

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair  
Commission Offices, Room 578, City Hall  
24 February 2004**

Present

---

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

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

Also

Robert Powers, Powers and Company, Incorporated  
Jack Thrower, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects  
Joanne Phillips, Ballard Spahr Andrews and Ingersoll  
Matthew McClure, Ballard Spahr Andrews and Ingersoll  
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance  
David McNulty, St Mark's Church, 1625 Locust Street  
Robert Hotes, DPK&A Architects  
Carolyn Gould, St Mark's Church  
William Jordan, St Mark's Church  
Lenore Millhollen, Preservation Alliance/Center City Residents' Association  
Gersil N. Kay, Building Conservation International  
Jason Schlesinger, Ceebraid-Singer Corporation  
John Kerns, Berger and Montague, P.C.  
Cletus P. Lyman, Lyman and Ash  
Andrew Shenton  
Maksym Szpilczak, 259 North 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Libby Espy, 2835 South Sydenham Street  
Monica Violante, 116 Arch Street  
Fr. Sean Mullen, St Mark's Church  
Joseph Caruso, Esq.  
Phyllis Ford  
Gerry Gutierrez, Group G  
Barbara Botting  
Tony Forte, Esq., Saul Ewing, LLP  
Charles Rue, Matrix  
Jim Datz, Group G  
Tom Barton, Barton and Associates  
Beth Richards, Old City Civic Association  
Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association  
Mike DelRossi Jr., Grayboyes Windows  
Chris Tranchetti, K. Hovnanian  
Andrew Poole, Pro Signs  
Jerry Roller, J.K. Roller Architects  
Gary Gevurtz, Somnia  
Nelson Batycki, Inter Nos BC, LLC

David Matus, Matus Windows  
 Jon Wagner, AIA  
 Allen Rubin, Spring Garden Civic Association  
 Brian A. McLelland  
 Katherine Bottom, Berzinsky Architects  
 Greg Berzinsky, Berzinsky Architects  
 Sam Harris, S. Harris and Company  
 Rachel Royer, S. Harris and Company  
 Jen Bretschneider, 2025 Green Street  
 Charles R. Mottershead, Capital Programs Office  
 Nurit Nachum, AIA  
 Gail Hauptfuhrer, Gaskill Street Neighbors  
 Bob Pierson, Gaskill Street Neighbors

Vincent Rivera, Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

### **140 South Broad Street**

Union League of America, Owner  
 Jeffrey McFadden, General Manager, Applicant  
 DATE: John Fraser, 1864-5, Horace Trumbauer 1910-11  
 PROPOSAL: Reconstruct cupola, add canopy on Sansom Street, rebuild front steps on Broad and 15<sup>th</sup> Streets, add security lighting, replace windows

The proposal involves reconstructing the cupola using historic photographs, rebuilding the front steps using a mixture of cast stone and brownstone. The stairs would incorporate lights in the risers. New security lights are proposed for the sides of the building. They also propose to retrofit windows on the Trumbauer addition with a second layer of glass and new aluminum storm windows.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the cupola and the rebuilding of the stair balusters in brownstone and the treads in cast stone as well as the addition of security lights and the metal marquee at the side entrance and a mixed recommendation on the stair lights, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

Mr. Baron explained the project and commented that retrofitting the wood windows had been substituted in place of the installation of aluminum windows. He thought the new storms would reveal more of the brick mold than the old.

Robert Hotes, the architect, noted the need for additional signage to highlight the ADA entrance. He presented a sample of the proposed lighting and said that the one piece cast stone steps would allow for the installation of the lights.

Committee members inquired about the stairs and thought the proposed cast stone appropriate; however, they judged the lights in the risers inappropriate. Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the stair lighting and handrails. Committee members thought that the many lights would be obtrusive. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested an alternative fiber optic light in the handrail. Mr. McCoubrey suggested a rail lighting system in the nosing of the stair. Committee members next discussed the center rail, which would have a modern appearance with two-inch tubes, and be continuous. Mr. Hotes explained that it would be a double bar design to satisfy stair code requirements. Mr. Rivera thought that it should be minimized as much as possible. Mr. Hotes also said that intermediate partial rails would be added to the 15<sup>th</sup> Street façade. Committee

members thought that the architect should restudy the side rails. Mr. Baron questioned the loss of the existing decorative rail ends and brackets. Mr. Hotes said he would further investigate these designs.

*The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the cupola; signage; metal awning; security lights; windows on the upper floors; stairs with cast stone risers and treads; but denial of the design for the stair lighting and railing. It offered the applicant suggestions and recommended that the lighting and railing design be resubmitted to the Committee pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.*

**1612-1618 Locust Street aka 1613-1619 Latimer Street**

TC and KY Associates, Incorporated, Owners

Jason Schlesinger, Applicant

HISTORY: 1612-1616, Locust Club

built 1960; architects Lary, Suponsitz and Demchick

Non-contributing

1618, Henry Dallett House; later the Charles Custis Harrison House

built c.1855, architect John Notman

altered 1888, architect Wilson Eyre Jr.

Significant

PROPOSAL: In concept – demolish 1612-1616 Locust (non-contributing), demolish all but the façade and a shallow return of 1618 Locust (significant), construct 8-story residential building with parking

This proposal in concept calls for the total demolition of the Locust Club and the demolition of all but the façade and a shallow return of the Dallett-Harrison House. In the place of these buildings, the applicant proposes an 8-story residential structure with a large rear garden. The rear and sides of the Dallett-Harrison House are highly visible from Latimer Street. Several buildings front onto this block of Latimer Street; it is not a service alley.

The house at 1618 Locust Street is Significant. It was designed by John Notman and modified by Wilson Eyre Jr., both nationally prominent nineteenth-century architects. It was the residence of Henry Dallett, the industrialist and, later, Charles Custis Harrison, both prominent Philadelphians. Harrison, who made a fortune in the sugar business, was extremely influential. For example, he hosted President McKinley at 1618 Locust in 1898. From 1876 to 1929, Harrison was a leader at the University of Pennsylvania. During his extraordinary tenure as Provost from 1894 to 1910, he directed the unprecedented expansion of the university's campus in West Philadelphia. Demolishing all but eight feet of the Dallett-Harrison House would seriously compromise the integrity and presence of this significant building.

The design of the new building is symmetrical despite the inclusion of the historic façade at the west. The design ignores the historic fragment and renders it a mere appendage. The new structure is inappropriately large for this section of the historic district and especially this block, one of the most distinguished in the entire city. The highly significant St Mark's Church by John Notman, the architect of the rowhouse at 1618, stands across the street. The block is lined with grand residences designed by important architects including Horace Trumbauer and Frank Miles Day. The proposal devotes an inordinately large part of the property to a rear garden; the design could be reworked to sacrifice some of the garden to preserve the building at 1618.

The applicant offers no claim of financial hardship or public interest to justify the demolition as required by Sections 7.6 and 7.9 of §14-2007 of the Philadelphia code, the Commission's ordinance.

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

Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Lawyers Joanne Phillips and Matthew McClure, architect Jack Thrower, and consultant Robert Powers represented the project. Ms. Phillips asserted that the project is being reviewed in concept only and that she intends to submit an application claiming financial hardship.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance strongly objected to a review of the architectural aspects of the proposal by the Architectural Committee prior to a finding of financial hardship. He asserted the staff should have rejected the application as incomplete because no justification of the demolition was provided.

Ms. Phillips refuted Mr. Gallery's statement, asserting that it is important to solicit input from the Committee and public at public hearings. She noted that she met with the Center City Residents' Association and neighbors from Latimer Street.

Committee members and the staff considered Mr. Gallery's assertion, but determined that the Rules & Regulations do not explicitly require a statement of hardship or public interest to complete an application for a review in concept. Mr. Rivera polled the Committee members about proceeding with the review. They agreed to hear the architect's presentation and public comment. Some Committee members stated that they would vote to recommend denial because they could not consider the demolition of the significant building without any justification.

Mr. Thrower presented an illustrated overview of the proposed development. He stressed his client's aspiration to create a floor plate that would accommodate two 3000-square-foot units per floor. He asserted that such a floor plate required the demolition of 1618 Locust. He stated that the below-grade parking will be accessed from Latimer Street and that trash will be stored internally. He also noted the design complies with the existing zoning regulations for the site.

Gersil Kay declared that the architect should redesign the building to preserve the brownstone building at 1618 Locust and to protect the important character of the block.

Mr. Gallery reiterated his opposition to the project. He again noted the application team's failure to address the hardship issue. He also stressed the importance of the building at 1618 and the uniqueness, scale and significance of the block and its streetscape.

Fr. Sean Mullen of St. Marks Church and Joseph Caruso, Esq. communicated their opposition to the proposal. Rev. Mullen said that St. Marks offers a sacred green space, which is welcoming to the public. An overly large building directly across the street would overshadow and detract from this important public space. He believes that the proposed development is overpowering and will throw long shadows on the historic church, negatively impacting its stained glass windows.

Ms. Pentz contended that the application team must provide a powerful justification for the demolition of the Dallett-Harrison House. She asserted that the application team presented no justification and urged her fellow Committee members to recommend denial of the proposal. Mr. Rivera agreed with Ms. Pentz that no compelling reason for the demolition had been presented. He added that the design should be more sensitive to the architecture of the significant streetscape, especially its scale. Mr. McCoubrey and Mr. D'Alessandro echoed the opinion of their fellow Committee members.

*The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial.*

**528 North 21<sup>st</sup> Street, SW corner of Brandywine Street**

Andrew Shenton, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Cut new windows, remove pent eave, replace deck railing, stucco and add molding to garage, paint building

This proposal calls for a series of modifications to both facades of this corner building. The plans call for removal of the pent eave and adding a cornice in its place. The siding above the garage would also be removed and the wall stuccoed and painted a uniform cream color. A new railing would be installed at the deck to meet code. Mr. Shenton wishes to remove the planter from the base of the front window and open it to its full height with a new two-over-two window. He also wishes to cut two new windows on the side façade and remove the sidewalk planters.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9. The storefront cornice should be modified to reflect better the building cornice and the new windows should be two-over-two double-hung windows.

Andrew Shenton, the owner, attended the meeting. He explained that he would like a gray pent roof to match the slate of the mansard roof. He proposed two tones of blue for the decorative details. Mr. Shenton noted his preference for six-over-six windows.

Ms. Pentz asserted that six-over-six windows are inappropriate for this style of building. Two-over-two windows would be appropriate. Mr. Shenton was receptive to the window change.

*The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with two-over-two windows, with staff to review details including the cornice pursuant to Standard 9.*

**259 North 3<sup>rd</sup> Street**

259 Third Street Development LLC, Owner

Maksym Szpilczak, Applicant

DATE: New front and rear façade c.1910, storefront c.1950, two stories added, 2003

PROPOSAL: Demolish and rebuild front and rear facades

This application proposes demolishing and rebuilding the front and rear facades at 259 S. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. The existing facades were added in the early twentieth century. Prior to the Commission's jurisdiction over the building, the applicant received permits to rebuild the interior and add two stories to the building.

The proposal to construct new facades went before the Committee in January 2004 and was tabled for additional information. The applicant returns this month with a more contemporary design that no longer includes the paired storefront doors and two-over-two windows. The storefront will be clad in sheet metal; metal windows and doors have been substituted for the previously proposed wood ones.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 The historic building has much of its integrity. The front façade has little historic significance and its integrity has been undermined by the new storefront. Retaining the 2<sup>nd</sup>-story front façade fragment and adding a new façade above it would create a confusing and awkward mixture.

Mr. Baron presented the application, which shows two drawings of the front façade. The first shows building above the existing façade fragment and the second constructing a new façade

which responds to the streetscape. The applicant proposes the new façade design. Mr. Baron noted that little of historic value remains on the front façade because the original two-story façade was replaced in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, then a new storefront was added to that in the 1960s. Finally last year before the Commission gained jurisdiction, the second story fragment had its cornice removed and two stories of framing without a façade were added above. The fragment at the rear has similarly been altered and added to above.

Mr. D'Alessandro questioned whether the 2<sup>nd</sup>-story front brick façade should be retained.

Maksym Szpilczak, pointed out that he has concerns about the existing structure even holding a the taller facade owing to structural issues.

Mr. Rivera stressed the importance of retaining the character of the street and asserted that the second option would better preserve that character. He asserted that retaining the 2<sup>nd</sup>-story front façade would interfere with the addition of the new façade at the upper stories. Mr. McCoubrey thought that if the old façade is retained then the new front façade at the upper stories should be differentiated from the old. He added that the twentieth-century masonry at the 2<sup>nd</sup>-story front façade is not worth saving. Ms. Pentz commented that building having lost so much of its character and having been changed into a four-story building would be more appropriate with new facades.

*The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal showing the entirely new four-story facades, with the staff to review details.*

### **318 Lawrence Street, SW corner of Wood Street**

Jim Datz and Barbara Botting, Owners

Gerry Gutierrez, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1920

PROPOSAL: Demolish 1-story building (contributing), construct 3-story building

This proposal calls for complete demolition of the building down to its foundation and construction of a three-story house on the site. The application provides no justification for the demolition

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. The applicant has made no showing of financial hardship or the public interest for the demolition in this application.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal and noted that the applications have not submitted any justification for the demolition. . Mr. Baron explained that he had met with the architect to discuss a design to add on top of the existing building, but that the applicant had elected not to follow that option.

Gerry Gutierrez, the architect, and Jim Datz and Barbara Botting, the owners, attended the meeting. Mr. Gutierrez said that the building has been vacant for many years. He contended that the proposed design is sensitive to the character of Old City and that a requirement that the historic building be retained would impose a substantial hardship. Mr. Gutierrez referenced two buildings recently demolished in Old City. Both Mr. Datz and Ms. Botting stated their desire to live in this neighborhood and said that proposed design is in keeping with the spirit of the block. They also reported that it is more economically feasible to demolish the existing building and construct a new building on the old foundations than to rehabilitate the historic building. Mr. Gutierrez offered an estimate of \$96,000.00 for the restoration of the existing building.

Richard Thom of the Old City Civic Association, speaking on its behalf, declared that the historic building should be restored.

Mr. Gutierrez informed the Committee that the building is in very poor condition. The rear wall is cracked, the steel lintels have rusted, and a section of the roof has caved in, allowing water infiltration. Also, the wall is leaning and one-third of the floor has collapsed. Committee members countered that an engineer's report documenting the structural problems should have been submitted with the application.

*The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial. It suggested that if a hardship application is submitted, it be referred to the Committee on Financial Hardship.*

### **110-112 North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street**

Philadelphia I, LLC, Owner

K. Hovnanian, Applicant

DATE: 1921-22, Jacob Ethan Fieldstein, architect, for Samuel Berkowitz

PROPOSAL: Replace windows

Two of the three upper floors still have the steel industrial windows. The application calls for replacing these with new aluminum, double-glazed windows that replicate the muntin pattern. However, at the intermediates, where there will be operable sash, the measurements differ by 1-1/8", with the new windows having much thicker members. Also, the proposed windows have sills 1 1/4" larger than the originals. Horizontally, the proposed windows also have heavier lines: the proposed fixed mullion is 3/8" larger, the proposed vent mullion is 1" and the jamb is 1-1/16" larger. The windows can be replicated exactly if done in steel, but they would be single-glazed.

The building has a five-story rear ell with a two-story side addition. The application calls for extending two of the windows on the third floor into single-leaf doors to lead out to a deck on the roof of the two-story extension. The deck itself is not visible.

The other proposed changes to the building have been approved at staff level.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the windows, pursuant to Standard 6. Approval of changing the two rear windows to doors and approval of the roof deck, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Tom Barton, the architect for the project; Tony Forte, Esq., and Mike DelRossi of Graboyes Windows attended the meeting. Mr. Barton explained that the front façade has industrial steel windows and the application proposes aluminum with slightly different dimensions. He expressed the need for energy-efficient windows that also operate.

Committee members asked the architect if he had explored other window companies. He had, but only the one proposed is thermally broken. Mr. DelRossi presented a sample of the proposed window. Richard Thom of the Old City Civic Association, speaking as an architect, noted that the proposed company was probably best on the market to closely match the original windows in dimensions. Mr. McCoubrey thought the proposed window matches well, since the intermediates are only 1-1/8 inch larger. Mr. Rivera concurred and said that in such large windows the changes are minimal.

*The Architectural Committee recommended approval.*

### **128-134 North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street**

Philadelphia I, LLC, Owner

K. Hovnanian, Applicant

DATE: c. 1965

PROPOSAL: Demolish 3-story building (non-contributing) and parking kiosk (non-contributing), construct 6-story residential building

This is a non-contributing building in the newly created Old City Historic District. The proposal calls for the complete demolition of the building and the construction of a six-story, multi-unit condominium building. The building has brick facing with cast-stone detailing and metal windows. At the north end there is an archway for a pedestrian entrance leading into the courtyard towards Bread Street. The north and west façades have similar, but simplified details. The Commission previously approved the proposal in concept.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, with staff to review a brick sample.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Mr. Barton explained that he wanted to create a contemporary building that would blend with the diverse streetscape of 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. Mr. McCoubrey thought that the windows were of a more domestic scale, but overall it was a good design. Committee members agreed that the design blended well with the surrounding buildings.

*The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the demolition of the existing building and the new construction, with the staff to review details including a brick sample and the cast stone color.*

#### **114-124 North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, 113-133 Bread Street**

Philadelphia I, LLC, Owner

K. Hovnanian, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Construct five residential buildings on vacant lots (45-day-review-and comment)

The application proposes the construction of five residential buildings on vacant lots; therefore, the Commission's purview is limited to a 45-day period of review and comment. The new construction consists of a mix of townhouses and a tower oriented to Bread Street and an infill building at 114-22 North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street.

The townhouse segment will consist of three buildings at the northwest corner of the development and have brick facing, cast-stone trim, and asphalt-shingled gable roofs. Small metal balconies and projecting bays break the overall massing of the structures and arched entryways allow pedestrians into the inner courtyard. Although slightly different than the design approved in concept by the Commission previously, the townhouses keep the overall massing and style that the developer originally proposed.

The ten-story tower is asymmetrical and oriented to Bread Street. It is faced with brick and cast-stone. The building has a metal canopy above the entrance and a metal bay at the upper floors. The Commission approved in concept a 13-story tower with a symmetrical design.

Like the others, the mid-rise building on 2<sup>nd</sup> Street has brick facing with cast-stone details. The vehicular entrance to the underground parking is located in this building; the entrance mirrors the pedestrian entrance at 128 North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. The building has 6-over-6 windows in the upper floors and a symmetrical façade with a shaped parapet.

Staff recommendation: The design of the townhouses should be more contemporary. Any multi-light windows should have significant muntins, not tape-like applied ones. For the tower, a



cornice line should reflect the height of the neighboring buildings. The design is too massive in its width and needs something to break it vertically. Approval of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Street building, with staff to review a brick color.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Tom Barton, the architect, elaborated on her introduction. He noted that a new pedestrian walkway would reconnect Elfreth's Alley to Cherry Street. He countered the staff's assessment of the townhouses, asserting that they are neither contemporary nor historic.

Mr. Rivera agreed with the staff's assessment of the townhouses, stating that they are not appropriate in scale or style. Ms. Pentz and Mr. D'Alessandro disagreed with Mr. Rivera and contended that the townhouse designs were acceptable.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance addressed the Committee and concurred with Mr. Rivera. He stated that the townhouses have no relationship to the taller building; the group along Bread Street should be a single, coherent composition. The townhouses should also be revised to be more contemporary.

Answering Mr. Gallery, Mr. Barton explained that he had intentionally differentiated the townhouses from the tower to celebrate the eclecticism of Old City. He agreed that he could amend the design of the townhouses to be more contemporary. Mr. Rivera reiterated that the design of the townhouses should be simplified.

Committee members agreed that the tower and 2<sup>nd</sup> Street buildings are appropriately designed.

*The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the Bread Street tower and 2<sup>nd</sup> Street building, but split on the townhouses. Two recommend approval; two suggest that they be revised to be more contemporary.*

#### **4050 Main Street**

Gary Gevurtz, Owner

Dottie Tuccio, Applicant

DATE: c. 1850 for Roxborough Mills

PROPOSAL: Revise signage design

The Commission previously approved signage on a projecting sign band for this furniture store. Drawings approved by the Commission showed individual box signs for each letter; the detail of the sign as submitted showed halo-lit letters. The permit documents, however, provide for individual box signs for each letter and, for the sign over the northern door, a single box sign with plastic facing hanging below. The Manayunk sign ordinance specifically prohibits box signs. For the sign over the southern door for the store on the second floor, the owner wishes to install individual box signs for the main portion of the sign with four, round box signs faced in vinyl hanging below. Owing to the fact that the sign band hangs rather low, these signs will hang over the transoms of the arched doors.

Also, the Commission approved the design of the sign band, which specifically stipulated arches over the windows to expose the soldier-course lintels and arched windows. When the sign contractor came to the Commission office for approval of the signs, his photographs showed that the installed sign band does not have arches and the band actually hides the arches of almost every window on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor of the building. Therefore, this application also proposes legalizing the sign band as installed.

Staff Recommendation: Denial of the sign band as installed, pursuant to Standard 9. Denial of the revised signs: the added box signs should be eliminated, pursuant to the Manayunk Signage Ordinance §14-2009 (6)(h)(i) and Standard 9.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Gary Gevurtz, the store owner, Andrew Poole of Pro Signs, and Jerry Roller, the architect, represented the project. Mr. Roller explained that the sign company was unable to fabricate the approved sign band with arches and therefore simplified the design. Mr. Gevurtz added that the sign band stands two feet off the building, allowing pedestrians to view the window and door details from below; the view of the details is only obscured from a distance. Mr. Poole explained that the individual letters of proposed signs are too small to fabricate with neon or LEDS; internally illuminated box signs are the only alternative with the current design. Ms. Spina reminded the Committee that internally illuminated signs are explicitly prohibited by the Manayunk sign ordinance.

At the urging of the Committee, the applicants explored solutions to the signage problem that would not violate the ordinance and would not obscure the building's architectural details. After it was suggested that "SOMNIA" and "DWELLING" be raised above the sign band, Committee members asserted that all signage be limited to the band itself. Mr. Roller then suggested placing all of the signage, "SOMNIA," "DWELLING," "FURNITURE," and the medallions, on the band itself. Mr. Roller noted that the Commission previously approved individually illuminated box signs for the letters of "SOMNIA" and "DWELLING." Committee members affirmed that the additional signage should not be internally illuminated. The applicants offered halo-lit letters for the additional signage as a compromise.

*The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend the legalization of the sign band as built and the approval of the new signage provided it is restricted to the sign band itself, is metal with cut-out letters and icons, and is halo-lit.*

#### **4137-4141 Main Street, NE corner of James Street**

Inter Nos BC, LLC, Owner

Nelson Batycki, Applicant

DATE: c. 1850; 4139& 4141 – Permastone added, c. 1940

PROPOSAL: Enlarge front windows and add front railings, cut rear doors, add rear decks with walkways

This property is comprised of three houses along Main Street that have been internally connected. Two were covered in Permastone; one retains its original rubble-stone façade. The application proposes window alterations at the front and several alterations at the rear. For the front, the owner wishes to remove the first-story windows on the three houses and install large bi-fold windows with railings. The first-story windows in the two buildings with Permastone have been altered; the third building (4137) retains its original window opening, but not the original window.

On the rear, the two outer buildings have additions on the first floor and all of the buildings have decks. The owner wishes to remove the decks and add a room on the middle building to match an adjacent addition. A new deck would be added to the roof the first-story additions with a staircase leading to the ground. A wooden walkway would connect the decks and stairs to the street. These changes would be visible from James Street.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the alterations at the rear, provided the façade is stuccoed, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Approval windows and railings at 4139 and 4141, provided the railings are redesigned to be flush as guardrails, not projecting, pursuant to Standard 9. Denial of

the window at 4137, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Nelson Batycki, the contractor, and Mario Presta, the owner, represented the project. Mr. Batycki explained that the owner desires the larger front windows to allow more light into the interior and to allow pedestrians a view into the restaurant.

Ms. Spina showed an older photograph of the building at 4137 Main to the Committee and applicants. It documented the original coupled double-hung window at the first-story front, which occupied the opening now filled by a non-historic, projecting, aluminum window. Mr. Presta, who had never seen the photograph, stated that he preferred the historic window to the plan he had proposed. He agreed to restore the window in 4137 if he could alter the non-historic window openings in the PermaStone buildings at 4139 and 4141. The Committee agreed that this was an acceptable compromise.

The Committee reviewed the proposed alterations to the rear and agreed that they were acceptable given the context and the existing decks and additions.

*The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the addition, decks, and walkway at the rear, provided the addition façade is stuccoed; approval of the windows and railings at 4139 and 4141, provided the railings do not project; and approval of a coupled, double-hung, one-over-one, wood window in the existing opening at 4137, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.*

#### **1428-1432 Chestnut Street aka 111 South 15<sup>th</sup> Street**

111 South 15<sup>th</sup> Street Associates, Owner

David Blumenfeld, Esq., Applicant

DATE: 1922, Ritter & Shay, architects

PROPOSAL: Extend temporary legalization of signs

This application proposes the temporary legalization of four signs on the Packard Building until 1 June 2004. The developer installed three signs at the street level advertising the availability of rental apartments without a permit or Commission approval. The signs were mounted directly to the limestone cladding of the building. In September 2003, the Commission approved the legalization of the three lower signs on the condition that they be removed by 12 December 2003. The developer expected the building to be occupied in a few months, negating the need for the signs. The building still has some vacancies; therefore, the developer is returning to the Commission for permission to extend the legalization for several more months. Also, the developer seeks the legalization of a very large canvas sign installed at the upper portion of the north façade without a permit or Commission approval. This upper sign was not addressed in the earlier application.

Staff recommendation: Denial.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Architectural Committee. David Blumenfeld, the attorney for the project, attended the meeting. He explained that he needed the signage until a greater percentage of the units were rented. Mr. Rivera asked about the vacancies. Mr. Blumenfeld responded that approximately 110 of the 153 units have been rented. He added that the people living behind the large sign on the north façade are not paying any rent. Committee members were surprised to learn that people were living in the perpetually dark apartments behind the sign. Mr. Blumenfeld informed the Committee that a movie company may begin

filming in the lobby in June 2004 and would require the removal of all the temporary signage by that date.

Committee members inquired about the history of the illegal signs. Ms. Spina reported that they had been installed in the summer of 2003, legalized temporarily by the Commission in the fall of 2003, and slated for removal by 12 December 2003. Ms. Pentz asked about the Committee's recommendation at the previous legalization review. Ms. Spina noted that the Committee had recommended approval of the temporary legalization until 12 December 2003, with the staff to review the patching of the damaged stone.

*The Architectural Committee split. Two recommend denial; two recommend legalization until 1 June 2004.*

### **2032 Pine Street**

Terry Darami, Owner

Jon Wagner, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Demolish portion of rear ell, construct addition with deck and stairtower on rear ell, add rear balconies with doors, reopen and replace windows

This application proposes numerous alterations to the rowhouse at 2032 Pine Street. At the front, in addition to some minor repairs, the applicant would like to install opaque glass in the basement windows to provide privacy. At the rear, which is visible from Capitol and Waverly Streets, the applicant plans to demolish the west façade of a poorly built, non-historic, rear addition to the rear ell as well as the roof and chimney of the rear ell. An engineer has determined that the west facade of the addition is not structurally sound. A 3<sup>rd</sup> story with roof deck and pilot house would be added to the non-historic, 2-story, rear addition. The new south façade of the addition would include balconies at the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> stories. The roof of the rear ell would be reconstructed, altering the historic roofline. Two infilled rear ell windows would be reopened and all rear ell windows would be replaced with one-over-one aluminum clad wood windows. The entirety of the rear ell, new and old, would be stuccoed to give it a uniform appearance.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the basement glass change; the reconstruction of the rear addition with balconies, roof deck, and pilot house, provided the historic rear ell is not altered; approval of the stucco and one-over-one aluminum clad windows for the non-historic rear addition, but denial of the stucco and clad windows for the historic brick rear ell, with staff to review details. The application proposes merging the historic rear ell and non-historic rear addition into one unified non-historic totality. The standards mandate that they remain dissimilar. These recommendations are made pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 9, and 10.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Terry Darami, the owner, and Jon Wagner, the architect, attended the meeting.

Ms. Pentz inquired about the report from the structural engineer. At reviewing the report quickly, she concluded that it confirmed that the west wall of the addition needs to be rebuilt. The Committee reviewed photographs of the failing wall.

The Committee and architect discussed the demolition of the rear ell's chimney and roof. Mr. Wagner said that the chimney's location prevents the efficient use of the space in the ell and addition. He also stated that little, if any, of the chimney is historic. Committee members posited

that the chimney is a later addition. They stated that it has an unusual configuration and agreed that it would be acceptable to demolish it.

Committee members also agreed that the addition, balconies, stair tower, and deck are acceptable because they will have little impact on the historic building. Some members regretted the proposed demolition of the historic rear ell roof, which is pitched, not flat.

The Committee asserted that the identities of the historic rear ell and non-historic rear addition should remain distinct. They agreed that the rear addition may be stuccoed, provided a brick red color stucco is used, but maintained that the brick of the historic rear ell should not be covered in stucco. Likewise, they concluded that clad windows were appropriate for the addition, but not the ell. Historically appropriate wood windows should be installed in the ell.

Mr. Rivera asked about the location of the air conditioning units and Mr. Wagner responded that they would be installed in the side yard.

*The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal, provided that the east wall of the historic rear ell is not stuccoed, historically appropriate wood windows are installed in the historic rear ell, and the non-historic rear addition is faced with a brick red stucco.*

### **1830 Rittenhouse Square, Unit 17C, SE corner of South 19<sup>th</sup> Street**

Barbara Mishkin, Owner

David Matus, Applicant

DATE 1913, Frederick Webber, architect

PROPOSAL: Replace windows with subframe and reduced sash

This application proposes the replacement of 12 windows, nine on the south façade and three on the east façade, at the 17<sup>th</sup> floor of the condominium building at 1830 Rittenhouse Square. The building is bounded by Rittenhouse Square at the north, 19<sup>th</sup> Street at the west, and Manning Street at the south.

Two options are proposed: a Marvin aluminum clad Ultimate double-hung window and a Marvin fiberglass Infinity double-hung window. Neither replicates the original wood. In both cases a new subframe would be installed within the existing window frame, reducing the size of the daylight opening (DO).

| Window   | Horizontal DO | Change  | Vertical DO | Change  | Area  | Change |
|----------|---------------|---------|-------------|---------|-------|--------|
| Existing | 30"           | —       | 23-3/4"     | —       | 712.5 | —      |
| Ultimate | 28-5/8"       | -1-3/8" | 22-5/8"     | -1-1/8" | 647.6 | -64.9  |
| Infinity | 29-1/2"       | -1/2"   | 23-7/8"     | +1/8"   | 704.3 | -8.2   |

Staff Recommendation: Denial, owing to the proposed subframes, non-historic materials, and reduced daylight openings. The application would set a negative precedent for the entire building. These recommendations are made pursuant to Standard 2, 5, and 6.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. David Matus, the applicant, claimed that the existing frames would not withstand the wind forces at this height. He asserted that the proposed subframe would be much stronger than the existing frame. He argued that the changes to the appearance would not be visible from the ground. Mr. D'Alessandra thought that the original windows should be restored or the historic sash replaced with new, historically appropriate wood sash. Committee members noted the many reviews of windows for this

building and stated that an approval of these inappropriate windows would set a negative precedent for the entire building.

*The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, owing to the proposed subframes, non-historic materials, and reduced daylight openings, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.]; and Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.].*

### **1927 Brandywine Street**

Brian and Jill McLelland, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1867

PROPOSAL: Construct rooftop addition and decks

This application proposes the construction of a rooftop addition as well as two roof decks on the carriage house at 1927 Brandywine Street. The rear of the building faces Wilcox Street, a service alley. The front deck and addition will be visible from Brandywine Street; the rear deck will be visible from Wilcox Street.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the rear deck; denial of the front deck. The staff split on the addition, but all agree that it should not be visible from any point on Brandywine Street. These recommendations are made pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Brian McLelland, the owner, Greg Berzinsky and Katharine Bottom, the architects, and Allen Rubin of the Spring Garden Civic Association attended the meeting. Mr. McLelland asserted that the addition and deck would be minimally visible.

Mr. Baron noted that the adjacent house has a rooftop addition with a highly visible deck railing. He said that the proposed addition would stand forward of the addition on the adjacent house. He suggested moving the proposed addition back to align with the neighbor's addition. Mr. McLelland contended that aligning the proposed addition with the next door neighbor's addition would result in an unacceptable loss of floor space. Mr. Baron also suggested a metal deck railing, which would be reduce visibility.

Allen Ruben said that a 4½-foot high gable centered on the front facade would conceal the deck and addition.

Mr. Rivera declared that the building has a strong character and that the proposed alterations would not destroy that character.

*The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal as submitted.*

### **4650 Germantown Avenue, Loudon House**

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Charles Mottershead, Applicant

DATE: 1796-1801, west section and sun porch, 1829, portico, 1850, rear addition, 1888  
 PROPOSAL: Reconfigure roof and gutter and replace porch decking

This application proposes alterations to the roof to enhance drainage and to the front portico to enhance ventilation. Owing to a poorly designed addition, 40% of the rainwater falling on the building is funneled down a single valley to one downspout. The downspout cannot be enlarged sufficiently to accommodate the runoff during heavy rains. Subsequently, the interior has suffered water damage. The application proposes raising a portion of the roof between the main house and the 1888 addition, allowing some rainwater to drain to other downspouts. The new roofing would match the existing metal roofing. A new catch box would be installed to collect the water that drains to the problem point. Rooftop vents would be relocated. The alteration would be visible from the west, but not any other direction. The south façade is the primary façade.

The application also proposes reconstructing the steps and flooring at the front portico. The portico suffers from excessive moisture, which accumulates beneath it. The existing tongue-and-groove flooring, which was installed in 1999, is rotting. The plans for the reconstruction are incomplete, but those submitted do stipulate 6-inch decking with 1/8-inch spaces between the planks. No information about the historic steps or decking has been provided.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the roof modifications, provided that the existing roof is documented with HABS-quality photographs deposited with the Historical Commission. Denial of the portico modifications. Historic information on the portico steps and decking should be provided. Less obtrusive solutions to the moisture problem should be sought. These recommendations are made pursuant to Restoration Standard 3, 4, 6, and 7.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Sam Harris and Rachel Royer, the architects, and Charles Mottershead of the Capital Programs Office attended the meeting. Mr. Harris presented a model to show the existing and proposed roof configurations. The existing roof funnels too much rainwater to one downspout; during hard rains the runoff penetrates the building at several points. The new roof configuration would distribute the runoff to several downspouts. He stated that a more efficient, better designed gutter would be installed; the current gutter often fails because of a sharp bend after a long vertical drop. Additionally, a large collection box would be installed at the bottom of the valley to eliminate the throw and collect the water into the downspout. The Committee asked about the visual impact of the changes. Mr. Harris explained that they would be visible from the west, but not from south, the primary façade. Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the complex ridge detailing where the new and old roof meet one another. Mr. Harris responded that the proposed alterations will require that the ridge be built outward. Ms. Pentz asked about the mushroom vents. Mr. Harris explained that they would be relocated, would be six inches in diameter, and would be painted to match. Mr. D'Alessandro expressed concern about expansion and contraction of the new roof and also asked about the plans for the old roof that would be covered. Mr. Harris answered that he had accounted for expansion and contraction. He also stated that a wood hatch would be relocated for roof access and the enclosed area between the new and old roofs would be periodically inspected. The Committee concluded that roof alterations were well designed and necessary for the preservation of the building.

The discussion turned to the porch. Mr. Mottershead noted that the porch was repaired four years ago and that an inappropriate material was used. The decking is already rotting. Mr. Harris said that he was unable to identify the historical decking. He noted that the entire porch had been rebuilt and that any information about the historic porch had been lost with its demolition. The staff suggested that further research be conducted to identify the historic decking. Even if all remnants of the historic porch have been lost, historic records may reveal the nature of the

decking. Mr. D'Alessandro offered the possibility of a painted canvas covering. Ms. Pentz maintained that the spacing of the decking boards would allow for proper ventilation. Others asserted that the original decking would not have consisted of spaced boards. Mr. Harris remarked that he could undertake further investigation after the extant decking is removed. Committee members concluded that additional research should be done to determine the historic decking material, but agreed that the proposal was acceptable if no further information is uncovered.

*The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal as submitted, provided that the existing roof is documented with HABS-quality photographs deposited with the Historical Commission, with the staff to review details.*

### **329 South Street aka 324 Gaskill Street**

329 South LLC, Owner

Nurit Nachum, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1875

PROPOSAL: Demolish rear additions and construct rear 4-story addition

This application proposes the demolition of a group of rear additions and the construction of a 4-story addition at 329 South Street. The rear addition would front onto Gaskill Street, a small street running parallel to South Street. The 300-block of Gaskill Street includes an interesting array of buildings of varied styles, types, and sizes. The historic building on South Street would be rehabbed and house commercial space on the first floor and two residential units on the upper floors; the new rear wing would house three residential units. The property abuts the Society Hill Historic District, but is not part of the district. It is listed individually on the Register. The buildings to the east on Gaskill Street are within the district.

An illegal sign would be removed at the storefront and the front windows would be restored if necessary; no other work is proposed for the South Street façade.

In order to secure its support for zoning variances, the owner entered into a covenant with the Queen Village Neighbors Association. Sections 7 and 8 of the covenant define the design of the Gaskill Street façade. It requires that the façade be red brick; that the penthouse be set back and not visible from Gaskill Street; that the window and door openings, cornice line, and cornice match those of 322 Gaskill Street; that the windows be 6-over-6; and that the door and doorway match those at 318 and 320 Gaskill Street. The buildings at 318 and 320 Gaskill date to 1825 and are Greek Revival in style; the Federal/Greek Revival-style door from these buildings stipulated in the covenant is inappropriate for a contemporary building. The building at 322 Gaskill dates to 1895; the pressed metal cornice from this building stipulated in the covenant is inappropriate. The 6-over-6 windows stipulated in the covenant are also inappropriate. Moreover, the 9-over-9 windows next door at 322 Gaskill, on which the window requirement was based, are entirely inappropriate for the 1895 building. Virtually every aspect of the covenant related to the Gaskill Street façade contradicts Standard 3, which states that features “that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties” are inappropriate. Likewise, Standard 9 states that “new works shall be differentiated from the old.”

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the demolition and construction, provided the Gaskill Street façade is revised to be contemporary rather than falsely historic, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

Nurit Nachum, the architect, Gail Hauptfuhrer and Bob Pierson of Gaskill Street, attended the



meeting. Ms. Nachum disclosed that the neighbors stipulated the design of the Gaskill Street façade, for which they had very specific requirements. Ms. Nachum added that the neighbors' support at her zoning hearing was predicated on her acceptance of their eclectic design for the facade.

Ms. Pentz asked the neighbors in attendance about their objection to a more contemporary design. Mr. Rivera commented that community support is important, but that a more contemporary design would have been more appropriate. Other Committee members concurred and contended that neighborhood groups should not involve themselves in minute design details, especially when their requirements contradict those of the Commission. Mr. D'Alessandro stressed the importance of adhering to the *Standards*, even over neighbor objections. Mr. Rivera suggested that the architect revise the cornice, window and door designs to be more contemporary and that the updated design be reviewed again by the staff and Architectural Committee.

*The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the demolition and construction, provided the Gaskill Street windows, door, and cornice are revised to be contemporary rather than falsely historic, with the Architectural Committee and staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 3 [Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.]; 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.].*

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes  
Executive Secretary