

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Robert Thomas, Chair
One Parkway, 1515 Arch Street, 13th Floor
28 December 1999

Present

Robert Thomas, Chair
Tony Atkin
Penelope Batcheler
Herbert Levy
Daniel McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Also

Ivano D'Angella, Studio Design/Build
Lenore Millhollen, Preservation Alliance/Center City Residents Association
Dave Macken, Erra Construction Company
Eric Voegelé, Voegelé Mechanical
Dan Clancy, Voegelé Mechanical
Marianna Thomas, Marianna Thomas Architects
June Spring, Wawa, Inc.
Simon Duffeed, TCHES
Peter Kelsen, Esq., Wawa, Inc.
Sheila Ryan
Dan Ioseb, 2219 Bainbridge Street
Anton Jung, 2219 Bainbridge Street
Ennis Litrell
Javier Arrastia
Meredith Slimmer, P. Agnes
Dennis Kaiser, 2128 Locust Street
Craig Hedlund, 2114 Chancellor Street
George Restrepo, 2006 Chancellor Street
Thomas J. O'Connor, SOSH Architects
Carmen Khan, The Philadelphia Shakespeare Festival
Bernard Neary, Roxy Theater, 2023 Sansom Street
Cathy Burns, 2017 Sansom Street
Dan P. Kopple, Dan Peter Kopple Associates (DPKA)
Sherman Aronson, DPKA
Sally Elk, Eastern State Penitentiary
John H. Bushnell
George Lutz, The Inn Philadelphia
Phil Orchowski, The Inn Philadelphia

220 W. Washington Square, nw corner Locust Street

Jack Noonan, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1911

PROPOSAL: New entry and windows

Ivano D'Angella, architect for the project, described the proposal, which includes a new entryway on Locust Street in a former loading dock and new aluminum windows. Mr. Baron stated that the proposed windows will match the existing muntin pattern and brick molds, but have applied muntins with correct dimensions and ½ screens. The proposal meets Standards 6 and 9 of the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval with staff to review and approve details.

1216-20 Arch Street

Modern Video, Owner

George Voegele, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: 1902

PROPOSAL: Vents cut into windows, South facade

Dave Macken, Eric Voegele and Dan Clancy presented the proposal. The building now houses condominium commercial space, and the new owners of the 7th floor wish to install an HVAC system. The space will be used as a studio for television and videos, requiring a high level of air-conditioning and ventilation. The proposal calls for two vents on the south side of the building, one for air intake and one for exhaust. The applicant explained that the ducts cannot be run to the roof, owing to lack of space in the mechanical ductwork chase. The Committee members noted concern that this building will suffer piece-meal ventilation systems that happened in other buildings and stated that owners of other floors must follow the vent patterns established with this proposal.

The Committee unanimously voted to recommend approval of vents on several conditions in order to meet the Standards: vents must be placed behind sash and muntin grid, with a bird screen; vents must be painted a dark color; louvers must have smaller slats, and staff must review and approve details.

College Hall, University of Pennsylvania

Marianna Thomas, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1870 - 72

PROPOSAL: Window and door alterations, remove fire escapes

Ms. Pentz recused herself, owing to her firm's involvement in the project.

Marianna Thomas, architect, described the overall project. This phase of the building's restoration involves mostly interior work with some exterior modifications. The first part of the proposal includes removing the non-historic fire escapes and returning the doors to the fire escapes to windows as originally designed.

The second part involves the re-glazing of a large triangular window with intricate tracery. The window was restored several years ago, but the central hexafoil was infilled with a window air-conditioner. The project now calls for removing the infill and re-glazing the hexafoil with a hexagonal operating window. The Committee discussed the treatment of the window, while at the same time keeping it operational. The Committee, following Standard 10, voted to recommend approval of a hexagonal window with a flat frame, painted out so that the window only reads as a single hexafoil.

The proposal included a new vent for the HVAC system. Ms. Thomas explained that the new HVAC system needs an air-intake vent. The proposal calls for removing the glazing and muntins of a window with circular tracery in a gable on the east façade. The removal of the tracery would change the original four circles into a quatrefoil design. Ms. Thomas stated that the air-intake is measured in square inches and the tracery blocks too much air. The Committee members questioned the need for removing the tracery if the vent is set back from the face of the window. They asked to see the mechanical engineer's report for the feasibility of this solution.

Another part of the proposal includes the redesign of a doorway. The historic transom remains, but the doors and sidelights were removed to make the entrance ADA accessible. Ms. Thomas now proposes to remove the historic transom and to install a design based on the historic design with larger doors to meet ADA regulations. Mr. Tyler questioned the need for larger doors, when a push button could open both doors at the same time to meet ADA regulations. Ms. Thomas explained that the doors must be larger to also meet the required units of exit width and the new doors must be wider than the historic configuration. Ms. Batchelor stated that the retention of historic fabric is important and specified in the *Standards*, and the slightly wider doors below the transom do not detract from the overall design. Mr. Atkin disagreed.

Ms. Thomas explained another part of the proposal, which calls for replacing non-historic doors leading to exit stairwells on the South façade. The new door design is a single-leaf version of double-leaf doors found in other areas of the building.

The final part of the proposal includes new doors for a portico. Although not a part of this proposal, the University wishes to open historic entrances that have been sealed, making an interior room an open portico. Ms. Thomas proposes to install new doors at the interior wall, which, if the portico is approved, will become the exterior wall of the building. These new doors are also based on double-leaf doors found on the building.

The Committee voted to recommend:

- Approval of removing three fire escapes and restoring non-historic doors to windows;*
- Approval of the hexagonal operating window, with a flat frame that is painted out;*
- Approval of the vent in the gable, but denial of removing the tracery until the Committee sees an engineer's report and revisits the proposal;*
- Approval of the new double-leaf doors and sidelights, but denial of the removal of the historic transom;*
- Approval of the new single-leaf doors;*
- Staff to review and approve details.*

7913 Oxford Avenue

Wawa, Inc., Owner

Peter Kelsen, Esq., Applicant

DATE: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: Complete demolition

Peter Kelsen, Esquire, described the proposal for demolition of the building. He explained that Wawa, Incorporated owns the property and has received zoning approval for a convenience store and gas station. The zoning approval included the demolition of all extant buildings, including the historic structure. It was not until the owner applied for a demolition permit that Wawa learned that the house appears on the Philadelphia Register. Mr. Kelsen argued that the historic context of the building is lost and the interior has been completely modernized. Shelby Weaver Splain stated that she did some investigation under the aluminum siding and the wood has seriously deteriorated. Committee members inspected photographs of the exposed wood siding. Mr. Thomas stated that he has worked on restorations of similar materials in the same condition. Other Committee members noted that, although commercial structures have appeared in the area, several early structures still survive, retaining the sense of the historic village.

Although the Historical Commission designated the building in November 1966, the Department of Licenses and Inspections issued two permits in the 1970s for the siding and brick façade without sending the applicants to the Commission. Mr. Baron explained that the owners applied for rescission of the entry of this property on the Philadelphia Register, owing to the loss of integrity. The Committee on Historic Designation refused to recommend rescission, stating that most of the historic fabric may remain under the aluminum siding.

Mr. Kelsen stated that the property on which the building sits will be turned into landscaped green space and the building, as it now stands, has no economic use. Committee members stated that the *Standards* do not allow for demolition, but the applicant may submit an application to the Committee on Financial Hardship.

The Committee unanimously voted to recommend denial.

2219 Bainbridge Street

Anton Jung, Owner

Dan Ioseb, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1868

PROPOSAL: Legalize window, bay and door alterations

Mr. Baron stated that the staff had approved two permits for this property. The first in March 1999 included interior alterations and work on the rear of the property. The permit explicitly stated "no work on front façade." The second permit, issued in July 1999 included "façade restoration per attached plans. Historical Commission staff must review masonry samples and window/door shop drawings for approval." Mr. Baron explained that the actual work performed on the front façade does not follow the drawing in three major aspects and the owner is applying to legalize the work. The work does not meet Standards 2, 3, and 6.

The bay on the first floor had full-length windows, a denticulated cornice and a basement window with wrought-iron grate. The contractor, Dan Ioseb, installed shorter windows, non-historic panels with a diamond pattern and glass block in the basement window.

The drawing called for segmental-arched, two-over-two windows on the second floor with cast-stone sills. The contractor rebuilt the second floor, making the windows several inches shorter than the originals and installed thinner sills and installed square-head, one-over-one windows.

The approved proposal included a half-glazed, 19th century door, but the contractor installed a pseudo-Colonial door with a glazed fanlight and panels.

Mr. Baron stated that, as built, the proposal violates Standards 3, 5 and 6. Mr. Ioseb explained that the architect who drew the plan was fired, and he did what he could. He stated that the building looks the same as before. Mr. Atkin explained that the building permit and attached drawing amounted to a legal contract between the owner and the City and, by not following the drawing, the contractor has violated the contract.

Anton Jung, the owner of the property, stated that he had concerns about the half-glazed door and wanted a more solid one for security. He also stated that he wanted glass block in the basement window for security and he believes the glass block is good looking.

Ennis Litrell, the next door neighbor, stated that the neighbors are happy that Mr. Jung has invested so much money in a building that should have been condemned owing to its poor condition, and it looks good now, because it matches her own. She also stated that the door proposed in the drawings was probably not the original door.

The Committee unanimously voted to recommend denial.

219 South 9th Street

Wills Eye Hospital, Owner

Meredith Slimmer, Applicant

DATE: c. 1815

PROPOSAL: Brace façade indefinitely

Mr. Baron explained that the Wills Eye Hospital owns several buildings in this row, but has left them vacant for a number of years. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation because of the deteriorated condition of this building. Meredith Slimmer of P. Agnes Company stated that on 20 December 1999, the Department issued a second violation, declaring the building imminently dangerous. The proposal calls for stabilizing the front façade with bracing that extends into the sidewalk. Ms. Slimmer stated that the Streets Department does not object to the bracing because it does not extend past the staircase. Committee members expressed concern for the safety and use of the building and asked for the owner to investigate a more permanent form of bracing on the interior of the building. Mr. Baron explained that with the "imminently dangerous" condition, the Commission staff could approve the application to erect the bracing.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the bracing for a period not to exceed nine months.

2128 Locust Street

Edward & Sunny Lee, Owners

Dennis Kaiser, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1900

PROPOSAL: Cut garage at rear, rooftop deck and stair tower

Mr. Baron presented the proposal, which will return the building to a single-family house. The new owners wish to install a garage at the rear of the property, next to the solarium, with a gate cut into the wrought-iron fence. No houses face the rear street. Also, the owners wish to install a rooftop deck and housing for the staircase. These will not be highly visible from the street.

The Committee voted to recommend approval with staff to review and approve details.

2114 Chancellor Street a.k.a. 222 Van Pelt Street

Craig Hedland, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1875

PROPOSAL: Replace deck, door, windows

Mr. Baron explained that the owner of the property added a third floor and rear addition before the designation of the district. This proposal involves changes to the modern additions, including a roof deck, replacement of the flush door to a paneled door and shortening a third floor window.

The Committee voted to recommend approval with staff to review and approve details.

226 South 16th Street, nw corner of Locust Street

James M. Dwyer, Owner

Thomas O'Connor, S.O.S.H., Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1929

PROPOSAL: New doors, marquees, penthouse addition

Thomas O'Connor, architect for the project, presented the three parts to the proposal. First, the proposal calls for replacing the non-historic entrance on 16th Street with new multi-light doors and re-opening the historic entrance on Locust Street with multi-light doors. Both entrances will have new metal and glass marquees. Second, the proposal includes a penthouse addition, set back from the front walls, next to the extant mechanical tower. The addition will prove only slightly visible. Third, the central windows on the Locust Street façade will be altered. The plan involves dividing the space at the central window mullion. The walls must have a fire rating of at least one hour; therefore, the new mullions will be several inches thicker to mask the new walls behind them.

The Committee voted to recommend approval with staff to review and approve details.

2006 Chancellor Street

George Restrepo, Owner/Architect

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Doors, windows, rooftop deck and stair tower

Mr. Baron and Mr. Restrepo, owner of the property, explained the many parts of the proposal. The roof will have a stair enclosure and roof-deck, set back from each façade. The rear façade presently has stucco, lots of wires and two small windows on the 1st floor. Mr. Restrepo wishes to cut a multi-light door on the 1st floor with a balconette, cut two new windows on the 1st floor and replace the balconette on the 2nd floor with a larger wrought-iron balcony.

On the side façade, Woodstock Street, the owner wishes to remove the non-historic door and install a window, cut down the only original window on the 1st floor so that its sill matches the other two on that floor, and replace all of the windows with one-over-one sash and new frames. Mr. Baron noted that the existing nine-over-one windows do not appear to be original, and there is no documentation for the original pane configuration; therefore, instead of a conjectural muntin pattern, the one-over-one windows meet the *Standards*.

On the front façade, Mr. Restrepo also wishes to replace the windows, remove the non-historic wood balcony, and replace the non-historic door. The new windows will have true vertical muntins of 1-1/8 inch, but applied 7/8-inch horizontal muntins. Ms. Batchelor objected to removing the original arched windows and suggested cleaning them and installing interior energy panels. For the proposed window in the former carriage entrance, the Committee suggested having a central mullion and four panels below to mimic a bi-fold door, rather than the proposed three-part configuration. The Committee did not object to the new multi-light door in the former hay-door, the new flower box and the new front door.

The Committee voted to recommend:

Approval of stair enclosure and roof-deck;

Approval of new multi-light window on rear façade with balconette, new one-over-one windows on rear 1st floor and new wrought-iron balcony on 2nd floor;

Approval of new one-over-one windows on side elevation, removing non-historic door, cutting down original window to meet sill height of other windows;

Approval of new front door, new multi-light door in hay-door with wrought-iron flower box, new window in former carriage door with three vertical mullions and four lower panels;

Denial of replacing three arched windows on front façade;

Staff to review and approve all details.

2100 Sansom Street

Lutheran Church of Holy Communion, Owner

Christian David, Applicant

DATE: 1890

PROPOSAL: Two banners 10' x 5'

Carmen Khan of the Philadelphia Shakespeare Festival and Jack Armstrong of the Lutheran Church of Holy Communion presented the proposal for two banners on new poles. One banner will advertise the Shakespeare Festival and the other, the church. The poles will be attached in the mortar joints and will hang about six-inches below the second floor window lintels.

The Committee voted to recommend approval.

2017 Sansom Street

Victoria & Slavko Brkich, Owners/Applicants

DATE: 1885

PROPOSAL: Sansom Street façade alterations

John Bushnell, architect for the project, and Cathy Burns, manager of the property, presented the proposal. The project includes replacing glass block in a window opening with a new one-over-one window and restoring the lintel, new sign band above the garage opening, awnings on the first and second floors, and a new metal roll-down door in the carriage opening, partially open at the top to provide ventilation.

Bernard Neary, a neighbor, stated that the previous owner used the first floor as an illegal parking garage. He stated that the new door should resemble wood carriage doors instead of being a metal roll-down gate. The Committee agreed, stating that the door should resemble wood, double-leaf carriage doors, with a vertical emphasis. The new doors could be open or have grilles near the top for ventilation. Mr. Bushnell stated that he will submit new drawings to the Commission staff. Mr. Baron noted that the drawings submitted previously showed no work on the rear of the property, but do not reflect the true extant condition of the windows. If the owner wishes to perform work on the rear façade, he must submit more detailed drawings to the Historical Commission for approval. Mr. Neary stated that the owner, when speaking to the neighbors, suggested that he wanted to install a garage opening in the rear of the property so that cars could drive through the building.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the window, front door and awnings as proposed; approval of wood double-leaf carriage doors with staff to review and approve details.

2951 Market Street

Amtrak, Owner

Dan Peter Kopple, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1929 – 34

PROPOSAL: Metal canopy on South façade in concept; bridge addition on North façade in concept

Dan P. Kopple explained the two parts of the proposal. The first part includes a glass and metal canopy at the Market Street entrance. Originally this entrance served as the taxicab station. Amtrak hopes to offer pedestrians a protected entrance to the retail stores inside the station. Mr. Kopple submitted three designs for the canopy. The Committee members agreed that the curvilinear lines of the suburban train-tracks canopy were not appropriate for the neo-classical, angular lines of the Market Street façade. However, the third, angular design evokes 1950s modern too much for the façade as well. Mr. Kopple will return with a revised design next month. Committee members questioned the height of the canopy. Mr. Kopple noted that the canopy must be tall enough to allow clearance for large trucks.

The other part of the proposal calls for a pedestrian bridge leading from the station to future development across Arch Street, which will include a multi-level parking garage, hotel and conference space. The mostly glass bridge will connect at the station on the western stone pier, with pedestrians entering the bridge at the mezzanine level and taking an elevator or escalator to the upper level. This

includes removing 160 square feet of historic fabric at the mezzanine level and partially blocking a neighboring window. Committee members suggested pulling the bridge further away from the building.

The Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of a metal canopy on Market Street, with a more angular design; approval in concept of the bridge addition, with the bridge brought out further from the building and a glass ceiling.

251 – 253 South Camac Street

George Lutz, Owner

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Canvas awning

Mr. Baron presented the proposal for an awning over the door and steps leading to the restaurant. George Lutz, the owner, stated that snow and rain cause dangerous conditions on the marble steps and he wishes to have the awning to make the entrance to the restaurant safer. The poles for the awning will not extend past the stairs, will have canvas-type of material, and will be installed in existing holes in the masonry. Mr. Baron stated that the door sits very high, so that pedestrians will still be able to the fanlight under the awning.

The Committee voted to recommend approval.

2100 block Fairmount Avenue, Eastern State Penitentiary

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Sally Elk, Applicant

DATE: 1825; altered 1889

PROPOSAL: Re-roof Link to Cellblock One

Sally Elk of the Pennsylvania Prison Society presented the proposal, which calls for removing the deteriorated folded-seam metal roof, installing a temporary roof during investigation by an engineer, and re-roofing with an EPDM rubber roof on the link connecting the Rotunda and Cellblock One. Ms. Elk stated that the old roof must be removed and an engineer has to investigate the condition of the supporting beams and walls of the link before a new roof can be installed. The Department of Licenses and Inspections closed the link, owing to its dangerous condition, hindering the public tours of the property. Ms. Elk explained that the barrel vaulted ceiling of the link retains approximately two-thirds of the original plaster from the 1820s and the Society wishes to retain as much of the plaster as possible for interpretation. The link, over the years received several additions. One addition has since collapsed, one will be removed and one will remain and be re-roofed in this project.

Committee members questioned the use of a rubber roof rather than folded-seam metal. Ms. Elk stated that the metal roof costs too much and the roof of the link is not visible, except from the towers of the prison.

The Committee voted to recommend approval on condition of submission of engineer's drawings and report after initial investigation.