

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Arlene Matzkin, Chair
Commission Conference Room
Suite 1301, 1401 Arch Street
30 December 1997

Present

Arlene Matzkin, Chair
Tony Atkin
Penelope Batcheler
J. William Cornell
Herbert Levy
Daniel McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
R. Scott Jacob, Historic Preservation Specialist
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Also

Philip Scott, John Milner Associates
Jason Manning
Brian Newswanger, Robert DeHaven Architect
Steven Pinkston, Robert DeHaven Architect
Christian Busch, Robert L. DeSilets Architect
Thomas Ferrick, Philadelphia Inquirer
John Connors, Buckstone Realty
William Brennen, Burt Hill Kosar and Rittleman Architects
James Platt, Burt Hill Kosar and Rittleman Architects

Samuel Olshin, Atkin, Olshin, Lawson-Bell and Associates
Martin Dorph, Temple University
George Schmidheiser, Temple University
Marvin Gerstein, Temple University
Patrick O'Bannon, Kise, Straw and Kolodner Architects
Rebecca Hunt, Kise, Straw and Kolodner Architects
Robert McCauley, Ueland Junker McCauley Architects
Sarah Loughran, Ueland Junker McCauley Architects
Hugh Zimmers, Zimmers Associates
Ignatius Wang, Urban Consultants, Inc.
Scott Kalner, Urban Consultants, Inc.
Michael Hauptman, Braver and Hauptman
Melissa Howell, Braver and Hauptman
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents Association
Judith Eden, Center City Residents Association
John Ciccone
Charles Datner
Eli Hadad
Livia Corman
Barry Dubrow, Vilna Shul Synagogue

Michael Stern, Preservation Alliance
Richard Meinzer, Maida Engineering Inc.
Jeffrey Davidson, Rittenhouse Regency Affiliates
Thomas Hall
Mark Sullivan
Carl Zucker
Neil Stein
Dana Bank

Ms. Matzkin called the meeting to order at 11:30 A.M.

1115-1131 Market Street, Reading Terminal Headhouse

Reading Terminal Headhouse Association, L.P., Owner

Chris Kern, Applicant

DATE: 1893

PROPOSAL: Alterations to north wall windows

This proposal involves cutting down several vertical rows of round windows on the north facade of the headhouse to create views from guest rooms. The high placement of the existing oculus-type windows cannot not afford occupants of these rooms a view. Mr. Baron stated that he visited the site and could only see two or three of the subject windows from street-level. Philip Scott, an architect for the project, explained that the top portion of the windows will remain, and that the new frame configuration will retain the appearance of an oculus at the head of each window.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval.

227 Chestnut Street

United American Indians of the Delaware Valley, Inc., Owner

Richard Thom, Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Repair and secure metal facade panels

Mr. Baron explained that the applicant desired approval to make temporary repairs to some faulty and possibly dangerous metal work on the facade of the building. Jason Manning, representing the applicant, stated that the much deteriorated tin facade panels hang from wood affixed to masonry, and proposes re-attaching them with galvanized metal strapping. Some decorative tin panels also require more permanent repairs using patching methods. Committee members specified that the new patches should match the existing.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposed strap securing method for a period not to exceed six months. The committee also recommended approving repairs, conditional upon a good match to the existing material, with staff to review and approve details.

1115-1131 Market Street, Reading Terminal Headhouse

Reading Terminal Headhouse Association, L.P., Owner

Robert DeHaven, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1893

PROPOSAL: Sign at 12th and Filbert Streets

This proposal involves a second large sign to complement the one the Commission approved last month. This proposed sign on 12th Street for the Red Bell brew pub includes neon bands and a large round sign with neon lettering. Steve Pinkston, a consultant for the project, explained that the applicant plans to anchor the sign in the joints of the masonry. Ms. Matzkin expressed concern that the deep drilling required to support a sign of this proportion would damage too much historic fabric.

Mr. Levy cautioned that approving this sign may set an unfortunate precedent, and result in several large signs on the various facades of the headhouse. Mr. Pinkston argued that his client needs to compete with the large amount of signage afforded to the Hard Rock Cafe, and that Red Bell does not have any signage on Market Street. Mr. Levy suggested that the Reading Terminal Market and Marriot Hotels should set standards concerning the amount, size, and placement of signage. Mr. Tyler recommended that the applicant meet with Marcine Rogovin, manager of the Reading Terminal Market, to discuss signage options.

Committee members recommended the applicant look into installing the sign on a pole, which would sit near the curb of 12th Street. Mr. Pinkston expressed some concern that trees would obscure the sign to Market Street. Ms. Matzkin noted that SEPTA requires signage in the same location. Mr. Pinkston stated that SEPTA has contacted the applicant and the management of Red Bell to discuss designing compatible or joint signage. Mr. Baron stated that a kiosk or a high sign pole could display several signs. Committee members informed the applicant that either of these options must secure approval from the Streets Department and the Art Commission. Ms. Matzkin suggested tabling the issue until SEPTA notifies either the applicant or the Commission of their sign proposal. Mr. Baron asked the applicant to return with a revised drawing reflecting the Committee's recommendation prior to 14 January 1998 if they would like the Commission to see a new proposal at the January Committee meeting.

Committee members voted unanimously to recommend denial of the current proposal, and to recommend approval of a sign kiosk or pole, conditional upon receipt of a drawing prior to the next Commission meeting.

925 Chestnut Street, Federal Reserve Building

Jefferson Hospital - Rothman Institute, Owner

Robert DeSilets, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1925

PROPOSAL: Landscape plan in ramp court, sign kiosk, lantern

This proposal includes a design for two kiosks for tenant signage located on the Chestnut Street sidewalk, a lantern at the planned 10th Street entrance, and a landscape plan for the ramp court. Christian Busch, architect for the project, showed Committee members an alternate proposal for the installation of the kiosks that would position them perpendicular to the Chestnut Street facade, thus providing greater visibility for pedestrian traffic. He added that the kiosks eliminate the necessity to install the metal sign placards on the corners of the Chestnut Street facade.

Mr. Busch explained that they would paint the proposed lantern over the new 10th Street entrance black to complement the existing ironwork on and around the windows. The lantern will hang from an iron arch that curls outward from the building about one foot. Committee members asked Mr. Busch to submit detailed drawings of the arch to Mr. Baron. Mr. Busch added that a chain will help secure the arch to the ironwork behind it.

The final aspect of this proposal involves the re-landscaping of the so-called ramp court. Mr. Busch stated that the new design allows for greater clearance and more accessible egress for the ramp leading to the underground parking garage. He reassured the Committee that only hospital staff may use the garage, which should keep the traffic to a minimum. The proposal also calls for moving the guard box to a more appropriate place.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of either the perpendicular or parallel placement of the tenant signage kiosks. The Committee also voted unanimously to recommend approving the lantern and landscape plan, with staff to review and approve details.

23-29 North Juniper Street, City Hall Annex

Annex Center Ltd. Partnership, Owner

James Platt, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1926

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation into hotel: porte-cochere on Penn Square, Loading docks, new windows, repair of materials

This application for converting the City Hall Annex to a Marriot hotel includes a conceptual proposal for a porte-cochere as well as a final application for loading docks on Commerce Street, new windows, and materials repair and conservation. This project is under review for Federal Tax Credits, and has received conceptual approval from the State Bureau for Historic Preservation regarding the proposed canopy. The applicants presented no signage proposals at this time, but informed the Committee of future plans for hotel signage.

The applicants showed the Committee a scale model of the front facade showing the porte-cochere. They propose installing a traffic island built into Penn Square. The porte-cochere consists of three, glass and metal canopies, which project up and

outward from a point just over the Juniper Street entrances, and do not actually touch the facade. These three units will form one contiguous canopy with decorative metal ties between them. In response to Mr. Levy's question, James Platt, architect for the project, explained that connecting the three canopies serves to maximize sidewalk coverage. Mr. Baron noted that the porte-cochere, as designed, obscures too much of the facade. In particular, the metal connectors cut across the middle of the bronze lanterns, which constitute the most significant decorative feature of the facade. Mr. Baron also noted that the model and rendering contradicted each other on the issue of the height of the canopy. The applicant explained that the porte-cochere must accommodate tour buses, which explains the dramatic increase in height. Mr. Baron recommended fitting three canopies, one within the width of each opening. Committee members recommended designing a simplified awning that better suits the building's character and hides less of the facade.

The application includes the repair and cleaning of much of the building's masonry and metal features. The applicant submitted a detailed survey of existing conditions and proposed repair methods. Mr. Baron asked the applicant to contact staff to review and approve the proposed procedures. Committee members thought that the proposed metal windows appeared a very good match to the existing windows. The applicants plan to save and refurbish the original bronze windows. The building's new use as a 500-room hotel necessitates the installation of new loading docks and a new employee entrance on the south side of the building. Mr. Baron asked the applicant if they could paint the new doors to match the limestone base of the building.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the repair and cleaning, loading docks, new windows and employee door, with staff to review and approve details. The Committee also voted unanimously to approve a simplified canopy or porte-cochere in concept, and one that does not hide the significant facade elements.

312 South American Street

Edward Plachter, Owner

Sam Olshin, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Alter rear window

This proposal involves converting a non-historic window on the visible rear of this property into a set of french doors with a balcony.

Five of the six Committee members present voted to recommend approval. Ms. Batcheler abstained because she lives next door to the applicant.

Temple University - Main Campus

Temple University, Owner

Marvin Gerstein, Applicant

DATE: Late Nineteenth century

PROPOSAL: Campus plan: demolition and new construction - not for Permit

This proposal serves as a sounding board for the Committee and Commission to provide guidance to Temple in the formulation of a planning document that will entail a number of changes to Temple's main campus, including the Baptist Temple itself and the Park Avenue Mall. The proposal includes demolishing much of the Temple, but leaving several pieces of exterior wall to surround a memory garden and outdoor theater. On Park Mall, Temple would like to demolish a building historically known as the Park Avenue Baptist Church (now Thomas Hall), as well as six historic rowhouses. On a now vacant lot and in place of that church, Temple plans to build a new dormitory. They propose adding awnings and signage to the remaining rowhouses of Park Mall to accommodate commercial tenants.

Martin Dorph, Chief Financial Officer, Vice President and Treasurer of Temple University, stated that over the past twenty years, Temple's student enrolment has decreased by twenty percent, and these proposed alterations to the campus form part of a broader plan to attract more students, improve campus and dormitory conditions, and increase retail activity.

Marvin Gerstein, Temple's Director of Planning and Design, stated that the Thomas Hall site was chosen for the new dormitory owing to its proximity to the cluster of student housing near the north end of the campus. He explained that keeping the residence halls close to each other alleviates the need to build more dining and activity spaces. Mr. Gerstein further stated that the main entrance for this proposed dormitory on Park Mall would serve as a preferable and safer solution to placing doors on Broad or Norris Streets.

Committee members suggested looking into preserving Thomas Hall by incorporating it into the new dormitory. Mr. Gerstein and Mr. Dorph explained that the funds required for an adaptive reuse of the church as a lounge or dining hall would greatly exceed the available funds. Temple wants to minimize the building of non-revenue spaces such as lounges to make room for more and better student housing. Mr. Gerstein added that expanding the dormitory over the Thomas Hall site enables it to remain under six stories, which he described as more in keeping with the scale of the surrounding buildings. Committee members thought that adding more stories to the dormitory seemed a preferable solution to tearing down this historic church. The applicant also noted that the plan shows several large open spaces. George Schmidheiser, Temple's in-house architect for the proposal, pointed out the need for open green spaces for the students, and said that retaining Thomas Hall would minimize the amount of property available for students' outdoor activities.

Committee members asked Temple to show a design and cost study of a new dormitory that kept the historic church or made extensive use of its structure.

Mr. Gerstein explained that Temple has kept the rowhouses on Park Mall vacant for about fourteen years. Mr. Dorph stated that Temple wants to tear down six rowhouses in the 1800 block of Park Mall to make room for a "quadrangle," which would give students a larger gathering place, and to install retail spaces in the remaining rowhouses. Committee members thought this proposal seemed more justifiable than the others, but asked to see a more in-depth study of conditions and need for demolishing these buildings.

Mr. Gerstein described the proposal to demolish most of the interior and the non-Broad Street facades of the Baptist Temple. Mr. Dorph explained that Temple has investigated several possible reuses for this building, none of which justified the exorbitant costs they entailed. He stated that stabilizing the Temple would cost almost four million dollars. Mr. Gerstein stated that alumni have not contributed financially to preserving the Temple. Mr. Baron asked whether the University ever instituted any fund raising drive or structure for contributing to save the Temple. Mr. Gerstein answered that the University never organized such a structure. The outdoor auditorium and garden with retention of some walls of the Temple will cost 3.4 million dollars. Mr. Baron noted that even secular universities such as Harvard have chapels, and asked if Temple has one. Mr. Gerstein stated that Temple does not have a chapel. The Committee and staff thought that Temple University should study more fully the possibility of the adaptive reuse of the Temple, and if it proves impossible, demonstrate more fully its inability to convert the Temple to a new use.

Committee members stressed the importance of the building to the University's history. Erected for Russell Conwell, the founder of Temple University, from plans by Thomas Lonsdale who designed the adjacent College Hall, this building has a long and integral association with the University. Committee members pointed out that several years ago the Commission denied a previous application to demolish the Temple and strongly urged the University to make every effort to preserve the Temple, and that since that time Temple has renovated Rock Hall and another church (Schusterman Hall) for a conference space. Committee members asked the applicants to give Russell Conwell's Temple the respect and attention it deserves.

231 South 33rd Street, White Field House

University of Pennsylvania, Owner
Robert McCauley, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1905

PROPOSAL: Exterior stairs, ramp, cut window down to create door, louver

This proposal, seen by the Commission before in concept, includes a new door and stair for fire egress, a new ramp for handicapped accessibility, a new glass fanlight and exhaust louver. The applicant made some minor modifications to the proposal. He wants to make the piers supporting the new stairs rectangular and brick-faced. Committee members thought staff should review and approve a sample of the brick. After some consultation with staff, the applicant resubmitted a design for the stairs, which still angles-off from the building. Committee members found this new proposal for stairs acceptable. After conducting some above-ground exploration, as recommended by the Committee, the applicant uncovered sheets of plywood nailed to both sides of the fanlight transom. The Committee agreed with the proposal to remove the plywood sheets and to glaze the transom. The proposal calls for replacing glass from out-of-use ticket office windows on the northeast corner of the building as well as a transom on the side of the building with dark-colored louvers to bring in fresh air to the new mechanical room, as well as a transom on the side of the building. In one location, the architect proposes a replacement window of a type approved at a meeting several years ago, except now in aluminum.

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

609 South Clifton Street, Waters Memorial AME Church

Waters Memorial AME Church, Owner

Hugh Zimmers, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1840 - remodeled c. 1895, 1921, 1953

PROPOSAL: New ramp

This proposal calls for a new ramp on the front of the church. Hugh Zimmers, architect for the project, stated that the ramp will cover the historic front steps, and has to rise 14 inches to meet with the door. Ms. Matzkin expressed concern over covering the steps with concrete, and suggested redesigning the ramp to lead off to the side of the stoop. Mr. Baron recommended tabling the proposal to allow the applicant time to further study possible options and to submit a photograph of the existing conditions and an elevation drawing of his proposal.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend rejecting the current proposal, but recommended approval of a redesigned ramp conditional upon submission of better photographs and a drawing, with staff to review and approve details. This proposal can go before the January Committee meeting should the applicant need more time to meet with the Committee's requests.

1006-16 Arch Street, Winston Building

Julie Wong, Owner

Scott Kalner, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1902

PROPOSAL: Alter storefront and west facade

This proposal calls for a new bank in the ground floor of this building. They plan to alter an existing 1950's front to revise the placement of entrances to incorporate the advice of a Feng Shui consultant. The architect proposes replacing the former green glass of the transom panels with new panels. Mr. Baron recommended restoring the Indiana limestone, classical, ground-floor facade that currently sits exposed in the area above the windows. Committee members did not object to re-covering the historic ground-floor facade, which shows some damage. The proposal also includes altering several windows on the side of the building. Scott Kalner, the project's architect, explained that the new, smaller windows are more energy efficient and hidden from view.

Committee members voted unanimously to recommend approval.

15 South 7th Street, Atwater Kent Museum

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Mike Hauptman, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1825

PROPOSAL: New roof

This proposal calls for a new unpainted, stainless steel,terne-plated roof in place of the tin, standing-seam roof. The existing roof dates from the building's erection in 1825, and its deteriorated state necessitates total replacement. The applicant researched several red coatings to replicate the original color, but found that they all required painting every ten to fifteen years. They propose not painting the roof to avoid creating a maintenance issue. Although stressing that the red color is a significant aspect of many historic metal roofs, Mr. Baron pointed out the relative unimportance of painting this roof red, as the public sees very little of it, and then mainly from Ranstead Street. He recommended painting the visible flashing red.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the unpainted roof.

317 Market Street

Carol Phung, Owner

Neil Rosenberg, Applicant

DATE: c. 1820 - remodeled c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Awning and sign legalization

Mr. Baron presented the proposal to legalize an existing sign and awning. The busy, large, pink and white sign clashes with the blue and yellow, scalloped, canvas-type awning. Committee members did not object to the awning, and agreed that it does not cover any significant architectural features. Committee members recommended designing a narrower, less busy, framed sign that complements the colors and design of the awning and facade.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approving the awning, but to reject legalizing the existing sign. The Committee asked the applicant to return with a new design for the sign reflecting the recommendations of the Committee.

10 South 2nd Street

Philadelphia R.E. Corporation, Owner

Charles Datner, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1800

PROPOSAL: Addition, alter party wall windows, new storefront

This proposal calls for legalizing and completing an addition on the lot next to the designated structure. The owner installed large horizontal windows on the side facade of number 10, and has also removed its Victorian storefront and constructed a new storefront without a door. Eli Hadad, owner of the building, stated that he had the old storefront removed because of its advanced state of deterioration. The new storefront has no door. He wants to locate the new entrance to the restaurant in the new portion of the building. Committee members recommended the architect submit new drawings rebuilding the historic storefront and a recessed doorway. The owner can install a shallower and non-operable doorway.

Mr. Baron expressed a concern that the new side windows do not fit with the scale of the historic windows or the building, and suggested dividing them into thirds, creating more vertical windows. Committee members did not object to the new windows in the former party wall. The applicant proposed to build an addition set back about 22 feet from the property line. Committee members expressed no objection to the addition on that non-designated lot.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the side windows and addition, and to recommend denial of the existing storefront. The Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval of rebuilding the historic storefront, modified with a shallower entryway, with staff to review and approve details.

509 Pine Street

Sons of Abraham Aba Shapiro Congregation of Vilna, Owner

Barry Dubrow, Applicant

DATE: 1922

PROPOSAL: Replace glass and repair window frame in front round window

This proposal entails rebuilding the frame of the round Star of David window over the front entrance of the synagogue. The applicant seeks to change the purple and light blue color window to a clear window with an indigo blue, Star of David with a linear border. Committee members objected to the new leading the proposed design requires, which they thought differed too much from the historic window. Committee members noted that the

original purple and blue of the oculus matched the arches of the other windows on the front facade. The applicant explained that the new window would bring more light into the upstairs room. Committee members recommended retaining the original design of one piece of glass inside each set of mullions, but allowed for the use of different colored glass.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the proposal, and to recommend approval of repairing the wood frame and installing new glass within the confines of the original wood frame, without introducing new lead lines.

1521 Spruce Street

Livia Salandria Corman, Owner/ Applicant

DATE: c. 1860 - remodeled c. 1920

PROPOSAL: Awnings and lights

This proposal includes signage, canvas-type awnings, and facade lighting. The owner wants to install a dome awning over the entry door, below the decorative trim, with "1521 Cafe" across the front of it. The proposal also calls for two shed-type awnings over the first-floor windows. These will have no signage. Livia Corman, owner of the building, stated that she wants the signs to draw attention to the cafe inside. Committee members objected to installing three awnings on this particularly elegant facade. Mr. Levy recommended limiting the awning proposal to the entry only. Ms. Corman agreed to comply with the recommendation.

Committee members expressed concern over the three proposed lights, which they cited as too intrusive and industrial for the historic character of the facade. Ms. Batcheler asked the owner to submit elevations showing exactly where the lights would go, and how they would look. Committee members discussed the option of installing small flood lights in the existing flower box that spans both windows, or installing one lantern near the front door and more in keeping with the design of the building.

Committee members voted unanimously to recommend denial of the two shed-type awnings over the windows and the current lighting proposal, and to recommend approving the awning over the door and a new lighting scheme using either flower box lighting or a lantern at the door, with staff to review details.

219-29 South 18th Street

Rittenhouse Regency Affiliated, Owner

Richard Meinzer, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1929

PROPOSAL: Storefront alteration, hotel canopy in concept

This proposal calls for installing a new hotel into the base and several floors of the building. It includes alterations to modern storefronts and a large marquee wrapped around the corner

of the building. Mr. Baron stated that the proposed upper-floor apartment entrance and storefront alterations on South 18th Street alter only non-historic fabric. The new ground-floor window configuration matches an existing one on the building. Committee members found these changes appropriate.

The applicant presented two canopy proposals for Committee consideration. The option preferred by the applicant consists of a wrap around canopy, composed of metal and glass, modelled on that at 1830 Rittenhouse Square. They also showed a simplified canopy with a sloped roof, exposed framing and internal light fixtures. Committee members pointed out that the wrap-around design does not conform with the historic character or design of the building because it cuts off the corner pier of the building. Mr. Baron thought that the new canopy should complement the existing as well. Committee members favored the third canopy proposal, which consists of two separate rectangular canopies, similar to the existing apartment house canopy on the building. Mr. Baron showed yet another design option that uses two canopies, one on each facade, that does not wrap around the corner. The applicant prefers the wrap-around canopy because it provides a sheltered place for people to stand directly at the corner. Committee members thought the applicant should eliminate the existing modern planters at this corner to create a sheltered walkway inside the existing corner.

Committee members voted unanimously to recommend approval of the new entrance, storefront alterations, and removing the corner planters. The Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the proposed wrap-around canopy in concept and recommended using the two canopy design.

2004 Sansom Street

Demcor II, L.P., Owner

John Ciccone, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850 - storefront c. 1935

PROPOSAL: Remove glass storefront, new storefront and awning

This proposal calls for stripping the 1950s green glass storefront off the facade and creating a new door, awning and transom. Mr. Baron recommended retaining the existing glass panels and patching or replacing the damaged portions. He explained that these storefronts are quite rare and have stylistic significance. John Ciccone, architect for the project, stated that he just recently destroyed several glass panels above the door by accident, and added that any replacement material will not match the historic fabric exactly. The applicant, Mr. Baron, and Committee members discussed several options to repair the glass front, including "Spandralite" and "Carrara" glass, as well as back-painted glass panels. Mr. Ciccone noted that back-painted panels would look slightly different, but does not object to complying with the Committee's recommendation to keep the glass. Committee members noted that the missing or damaged panels made up a strip at the base of the storefront that the

applicant could replace with glass or enameled panels without changing the integrity of the design. Ms. Batcheler recommended matching the proposed metal sign band to the window frames, in keeping with the style of the storefront. Mr. Baron concurred with the appropriateness of a "moderne" sign. Committee members did not object to the awning and thought that it would hide the new glass in the recently broken transom area.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the new awning, and repairing the green glass storefront, with staff to review and approve details. The Committee voted unanimously to recommend denying the proposal to strip off the remaining glass panels on the facade.

2010-2012 Sansom Street

John Ciccone, Owner/Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Facade renovations, signage

This proposal involves repairing the stucco, replacing lintels and adding signage. John Ciccone, the architect for the project, has designed a framework that surrounds and projects in front of a narrow, 1920s balconette. These iron balconies give the building its "Spanish Revival" style. Mr. Ciccone submitted an alternate design that incorporates more of the balcony. Committee members thought the applicant should cut down the size of the signage by bringing the framework flush with the balconette, and holding it away from its edge about four or five inches. Mr. Ciccone added that he intends to use low lighting on the signage. Mr. Ciccone agreed with Mr. Baron's recommendation to repair the facade in actual stucco, and to use stone lintels.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approving the facade renovations and signage flush with the balcony.

2032 Sansom Street

John Ciccone, Owner, Architect, Applicant

DATE: c. 1870

PROPOSAL: Metal Marquee

This proposal involves the installation of a metal marquee to this row house turned theater. John Ciccone, architect for the project, stated that he altered the design of the marquee in response to Mr. Baron's observation that the originally proposed marquee did not fit the scale of the building. Mr. Ciccone presented the Committee with two new drawings for scaled-down, triangular marquees. One extends out 7'10" and the other 6'8".

Committee members voted unanimously to recommend approving either of the newly proposed triangular marquees.

1811-17 Chestnut Street, Belgravia Hotel

Lubert - Adler Partners, L.P., Owner

David Schoenhard, Applicant

DATE: c. 1895

PROPOSAL: Lighting and signage

This proposal entails painting the exterior of the marquee dark green, painting its interior rafters light blue, and removing the film off the canopy glass. The proposal also includes two new internally lighted metal signs on either side of the marquee with a dark green background, with gold-leafed aluminum faced and raised lettering in the "Caslon" font. The architect wants to install brass light strips with bulbs about every six inches on each side of the marquee, and a fourteen inch globe light inside the canopy. The proposal also calls for some lighting in the trees near the entrance.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval.

201-05 South 18th Street, aka 1718-40 Walnut Street

Rouge '98 Incorporated/Neil Stein, Owners

Mark Sullivan, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1955

PROPOSAL: Storefront alterations, vents on Chancellor Street

This proposal calls for installing a new storefront into an existing large opening, a sign above it and vents on the Chancellor Street side of the building. Neil Stein, owner of the space, explained that the design elements used in the proposed storefront recall a Parisian style of the 1920s. Committee members noted the inappropriateness of the proposed Regency Style railing in this 1950s building. Committee members objected to the amount of wood used in the storefront, as well as the faux colonial lanterns. The applicant explained that the lanterns mimic those on another storefront of the building. The signage proposal features black back-painted glass panels with internally lighted, gold-colored letters. The applicant plans to paint the columns in the storefront dark brown. The proposal also involves installing vents on Chancellor Street. Although not detailed in the presentation drawings, the applicant agreed to install an internal fan that would have louvers flush with the facade. They will paint them to match the facade brick. The Committee suggested that the designer work with Mr. Baron to reduce the width of the sign to match the width of the opening and to redesign the railing to something more contemporary. Because the designer showed a very light finish on the wood sample, the Committee agreed that the wood looks appropriate to the 1950s.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposal, modified with a detail of the fan, a revised railing and sign panel and without the colonial lights, with staff to review the revisions for approval.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Scott Jacob