

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Arlene Matzkin, Chairperson
Commission Conference Room
Suite 1301, 1401 Arch Street
30 January 1996

Present

Arlene Matzkin, Chairperson
Tony Atkins
Penelope Batchelor
William Cornell
Herbert Levy
Suzanne Pentz

Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer
Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Jeffrey Barr, Historical Research Technician

Also

Ellen Emmens, 258 S. 16th Street
Joe Bruski, Hamada Inc.
Earl Cain, Hamada Inc.
William Schwartz, Esq.
Bobbie Burke, Center City Residents Association (CCRA)
Carmen La Rosa, 1719 Rittenhouse Sq.
Bernard Nearey, CCRA
Judith Eden, CCRA
W.V. Toner
P.R. Toner
C. Ambrose
Nace Mullen
Pamela Todd
Edward Bronstein
Stephan White
Chris Jaes
Thomas Rogers, 254 S. 16th St.
Mike Nathan
Hamid Homaee
Missy Maxwell
Jerry Roller, Architect
Matthew Koenig
Robert Powers
Patrick Bolger
Lane Fike, Streets Department
W. Mulhern, Kling Lindquist, Architects

1909 Mt. VERNON STREET
Hamp Young, Applicant
PROPOSAL: Restore Front Facade

This proposal calls for the restoration of the front facade of this Philadelphia Housing Authority Property. The project includes the restoration of the window and door openings to their original size with wooden 2/2 replacement windows and a double width replacement door, and the removal of paint from the stonework.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal with staff review of mill work details.

2335 NORTH BROAD STREET
William Schwartz, Counsel for the Applicant, Food for Life
PROPOSAL: New Roof

At its January meeting, the Commission considered the applicant's proposal to reroof with shingles an existing shingle roof that had replaced the standing seam roof that covered the building at the time of designation. The present shingle roof had been installed without a permit. Members of the Architectural Committee thought that the roofing bids were many times too high and that a non-profit organization such as this should try to get a better roof at lower cost. The Committee also thought that using the consultant who had initially recommended a design for the roof could in fact save the client money and provide a better roof. In January, the Commission determined that the applicant should work with the staff to seek additional bids and a more sympathetic treatment of the roof.

William G. Schwartz, Esq. brought this matter before the Committee again for the applicant. The roofing contractor, not the consultant, accompanied Mr. Schwartz to answer any questions about the proposed roof. Mr. Schwartz explained that the requested asphalt shingle roof is temporary and that the applicant hopes to install a standing seam metal roof at a later date. For now, however, the applicant's bank has conditioned its lending of funds for interior renovations on the reroofing of the building. The applicant cannot afford a real or simulated standing seam roof at this time. Committee members thought that if the applicant did not want to take what they considered helpful advise that it was not worth pressing the issue. Mr. Schwartz left a copy of his proposed appeal to the Board of Licenses and Inspections Review Board in the event that the Commission does not approve the roof.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the initial gray asphalt shingle roof proposal.

1719 RITTENHOUSE SQUARE STREET
Carmen La Rosa, Architect
PROPOSAL: Rear Stair and deck

The applicant proposes to add an exterior open metal fire escape at the rear of this single family house in conjunction with the conversion of the building to offices and an apartment for the owner's use. The proposed open metal fire escape would also serve to allow the owner to exit the building without going through the open offices on the first floor front. It would be visible from both Bouvier and Latimer Street. The applicant also seeks to replace an existing rear deck.

The Committee members thought that it would not be difficult to close off the offices from the apartment without resorting to an outside stair. They also found that the exterior stair would compromise the rather nicely detailed facades and did not seem to be necessary for the workings of the building. Committee members said that if the stair were to constitute the sole means of egress for the apartment, the Code would probably require an enclosed stair and the alteration of windows and doors along that stair to metal. A less visible location exists for a rear stair, but placement there would compromise the parking space for the building.

The Committee did not discuss the proposed replacement of a rear deck.

The Committee voted to recommend tabling this application for up to two months until after the architect seeks and receives zoning approvals for this expansion of the building footprint. They also asked him to investigate internal means of egress for the apartment and whether the external stair would need to be covered. If new information is not received in time for the April Commission meeting the Committee would recommend denial at that meeting.

126 N. 3RD STREET
David Schultz, Architect
PROPOSAL: Restoration of front facade

The applicant seeks to unblock the upper floor window openings and install new wooden, true muntin windows. At the second floor the applicant would have doors milled to match the original surviving one. After reading through the insurance survey the Committee recommended a slight change in the design of the ground floor doors. They asked staff to review the shop drawings carefully.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the drawings as submitted with only slight modifications to the

window pane configuration of the doors and the material notes.

1835 SPRUCE STREET

Don Friday, Owner/Applicant

PROPOSAL: Facade Restoration

This proposal calls for installing a new wood cornice to match the one on the twin building next door. The permastone will be removed from the first floor bay and the building repointed and cleaned as necessary with staff review of details.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal with staff review of details.

127 S. 22ND STREET

Edwin Bronstein, Architect

PROPOSAL: Ground floor window restoration and flag pole

This application involves removing the infill enclosure from the ground floor window, reinstalling the masonry piers, and inserting new windows. The proposed windows would be fixed with a transom bar dividing the window into uneven parts rather than the 1/1 double hung sash of an old picture that was presented. Committee members indicated their strong preference for the original configuration. They also recommended against the new flag pole, because of possible damage to the stone and because it would confuse people into thinking that the door, above which it would be placed, was a main entrance. The architect explained that the existing doors will be refurbished.

The Committee voted to recommend approval with the provision that the new windows be 1/1 equally divided sash. They also expressed a preference to see the flag pole deleted in this location.

229 DELANCEY STREET

Stephan White, Architect

PROPOSAL: New side fence and garage opening

This proposal involves demolishing a non-historic brick fence and installing a mechanical garage door facing American Street of this corner property. The architect had drawings of both a typical panelled garage door and a cross bar carriage type door both of which would rise mechanically on an open track. The owners, Mr. and Mrs. Jones, spoke of the vandalization of their car upon several occasions when parked on the street. They said that parking exists at nearly every corner of Phillip and American Streets, with Spruce and Delancey Streets and across the street on American from their property. They explained that they value the historic quality of the area and would abide by a

consensus of the neighbors and the Historical Commission on the design of a parking area at the rear of their house.

Mr. Toner, the neighbor directly adjoining the yard to the rear, expressed his complete opposition to the idea of parking in this location. He opposed both the noise of the car and of the door/gate motor. He stated his concern for security in the event of an open parking pad such as the one across the street, but also objected to the glare of any security lighting. In addition, he mentioned the tightness of the necessary turning radius and the possible moving of a streetlight.

Another neighbor, Nace Mullen from across the street, explained that he chose to invest in a house on this street because it did not have garages, cars and parking. He said that parking would in fact lessen the value of his property and expressed his complete opposition.

The Committee received letters from neighbors Harvey Bartle III and Susan and Barry Milberg in opposition to parking or a garage on American Street.

Committee members explained that parking and use issues were to be decided by the Zoning Board but that from an historical perspective a gated fence was as appropriate as the existing brick wall. The Committee agreed that a six feet high brick fence with a manually operated wooden gate would constitute an historically appropriate design solution in this context.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of a proposal to demolish the existing rear yard wall and construct a new wall of the same height with a manually operated double gate of vertical wood plank design. As a neighbor to the property in question, Penelope Batchelor abstained from voting.

254 S. 16TH STREET

Thomas Rogers, Building Manager/Applicant

PROPOSAL: Legalize ornate metal and glass canopy over door

The applicant seeks to legalize the installation of an ornate metal and glass canopy installed over the front door. Committee members explained that the canopy was unacceptable in that it altered the look of the building and had no historic basis. Mr. Rogers informed the Committee that he had previously erected a new brick facade on the ground floor without a permit and subsequently received Commission approval for it. He assumed that since the Commission had approved that work, that he could make other ground floor alterations in this already damaged area. Committee members were aghast that such an alteration had been approved in the past. They explained that the earlier work had not damaged the marble frontispiece now altered by the new

canopy. Moreover, as pointed out previously, the Code requires the securing of a permit before the undertaking of any alterations. Members of the Center City Residents Association and a neighbor spoke in objection to the canopy not only from an historical perspective but also from the standpoint of danger from falling snow that collected on this roof.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application and asked that the canopy be removed and that the holes in the marble be patched with a material to match the marble.

256 S. 16TH STREET

Nathan Hayward III Applicant

PROPOSAL: Roofing and dormer restoration

This proposal calls for approval of reroofing with gray shingles, cladding of the dormer in copper and installation of new 4/4 wood true divided light sash to match the originals in the dormer. It was explained that the work was already completed with incorrect metal windows with snap in muntins; the roofer contended that he had spoken to the Historical Commission and had received an approval. Because this could not be verified and because Mr. Hayward is concerned about the historic character of the neighborhood, he worked with staff on a proposal to replace the windows with the correct true muntin sash and to retain the roofing and copper flashing.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal with staff review of details.

STRAWBERRY MANSION BRIDGE

Missy Maxwell, Susan Maxman Architects

Hamid Homaei, Engineer

Lane Fike, Streets Department

PROPOSAL: Bridge Rehabilitation

This application involves the rehabilitation of the Strawberry Mansion Bridge for vehicular and pedestrian traffic. Decorative railings on either edge of the bridge will be restored using pieces salvaged from a third railing that separated the walkway from the cartway of the bridge. To discourage people from throwing objects on scullers below, new square grid railing extenders will be added atop the existing rails. On either side of the roadway New Jersey concrete barriers will be placed to protect pedestrians on the sidewalk. The beams under the sidewalk area will be replaced with shorter beams without rivets. A selection of two lamps were offered: a lantern based on the 1890s drawing of the proposed bridge and a gooseneck type shown in a 1940s photograph. The Committee expressed dismay over the

Jersey barriers. Safety standards and the question of liability leave no option. Although the Committee members accepted the new beams without rivets, they asked that the new vertical braces match the existing structure. They favored the gooseneck lamp.

The Committee voted to recommend approval with the gooseneck lamp design and vertical bracing on the bridge supports.

1811 CHESTNUT STREET

Jerry Roller, Architect

PROPOSAL: Reopen basement windows, install signage

This proposal calls for reopening the basement windows of the Belgravia building and installing an electrical box cornice and sign of plastic letters over each window opening. The Peale Club facade would be brought forward and a large sign of red plastic letters placed over the door at that later addition. Committee members found the attachment of plastic signage to the granite base of the building inappropriate.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal except for the sign boxes and plastic signage over the windows for which they recommended a denial.

400 N. BROAD STREET, INQUIRER BUILDING

William Lukens, Kling Lindquist Architects

PROPOSAL: New windows, west facade alteration

The proposal calls for new metal replacement windows for some of the windows in the tower and most of the windows in the rear production building. The window frames will be green and the muntin profiles will match originals either as true divided lights or with full profile internal and external applied dividers with an internal spacer bar. The submission also entails the removal of a modern corrugated wall from the loading dock and re-exposing the old wall behind it.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal.

1632 AND 1638 WAVERLY STREET

Elgart Aster, Manager Owner

PROPOSAL: Window Replacement

The applicant came before the Committee owing to the issuance of a violation for the replacement of wooden 6/6 wood windows with vinyl windows with snap in muntin bars. The applicant had replaced these windows in the period between the sending out of the letters for the district in September 1994 and the designation of the district in February 1995. In the spirit

of the rules for work undertaken in the transition period (Rules and Regulation, § 6.3.b), staff worked with Mr. Aster on a compromise in which he would restore the wooden, three light transoms that had been closed up over the doors and retain the vinyl replacement windows.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal.

PENNSYLVANIA BARGE CLUB

Anthony Weber, Architect

PROPOSAL: Door Replacement

The existing wood front door of this boathouse has horizontal bottom panels and a glass panel with diamond pane dividers. Vandals have ravaged the door which the applicant seeks to replace with a metal door. After much searching, he has found a similar door with diamond glass panes but with two vertical, not horizontal, panels on the bottom.

The Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposal and to ask Mr. Weber to investigate wood doors to be milled to match the existing.

1217 LOCUST STREET

Rosann Kozlow, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Punch windows in facade

This application involves a twin Furness designed rowhouse on a very architecturally distinguished block of Locust Street where the first floor was covered with a windowless stone veneer sometime in the 1950s. The owners bought the building to keep it from reopening as a club. To make it suitable for rental as an office, they would like to open windows on the now closed first floor. The Committee members said that the drawing is not sufficient for review and that an architect should be hired. In addition, they expressed concern that pieces of the Furness facade might still exist beneath the veneer and that the new windows would destroy that fabric. They asked that exploratory removal of stone veneer be done around a vent and in any location where cutting of windows might occur to determine what survives underneath.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of selective veneer removal and exploration and will review the project when a proper drawing is received.

Committee members requested that the Rules Committee meet so that more reviews could be delegated to staff. They said that Committee meetings have become extremely long.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Randal Baron".

Randal Baron

MEMORANDUM

Philadelphia Historical Commission

6 February 1996

TO: Philadelphia Historical Commission

FROM: Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer *R. Tyler*
Philadelphia Historical Commission

RE: Music Building
University of Pennsylvania

At its meeting of 25 January 1996, the Commission discussed the report of the Architectural Committee on the replacement of the roof of the Music Building at the University of Pennsylvania. The Committee had recommended permitting either the replacement in-kind of the existing asphalt shingle roof or the use of a rubber/plastic composition shingle that more closely resembled the original slate roof. The Commission tabled this proposal and requested more information about the University's obligations under the Memorandum of Agreement for the Institute for Advanced Science and Technology (IAST) which included the demolition of Smith Hall.

I have discussed this matter with the University's Offices of Facilities Planning and Facilities Maintenance and with its roofing consultant. The latter reported that the rubber/plastic composition material would add \$37,000 to the cost of the project. This more than doubles the price of the roofing component, but has no effect on the cost of the sheet metal work. The conversations with the University's officials focused on the future treatment of the Music Building, the Morgan Building, the Towne Building, Hayden Hall and the Cret Building stipulated in the Memorandum of Agreement. Although the synthetic slate will entail a greater immediate expenditure, the University recognized that installing a more appropriate material now would be cheaper in the long pull than replacing a new asphalt roof as a part of Phase II of the IAST project in five or so years. Indeed, the University's consultant is now seeking bids for the synthetic material and for natural slate for the reroofing of the Music Building. I shall report the result of this process to the Commission upon its completion.