideline. Denial of the removal of the revolving door; the applicant should return with a plan for the permanent storefront design. Denial of the signage, though the signs may be temporary, the penetrations are not.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal and noted that the installed signs obscure historic windows. David Blumenfeld, Robert Powers and Victor Antes attended the meeting. Mr. Blumenfeld explained that the window alterations in the light court area have received the approval of the State Historic Preservation Office and National Park Service. He noted that the windows on either side of the return are not being altered. Mr. Blumenfeld said that the Chestnut Street doors

did not operate properly and were removed temporarily for construction and safety issues. They were replaced with a new aluminum doors. He asked the Committee to grant a ninety (90) day continuance, which would allow for the submission of a new design. Mr. McCoubrey said that the Committee generally does not recommend temporary approvals. Mr. Powers said that most of the screws for the signs are attached within the mortar joints. Mr. Blumenfeld inquired about the approval of the signs, if they are relocated to expose the obscured windows. Ms. Spina emphasized that the signage is not considered temporary. She suggested that the applicant withdraw the proposed legalization of the signage and façade alterations from the application and re-submit with a new designs. Mr. Blumenfeld concurred.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the 25th floor window enlargement, but denial of the legalization of the signage and the removal of the revolving door, pursuant to Standard 9 and the window guideline [Recommended: designing and installing additional windows on rear or other non-character-defining elevations if required by the new use. Such design should be compatible with the overall design of the building.] .

2020 Chancellor Street

Cary Borish, Owner

Neil Sandvold, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1880

PROPOSAL: New casement windows, carriage house doors

This proposal involves a property that has two garage entrances, one on Van Pelt Street and one on Chancellor Street. The application calls for switching the paneled, overhead garage door to the Van Pelt Street façade and restoring the original bi-fold doors and installing them on the Chancellor Street façade. The proposal also includes removing the arched, non-historic, single-paned windows in the upper floors with wood, double-leaf casement windows. The original windows would have been two-over-two, double-hung windows. The casement windows would have two-panes to simulate the original pane configuration, but the dimensions of the central mullion would be much thicker than the original.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the proposal, pursuant to Standard 9 and window guideline.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Jay Borish, the owner's father, attended the meeting. The Committee discussed the proposal at length and expressed concern about the lack of a brickmold and the proposed depth of the window, owing to the arched shape. Mr. Rivera stressed the possible water infiltration with inward opening of the windows. Committee members agreed that more details are needed, therefore it recommended the conceptual approval of the windows.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the doors, with staff to review details, and conceptual approval of the windows pursuant to Standard 9 and the window guideline [Recommended: Designing and installing new windows when the historic windows are completely missing. The replacement windows may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the window openings and the historic character of the building.] .

255 South 20th Street

Young Ju Kim, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c 1880

PROPOSAL: Alter storefront

This application is for renovations to the historic storefront. The proposal calls for new overhead lighting sconces to correspond with the transom windows. The transoms break the storefront into a tripartite configuration. The owner wishes to turn the southern third into a door opening. The new fully-glazed wood door would have a wood surround and new marble steps to match the original. The rest of the storefront would be restored. The plans also call for replacing the existing blade sign.

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

Young and James Kim attended the meeting. Committee members, in reviewing the plans, questioned the absence of a light fixture over the existing door. After discussing the applicants needs, the Committee recommended eliminating the lighting fixtures. The applicant agreed.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the blade sign and storefront alterations, with the elimination of the lighting, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

1509 Walnut Street

John Lee, Owner

D. Lance Muscara, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1902, Newman, Woodman & Harris, architects, c. 1985, storefront cut

PROPOSAL: Alter storefront, signage

This proposal calls for refurbishing the building for a new store. The fully-glazed wood door would be removed for a frame-less glass door. A single storefront window would replace the bi-fold windows and railing. The owner wishes to install a 4'0" x 11'0" sign at the top of the storefront window, which would cover the cornice area. A 5'0"-long florescent light would be mounted above the signage for illumination.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the proposed door, pursuant to Standard 9 and door guideline [Not recommended: introducing a new entrance that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color.] Denial of the signage as proposed, the sign should not cover the cornice area over the window, pursuant to Standard 9 and storefront guideline.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Dominic Muscara and Howard Nelson Dorf attended the meeting. Mr. Muscara said that he proposed to maintain the original transom, but install a frameless door. He showed photographs other buildings that have the same door, but Ms. Spina noted that these alterations occurred prior to designation. Mr. Muscara pointed out that the area, which is concealed by the proposed signage is chipped and damaged. In addition, he proposed to retain the cast stone and limestone above the storefront window, but noted that the opening is non-historic.

Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the existing window and door complement each other, so if the window is changed he supported changing the door. Mr. McCoubrey agreed, but expressed concern about the signage obscuring the storefront cornice. Mr. Rivera noted that the existing door is appropriate, but the window could be altered. He also thought the signage and proposed frameless glass door with the stain glass transom inappropriate. Ms. Pentz concurred, and remarked that the signage should be less intrusive.

Mr. Muscara suggested removing the non-historic "steps" above the window and extending the glass, with the signage behind the glass. A small, illuminated logo could be installed in the storefront cornice. Committee members thought this appropriate.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the window alteration and small signage in the storefront cornice, pursuant to Standard 9 and storefront guideline [Not recommended: using inappropriately scaled signs and logos or other types of signs that obscure, damage, or destroy remaining character-defining features of the historic building.]. The Committee split on the proposed frameless glass door.

2043 Rittenhouse Square

Boris and Sheila Shapira, Owners/Applicant

DATE: c. 1870, c. 1970 façade alterations

PROPOSAL: Infill door

In the early 1970s one of the front windows was cut down into a door. This application calls for removing the non-historic door and infilling the area; however, the historic window opening will not be restored.

Staff recommendation: Approval of removing the door, but denial of the infill. The historic window opening should be restored, pursuant to Standards 2 and 5.

Sheila Shapira, the owner, attended the meeting. She explained that the house had been split into a two-family dwelling, requiring the second door. She and her husband are restoring the building to a single-family dwelling. The Committee discussed the current design of the building and noted that it has been compromised severely.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal.

1600 Locust Street

Michael J. Stack, Jr., Owner

Jeffrey Hawver, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1948, Walter K. Durham, architect

PROPOSAL: Review in concept of stair tower, ATM machine, night deposit box, and signage

This application for review in concept proposes several alterations to the Colonial Revival building at the southwest corner of S. 16th and Locust Streets. A 3-story stair tower addition is planned for the rear. It would be built in the rear garden and would open onto Latimer Street. The Latimer Street façade would be brick, the 16th Street façade would be stucco and glass, and a steel and glass link at 2nd and 3rd stories would connect the tower via a faux dormer to the building. The ATM machine would be installed in a new opening in the historic brick 16th Street façade, partially in and partially above the watertable. The night deposit box would be installed in a new opening in the historic brick Locust Street façade. The signage would include two very tall aluminum signs with cut-out lettering and neon illumination, one on each of the primary facades, and logo signs on the windows.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the stair tower, provided the faux dormer is redesigned to avoid confusion between the historic fabric and new addition. Denial of the ATM machine and night deposit box. They should be moved, preferably to a lobby or, if not feasible, to the garden wall. Denial of the projecting signs, which are much too large. Approval of the window signs. 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.].

Jeff Hawver, Gerhard Mayer and John Mitkus attended the meeting. Mr. Hawver explained that United Savings Bank is considering the building for purchase. He noted that other options have been explored for development. He said that he met with the staff to discuss the ATM machine and signage prior to the meeting. Mr. Hawver emphasized the importance of the visibility of the bank and security issues. Mr. Mayer commented that the ATM machine is an important feature, and that an interior ATM would not be accessible. He believes that the proposed location for the ATM machine is least intrusive and the safest without disturbing the window. In addition, he said that the projecting signage was designed based on the scale of the building, but he could concede to the decrease in its size. Mr. Mitkus explained that the proposed stair tower would allow for another means of egress from the third floor. He also intimated that the denial of the ATM machine could be a deal breaker and that its size is comparable to the size of an air conditioning unit.

Mr. Rivera thought that the ATM location and night deposit box are appropriate, but that the signs should be smaller. Mr. McCoubrey thought that the ATM is modest in design; however, he expressed concern about setting a precedent. He also believed that the night deposit location and stair tower are appropriate, but expressed concern with its infringement on the rear bay. Additionally, he believed that the signs should be reduced in size and that the proposed dormer should not mimic the historic features. Ms. Pentz stressed the importance of not setting a precedent, owing to the many previous denials of exterior ATM machines. Mr. Baron said that this building has delicate details with residential character, which would be lost with the proposed alterations. Mr. Tyler commented that although the building is being adapted to commercial usage and the modest design of the ATM machine, his preference for its location would be the garden wall or in the vestibule. Mr. Hawver remarked that the handicapped lift would occupy the vestibule space. Mr. D'Alessandro said that the proposed ATM machine's impact on the building is minimal given the scale of the building.

Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance, speaking on their behalf, expressed opposition to exterior ATM machines.

The Committee had a length discussion, about the location of the ATM machine and noted its compatibility owing to the scale of the building.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the window signs and stair tower, provided the faux dormer is redesigned to avoid confusion between the historic fabric and new addition, but denial of the projecting signs, ATM machine and night deposit box.

1901 Spruce Street aka 262 South 19th Street

Wendy Born, Owner

Arlene Matzkin, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1950

PROPOSAL: Legalize painting, new awnings

This application proposes new awnings for the 19th and Spruce Street facades of this commercial building. It also proposes the legalization of the painting of the upper portion of the 19th Street façade and the approval of the painting of the remainder of the building. The 1st story was painted at the time of designation. An inspector from the Department of Licenses and Inspections issued an oral stop work order during the painting. Although the 2nd-story windows appear to have been changed since designation without the Commission's approval, this application does not propose the legalization of the new windows.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the awnings, which are not historically appropriate, 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.*]. Denial of the paint, which should be removed, 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.*].

Arlene Matzkin, the architect, attended the meeting on the behalf of the owner. Ms. Matzkin urged the Committee to consider legalization of the painting and the awnings since, the owner has already ordered the awnings. The Committee concurred with the staff recommendation.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal.

256-58 South 20th Street

Salvatore D'Angelo, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1840, storefront at 258 c. 1885

PROPOSAL: Legalize storefront alterations

This application seeks the legalization of storefront alterations executed at 258 S. 20th Street, which, together with 256 S. 20th, forms D'Angelo's Restaurant. A violation was issued on 25 February 2000 for the work performed without a permit. The Architectural Committee reviewed this application at its 24 June 2003 meeting. The Commission reviewed the application and Committee recommendation at its 11 July 2003 meeting. It decided to table the application for up to 90 days to allow the applicant and staff to meet and identify the unresolved issues. Since the Commission meeting, the staff has re-examined the storefront and conferred with the applicant. The applicant subsequently withdrew the segment of the application proposing new work.

The application now proposes (numbers correspond with notations on photograph):

1. legalizing the removal of the storefront awning
2. legalizing the storefront window alterations, but removing the wood panels below the front and recessed windows
3. legalizing the addition of a transom approximating the existing transoms
4. removing the plywood facing and molding applied to the recessed single-leaf Queen Anne door and reglazing and restoring the door
5. legalizing the double-leaf doors, which are new, not historic
6. legalizing the molding on the bulkhead below of the storefront window

Staff recommendation: Approval, provided the storefront is painted a subtle color such as cream, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 6.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal including its history before the Committee and Commission at previous meetings. He also explained that he had met with the applicant and revisited the site to re-examine the storefront. He noted that during the re-inspection he discovered that the double-leaf door was a replacement, not an altered original door as initially thought, and that the panels in the recess were not original, but had been significantly altered. He also noted that further research had failed to provide sufficient information on this or similar storefronts to allow for a faithful restoration. He stated that the applicant may have removed the original double-leaf doors, but photographs show that he did not remove any other historic fabric. Concluding, he

stated that the staff agreed that painting the storefront an inconspicuous color such as cream would allow the non-historic moldings and other additions to recede, becoming inconspicuous.

The Committee reviewed the proposal as well as photographs of the storefront. Members agreed that the historic single-leaf door, one of the few significant pieces of historic fabric remaining, should be restored. They also agreed that the unusual storefront could not be restored without the missing documentation. They therefore decided that the proposal was appropriate, provided the storefront was painted.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommends approval, provided the storefront is painted a subtle color such as cream, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; 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.].

1912 Delancey Street

Albert and Rosa Esquenazi, Owners

Richard Wesley, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c.1880

PROPOSAL: Side additions in concept

This application for review in concept proposes the construction of additions to the carriage house at 1912-1914 Delancey Street. Richard Wesley is the local associated architect. The architect is Isaac Broid of Adria, Broid & Rojkind, an internationally renowned firm in Mexico City. The additions would extend out from the east façade into the side yard. The east façade is a stuccoed former party wall; a carriage house once stood at 1908-1910 Delancey Street. An existing 8-foot brick wall topped by a 3-foot wrought iron fence runs along the Delancey Street frontage of the side yard obscuring the view of much of this facade. The additions to the carriage house would include a 2-story stair tower clad in slate nearest Delancey Street, a shallow 2-story glass and aluminum projection in the center of the façade, and a large 1-story glass and aluminum projection with rooftop terrace at the rear of the façade. Further information for the alterations at the 3rd-story level of the south or rear façade should be provided.

Staff Recommendation: Approval in concept, pursuant to Standard 9.

Rosa Esquinazi, the owner, and architects Richard Wesley and Lisa Newcomber attended the meeting. Mr. Farnham presented the project. Mr. Wesley explained that Mr. Broid of Mexico City developed the initial concept. As associated architect, Mr. Wesley and his firm will develop the design, especially the plan for the restoration of the front facade. He further explained that his firm will provide details for the garage door and other elements when they submit a subsequent application for final approval. Committee members agreed that it was an interesting and exciting project worthy of approval.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommends approval 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 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.].

508 South 3rd Street

Jason Beccaris, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830, new façade, c. 1950

PROPOSAL: Legalize roof deck

This application seeks the legalization of a roof deck reconstructed without a building permit. An informal roof deck consisting of planks laid directly on the roof and a metal railing existed at the time of designation. The applicant removed that decking and railing and replaced it with a new deck. This rowhouse does not have a rear ell, the most appropriate location for a roof deck. Also, a small penthouse with a door providing roof access was erected many years before designation.

At its 29 July 2003 meeting, the Committee reviewed an application to legalize this deck and recommended legalization, provided the railing is set back to a point where it is not visible from the public right-of-way, with staff to review details. At its 8 August 2003 meeting, the Commission reviewed the application and Committee recommendation and decided that the railing setback constituted more than a detail. It therefore denied the application without prejudice and suggested that the applicant submit a revised proposal specifying a particular setback determined by the applicant and staff.

The staff and applicant met at the site on 12 August 2003 and assessed the visibility of a mock-up of the front railing in various positions. Using the mock-up, the staff identified a position in which the railing, excepting a few inches of the top of the northernmost post, would not be visible from the public right-of-way. The application now proposes a deck with the front railing in this position; the railing is set back from its original position 9½ feet at the north and 6½ feet at the south.

Staff Recommendation: Approval with the railing as depicted in the new plan, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. The Committee members discussed the new railing design and noted that the applicant had agreed to a very substantial setback. They then concluded that the railing would be virtually invisible, if not entirely invisible, from the street.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommends approval of the revised design, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new 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 Roofs Guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as ... decks and terraces ... when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

223-25 South 6th Street

John Turchi, Owner

John Partridge, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1957 by architect G. Edwin Brumbaugh for Philadelphia Mayor Richardson Dilworth

PROPOSAL: Demolition rear wing and garden wall, construction of rear wing, garage, garden wall, trellis, addition of window and multi-light doors with balcony in new openings

This application proposes several alterations including a very large rear wing and a detached garage to the Colonial Revival house designed by architect G. Edwin Brumbaugh for Philadelphia Mayor Richardson Dilworth in 1957. Dilworth was an early advocate of the redevelopment of Society Hill and erected this house to encourage the effort. His house is considered a “significant” resource in the Society Hill Historic District. The property faces Washington Square from the east across S. 6th Street, backs up to Randolph Street, and is visible from St. James Street.

Significant alterations are planned for the main block of the original building. A window would be removed, the opening enlarged, and double-leaf multi-light doors with an ornate lintel and a metal balcony added at the 3rd-story level of the south façade. A window with an ornate lintel would be added at the 1st-story level of the same façade. The window is shown on the plans, but the drawing's notes do not indicate that it is new. Photographs reveal that it is not extant. The drawing should be updated to reflect this aspect of the proposed work. The doors, balcony, and window would be visible from S. 6th Street. Also, an elevation drawing of the east or rear façade of the main block of the original building should be provided for review. The plans do not provide complete information about changes to this historic facade.

The construction of the 2-story, rear wing would necessitate the demolition of the original rear wing. The staff questions whether the demolition of the two-story section of the original rear wing is necessary. It may be able to be incorporated into the new construction, thereby preserving a substantial portion of the historic fabric. Three additional aspects of the design for the proposed rear wing raise concerns. A stucco wall at the western end of the new rear wing would be visible from Washington Square above the original two-story stair tower at the north, disrupting the massing of the historic building. The new rear wing, which would be taller than the original rear wing, would cut awkwardly across the rear cornice of the original building, disrupting the cornice line of the historic building. The large, medieval revival-style chimney on the new rear wing, which would be visible from Washington Square, would be stylistically unrelated to the historic Colonial Revival building. Also of note is the fact that the new rear wing would be highly visible from Randolph Street.

The construction of the three-car, 2-story garage as well as a stucco and limestone garden wall with gate along Randolph Street would necessitate the demolition of the existing garden wall with gate. The garage and garden wall would be visible from Randolph and St. James Streets.

A 20'-3"-tall prefab metal trellis system would be erected along the party wall with the property to the south. The trellis would cover windows in the north façade of the Lippincott Building and would be visible from S. 6th Street. Details for the trellis should be provided to verify that its attachment would not damage the party wall. Information about the ownership of the wall should also be provided.

Staff Recommendation: No recommendation until further information is provided.

Patrick Hauck, preservation consultant, and Tuong Huynh, project architect, represented the application at the Architectural Committee meeting. Mr. Farnham presented the project. Richard Tyler explained that Mayor Dilworth had erected the house in 1957 to bolster the redevelopment of Society Hill, which had fallen to a dilapidated state. He contended that the Colonial Revival building is significant for its cardinal role in the preservation of one of the city's most historic neighborhoods.

Roger Moss, the director of the Athenaeum of Philadelphia, which stands to the north of the Dilworth House and shares a party wall with it, recited his concerns about the project. He noted

that when the buildings were demolished to clear the site for the Dilworth House, the south wall of the Athenaeum nearly collapsed. At that time, in 1957, the stabilization of the wall cost \$150,000, an enormous expense. The new additions to the Dilworth House would require foundations deeper than the Athenaeum's foundations. He asserted that great care must be taken to ensure the protection of the Athenaeum building during any construction on the Dilworth site. He also asserted that the Athenaeum and its collections should be protected from vibrations caused by the construction. Mr. Moss also expressed concern about the proposed height of the new addition, which would stand much taller than the current rear wing. As proposed, the new addition would block a window and a light well at the Athenaeum. The light well illuminates the grand stairway in the Athenaeum.

Becky Stoloff and Bernice Hamill of the Society Hill Civic Association expressed their opposition to the present design and support of Mr. Moss's concerns. They also stated that some residents of St. James Court to the west of the Dilworth House, especially those who look out onto the Dilworth House across Randolph Street, would have concerns about the project. They noted that the near neighbors were not notified of the Commission's consideration of the proposal, including the demolition.

The applicants explained that, despite the degree of detail, their design should be considered preliminary. The staff explained the review in concept process, which might have been more appropriate, but noted that this application was submitted for final approval. The applicants stated that they would record the suggestions of the Committee and consult with their client.

Committee members stated emphatically that the demolition of the rear wing constituted a significant loss of historic fabric. They contended that a study should be undertaken to determine if the existing two-story section of the wing could be retained and adapted. They decided that the proposed demolition of the 1-story section of the rear wing might be acceptable, owing to its relative insignificance. Suzanne Pentz reminded everyone that the Commission has criteria that must be met to approve significant demolition as well as procedures for applying for such demolition. She asserted that the criteria do not appear to be satisfied and the procedures have not been followed. Committee members also voiced concerns about the scale and design of the rear garage, especially its large sloping roof with dormers. They thought it should have a more residential scale and more urban, less suburban, look. After assurances that the wall at the south property line was a true, jointly-owned party wall, the Committee did not object to the proposed trellis. They also agreed that a large addition to the Dilworth House would be appropriate if it did not require substantial demolition, was not visible from Washington Square, and did not block the light and air of the Athenaeum. They noted that the style of the proposed chimney was inappropriate for the Colonial Revival building. They then assessed the window and French doors with balconette proposed for the south façade of the main block of the house; they agreed that the addition of a window was acceptable but that the doors with balconette, which would replace an existing window, did not meet the Secretary's *Standards*.

At the end of the meeting, the applicants presented an elevation drawing depicting the proposal for the east-facing façade of the main block of the historic building. No information about this façade had been included in the initial submission.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommends denial of the proposal. However, the Committee members urged the applicants to incorporate their suggestions into a revised design and return for another review.

436 Walnut Street

One Beacon Insurance, Owner

Mark Coffey, Applicant

DATE: c. 1915

PROPOSAL: Remove window for louver and exhaust fan

This application proposes the installation of two exhaust fan louvers in non-historic window openings at the 1st-story level of the east façade. The louvers would be minimally visible from Walnut Street down a gated alley.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, provided the louvers are set back to the plane of the glass in the other windows and are painted to match the window frames, 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.*].

The Committee members concurred with the proposed alterations.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

700-18 Walnut Street, York Row

P & A Associates, Peter Shaw, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1807

PROPOSAL: Reconstruct cornice in alternate material

This application involves reconstructing damaged marble cornices in fiberglass. This comes to the Commission as a piece of a previously approved larger project which demolished a substantial portion of York Row to build an attached residential tower. The applicant said he would restore the facades of York Row since he would be demolishing a substantial portion of the buildings. In spite of numerous requests on the part of the neighborhood and the Commission to secure the remaining facades better, the carved marble cornices collapsed in the early part of 2003 and largely destroyed the ornate marble stoops and wrought iron railings. Numerous windows have also been destroyed. The staff believes this constitutes demolition by neglect.

The applicant has pointed out that on the approved drawings, they have called for the demolition and replication of the gutters and eaves. They interpret this to mean that the cornices could be demolished and re-made in fiberglass. The staff contends that the word replicate includes material as well design. The cornices, stoops, and railings should all be salvaged where possible and reproduced in original materials where replacement is necessary.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standards 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. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated with documentary evidence.*]

Mr. Baron presented the application and noted that the falling cornices resulted in the destruction of the marble stoops and railings. He informed the Committee that a letter was sent to the developer, that the damaged pieces should be salvaged where possible and otherwise replicated in marble and iron.

Mark Brodsky, the architect, said that their request to replace with fiberglass only pertains to the replacement of the cornice. He cited other properties, such as the Smythe Stores, where significant pieces of the façade were reconstructed in fiberglass. He believes that the ultimate goal is to rectify the situation and not affix blame. Mr. Atkin acknowledged that the renovations to the Smythe Stores involved the replication of pieces, but only the missing portions. He pointed out the distinct difference between marble and fiberglass, and noted that the damage was sustained under the watch of the developer which he said amounts to demolition by neglect. Mr. Brodsky believes that the stoops and railings will be replaced in kind; however, the application at hand is solely for the cornice replication. He noted that fiberglass was chosen for replication, owing to cost factors.

Mr. D'Alessandro expressed his opposition to the replication in fiberglass. He also stressed the need for better protection of the facades during further construction work.

Rebecca Stoloff, Society Hill Civic Association, expressed support of the staff's recommendation. She also reiterated that the project received a compromise on the height issue subject to the preservation of the historic structures. Ms. Stoloff said that the developer was called continuously about the inadequate protection for the historic structures.

Committee members concurred that the developer has received many concessions with regards to this project.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal pursuant to Standards 2 and 6.

224 St. Mark's Square

Kara and Paul Schmidt, Owners/Applicants

DATE: 1877-80. Architects GW & HD Hewitt

PROPOSAL: Legalize rear deck, cut window into door

Mr. Baron presented this application, which calls for legalizing a rear deck and circular metal stair leading to the yard as well as applying to cut a window down into a single-leaf door.

Staff recommendation: Approval pursuant to Standard 9 [*New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize 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.*] with the stair painted black.

Paul Schmidt, the owner, attended the meeting to explain the proposal. Committee members agreed that the existing wall on the side would minimize visibility. They also thought that the stair should be painted a dark green or black to lessen its intrusiveness.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval subject to painting the stair a dark green or black color, with staff to review details.

1027 Arch Street, Pitcairn Building

1027 Arch Street Development, Owner

Liz Pisano, Applicant

DATE: 1901, architect, Hewitt Brothers

PROPOSAL: Legalize signage, add two projecting signs

Mr. Baron presented this application, which calls for legalizing two illuminated window signs, and approving illuminated signage for cash machines as well as two illuminated, plastic face projecting signs.

Staff recommendation: Approval pursuant to Standard 9 [*property and its environment 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.*]

Robert Acosta, attended the meeting on behalf of the owner. He noted that the signage is attached in the mortar joints. Mr. Atkin questioned the Commission's jurisdiction over interior signage and it was explained that some interior work is covered because it affects the exterior appearance. Committee members thought it important that the applicant submit details of the sign attachments.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the legalization of the window signage and the addition of the new signs with staff to review details including the attachment methods.

941 Race Street

Ruo Wu Zhang, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1900, architect, E. Gilbert

PROPOSAL: Legalize projecting sign and illuminated awning

This proposal, which calls for the legalization of the refacing of an existing internally illuminated projecting sign and the installation of an awning. The awning appears to be covered with plastic, features internal illumination, an egg crate bottom and a shape the stretches across several openings and obscures the arched openings.

The staff, while noting the variety of signage in Chinatown, thought that the awning should be remade in canvas in a shape to match the arched openings.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the refacing of the blade sign, Denial of the awning 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. Baron presented the proposal and pointed out that the correct awning would be a non-illuminated canvas type, which would not obscure the arched windows. He also noted that other property owners of individually designated properties on this block have come to the Commission for approval and have used canvas. He said that he apprised the applicant prior to this work that exterior alterations and awnings require approval from the Historical as well as the Art Commission.

Jong Kai Chin, the owner, Ruo Wu Zhang, Stacy Gao, and Albert Weiss, Esq., attended the meeting. Mr. Weiss stressed that the installed sign is common to the Chinatown streetscape and that the recommended awning will not blend with its surroundings.

The Committee agreed that given the context of Chinatown, the installed awnings are compatible

with the streetscape. However, it believed that the awnings should be respectful of the arched windows. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested an awning, which is a foot shorter to exposes the arches. Some members thought the illumination and egg crate bottom inappropriate.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the refaced sign and a revised awning design, which eliminates the illumination and the egg crate bottom to expose the arches.

1253 South 19th Street

19th Street Baptist Church, Owner

Marianna Thomas, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1874-75, architects, Furness and Hewitt

PROPOSAL: Alter roof

This application, calls for re-roofing the church structures with asphalt shingles in a pattern to match that shown in an historic photograph. The pole gutters will be replaced with a hanging gutter. The architect proposes to change the roof structure and provide a greater slope in one section of the roof.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the re-roofing except denial of the change in roof shape 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 with documentation and physical evidence.*]

Mr. Baron explained the proposal. He thought that special consideration should be given to the brick replacement at the top of the walls, which is needed as a result of the deteriorated roof, for uniformity.

Marianna Thomas, the architect, attended the meeting and said that proposed replacement asphalt shingles will be gray with red stripes.

Ms. Pentz commented that she believes that the changing of the slope of the roof is necessary, but encouraged the applicant not to remove the entire roof until there is a structural determination.

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

225 Race Street

John Beirs, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1855, cast iron facade

PROPOSAL: Legalize new doors to basement with railings

This proposal seeks to legalize the removal of a pair of metal doors at the basement level and the installation of wood multi-light doors to allow more light and a railing for safety. The doors do not match the light pattern described in the insurance survey of 1865, being 30 light rather than 12.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the doors, The staff was split on the issue of the removal of the basement hatch and installation of railings 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. Baron presented the proposal and noted that owner said that he was unable to afford the correct milled doors, therefore, he installed doors from Home Depot. He explained that the owner could not take time, since he has a one-person business, to represent the application. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that even with glazed doors, the correct configuration would include an horizontal hatch as well. Committee members concluded that the alterations diminish the original character of the building.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the application pursuant to Standard 9.

1923 Brandywine Street

Geoffrey Posner, Owner

Kevin Rasmussen, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855, alterations 1987

PROPOSAL: Replace roof deck

This application calls for alterations to a roof top addition approved by the Commission in 1987. The plans call for new windows and for a railing of the roof deck moved forward and placed higher on top of the cornice. This will result in considerably greater visibility than before. In the old scheme the cornice and parapet hid most of the rail. There are rear alterations as well.

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

Mr. Baron explained the proposal and noted that the parapet wall and cornice hid the railing of the existing deck. He pointed out that the proposed alterations would give visibility to the deck rail. He noted that the proposal includes a much larger deck on the rear of the house as well.

Kevin Rasmussen, the architect, and Geoffrey Posner, the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Posner said that the railing is needed for safety, and setting it back will not allow for an expansion of the area of the deck.

Ms. Pentz emphasized the visibility of the deck is an important issue, but pointed out that the deck existed previously, and that the applicant wants to make it safer. Mr. D'Alessandro thought it important that the sight-line study falls below the cornice line. Pictures of a mock up study were shown.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with a simple metal picket railing.

2028 Latimer Street

Allaire Wohlgemuth, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c.1850

PROPOSAL: Window replacement

This application calls for the replacement of windows with non-historic, aluminum-clad, double-

hung, 1/1 windows. The applicant has priced historically appropriate windows and claims that she cannot afford them. She therefore claims economic hardship. The applicant also states that security issues complicate her application. She says that her house has been broken into twice broke by reaching through a 1st-story window to unlock her front door. She contends that the existing windows do not lock properly. She is citing safety as her reason for seeking a change in windows. Because of concerns for Ms. Wohlgemuth's safety, Mr. Tyler agreed to add her application to the agenda after the deadline.

Mr. Tyler presented the application. He stated that the historically appropriate windows for a building of this date (c. 1850) and location on a back street are wood, double-hung, 6/6 windows with true-divided lights. He explained that the applicant decided to replace all 10 windows on the front and rear of her building following a break-in. The break-in had occurred at the 1st-story window on the front façade of the building.

Ms. Wohlgemuth appeared at the Committee with papers documenting the cost of several types of windows and her own living costs and income. She discussed the current conditions and window options with the Committee. She stated that her preference was the Pella aluminum-clad 1/1 window, which would cost \$7,188 to replace all 10 windows; wood Pella windows, she claimed, would cost \$15,000 including \$2,000 for painting. Mr. Baron commented that Pella windows come with a sub-frame, which narrows the opening, and that indeed the picture that Ms. Wohlgemuth provided shows a sub-frame. She insisted that the Pella distributor said that she could leave her existing frames and install new sash with a jamb liner, not a sub-frame.

Mr. Baron suggested that a possible solution might be to replace the 1st-story front window, the window through which the break-in occurred, with a historically appropriate window. The applicant responded that she thought that replacing the one window, and thereby having mismatched windows, would decrease the value of the house.

Mr. Atkin informed the applicant that the Architectural Committee does not evaluate financial hardship applications. The applicant therefore asked to be referred to the Committee on Financial Hardship.

Mr. Tyler noted that the staff could approve a 6/6 wood window for the 1st-story front at the staff level immediately. The applicant again noted that the windows would be mismatched. Mr. Tyler suggested that she replace the other windows with historically appropriate windows in the future when she can afford them. The applicant stated that she was not willing to consider that option.

Mr. D'Alessandro explained that the Committee had to look at the application on its architectural merits. The applicant countered that she is confronted with a safety issue. Mr. D'Alessandro replied that the safety issue could be solved with the replacement of one window.

Mr. Baron suggested that, for safety, the applicant install locks on her existing windows as soon as possible.

After the applicant stated that she was confused and frustrated by the workings of the Commission and its Committees, Mr. Tyler explained the Commission's procedures to the applicant.

The applicant again insisted that her application must meet the requirements for financial hardship. Ms. Pentz reminded her that the Committee has offered her an inexpensive solution, the replacement of the one problematic window with a historically appropriate window.

The applicant explained that she has an \$8,000 inheritance and would spend it on windows. She

again stated that she meets the requirements for financial hardship and therefore should be able to spend her money as she deems appropriate. Mr. Baron noted that a finding of financial hardship does not give her license to make any alterations to her building. The hardship sections of the ordinance and *Rules and Regulations*, he explained, provide a means to compromise. The applicant asked for names of other window providers. Mr. Baron answered that he could provide those.

Mr. D'Alessandro again suggested that the applicant replace the one troubling window. Ms. Pentz added that having one correct window is better than having none.

The Architectural Committee recommends that the Commission refer the application to the Committee on Financial Hardship.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary