

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

**Herbert Levy, FAIA, Acting-Chair
Commission Offices, One Parkway, 13th Floor, 1515 Arch Street
27 November 2001**

Present

Herb Levy, FAIA Vice-Chair
Tony Atkin, AIA
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Suzanne Pentz

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

Also

Christian A. Busch, The Sullivan Company
Chariss McAfee, Loomis McAfee Architects
Kenneth Kalfas, 330 South 24th Street
Mary Hunt, Kaiserman Company Incorporated
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance
Lauren Weinstock, 245 South 17th Street
Judith Eden, Center City Residents' Association
Ray Hewitt, Radisson Plaza-Warwick Hotel
Rand Baldwin, Radisson Plaza-Warwick Hotel
Bret Smith, Radisson Plaza-Warwick Hotel
Frank Kakos, Kakos Architects
Michael Hauptman, Brawer & Hauptman Architects
Peter Zambelli, 2215 Rittenhouse Square
Vern Lei, T.C. Lei & Associates
Judith Robinson, Woodstock Street
Sarina Rose, Kramer Marks Architects
William Kramer, Kramer Marks Architects
Ayan Addou, Penn
Harold Aponte, Capital Programs Office
Michael Johns, Philadelphia Housing Authority
Randy Cotton, Preservation Alliance
Dennis Torres, Redevelopment Authority
Eileen Eckstein
Gregory Wright
Sylvia Palms
Bernadette Mestichelli
Jane Glenn, Manayunk Neighborhood Council
Brett Webber, Brett Webber Architects
Diane and Ira Pastor
Kristin Mullaney, Amburn/Jarosinski Architects
Daniel R. Neducsin, Neducsin Properties
Ronald Patterson, Esquire, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers

Reese Browne, Charles and Lillian Messick, 415 South Perth Street
 Rebecca Stolloff, Society Hill Civic Association
 Andreas Bacher
 Valerie Rogers, Grid Sign
 Sharon Suleta, Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll LLP

Herbert Levy, FAIA, Acting-Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:07 a.m.

237 South 18th Street, Unit 21B, The Barclay

Steven Wolfson, Owner
 Christian Busch, Architect
 DATE: 1928, Architect, J.E.R. Carpenter
 PROPOSAL: New French doors and balcony in light court

The proposal calls for installing a balcony on the west façade within the lightcourt. The plans show removing the metal casement windows and cutting the brick down to install new French doors. The staff recommended denial per Standards 2 & 9.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal and stated that an earlier balcony application on the 17th floor was denied by Committee and Commission and also denied by the License and Inspection Review Board; however, a court appeal produced a compromise of allowing a balcony if situated behind the fire balcony.

Christian Busch, the architect, attended the meeting. He stated that the proposed balcony will be situated in the corner behind the fire balcony with only limited visibility from Locust Street. He also noted that the proposed balcony is one foot deep and slightly wider than the existing window and plans to cut down the brick to the sill to install a metal casement door with two leaves and a transom. The metalwork of the balcony will be painted black for consistency.

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

330 South 24th Street

Ken Kalfus and Inga Saffron, Owners
 Chariss McAfee, Architect
 DATE: c. 1845, altered c. 1870
 PROPOSAL: Alter roof and first floor windows

The proposal involves alterations to the first floor windows, installing a flower box and shorter sash to hide the raised countertop in the kitchen. The applicant seeks to replace other window sash and frame moldings. Unfortunately the molding shown does not replicate an historic molding appropriate to the windows. On the fourth floor the application calls for recovering the roof in metal and altering the windows to a two-over-two pattern. The staff recommended approval of the metal roof and dormer windows as we do not have historic information on the mansard. The existing elements appear modern and the proposed elements appear compatible. However, the staff recommended denial of the first floor window alterations per Standard 2.

Chariss McAfee, the architect, stated that a kitchen now exists behind the first floor windows. She reiterated that debris falls behind the countertop, which can be seen from the outside. She also noted that the block's context is not a continuous fabric, it has varying styles and has been altered.

The Committee believed that changing of the first floor windows would be a radical alteration and that the sash should match the existing sash. It recommended placing the flower boxes lower at the level of the stone sill. It also thought that in the replacement of the other windows a clam-shell molding is more appropriate.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the roof and window frames working with the staff for their design, but denial of the first floor window alterations.

245 South 17th Street

University City Housing Company, Ithaca Partnership, Owner

Lauren Weinstock, Applicant

DATE: 1888, Frank Miles Day, Architect

PROPOSAL: Install garage door

The proposal returns to the Committee and Commission for the review of the garage door materials and details. The cutting of the opening for the garage received Historical Commission approval in 1997. The owner cut the opening in the last few months.

Lauren Weinstock attended the meeting and stated that the proposed garage door will be hemlock a natural wood with invisible seams in the panels with fixed glazing at the top.

Judith Eden, Center City Residents' Association, questioned the approval of the curb cut.

The Committee concurred that the drawings presented by the applicant do not give a true depiction of the proposed door. Committee members thought the application incomplete and recommended tabling the proposal awaiting a better drawing.

The Architectural Committee recommended tabling the proposal owing to insufficient information about the proposed door.

1920 Waverly Street, Ringgold Place

John and Barbara Ramb, Owners

Frank Kakos, Architect

DATE: 1862, Walter Allison, builder

PROPOSAL: HVAC at the third floor exterior, flower boxes

The proposal involves the installation of flower boxes and a rooftop air-conditioner unit. Most of the staff recommended approval; however, one staff member thought the unit could be hidden if tucked into the corner of the rear ell.

Frank Kakos, the architect, attended the meeting and requested additionally the raising of the existing sloping roof which has vents on the front and back wall. The reason for raising of the roof and sealing the vents is for insulation and keeping the rafters, which run from side to side from rotting out.

Committee members thought that insulation could be accomplished from underneath thus eliminating the need for raising the roof, which would abutt the neighboring house.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the following:

1. *Tying back the shutters;*
2. *The window boxes, and*
3. *HVAC in a location which minimizes visibility from the front and rear*
With the staff to review all details.
4. *Denial of the raising of the roof.*

1701 Locust Street, NW corner 17th Street, Warwick Hotel (Radisson)

AP/RAD Venture L.P., Owner

Barry Jacobson, Applicant

DATE: 1925-1928, Frank Hahn, Architect

PROPOSAL: Plaques, awnings and signage

The proposal calls for installing new wall plaque signs at the corners of the building and on the marquee. These signs will feature gold and black backgrounds with push through plastic letters. The applicants will replace a large back-lit parking sign on the northeast corner of the building with a much smaller back-lit sign. The staff recommended approval of the parking and marquee signs, but a redesign of the corner signage with a more traditional approach that does not include plastic or the shiny gold background per Standard 9.

Marty Jacobson, Rand Baldwin attended the meeting to explain the project and presented a sample of the proposed signage to be installed below the marquee and above the doors and at the corners of the building. The signage on the marquee will have back-lit lettering.

The Committee thought the signage on the corners of the building should be modified to reflect such a classical building. Members believed that a sign with equal gold vertical dimensions approximately 1 ½ inches wrapped around more appropriate. The question of a brushed gold or mirrored was discussed, and members concluded that with the existence of brass rails the mirrored finish would be acceptable. Mr. McCoubrey expressed concern about the parking sign on the quoins of the building and noted that this sign should be slightly lowered for more visibility to drivers; however, the Committee thought the design appropriate.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the signage, but the signs on the corners of the building should have equal vertical dimensions of gold colored metal and the parking sign should be moved off the quoin.

2215 Rittenhouse Square Street

Peter Zambelli, Owner

Michael Hauptman, Architect

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Legalize aluminum windows, new door

The proposal calls for legalizing four-over-four aluminum clad sash. The owner installed them without a permit, against the specific advice of the Historical Commission staff and received a violation which includes the removal of the shutters. The owner has purchased a door with horizontal panels which he seeks to use as a front door. He also wishes to install an ornate Federal Style fanlight transom. All the original examples in the same row have a simple three-light transom. The staff recommended denial of the windows and transom per Standard 6, but approval of the door per Standard 6.

Michael Hauptman and Peter Zambelli, the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Zambelli argued in support of his proposal. He cited properties and showed photographs of houses with 4/4 windows on neighboring streets. He explained that he wished to install marble sills in place of the existing wood sills.

Mr. Levy questioned the disregard of the staff's advice on the windows, the owner claimed ignorance and attributed the error to his contractor. The Committee stated that on basis of the material alone, it could not approve the windows. It also reiterated that although this condition exists on other properties, it is not appropriate for this building. Members also thought the transom should have three panes to match neighboring houses and the fanlight transom inappropriate. Mr. Levy questioned the removal of the shutters and it was explained that although it is not part of this application, he should apply for the removal of the shutters. Although the staff objected to substituting marble for the sills, the Committee did not.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the fanlight transom and four-over-four windows per Standard 6 but approval of the door and marble sills of King of Prussia Marble with the staff to review details.

1921 Walnut Street

Vern Lei, Owner/Architect

DATE: 1897, Cope and Stewardson, Architect

PROPOSAL: Cut new door and alter storefront

The proposal involves alterations to a former residence that received a storefront probably about 1920. Plans call for removing the storefront window and three-part transom and installing a bronze aluminum storefront system. The new storefront will have a single light transom, a new central doorway with stairs and flanking operable windows. The plans also show neon signage. The staff recommended denial per Standards 4 and 9. It recommends that the transom should be preserved.

Vern Lei, the owner, attended the meeting and stated that he wishes to improve the economics of the property. In response to inquiry about handicapped accessibility, the applicant said that this is structurally impossible owing to the stone base and the interior stairs.

The Committee questioned the use of metal sash, because wood sash exist throughout building. The applicant noted the expense of the wood, the treatment it requires and believed aluminum a better material. Members thought the materials for the door and windows inappropriate and the original transom should be saved and restored with the transom bar below. In reviewing the drawings, members suggested possibly moving the stairs to one side; this however, still posed a problem.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal per Standards 4 and 9.

1929-39 Sansom Street, corner of 20th Street, Lucy Eaton Smith Residence

Project H.O.M.E., Owner

William Kramer, Architect

DATE: 1925, Arthur L. Harmon, Architect

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation, new doors and HVAC on roof

This proposal includes new storefront doors on 20th Street, a new door on Sansom Street and HVAC units on the roof of the building. The staff recommended approval of the proposed door on the Sansom Street façade, approval of storefront doors on 20th Street with sidelights and mullions with a thinner profile. The staff asked for more details concerning the HVAC units on the roof.

Sarina Rose and William Kramer attended the meeting. Ms. Rose stated that the proposal has the approval of the National Park Service. Owing to tax credits and PFHA funding, the rehabilitation extends only to the residential space not the commercial space. The applicant proposes anodized silver colored aluminum in the new storefront, which mimics the adjacent storefront. The extracted marble will be used for the adjacent window. She also proposes stone panels between the window and storefront with the same detailing as above. The main entrance is currently an aluminum double-leaf door, which does not meet the egress requirement of three foot doors; therefore, the applicant proposes a widened single-leaf door with two side lights. The alley doors will be replaced with flush aluminum doors. One door is currently recessed with an iron gate, which will be removed and the door moved forward to match the adjacent door. After sight-line studies showed visibility, the applicant proposes to place the HVAC units to the east to minimize visibility. The applicant also proposes to point the exterior to match the existing with the staff to review a sample of the mortar mix.

Ms. Spina questioned whether the infill at the front entrance is a later alteration. If the infill is historic the staff asked that the applicant research the original configuration and replicate that design. Ms. Rose said that the project has an historic consultant researching the archives for documentation of the doors.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the following:

1. *Placement of the HVAC eastward on the roof;*
2. *Flush aluminum doors in the alley;*
3. *Handicapped accessible door on 20th Street, and*
4. *Approval of the main entrance door as submitted unless historic documentation reveals the original configuration. At that time the staff can approve a replication of the historic door. With the staff to review details.*

City Hall, Broad and Market Streets

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Sheth Jones, Capital Program , Applicant

DATE: 1871-1901, John McArthur Jr., Architect

PROPOSAL: Install ballards around perimeter

This proposal calls for increasing security at City Hall by installing bollards around the perimeter of the building apron. The design will match existing bollards on the property. The staff recommended approval per Standard 9.

Harold Aponte and Sheth Jones attended the meeting to explain the project.

The plans show a horizontal attachment fixtures sticking out four inches, the Committee thought it should be rounded off to lessen the possibility of injury.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

2000-26, 2001-09 West Diamond Street

Philadelphia Housing Authority, Owner

William Kramer, Architect

PROPOSAL: Construct new houses

This proposal calls for new construction within the Diamond Street Historic District. At the time of designation, these lots had historic houses. Over the course of several years, the Department of Licenses and Inspections demolished the buildings because of imminently dangerous conditions. Many of the properties were owned by PHA at the time of designation. This application requires full approval by the Historical Commission, not just review and comment.

The Philadelphia Housing Authority proposes to build three sections of housing, one section of five houses on the north side of Diamond Street and two sections four houses on the south side. All of the proposed units have parking pads and setbacks of at least 18 feet from the historic street line; most units are set back 24 feet. All units are only one or two-stories tall. The applicant proposes four different schemes for the design of the units on the south side of the street. These include a scheme with pseudo-Victorian detailing, one with pseudo-Colonial detailing and two generic styles. The applicant stated that the design resulted from the requirement that some of the units must be handicapped-accessible.

The staff recommended denial. The units should match the overall massing and scale of the other rows within the district, be at least three stories in height, set at the historic building line and parking should be in rear of the properties. The Historical Commission previously approved new construction along the 1600 block that met these guidelines. On the south side of the street, the new construction should articulate individual units, as in scheme #4. However, staff preferred the gable detailing of scheme #1.

Only front elevations were submitted. The materials submitted constitute an application for an approval-in concept. More details are necessary for a final approval. The applicant must also submit side and rear elevations, and material details, such as brick color.

William Kramer, of Kramer Marks Architects, and Michael Johns, of the Philadelphia Housing Authority, attended the meeting to explain the project and answer questions. Mr. Kramer explained the program goal for homeownership and requirement for handicapped accessible units. By court order, PHA must provide a minimum number of accessible units as part of this new construction project. 33 of 57 units of new infill housing units planned by PHA throughout North Philadelphia must be handicapped accessible. The design team has attempted to put most of the able-bodied units on the Diamond Street site. PHA intends to eventually convert these new units to homeownership. Mr. Kramer stated this homeownership program goal, as well as the zoning requirements, have influenced the site plan, design and parking pads at front. PHA does not want a common parking area or common driveway because of maintenance issues and complications in the conversion to homeownership.

Judith Robinson, a neighborhood resident and block captain on North Woodstock Street, expressed the neighborhood preference for homeownership.

In response to specific staff concerns, Mr. Kramer stated that they had attempted to express “verticality” in the façade design and that many of the accessible units include interior lifts to make them more than just a single story. On the south side of the block, the massing of the row

as a “manor house” responds to the scale of the church at 2017-29 Diamond Street. Mr. Kramer asserted that there are other buildings of varying setbacks on Diamond Street and they attempted to cluster the units in a composition to suggest a “town square” concept.

Mr. Baron stated that the Commission has approved three-story new construction, with no setback, further east in the historic district. The setback and town square concept is not compatible with the character of the district. Ms. Spina added that design would be more compatible with the historic context if the buildings were pushed forward to the historic building line with the parking at rear. Mr. Kramer responded that parking at rear would require common parking, or a common driveway, and loss of rear yard space. Eliminating the parking would require a zoning variance. Mr. Baron added that the Advocate Community Development Corporation, among others, have developed both new and rehabilitated homeownership in the neighborhood that comply with the Secretary’s “Standards”.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that Philadelphia is full of housing with parking at rear, off of alleyways, and the Committee recognizes that there are difficulties in complying with all the contemporary zoning and code requirements. Still, the design as presented does not contribute to the historic district.

Ms. Robinson added that the neighborhood had concerns regarding parking but she thought the parking, as proposed, could be modified.

Michael Johns from the Philadelphia Housing Authority explained the court order and federal mandate to provide accessible units. PHA did look at potential sites around the City but ownership and site acquisition have been major issues throughout the project planning process. This project must break ground by early next year.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that our “Standards” appear to conflict with what the Housing Authority and federal requirements mandate. Mr. Levy pointed out the difficulty in resolving the competing interests of all the different agencies.

Randy Cotton, of the Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia, observed that the Housing Authority is apparently bringing this project before the Historical Commission very late in their process after other city and federal agencies have been consulted. He also stated that many of the larger issues under discussion are not for the Committee to decide but asked if this is the right type of development for this site. The Preservation Alliance is concerned about setting a precedent for new construction within an historic district. He thought the standards of good design should be the same in North Philadelphia as in Rittenhouse Square.

Regarding the height and massing of the new construction, Tony Atkin asked about increasing the density of the project. Mr. Kramer responded that an increase in the density might require a variance from R-10 zoning but conceded that they could probably add one or two units per block. According to Michael Johns, to increase the number of units, or change the mix of units, the Housing Authority would have to go back to Court and HUD for more funding and additional approvals.

Mr. Atkin stated that the setback with front parking pads is not a Philadelphia condition and, after pointing out the double parking spot at the side, for the end duplex units, asked about the necessity of parking at front. Mr. Kramer responded that the project needed parking without common areas. Mr. Atkin added that a remote space could be deeded to each unit.

Mr. Levy observed that the Committee can only make recommendations based on the architectural merits of the project and, in accordance with the “*Standards*”, would have to recommend denial. Mr. Kramer expressed a desire to work with the staff and Committee on design modifications that could be supported by the Committee. Mr. Atkin added that nothing mandates a setback and stated that the design should have more height and more of a rowhouse rhythm to the façade. Mr. Baron added that the “manor house” massing is not an agreeable goal and a taller row would be more compatible with the rowhouse fabric of the district.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the project as submitted. The Committee thought that the scale, proportion and massing of the new construction as well as the setback, with front parking pads, were not compatible with the character of the Diamond Street Historic District.

JRB

1717 Spring Garden Street

Gregory Wright, Owner/Applicant
DATE: 1878, Charles W. Budd, builder
PROPOSAL: Rear ramp

The owner proposes to install a handicap-access ramp on the visible rear of this property to serve the commercial space on the first floor. The weather-treated wood ramp will extend 35 feet into the rear yard. The staff recommended approval.

Gregory Wright attended the meeting to represent the project. Mr. Wright explained that the owner wishes to use the first floor as commercial space and will require an accessible entrance. The first floor level is unusually high at this property. The Committee questioned the orientation of the ramp. Mr. Wright responded that switching back the ramp across the rear would block an egress door. The ramp will not fit within the open space at the side.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the project as submitted.

JRB

213 St. Marks Square

Sylvia Palms, Owner/Applicant
DATE: 1877-80, George W. & William D. Hewitt, Architects
PROPOSAL: Install square-head storm windows in arched openings

These ornate houses have segmented-arch windows on the second floor and gothic-arched windows on the third floor. The owner wishes to install triple-track aluminum storm windows that have square heads. The remaining space within the window opening will have aluminum panning. A neighboring house has similar windows; however, the Commission did not approve them. The staff recommended denial per Standard 9.

Sylvia Palms, the owner, attended the meeting and said that the triple track windows give better insulation, protect the frame and in respect to security it will allow the previously installed bars to be removed. Citing neighboring houses with this condition, she believed that she was replicating

the same condition. The applicant noted that Allied windows require an operable top sash, and her sash is not operable.

The Commission previously gave approval to the staff for review of storm windows with the proviso that they meet the required standards, of matching the shape of the existing windows, having the meeting rail mirror the placement of the meeting rail of the sash, and with the color to match the wood frames. The Committee commented that these windows will set a precedent for the block and that it is important that they preserve the character of the facade. The Committee members reiterated the importance of keeping the historic shape of the window. Members also noted the importance of the color and the need for consistency. They explained that interior storms can be made to work and that the top sash in this case may only be painted shut. This could be repaired allowing for the installation of the Allied or similar storm sash, which match the shape and color of the historic windows.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial per Standard 9.

1735 Porter Street

Bernadette Mestichelli, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1906, James & John Windrim, Architects

PROPOSAL: Security doors

The proposal calls for new ornate security doors on both the front and the visible rear door. The owner proposes a different bar pattern for each.

The staff recommended approval of new security doors because of the fact that the front door sits within a new addition, but not as proposed. The rear door should have simplified bars, such as #560-Ornatube, and the front door should be fully glazed without bars, such as #572-Ultra View.

Bernadette Mestichelli, the owner, said that the front door is exposed to inclement weather and security is an important issue. The front door has had previous alterations and the rear door currently has a storm door.

The Committee thought the design for the rear appropriate; however, the front door design should be less ornate. It recommended the Ornatube design for the front.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the Ornatube design for the front and rear doors. The recommendation passed with three votes, one Committee member dissented.

4129-4135 Main Street

Daniel Neduccsin, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1845

PROPOSAL: Demolish facades, new construction

The proposal involves the complete demolition of the two historic facades at 4129 and 4135 Main Street. The plans propose constructing new facades that do not match the historic facades. They do not have doorways and they show large first floor store windows specifically denied by the Historical Commission. The Commission had previously approved a plan to allow a structure to be constructed behind the historic facades. This proposal abandons that earlier concept and approval. The staff recommended denial per Standards 2 and 9.

Daniel Neducsin, Kristin Mullaney and Ronald Patterson attended the meeting to explain the project. Mr. Patterson, attorney for the project, stated that the owner has made every effort to retain the facades; however, it has proven economically and architecturally not a viable option. They showed photographs of some bricks, crumbly cement and rubble found underneath the stucco making the facades less original and less sound.

The Committee noted that the existing areas of infill below the windows does not mean that this is the condition of the entire structure and that brick is part of the infill. It noted that the Manayunk Ordinance reads that historic materials should be retained and replacement materials shall duplicate the original. Ms. Pentz said that the new evidence implies less historic fabric but the scale, rhythm and materials should be compatible.

The Architectural Committee approved the following:

1. *The complete replacement of the facades in stone and stucco to match the original;*
 2. *Maintaining the doors and steps;*
 3. *Wood true divided light windows in the upper floors to match the original;*
 4. *First floor window widened and lowered slightly, and*
 5. *Roof rebuilt maintaining the existing historic terraced heights.*
- With the staff to review all details.*

313 South Lawrence Court

Ira and Diane Pastor, Owners

Brett Webber, Architect

DATE: 1970, Bower & Fradley, Architects

PROPOSAL: Fourth floor additions

This is one of a series of houses encircling Lawrence Court. The original design for this gateway building included setbacks on both the eastern and western facades, at the fourth floor. The owners propose to extend the fourth floor to the full footprint of the building, as on the lower floors, eliminating the designed voids. The western end includes a designed opening in the parapet wall to emphasize the fourth floor deck.

Other buildings around the court have had their designed decks enclosed in later years, but this is the only building with decks at both ends of the house. The design of the eastern end closely matches the changes on other houses, and the proposed addition mimics the historic fenestration configuration. The design of the western end is unique to the corner house in the court and serves as an important focal point in the overall design of the court. The staff recommended approval of the eastern addition, but denial of the western one per Standard 9. The staff believes that the proposal compromises the designed opening at the western end.

Brett Webber, the architect attended the meeting and said that the design is consistent with the four-corners of the courtyard. In addition, there is a mixed vocabulary of infill, varying from house to house. He explained his proposal for the western end that extends above the original roofline which he prefers not to modify. The glazing for the large opening is comparable with the extended bay, and metal at the jam and above the pivot window.

Mr. Atkin suggested a reveal at the opening so that the new window would read as an infill with a setback. Members also thought the cornice at the northern end should be set back. The Committee asked the applicant to submit revised drawings to reflect its recommendations.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of a modified proposal with the side window heightened and widened into a single glazed unit and the front glazing and cornice drawn to visually float free of the end walls. With the staff to review details.

312 Cypress Street

Kimberly and Andreas Bacher, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1797, Finnix Stretcher, house carpenter

PROPOSAL: Rear deck

This proposal calls for a rear deck built on an existing one-story rear addition. The proposal includes changing the 9/9 double-hung window into a multi-light door, without altering the size of the opening. The staff recommended approval per Standard 9 and 10.

Andreas Bacher, the owner, attended the meeting. Owing to the length of the existing window, changing it to a door can be accomplished without disturbance to the opening size.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

415 South Perth Street

Charles and Lillian Messick, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: Visible rear addition

This application calls for a rear addition on the third floor, with contemporary, horizontal fenestration. The house has a half-gambrel roofline, and the proposed addition would meet the historic roof at the ridgeline. The staff recommended approval of the addition with two changes: the roof line of the addition should be a shallow gable that starts below the historic ridgeline and the fenestration should have more vertical features.

Reese Brown attended the meeting on behalf of the property owners. He stated that the location of the plumbing is dictating the height level of the windows.

The Committee recommended the elimination of the cornice line at the second floor. It also noted the windows in the drawings have a narrow orientation. It believed that a continuous larger vertical oriented window more appropriate owing to the excess of three feet of space below the roofline. Members agreed the roofline should be lowered, so that it falls below the historic ridgeline. The Committee asked that the applicant to submit revised drawings to the Commission to reflect the its recommendation.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of a revised proposal with larger, continuous vertical-oriented windows, and lowering the new roof to retain the integrity of the half-gambrel.

1113-31 Market Street, Reading Terminal Headhouse

Headhouse Realty Associates, Owner

Valerie Rogers, Applicant

DATE: 1891-93, Frances Kimball and Wilson Brothers, Architects

PROPOSAL: Signage

This proposal calls for signage for the Verizon Wireless store. The signage matches the previously approved Dunkin Donuts sign in size, shape and overall appearance, as requested by the Committee and Commission. The staff recommended approval per Standard 9.

Valerie Rogers attended the meeting and said that the Zoning Board denied the previously approved signage.

The Committee discussed the finish on the proposed signage. The discussion centered around polished mirrored finish or a brushed finish on the stainless letters. Members thought the brushed finish more appropriate.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the sign with a brushed finish with the staff to review details.

1113-31 Market Street, Reading Terminal Headhouse

Headhouse Realty Associates, Owner

Glenn Brown, Applicant

DATE: 1891-93, Frances Kimball and Wilson Brothers, Architects

PROPOSAL: Signage

This proposal calls for signage for the PNC Bank branch. The sign matches the previously approved Dunkin Donuts sign in size, shape and overall appearance, as requested by the Committee and Commission. The staff recommended approval per Standard 9.

Sharon Suleta attended the meeting and said that the Zoning Board denied the previously approved signage.

The Committee discussed the finish on the proposed signage. As with the Verizon sign, the discussion centered around a polished mirrored finish or a brushed finish on the stainless letters. Members thought the brushed finish more appropriate.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the sign with a brushed finish with the staff to review details.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary