

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Commission Offices, Room 578, City Hall
26 October 2004**

Present

Vincent Rivera, Chair
Herbert Levy, AIA
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Suzanne Pentz
Robert Thomas, AIA
Daniela Voith, AIA

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jonathan Farnham, Historic Preservation Planner
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner

Also

William Youngblood, 921 Spruce Street
Van Strother, New Covenant Church
Virgil Procaccino
Craig Deutsch, Harman Deutsch Architects
John Gallery, 910 Spruce Street
W.K. Baker
J. Kenmoore
Virginia H. Beier, 253 South Van Pelt Street
Michael D. McCoy, T-Mobile USA
Joan Hooke, 264 South Van Pelt Street
Lenore Milhollen, Preservation Alliance and Center City Residents Association
John Clausen, T-Mobile/Betzwood
Sylvie Fallot Ftaiha, FSB, LLC.
Cindy Candowick, Atlas Sign
Therese May, Agoos/Lovera Architects
Mike Choi, SGRA
Michele Williams, 1917 Panama Street
Gerry Gutierrez, Group G
Alma W. Thubin, Spring Garden Civic Association
Steven Westbrook
Herb Sctoot
John Loonstyn
Frank J. Graham
Mike Gavin, Verizon Wireless
William Schwartz
Neil Sandvold, AIA
David W. O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighbors Association
Marion Buczek, Queen Village Neighbors Association
Alexandra Buczek, Bodine Street Neighbors Association
John Bells, 225 Race Street
Jason Silverman, Bodine Street
D. S. Ventresca, 238 Christian Street
Mary Shaffer, Shaffer Group
Robert Shaffer, Shaffer Group
Diane Fink, 903 Bodine Street

Scott Larkin, Brawer Hauptman Architects
Talmerge Brennan, 732 Catharine Street
Beth Richards, Old City Civic Association
Alex Generalis
Theresa Stigale
Helma Weeks, Powelton Village Civic Association
Israel Shenker
Kathryn Kurtz, Powelton Village Civic Association
Nancy Drye, Powelton Village Civic Association
Debra McCarty, Powelton Village Civic Association
Joy Donnelly, 3620 Hamilton Street
Jennifer Grafton, Agoos/Lovera Architects

Vincent Rivera, the chair, called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m. Mr. Rivera, Suzanne Pentz, Robert Thomas, and Daniela Voith constituted the Committee.

7500 Germantown Avenue

New Covenant Church, owner

Van Strother, applicant

History: Eagles Hall, 1890-1892, Wilson Brothers, architects and engineers

Sanctuary, 1997, John Teets, architect

Project: Construct 3-story addition to sanctuary and pedestrian bridge – in concept

This application requests the in-concept review of a large addition to the New Covenant Church sanctuary and a pedestrian bridge connecting the sanctuary to Eagles Hall on the church's large campus in Mt. Airy. The sanctuary was erected with Commission approval in 1997.

The addition would stand at the rear of the 1997 sanctuary and would house a Children and Family Center. The construction of the addition would not require the removal or alteration of any historic fabric. At the back of the large campus, several hundred feet from Germantown Avenue and W. Gowen Street, the addition would not be visible from any public right-of-way.

The pedestrian bridge would link the sanctuary to Eagles Hall, historically Cresheim Hall. The Commission's nomination classifies it as equivalent in importance to a significant resource in a district. The bridge would be visible, albeit from a great distance, from a public right-of-way. More significant, the application provides very little information about the proposed bridge and the impact of its construction on historic fabric. The rendering and "master plan" do not specify how much or what types of historic material would be obscured or removed for the addition of the bridge.

Staff Recommendation: Approval in concept of the addition to the sanctuary, pursuant to Standard 9; denial of the pedestrian bridge, owing to the incompleteness of the application.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Van Strother, the church's architect, represented the proposal.

Mr. Thomas and Ms. Voith agreed with the staff that not enough information had been provided to assess the proposed pedestrian bridge. Mr. Strother stated that one second-story window and some surrounding stone would be removed to connect the bridge to

the historic building. Ms. Voith countered that the aerial rendering implied that much more than one second-story bay would be impacted. She and Mr. Thomas affirmed that not only much more information was needed to make an informed decision, but also that the scant information provided implied that the bridge as currently designed would be unnecessarily detrimental to the historic fabric. Mr. Rivera agreed. Ms. Pentz questioned the capacity of the extant porte-cochere piers to support the proposed bridge. All Committee members asserted that scale drawings of the proposed bridge are needed for a thorough review, even an in-concept review. Ms. Voith and Mr. Thomas recommended that the bridge be redesigned to minimize its impact on the historic building. They concurred that a bridge, if better defined, but not this bridge, would be acceptable. They suggested a bridge with an elbow, which would connect with the historic building at a right angle, thereby minimizing the loss and eclipsing of the historic fabric.

Committee members then discussed the addition to the sanctuary. They agreed that the proposal, although poorly defined, would not impact any historic fabric and would not be visible from any public right-of-way.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval in concept of a rear addition to the sanctuary and approval of the concept of a bridge between the sanctuary and hall, but denial of this particular bridge design, pursuant to the incompleteness of the application and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

Mr. Levy arrived to join the Committee.

921 Spruce Street

William Youngblood and Nicole Westerman, owners/applicants

History: c. 1890

Project: Demolish garden wall, add garage and HVAC equipment, cut door and windows

This application proposes several alterations to the rowhouse at the northeast corner of Spruce and Hutchinson Streets. A garden wall along Hutchinson Street, which encloses a small courtyard, would be demolished and a garage with a flat roof constructed on the court. A new entrance doorway with step would be cut into a small, non-historic shed addition on the Hutchinson Street façade. Four new window openings would be cut into the Hutchinson Street façade; an existing window on the same façade would be replaced. A set of large, non-historic windows at the rear ell would be replaced with two double-hung windows. At the roof, HVAC equipment would be added and non-historic skylights would be removed. The HVAC equipment would not be visible from the street.

The addition of the garage will disrupt the historic spatial relationships between the main block, rear ell, and street. It will also detract from the pedestrian experience of Hutchinson Street. On the other hand, this façade has been altered and the property is not in a district.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owners William

Youngblood and Nicole Westerman and architect William Becker represented the project at the meeting.

Ms. Voith stated emphatically that she found the proposed garage “extraordinarily detrimental to Hutchinson Street.” She is “very concerned” about the impact it would have on the narrow, historic street, which is lined with small residences, most of which are on the Register. The staff noted that this block of Hutchinson is included in the Thematic Street Paving District. Ms. Westerman displayed photographs of cars parked on the sidewalk directly across Hutchinson Street from the proposed garage. Ms. Voith countered that illegally parked cars do not justify the construction of an obtrusive garage on the pedestrian-friendly street. Ms. Westerman and Mr. Youngblood presented photographs of other garages in the neighborhood but none on this block of Hutchinson. The owners promised to gently cut or lower the curb. Mr. Becker, the architect, also advocate for the approval of the garage. Mr. Thomas insisted that this block of Hutchinson is not an alley or service street, but is a small residential street onto which numerous houses front. He argued that approving this garage would prompt the decline of the street to an alley. He added that the proposal fails to meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. Ms. Pentz agreed with Mr. Thomas.

John Gallery spoke, referring to the letter he submitted to the Committee. He emphasized that he was speaking as a resident of the 900-block of Spruce Street, not as the executive director of the Preservation Alliance. He asserted his opposition to the garage as well as the conversion of the building from single to multiple-family use. He noted the importance of the historic side street and remarked that Washington Square West has been “ravaged” by apartment conversions. He also noted that he had opposed the proposal at the civic association meeting.

The Committee discussed the other work proposed including the new windows and door and agreed that it was acceptable.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the new entranceway, window openings, windows, and HVAC equipment, with staff to review details, but denial of the demolition of the garden wall and addition of the garage, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

261-63 South 22nd Street aka 262 South Van Pelt Street

200 Christian Street Partners, owners

Craig Deutsch, applicant

History: 261 S. 22nd/262 S. Van Pelt Street, c. 1875

263 S. 22nd Street, 1957

Project: Demolish facades and rears, rebuild facades, erect additions with decks

This application proposes the partial demolition of a large L-shaped building and the construction of three residential buildings with garages and decks in its place. At the north, the property extends from 22nd Street to Van Pelt Street and includes the 261 S. 22nd and 262 S. Van Pelt facades. At the south, the property extends east about 120 feet from the 263 S. 22nd façade. The site is listed as three buildings in the Rittenhouse-Filter Historic District inventory; all three are classified as Contributing.

The site has a complex history. The structure extending from 261 S. 22nd to 262 S. Van Pelt was constructed about 1875. Fronting on both streets, the structure was used as a livery stable and had stable doors at both facades. The 261 S. 22nd façade has been altered several times, but most of the brick, the third-story window frames, and the uncommon pierced Neo-Grec cornice survive. The brick of the Van Pelt Street façade, which is covered with several layers of paint, is original; the windows and door on Van Pelt are not. To the south, a four-story rowhouse once stood at 263 S. 22nd. It was demolished by 1957, when the two-story brick structure was erected as an addition to 261 S. 22nd/262 S. Van Pelt building.

The proposal stipulates the demolition of the facades at 263 S. 22nd and 262 S. Van Pelt. New facades would be constructed. Garages would be included in all three new townhouses. The proposal also stipulates the demolition of the center section of the 261 S. 22nd/262 Van Pelt building and the rear section of the 263 S. 22nd building to create rear yards for the three new townhouses. A fourth-story addition would be constructed on the three-story section at 261 S. 22nd; two-story additions would be constructed on the two-story sections at 263 S. 22nd and 262 S. Van Pelt. Roof decks would added atop all three buildings.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the demolition of the rear sections to create yards; approval of the demolition of the facades at 263 S. 22nd and 262 S. Van Pelt; approval of the construction of a new façade at 263 S. 22nd with a third-story addition; approval of the construction of a new façade at 262 S. Van Pelt with a setback third-story addition; approval of the roof decks, provided their railings are the simple black metal picket type; denial of the façade details at 261 S. 22nd; denial of the inset entranceways at 263 S. 22nd and 262 S. Van Pelt; denial of the fourth-story additions; with staff to review details; pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Committee. Architect Craig Deutsch and developers Virgil Procaccino and Arthur Elwood represented the project. In response to the staff recommendation, Mr. Deutsch asserted that the penthouses do not include living space, but only room for a stairway, elevator, and light well. Mr. Rivera recommended that the applicants reduce the sizes of the penthouses to the minimum required for rooftop access. Other Committee members agreed that the penthouses should be reduced in size. Mr. Farnham noted that this month's original submission stipulated much smaller rooftop structures than those shown in the revised proposal, which was submitted a few days after this month's deadline. Interior plans for the buildings were submitted a few days after receipt of the revised plans to justify the sizes of the larger penthouses.

The discussion turned to the setback or recessed entrances. Mr. Rivera stated that he found them acceptable, despite the staff's rejection of them. Ms. Voith and Mr. Thomas agreed with the staff that the recessed entrances should be eliminated from the plans because they ignore the historic building line and can be magnets for vandalism and trash. Committee members noted the large number of applications to add metal gates at recessed entrances.

Ms. Voith asserted that the designs for the facades are extremely awkward. She agreed with the staff that the garage and entrance doors with transoms at 261 S. 22nd are inappropriate. She also expressed concern about the design of the 263 S. 22nd façade, especially the unusual window proportions and pane configurations. Mr. Farnham explained that the architect is restricted by some historic accretions at 261, but concurred that the facades need improvement. Ms. Voith suggested that the architect rework the design details of the facades.

Joan Hook, the neighbor to the south of 262 S. Van Pelt, stated that a coalition of neighbors opposes the application. She said that the neighbors reject the massing of the Van Pelt building and the decks and penthouses on all three buildings. She pointed out mistakes on the architect's renderings of neighboring buildings including her property at 264 S. Van Pelt. She asked that the Committee deem this an application for demolition in whole or significant part and therefore require a showing of public interest or financial hardship. She pointed out her adjacent building, which includes a fourth-story addition recently approved by the Commission, and contended that it is like a tiered wedding cake, not a solid mass. She asked that the Commission review all proposed facades carefully because some not visible from the public right-of-way will be visible from neighboring buildings. She claimed that elevators are unnecessary in these buildings.

Mr. Deutsch conceded some errors in the depictions of neighboring buildings. He explained the rationale behind the Van Pelt façade, which includes a garage door, mansard at the third story, and penthouse with deck. Ms. Voith stated that it is difficult to make sensitive judgments when the drawings are flawed. Mr. Deutsch stated that he had not completely surveyed the neighboring buildings. Committee members noted that they do not require drawings of neighboring buildings with applications.

John Moore, the neighbor to the north of 262 S. Van Pelt, reported the opposition of many neighbors to the third story on the Van Pelt building. He stated that it would be too massive for the narrow street. He added that the neighborhood is in favor of the redevelopment of this site, but that some aspects of this proposal are inappropriate.

Mr. Rivera noted that the plans should be drawn properly, but explained that he is not opposed to the project. Mr. Levy stated that the height of the façade on Van Pelt is appropriate, but the penthouses are not.

Mr. Moore asked about the applicants' plans for the party wall at the north. Mr. Deutsch explained that he planned to retain the party wall despite the demolition at the rears. Mr. Moore pointed out that any new open space would remain enclosed within the development and would not be enjoyed by the neighborhood in general, as some had claimed. Ms. Pentz asked how the architect planned to support the party wall after the demolition. The architect stated that it would be supported, but offered no details. Ms. Pentz questioned the feasibility of the retention of the wall.

Committee members suggested that the architect update his drawings to reflect the suggestions and submit new drawings to the staff in time for distribution to the Commission.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend the following, with staff to review details:

1. *approval of the demolition of the rear sections to create yards;*
2. *approval of the demolition of the facades at 263 S. 22nd and 262 S. Van Pelt*
3. *approval of the restoration of the façade at 261 S. 22nd with a center window at the second story, with staff to review window, door, and other details, but denial of the details as proposed*
4. *approval of the third-story addition and overall layout of the façade at 263 S. 22nd, with staff to review window, door, and other details, but denial of the details as proposed*
5. *denial of the massing and façade at 262 S. Van Pelt*

6. *denial of the inset entranceways at all three buildings. The building line at the sidewalk should be maintained.*
7. *approval of small fourth-story additions for rooftop access, but denial of the large penthouses as proposed*
8. *approval of the roof decks, provided their railings are the simple black metal picket type*

These recommendations were made pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]; and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

2201-03 Pine Street

Sheldon and Phyllis Moss, owners

John Clausen, applicant

History: c. 1925

Project: Install telecommunications equipment on roof

This application proposes the installation of telecommunications equipment on the roof of the two-story garage building at the northwest corner of 22nd and Pine Streets. The building is bounded on the north by Panama Street. It is classified as Contributing to Rittenhouse-Filter Historic District.

The rooftop equipment would include three sleds with antennas, one at the northeast and two at the southeast; a platform with six equipment cabinets; and two pole-mounted antennas. The sleds with antennas and pole-mounted antennas would be highly visible. Views of the equipment cabinets would be blocked by an existing elevator penthouse.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, owing to high visibility, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

Mr. Farnham presented the project to the Architectural Committee. John Clausen, Pablo Lopez, and Mike McCoy represented the application. Mr. Clausen submitted photographic mock-ups of the installation.

Ms. Voith suggested that the antennas be mounted where they could not be seen. Mr. McCoy replied that they will not work if they are not visible. Mr. Lopez, the engineer, stated that setting the antennas back from the parapet would result in losses of service in shadow areas. He did concede that the heights of the antennas could be reduced somewhat. Mr. Rivera claimed that antennas are a fact of life in the twenty-first century.

Lenore Milhollen of the Preservation Alliance and Center City Residents Association stated that the neighbors were unaware of the proposal, but would oppose it. She asserted that it is inappropriate for the building.

Ms. Voith suggested that the applicants develop a better solution to the problem. Mr. Thomas and Ms. Pentz agreed that alternative plans should be proposed. Mr. Thomas promised to locate a book on the installation of telecommunications equipment on

historic building that he has found helpful. The applicants stated that they would endeavor to devise alternatives that would be less conspicuous.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial and suggested that the applicants develop alternate solutions, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; and the Roofs Guideline [Recommended: Installing mechanical and service equipment on the roof ... when required for the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

2031 Walnut Street, first-floor commercial unit

Tim Bonni, owner

Cynthia P. Cardonick, applicant

History: c. 1855-1860

Project: Add signage

This application proposes a storefront sign at 2031 Walnut Street. The sign would be manufactured in aluminum and would not be illuminated.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the project to the Architectural Committee. Cynthia Cardonick of Atlas Sign Company represented the application. Ms. Cardonick stated that area civic and resident groups approved the proposed sign after nine months of reviews. Ms. Voith spoke for the Committee, stating that the sign was not appropriate to the storefront. She further stated that the restaurateur needed to develop a comprehensive plan for the storefront. She added that the drawings, which are neither to scale nor consistent, need improvement.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

2031 Walnut Street, upper-floor residential units

FSB LLC, owner

Sylvie Fataiha, applicant

History: c. 1855-1860

Project: Add roof decks on rear ell, cut window into door

This application proposes roof decks on the rear ells at the 3rd and 5th-story levels. It was reviewed by the Architectural Committee in August 2004, deemed incomplete, and withdrawn. Although some supplementary information has been provided, this application must also be deemed incomplete. Several submitted drawings do not include the proposed decks. Scaled elevation drawings of the rear ells with the proposed decks from the east, north, and west, a roof plan of the entire building with the decks, and

information about the proposed door must be provided. The current submission does not fully define the proposal. Nonetheless, the staff would not oppose well-designed decks in these locations, provided the upper deck does not extend north of the chimney and the new door maintains the appearance of the historic window.

Staff Recommendation: Approval, subject to the submission of complete plans, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property manager Sylvie Fataiha, engineer John Fee, and contractor Michael Bagwell represented the proposal.

Committee members agreed that the drawings submitted are incomplete and confusing. Ms. Voith and Ms. Pentz suggested that some structural details needed clarification. They also agreed that decks would be appropriate on the rear ell in this context. They noted that a parapet wall and chimney would block the view of the upper deck from the west. They suggested that the applicant and her consultants work with the staff to develop a complete application.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval, provided the upper deck does not extend north of the chimney, subject to the review of complete plans by the staff, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; and the Roofs Guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as ... decks and terraces... when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

1822 Addison Street

Howard Trachtman and Ivy Gilbert, owners
James Rowe, Agoos Lovera Architects, applicant
History: c. 1840

Project: Build rear addition, cut new windows, replace windows, paint masonry

This application proposes several alterations to the pair of adjoining rowhouses at 1822-1824 Addison Street. Most of the work is proposed for the rear. An infill addition would be constructed at grade below an existing second-story bay. A bay widow would replace a smaller double-hung window at the first-floor rear. A new window would cut into the rear façade of the 1824 building. All of the windows in existing openings would be replaced. All of the trim on the front façade would be painted including some masonry.

No details have been provided for the replacement windows. The appropriate windows, six-over-six double-hung windows, are proposed for the front facades. They should be wood, true-divided-light windows. The one-over-one windows proposed for the rear of 1822 are not appropriate; they too should be six-over-six. The paired casement windows proposed for the rear of 1824 are appropriate to the façade, which was significantly altered when the penthouse was added in the 1970s or 1980s.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the infill addition; approval of the bay window; approval of the new window opening at the rear of 1824; approval of six-over-six, true-divided-light, double-hung, wood replacement windows at the front facades; approval of

six-over-six, double-hung, replacement windows at the rear of 1822, but denial of the proposed one-over-one windows; approval of paired casement windows for the rear of 1824; denial of the painting of all masonry trim; with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Therese May of Agoos/Lovera Architects represented the proposal.

The architect discussed the proposal with the Committee. Members agreed that the proposed alteration and restoration was appropriate with the exception of the rear windows at 1822 and the painting of the masonry. The Committee concurred with the staff that rear windows at 1822 should be six-over-six and that the masonry should not be painted, but should be cleaned and restored.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend the following:

- 1. approval of the infill addition;*
- 2. approval of the bay window;*
- 3. approval of the new window opening at the rear of 1824;*
- 4. approval of six-over-six, true-divided-light, double-hung, wood replacement windows at the front facades;*
- 5. approval of six-over-six, double-hung, replacement windows at the rear of 1822, but denial of the proposed one-over-one windows*
- 6. approval of paired casement windows for the rear of 1824;*
- 7. denial of the painting of all masonry trim. Paint should be stripped from the masonry watertable, lintels, and sills. If stripping proves infeasible from a conservation perspective, the masonry may be painted white.*

With staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]; and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]

1710 Walnut Street

Joan W. Keiser, owner

Mike Choi, applicant

History: c. 1840; storefront added, c. 1930

Project: Add signage

This application proposes two signs for the storefront at 1710 Walnut Street. A Sunbrella banner would project from the face of the storefront at the east. A metal and plastic illuminated sign would be mounted at the transom above the door. A space above the sign would be infilled with an Exterior Insulation and Finish System (EFIS) material to match the color of the building.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the banner. Approval of an internally illuminated sign in the transom, but denial of the infilling of the transom with EFIS. The transom has been altered and partially boarded without the Commission's approval. The transom should be glazed, not infilled. This recommendation is made pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Michael Choi of Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects represented the proposal.

Ms. Voith and Mr. Levy strongly stated that the illegally boarded transom should be reglazed. The Committee members agreed that an internally illuminated sign at the interior or exterior of the transom was acceptable. They likewise agreed that any infilling of the transom was unacceptable. They did not oppose the banner sign.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the banner and internally illuminated sign in the transom, but denial of the infilling of the transom, which should be glazed; with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

1917 Panama Street

Michele Williams, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1835/1920 alts

PROPOSAL: Legalize cutting of masonry, install new windows, remove ironwork

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron summarized the history of this application including the illegal work, the denial by the Committee and Commission and the review by the Hardship Committee that ended with Ms. Williams withdrawing that application. Several Committee members expressed concern about the very wide pointing.

The Committee unanimously recommended the approval of the cutting down of the first-floor window and the installation of wood casement windows and a decorative metal sconce next to the door, subject to the removal of the decorative bars. The Committee suggested that these could be retrofitted to operate on the inside of the windows.

2028-30 Fairmount Avenue

Savaas Navrosidis, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1855, 1970 storefronts

PROPOSAL: Replace storefronts

Staff Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron explained that Mr. Gutierrez returned with the details for the replacement storefronts that the Committee asked for at the last meeting.

Mr. Rubin explained that the neighbors just want to make sure that the Commission reviews the details.

The Architecture Committee unanimously recommended approval of the proposal.

Daniel McCoubrey arrived to join the Committee.

613 North 18th Street

Steven Westbrook, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c.1855

PROPOSAL: Demolish and rebuild front façade and rear ell with decks

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 6, 9 & 10.

Mr. Baron explained that the staff had several years ago approved a plan for the same owner which called for the restoration of the building including the rebuilding of the frame rear bays which are highly visible from Mt. Vernon Street. Instead of following this plan, the owner demolished the brick rear ell and the bays and the building has sat open and vacant. Now the applicant proposes demolishing practically the whole building and rebuilding it with a rear addition that no longer follows the shape of the old rear bays. He proposes to rebuild the front façade with matching brick.

Committee members discussed the front façade and thought that the damaged portion of it could be rebuilt with the existing brick but that the applicant should come back with a drawing that details that work. They also thought that other pieces of the façade should be retained such as the majority of the wall, the door frame, the cornice and marble base. On the rear they asked him to go back to the old dimensions and a cedar shingle on the rear bay. They did indicate however, that he could dispense with the brick and use cinderblock and stucco on the rear instead. The applicant agreed.

The Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials.]; and 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be impaired].

1904 Spring Garden Street

1904-08 Spring Garden LLC. Owner

David Nasatir, Esq., Applicant

DATE: c. 1975

PROPOSAL: Demolish non-contributing building

Staff recommendation: Approval subject to the Commission reviewing and approving the new buildings with particular attention to the historic rear wall and the bay on the house to the east.

Mr. Baron explained that the applicant is in his due diligence period, considering the purchase of the property. The outline of the new structure will fill the property to the front property line. Parking will be from the rear on Nectarine Street.

The developer Mr. Loonstyn was represented by his lawyer Mr. Schwartz, Frank Groff, his project supervisor, and his architect Neil Sandvold.

Committee members agreed that the building could be demolished to the betterment of the streetscape but discussed the code issues associated with the visible decorative bay to the east, which sits across a narrow alleyway from this property. It was agreed by the Committee that the new property could be designed in such a way that the windows on the neighboring property might not have to be closed if there are not windows directly across the alley from it. This is a code issue but the Committee asked the applicant to be sensitive to the problem as they design the new building. Mr. Schwartz said that his client would not grant an easement to the adjacent property for their window.

The Committee unanimously recommended approval of the demolition of this non-contributing building subject to the Committee and Commission's review of the new construction with particular concern for the bay at 1902 Spring Garden and the stone wall on Nectarine Street.

1113-31 Market Street, Reading Terminal Headhouse

SEPTA, Owner

Michael J. Gavin, Applicant

DATE: 1893

PROPOSAL: Add antenna

Staff Recommendation: Denial

The Committee discussed alternative locations for this highly visible antenna with Mr. Gavin. He presented digitally altered photos to explain that it would not be very visible. The Committee members thought the photos were not an accurate representation. Mr. Gavin said that Septa does not wish to install the antenna under the bridge at Filbert Street or higher on the roof of the building because they do not own those areas and would have to lease them to use them. He explained that the signals are beamed to a receiver across the street and that this antenna represents a secondary receiver of those signals.

The Committee unanimously recommended denial of the proposal, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

225 Race Street

John Beirs, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Legalize railing and removal of cellar doors, restore doors

Staff recommendation: Approval

Mr. Beirs attended the meeting. Mr. Baron explained the history of the proposal which had previously been denied by the Commission and been appealed to the L&I Review Board. The applicant proposes a compromise to legalize the removal of the grate and installation of the railing subject to the restoration of the doors to their correct muntin pattern.

The Committee unanimously recommended approval of the proposal.

238 Christian Street

Mark Bojanowski, Owner

Don Ventresca, *Applicant*

DATE: c. 1815

PROPOSAL: Install rear vestibule, demolish garden wall, install fence, add landscaping

Mr. Ventresca attended the meeting.

Mr. Baron explained that Mr. Ventresca had obtained several permits from staff including for the restoration of the windows, masonry, and new chimney. From the Commission he had obtained approval for cutting a gate for a car in the rear yard. The new proposal includes removing a fence along the three sides of the yard, the construction of a small porch and multi-light door in the piazza area, where the main house and rear ell join. He proposes a new wood fence along the south and west sides of the yard. There is a small two-foot wide walkway along the eastern side of the property which Mr. Ventresca proposes to plant with shrubs and fence across at the rear. Mr. Baron noted that when he had recently visited the property it became clear that the property extends over a hundred feet back to Montrose Street and that it was recently cleared for construction. He noted that if that property is part of this address that any new construction on that ground may also be subject to the Commission's review as well.

Many property owners on Bodine Street including Alexandra Busyck at 907, Jason Silverman at 909 and Diane Fink at 903 S. Bodine as well as Marilyn Busyck and David O'Donnell of the Queen Village Neighbors Association all expressed concern with the Commission's approval of a parking cut for the property given the narrow width of Bodine Street and the possible damage to the street paving of this street listed as part of the Street Paving District. They also thought that they should not be subject to the car exhaust and possible damage to the houses of a car pulling out of this driveway.

The Committee members agreed that the parking, although not a positive design for the street, had been already approved. They agreed that the approved wall with parking should be built to the formerly approved dimension so that the parking at least could not be expanded and the car would not be visible from the street. They recommended approval of the demolition of the fence on the west and south side of the lot and its replacement with a wood fence so long as that fence does not extend across the walkway. They also thought that the walkway should not receive shrubs. They did not object to the modifications to the building.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the demolition and rebuilding of the fence on the south and west sides of the property; approval of the alterations to the porch and door in the piazza; denial of the changes to the approved plans along the east property line including, opening the yard, and installing shrubs and a piece of fence on the walkway, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

806 South Hancock Street

Therese Zeccardi, Owner

Scott Larkin, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Replace larger roof deck with smaller roof deck

Ms. Spina presented the project. The building presently has a roof deck that covers the entire roof, built by the previous owner without a permit or Historical Commission approval. The proposal calls for demolishing the current deck and installing a roof deck towards the rear portion only. The deck will be set behind the chimney and almost behind the front slope of the roof. The access to the deck will be through a roof hatch that is converted from an old skylight at the peak of the roof; the Historical Commission approved the placement of the skylight in 1976. Since the house now stands alone, the deck will still be visible from both sides.

Staff recommendation: Approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and Roofs Guideline.

Committee members noted that the reduced deck will be an improvement.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended approval of the proposal, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and the Roofs Guideline [Recommended: designing additions to roofs such as decks and terraces so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

611-19 Catharine Street

Rick Shaffer, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1838

PROPOSAL: Legalize roof

Ms. Spina explained the proposal. The Committee and Commission approved work to this building last year; however when the final construction plans were submitted to the Department of Licenses and Inspections they did not come to the Historical Commission for review. The plans included replacing the roof and installing asphalt/fiberglass roofing to replicate the original cedar shingle roof, but they are the wrong color; the shingles are black instead of weathered wood. The proposal calls for legalizing the darker roof and replacing the cornice with a plain board. The drawing submitted for the cornice is not drawn to scale.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the roof, but denial of the cornice, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Shaffer explained that he had received a permit to replace the roof when the plans were submitted to the Department of Licenses and Inspections. Ms. Spina reiterated that these plans did not come to the Historical Commission for review before the Department issued the permit. The Committee discussed the cornice profile for the side elevations and determined that the ends of the joists were cut at some point in the past. The joists should be extended to accept a larger cornice; the larger overhang will also aid in water drainage for the building. When Mr. Shaffer asked about the downspouts, Mr. Levy replied that they can be boxed into the new cornice without changing their locations.

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended approval of legalizing the black asphalt shingles and extending or “scabbing” the joists to accept a cornice matching those on the front and rear, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old in design, texture, and where possible, materials.].

48-50 South Front Street, 101-03 Chestnut Street

Allied Holding, LLC, Owner

William G. Schwartz, Esq., Applicant

DATE: c. 1840 for all

PROPOSAL: Add stair and elevator penthouse, roof deck, flower boxes and awnings

This property returns for just a rooftop deck with a penthouse for an elevator and stair. The elevator and stair penthouses will be sheathed in vertical metal siding, painted a grey color, and will have flush metal doors. The penthouses will be set back over twenty-five feet from the Front Street façade and will sit along the northern party wall of 48 South Front Street. These will be visible from Front Street, owing to the empty lot next door. The deck will be set back five feet from both the Front Street and Chestnut Street facades and will have a metal picket railing. The application also includes installing flower boxes on all of the windows and fabric marquees at three entrances.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the penthouses and the deck, with a larger set back of the deck from Front Street, pursuant to Standard 9 and Roofs Guideline Denial of the flower boxes, pursuant to Standard 7; they will cause too many penetrations into the masonry. Denial of the marquees as designed; the entrances should have shed awnings within the openings.

Ms. Spina presented the application and noted that the applicant has changed the proposal by removing the flower boxes and changing the marquees to shed-type awnings. She explained that the entire roofing structure of the buildings will be removed and rebuilt so that the deck and penthouses will sit as low as possible. Mr. Schwartz assured the Committee that the deck structure will be pocketed into the sides of the building rather than sit on top of the façade walls. The Committee members agreed that the railing of the deck should be moved back from the Front Street façade to a point where it would be not visible. They asked that a mock-up be erected to allow the staff to determine the precise set-back.

The Committee unanimously recommended approval of the penthouses, awnings as revised, and roof deck with the position of the railing at the Front Street elevation to be determined with a mock-up, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; and the Roofs Guideline [Recommended: designing additions to roofs such as decks and terraces so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

22 South 3rd Street

Helen and David Cohen, Owners

Karen Robinson, Applicant

DATE: 1837, William Strickland, architect; John Struthers, stonemason

PROPOSAL: Legalize blue paint on marble façade

No one representing the application attended the meeting. Ms Spina presented the proposal. Without a permit or Historical Commission approval, the tenant in this highly significant building painted the front, marble façade blue. The owner granted the tenant permission to do the painting.

Staff Recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 7.

The Committee members stated that the paint should be removed immediately. Ms. Spina emphasized that the paint removal will require a building permit and Historical Commission approval since removing the paint may cause damage to marble as well. Mr. Baron said that this building has suffered many indignities over the years, including the removal and sale of the original Strickland-designed lanterns as well as unsympathetic signage, all without the Historical Commission approval.

The Committee unanimously recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 7 [Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.].

28 North 3rd Street

Alexander Generalis, Thomas Miles and Theresa Stigale, Owners

Theresa Stigale, Applicant

DATE: 1857 for Henry Korn by Stephen Button, architect

PROPOSAL: Cut opening and install garage with roll-up door

Ms. Spina presented the application. The owner wishes to install a garage in an alley at the rear of the building. The opening will have a roll-down metal door with the mechanicals on the interior.

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

Mr. Generalis explained that he and the owners of the neighboring properties own easements to the open court that runs behind these buildings. Mr. Baron noted that the garage opening will actually be in the rear of a building that faces Filbert Street, but the property has the North 3rd Street address.

The Committee unanimously recommended approval, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

1010 Arch Street

Israel Shenker, Owner

Jennifer Grafton, Applicant

DATE: 1902, William Prichet, architect

PROPOSAL: Cut window openings in west façade, enclose rear loading dock for lobby

This property returns with additional information requested by the Committee and for another alteration to the rear.

On the west façade, the owner wants to cut eight hopper windows. The building will have two new mezzanine floors with bathrooms, and the floors would bisect double-hung windows. The Committee had asked for section drawings at a previous meeting, which have been submitted.

At the rear of the property, the building has a loading dock. The application calls for infilling the area with brick and windows to create a lobby space. The windows will match those approved for the upper floors and the door will be a single-leaf and fully-glazed.

Staff recommendation: Approval with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9, Windows Guideline and Entrances Guideline.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Ms. Grafton explained that mezzanine levels will be constructed within individual units and that the floors would bisect the typical one-over-one windows approved for other openings in the façade. Mr. McCoubrey suggested elongating the windows so that they had a more vertical orientation to be in keeping with the other windows in the building. The other Committee members agreed. Ms. Grafton questioned lowering the sill, since the windows would be in bathrooms. The Committee said that frosted glass could be used for privacy.

For the loading dock area, Ms. Voith questioned the brick infill and believed that the windows should fill the entire opening. Ms. Grafton explained that the ceiling would be dropped in the room. She and Mr. Shenker noted that the loading dock area of the building is not visible from Arch Street because of fencing from the neighboring properties. Owing to the lack of visibility, the Committee agreed to the proposal.

The Committee unanimously recommended approval of the windows, on the condition that they are changed to have a more vertical orientation, and approval of the infilling of the loading dock area, all with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; the Windows Guideline [Recommended: Designing and installing additional windows on rear or other non-character-defining elevations if required by the new use. New window openings may also be cut into exposed party walls. Such design should be compatible with the overall design of the building, but not duplicate the fenestration pattern and detailing of a character-defining elevation.]; and the Entrances Guideline [Recommended: Designing additional entrances on secondary elevations when required for the new use in a manner that preserves the historic character of the buildings.].

3620 Hamilton Street

Joy Donnelly, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Legalize deck and conversion of a window into a door

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Without a permit or Historical Commission approval, the owner installed a deck on the roof of a side porch. The deck has an exposed support structure and a wood railing with turned balusters. To access the deck, the owner enlarged a window opening and installed a door.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

Joy Donnelly, the owner, objected to the designation of her property, noting that the designation happened in 1963 as a response to the request by a previous owner. Her half of the twin is designated; the other is not. She does not want her house to be designated and intends to request a rescission. She claimed that when she recently visited the Commission's offices to question the designation and inquire about the designation criteria, Richard Tyler stated that her house does not meet the criteria for designation.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that a different committee evaluates designations and the purpose of the Architectural Committee is to evaluate the application to legalize the deck. Ms. Donnelly then said that in the Historic District [the Powelton Village National Register Historic District] her house is listed as contributing, not significant, so she could not understand why the Commission would take issue with her deck. Mr. Levy responded that a classification of contributing does not mean that the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards* should be ignored. The deck does not meet the *Standards* because she cut historic fabric to change the window into a door and the railing does not match the rest of the house in its style.

Ms. Voith noted that the entire application appeared incomplete. Ms. Donnelly stated that she had submitted additional structural information to the Department of Licenses and Inspections. Ms. Spina requested a copy of that additional information for the file.

Ms. Donnelly stated that she learned of the property's designation after she signed the agreement of sale. Ms. Spina noted that the work she performed required a building permit, regardless of whether the property was listed on the Philadelphia Register.

Helma Weeks, chair of the Historic Preservation Committee of the Powelton Village Civic Association, presented a letter from the civic association opposing the legalization. She noted that the house is part of the historic fabric of the neighborhood and the civic association believes that the work that was done does not conform to the historic nature of the area.

Kathryn Kurtz, also of the civic association and a neighbor at 3613 Hamilton Street, wants to see all of the regulations of the Historical Commission followed and objected to the deck, which was built without a permit.

Nancy Drye, neighbor at 3624 Hamilton Street and wife of Robert Thomas, contended that the owner knew of the building's historic status prior to purchasing it, because she had informed the realtor that the house was listed on the Philadelphia Register when it was put up for sale. She also objected to the deck.

Debra McCarty, a neighbor at 3608 Hamilton Street, objected to the deck because she believes it is out of character for the district.

The Committee unanimously recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron
Jonathan Farnham
Laura M. Spina