

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

**Robert Thomas, Chair
Commission Offices, One Parkway, 13th Floor, 1515 Arch Street
27 June 2000**

Present

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

Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Also

Charles Burdumy, 132 Christian Street
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents Association
Peter Miller, Towers and Miller Architects
John Todd, John Todd Associates
Nicholas Ghionni Jr.
Michael Carullo, C. Erickson and Sons
Timon Duffield, Trammell Crow/University of Pennsylvania
Richard N. Russell, University of Pennsylvania
Michael D. Swiszczy, University of Pennsylvania
Marita Osbourne, Amerimar Wanamaker Management
Kristin Speers, Anderson Consulting
Jeff Mooney, Hillier Philadelphia
John Bosio, Hillier Philadelphia
Rebecca Stoloff, Society Hill Civic Association
Christopher Scalone, Christopher Scalone Associates
Thomas Rorke, 324 Delancey Street
Bob and Carolyn Wahrenberger, 507 Delancey Street
Tony Khoury, Xando Cosi, Incorporated
Rhoda Polish, Homeowner
K. James McDowell, Executive Director, Academy of Vocal Arts
Douglas Seiler, Seiler Architects/Academy of Vocal Arts
Lanny Liebowitz, Architect
Roger Johnson, 1915 Delancey Street
Ellen Prince, 1911 Delancey Street
Glen Krotick, Esq., 1707 Pine Street
Allen Roth, Joseph Callahan Incorporation

Albert Taus, AIA, Albert Taus and Associates
John Aikman

Herbert Levy, Acting-chair, called the meeting to order at 12:25 p.m.

The Committee recommended Rudolph D'Alessandro to fill the Architectural Committee's vacancy, owing to the resignation of William Cornell.

128-132 Christian Street

Charles Burdumy, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1790

PROPOSAL: Rear addition

The proposal involves adding a one-story brick addition to the rear of the existing house. Owing to the adjacent vacant lot, the addition would be visible.

Charles Burdumy and Lance Kramer, architects, were present to explain the proposal and answer questions. Mr. Kramer stated that the windows would be true divided light to mimic the front windows.

Ms. Batcheler questioned whether the brickwork on the addition would be on the same plane as the party wall and suggested a reveal; since the addition is small, this 20th century detail would make it clear. The applicant stated that since there are studs inside, a four- inch reveal would not be a problem. He also stated that since the contractor had to repair some of the original brickwork, the contractor had been able to find brick almost identical with the bond pattern.

The Committee asked the applicant to submit revised drawings before the Commission meeting.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the addition with a reveal and true divided light windows with staff to review details.

423-425 Vine Street

Bill McNett, Chris Mallios, Owners

Peter Miller, Architect

DATE: c.1760

PROPOSAL: Garage and deck

The proposal calls for building a garage and deck attached to the side of a designated house. A garage with custom wood roll-up doors and a decorative wood privacy rail and trellis would replace a yard with existing swinging doors.

The applicant proposes to replace an existing garage door, enclose an existing parking area in a lot adjacent to the house, and cut down two existing side windows not visible from the street creating doors in these window openings. The applicant does not want to jeopardize the garage and deck, if the doors pose an issue. The applicant stated that the existing windows are not original.

Ms. Batcheler suggested that the applicant submit photographs to document the existing rear ell area since the original fabric would be removed at the windows.

Mr. Levy questioned the rail height. The applicant noted an error in the drawings and stated that the rail height is 42 inches.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of garage, deck, doors, and railing at 42 inches, and also recommended that the applicant submit photographs to document the original fabric.

637-647 North 19th Street, a.k.a. 1830 Fairmount Avenue

Spring Garden Community Development Corporation, Owner

Elizabeth Masters, Architect

PROPOSAL: Build eight new townhouses, review and comment pending Spring Garden District

The proposal involves constructing eight new townhouses on vacant ground within the pending Spring Garden historic district. The Ordinance limits the Commission's role in this case, involving a new site that is not attached to a designated building and where no building is being demolished. The Commission can review and comment for up to 45 days. Were the building attached to a designated building or if demolition was needed, the Commission would have review for approval.

The applicant proposes two rows of red brick and stuccoed townhouses facing North Street and Fairmount Avenue. The Committee believed the small light sash to be inappropriate and instead suggested that a larger light sash be used. It also believed that front garages are not appropriate for the streetscape although there appears to be no alternative without rear parking taking up the yards.

Committee members thought that the sill height of the windows flanking the central French doors should be raised to better fit the scale of windows in the neighborhood.

On a positive note this proposal maintains the street line of both North Street and Fairmount Avenue. The purpose of the review and comment is for the Commission to give suggestions and the official comments.

The Architectural Committee recommended Approval with modification to the windows and a higher sill height on the windows flanking the central French doors. The applicant should also be encouraged to avoid front garage doors if possible.

2120 Shunk Street

Alfonso Gambone, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1915-16

PROPOSAL: Open two gable windows, close side window

This proposal is for a house in the new Girard Estate district. These are paired houses and the neighboring house in this pair has an octagonal window in the gable end. The applicant's house has a small vent. Of the other houses in the area, some have octagonal windows, some have one-over-one windows, and some have none.

The applicant wishes to install two octagonal windows in the front and side gable to match the adjoining house. Pictures show a wood lentil installed in the brickwork of the gable perhaps indicating an original opening.

Mr. Baron suggested that if the Committee recommends approval that it does so with conditions specific enough so as not to set a precedent. Specific conditions exist based on the existence of the lentil and vent and the disturbed brickwork.

Towards the back of the house on the side there is a window, it has a new metal lentil indicating that the three-part window had been cut in, (that the applicant wishes to close). This window can only be seen from an oblique angle. The applicant also wants to close an original side window. The Committee believed this window should remain open.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the application with closure of only one side window, conditional upon the submission of a scale drawing with the dimensions of the new window condition with staff to review details.

2521 South Cleveland Street

Rita Marconi, Owner

Nicholas Ghionni, Jr., Contractor

DATE: 1909

PROPOSAL: Replace concrete steps with brick and stone steps

This proposal calls for replacing the original concrete steps with brick risers and stone tread. The brick piers will remain. The staff recommended rebuilding in concrete to match the original and the others on the block.

Mr. Ghionni, the contractor was present to answer questions and explain the proposal. He stated that the present concrete comes out white and will stick out. He also stated that for such a small job the company will not mix a special tinted color. The longevity of the proposed material is the reason for the applicant's request of usage. The sidewalk and the alleyway are the same color as the steps.

Mr. Levy stated that the brick riser would appear even more different and that it is possible to tint concrete grey.

Mr. Baron made the applicant aware that if he decided to use concrete, he would not have to go to the Commission, and the application could be approved at staff level.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposed brick and stone steps.

244 Queen Street

Joan Snowden, Owner

Patricia Patterson, Applicant

DATE: 1841-42

PROPOSAL: Handrail

This proposal involves installation of a simple stair rail on marble steps. The railing will not have any balusters.

The Committee believed the design to be odd, even though a like example exists on the Hill Physick Keith House. Ms. Batcheler stated that the railing looked too 1930s with the top curve. The traditional railing would have a lamb's tongue front.

The Committee had differing opinions about the railing and the vote was four to two in favor of denial. The Committee recommended that the applicant restudy the mounting and confirm the current building code regarding the need for balusters.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of this particular design.

250 South 17th Street, NW corner of Rittenhouse Square Street

Rittenhouse Management Incorporated, Owner

Michael Carullo, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: 1920

PROPOSAL: Repair balconies and replace railings on fire landings

The proposal involves replacement of the concrete fire balconies, and replacement of pipe rails on the balconies with simple vertical picket railings.

This is a large apartment building with a series of balconies on the west facing side. The balconies have concrete bases and a pipe railing and are used for fire escapes.

The proposal is to take off the balconies and rebuild them in metal. The floor is to be a diamond plate metal. The balconies will be raised up, so there isn't a step down, and also expanded to project another foot. The replacement railing will be a simple metal railing with a vertical picket and will meet code requirements.

Mr. Carullo, the contractor, explained that the original plan was for the restoration and rehabilitation of the balconies in concrete and replacement of the perimeter angles. An engineer's inspection found that the existing brace, thought to have double channels at five locations, turned out to have double angles and this was deemed unsafe. This inspection showed that the balconies were actually held up with one bolt and only one support was semi-attached and not rusted all the way through. All five braces inside the building were just about gone. This was not seen until the brick was opened. Mr. Carullo also showed drawings of the soffitt, which showed that there is no reinforcing steel remaining in the concrete. The type used is not durable therefore rendering the balconies unsafe.

Shop drawings for the proposed balconies showed that the structure would have a steel frame. The simple frame will have pickets and will be painted black. He explained the reasons for making the balconies, which are presently very narrow, deeper. Life safety is one reason—the balconies will tie the two apartments to a center fire tower, which is now 3 feet one inch and will be expanded to 4 feet. The other reason is the elimination of the condition of some condenser units sticking off the balconies and some condenser units hanging in the path between the apartment and the fire tower. Mr. Carullo has recommended taking down the units and moving them to a corner in the far right. This would take them out of the path of fire exiting.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with shop drawings and staff to review details.

135 South 18th Street, NE corner Walnut Street

Rittenhouse Management Incorporated, Owner

Michael Carullo, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: 1913

PROPOSAL: Repair balconies and replace railings on fire landings

The proposal involves repair to masonry, fire balconies and replacement of pipe rails on the balconies with simple vertical picket railings.

Mr. Levy questioned the rail height, and it was noted that they probably don't meet today's code.

Mr. Carullo, the contractor gave a presentation with drawings and photographs. The pictures showed balconies on the first to the third floor caged in. Questions arose about balconies of this type and it was noted that they were used for security. The applicant stated that he would remove and replace the caged balconies. Mr. Carullo stated that all the railings would be removed, since they are structurally unsound and wired together. The concrete is true cantilever reinforced slab with no internal steel. Mr. Carullo believes that the slabs are structurally sound. He proposes to restore the slabs in any area that is rotted away. The concrete would be restored. A Volcum coating applied to stop water penetration. The railings would have vertical pickets. The applicant will repair the decorative balconies, which have balustrades with cast stone on top that have become loose but are pinned at the bottom, by simply taking out grout joint where it hits the cap and then re-drying and packing. The flat part of the balcony would be coated with Volcum, a material that has a sand texture, which would protect it from water penetration.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with staff to review details.

3814-18 Walnut Street, Fels Center Annex

University of Pennsylvania, Owner

Richard Russell, Applicant

DATE: 1907-08

PROPOSAL: Landscape and handicapped accessibility

This proposal involves installation of a handicap lift and new landscaping around this house.

Richard Russell, Michael Swiszczy and John Aikman were present to answer questions and explain the project.

This colonial revival house has green area around it. The project on the outside involves putting a new walkway where there is currently grass. Wheelchair visitors arrive through the parking lot where there is a fence and an existing brick oval with the project annex in the back. There is a raised interior in the courtyard with 4 marble steps. The applicant proposes to move the marble steps two feet to the right and put in a wheel chair lift. The walkway would be the same brick as the annex. To get up to that level, the raised flagstone would still have a six-inch rise to the first floor. The applicant plans to re-grade the flagstone, which will give wheelchair accessibility to the entire first floor.

Questions were raised about the closeness of the next building and the visibility issue. When asked about exterior lifts being disallowed, it was stated that the allowance is based on the expected volume and level of use.

The Committee believed moving the steps for the lift is a good idea. The Committee also suggested that the condenser be shifted east towards 38th Street to make it flush with the other condenser. The Committee stated that a large part of the character of this building is the landscape.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the handicapped accessible lift and the walkways to be parallel to the fence.

3601 Locust Walk

Trustees, University of Pennsylvania, Owner

Richard Russell, Applicant

DATE: 1926

PROPOSAL: Temporary handicapped accessible ramp

The majority of the work is the infrastructure replacement, owing to the housing of student groups, without disturbing the interior. The University took ownership of the building and the lease for the restaurant still remains for two years.

Timon Duffield explained the project and the need for the temporary handicapped ramp, owing to the main entrance being inaccessible to the restaurant. The applicant chose the side entrance on 36th Street for the handicapped entrance. He proposes to build a temporary ramp with the understanding that the building would be renovated in two to five years. There is urgency attached to this proposal. On the first floor, the applicant chooses to make the ramp hardwood so that it rests on the structure as it is. The stone stair and interior walls would not be disturbed. On the 36th Street walk, there is a wood ramp and a wood platform that brings you up to the level of the interior vestibule where the wheelchair lift comes down. The ramp would be removable at the time the lease of the restaurant is finished. Then access for the disabled will be established at a different location. This proposal requires minimum alterations.

The question of the color of the ramp and railing was raised. The applicant stated that the ramp would be stained and the surface treated to be made non-slip. The railings would be bent metal pipes. The Committee suggested painting the railings black.

The existing handicapped ramp crosses a grate and a lightwell. It is not an attractive entrance.

The Committee stressed the importance of this ramp being temporary.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval for the ramp, not to exceed a period of three years, railing to be painted black with samples of colors and details to be reviewed by the staff.

1300 Market Street, Wanamaker Building

Philadelphia Center Realty Associates, L.P., Owner

Patrick McGranaghan, Applicant

DATE: 1902-10

PROPOSAL: Signage facing Penn Square

This proposal calls for installing a slab type sign in the island outside the Penn Square entrance to the building.

The Committee recommended that the building's management come up with a plan for all signage, designed in such a way that other tenants could be added. The Committee would like to see the whole picture and what is anticipated.

Marita Osbourne, Wanamaker Management, said she did not realize that the Commission wanted a multi-tenant sign. She also stated that signs are subject to management approval.

The Committee's concern is too much signage. Mr. Tyler recommended that the building management ask the design consultants to come up with a multi-tenant sign which would allow other tenants to be added. He recommended approval of this proposal, but recommended that management should start getting a master plan for future tenants.

Mr. Thomas stated that each time the Commission approves something, it limits options for the next choice, and so the management should come up with a plan in anticipation of future tenants and set a building standard.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with the recommendation that future approvals will be conditioned upon approval of an overall plan for building signage.

328 and 330 Delancey Street, 329 Pine Street

Joseph Ottaviano, Jr., Owner
Christopher Scalone, Architect

DATE: c. 1950

PROPOSAL: Demolish two non-contributing houses, conceptual review to build new house

This application calls for approval for the demolition of two non-contributing structures and conceptual approval for the construction of a large house seen previously in preliminary form.

Christopher Scalone explained the proposal. The two contributing buildings were re-classified to non-contributing and the new building design modified to reflect the concerns of the community about the facade. The issues of design, massing and scale have been addressed, and the new design continues the row-house rhythm. Mr. Scalone asked that posting of the demolition signs be done as soon as possible.

Mr. Tyler and Mr. Baron went for a site visit and found that the vast majority of the material dates to the 1950s.

Ms. Batcheler expressed concerns about the window sash and size of lights fitting in with the rest of the block where the elements are smaller. She believes that in Philadelphia the same element is continued throughout. She also stated that the battered chimney is totally foreign to Philadelphia. Ms. Batcheler questioned why the columns are each of a different size. The applicant stated that one is a partial column attached to the easement.

Mr. Thomas stated that the modern building has order and the bay of the existing street has been maintained. He believes that the overall materials and overall scale with fairly large perimeters is appropriate.

Mr. Levy stated that he does not mind the size of the openings, but he remarked that the battered chimney hits the window.

The Committee had mixed opinions in regard to this proposal.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the demolition, simultaneously with the building permit being issued.

The Architectural Committee recommended the conceptual approval of the demolitions and of the new design. Committee members suggested that the panes of glass in the windows have a vertical orientation. Two members favored approval with no conditions, and four expressed serious reservations about the battered chimney.

324 Delancey Street

Tom and Tania Rorke, Owners/Applicant

DATE: c.1900

PROPOSAL: Roof deck extension and stair house

The application involves extending an existing deck to the rear and constructing a stairhouse to reach the roof.

This proposal involves a building that has a metal bay on the front. There is already a large roof deck on the front that is highly visible. The applicant proposes no changes to this deck and will leave it intact.

The proposed extension to the deck would be in the rear. Currently there is a flip-up hatch, and this would be replaced with a stairhouse to the roof. Photographs were presented to show the visibility of the deck. The rear extension would be hidden by the existing deck on the front and also by the proposed new three-story house next door.

The Committee encouraged the applicant to redesign the front deck for the future, so that it will be less visible.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

535 Delancey Street

Carolyn Wahrenberger, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c.1802

PROPOSAL: Add new floor and dormer to house

The proposal calls for removing the existing roof structure and adding a fourth floor with gambrel roof and dormer.

This is an early intact building. The existing house has a shallow roof and there are no signs of it ever having an attic and dormer. To put something of this nature on the top would give the appearance that a historic roof with a dormer had always been there, and it would violate nearly all the *Standards*.

The applicant requested that this application be in concept only.

The Committee suggested that the applicant do a site line study of the addition with a set back to see if it would be visible. The Committee also suggested that the applicant look at property atlases to see if there was ever a fourth floor there. They suggested looking at the party wall to see if there is any evidence of a fourth floor or if the ghost of a stair exists.

The applicant stated that the party wall had been stuccoed. It was suggested that the applicant take off a small amount of stucco to reveal any evidence of a higher gable wall.

The Committee urged the applicant to pursue the search for evidence of an fourth floor because this would mean that the work might constitute a restoration, and the addition might then meet the *Standards*.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the concept unless evidence can be found of a former fourth-story. If no such evidence is found, the Committee would favorably revisit a scheme that would show an addition not visible from the street as evidenced by a the site line study.

201 South 18th Street, a.k.a. 1720 Walnut Street

Rittenhouse Claridge L.P., Kenneth Kaiserman, Owner
Shep Wainwright, Applicant
DATE: 1955
PROPOSAL: New storefront, awnings and signage

The proposal calls for removing the fabric of the non-original I.H.O.P. restaurant and installing a new dark metal and glass storefront with operable windows.

This is a part of a building which faces on 18th Street. The existing storefront has T111 siding; the original storefront had more open glass area and old photographs show large panes of glass with dark metal piers. Recently an awning has been installed without a permit.

The application is for the installation of a coffeehouse at this location. The Committee favored the removal of the large portion of the T111 siding and opening the area with the large panes of glass. The Committee also suggested decreasing the width of the awning, to extend only the length of the actual opening.

Judith Eden, Center City Residents Association, stated that one tenant in an entire building should be asked to bring a drawing to show how the storefront relates to other storefronts within the same property. Committee members agreed.

The applicant explained that the awning would not match the adjacent one in location, pitch or design.

Mr. Levy urged the applicant to submit a drawing that shows the proposed awning next to the existing awning on the other side. The idea is to see all the awnings and the designs from opening to opening.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval on the condition that the awning's width is shortened to the ends of the opening; the awning should be equal in placement and design to the adjacent awning, be open-sided and should not be internally lit.

1920 Spruce Street, Academy of Vocal Arts

Academy of Vocal Arts, Owner
Douglas Seiler, Architect
DATE: c.1855
PROPOSAL: Remodel rear addition on Delancey Street

The proposal calls for renovating the rear addition to the Academy of Vocal Arts. The architect has provided additional information about the project and a petition of neighbors who find the existing design objectionable.

The Commission believed that the Committee should hear this new information since the applicant has a new submission with a new design.

The applicants explained that the architect's original intention was to stucco the building but owing to a financial shortfall, the walls were constructed of unstuccoed cinderblocks. A revised design was brought to the Committee. The applicant explained that water penetration has been a problem in some areas.

Douglas Seiler, architect for the project, and K. James McDowell were present to explain and answer questions about the project. The proposal is to revise the wall surface of the 1982 addition, paint the windows, and repair fire escapes. The applicant stated that the community was outraged over the cinderblock bay and presented a petition from neighbors in support of the stuccoing of the bay, owing to the cinderblock being out of character with the streetscape.

Mr. McDowell, Director, spoke in support of the alteration of the bay, because he believed that this was not the architect's original intention, but stated that documentation has not been found to document his intention.

Roger Johnson, 1915 Delancey Street, stated that the architect had proposed the stucco but instead used the cinderblock, having run out of money.

Ellen Prince, 1911 Delancey Street, was told that proposed material was to be stucco. She also stated that she believed the Historical Commission's authority is to maintain the integrity of the neighborhood and make sure the new structures are compatible with the neighborhood, and she believed that this structure is not compatible.

Although many members of the Committee thought that the cinderblock design had architectural quality and integrity, they agreed to a compromise to stucco the building, score it horizontally but retain all other elements intact and repaired. The woven corners would be lost in the stuccoing.

The Architectural Committee recommended the stuccoing of the addition with horizontal scoring, keeping the details. They recommended in favor of the fire escapes and window work.

1701 Spruce Street, NW corner of 17th Street

David Richards, Mark Bojanowski, Owners

Richard Stange, Architect

DATE: c. 1920

PROPOSAL: Conceptual review of adding on floor, full footprint coverage

The proposal involves adding a floor to the top of this two-story building.

The conceptual review of adding one floor does not meet *Standards 9 and 10*. The addition creates a look that changes the meaning of the building. Owing to the lowness of the building, a set back is not possible that will make the addition invisible.

David Richards, Mark Bojanowski, and Richard Stange were present to explain and answer questions about the proposal.

The Committee has concerns about historic buildings or buildings in a district when there is a proposal for an addition on the top. Mr. Thomas explained that the Committee's general approach to additions is to consider to what proportion the existing building is being increased. In this case, the increase would be 50% in size, and would be visible from a site line study. The other approach would be to make a case for hardship, showing that the building cannot be utilized without this addition.

The applicant stated that he agrees with historic preservation, and questioned how the Rittenhouse Civic Association viewed the proposed addition. He also believed that the addition would add character to this building. Virtually every building in the area has four stories. The applicant stated that the financial aspect of this proposal is not the issue for him. The applicant stated that the owner wishes to install an upscale restaurant at the site.

Judith Eden, Rittenhouse Civic Association, spoke and said that the Association does not routinely comment as long as the guidelines of the *Secretary of Interior Standards* are followed.

Mr. Thomas clarified the *Standards* that pertained to the proposal for an addition.

The applicant questioned the possibility of a glass atrium with a roof deck that is set back and less visible.

Some of the Committee members strongly believe that adding an addition would change the character of the building completely, violating the *Standards*, and also stressed the importance of being consistent in denials of visible additions such as the one recently on Cypress Street. Others believed buildings should grow with the times and that this building has a flat roof and because it was surrounded by taller buildings, could take an addition. These differing opinions are reflected in the Committee's recommendation.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept of alternate B, conditioned upon a set back and simplified details. The uniqueness of the building prompted the recommendation, which carried with a vote of four in favor and two in opposition.

267 South 19th Street

Alan Domb, Owner

Lanny Liebowitz, Architect

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Cut storefront window in ground floor

The proposal calls for cutting a large store window into the residential ground floor of this row house. The architect claims that the fabric of the ground floor looks newer than the brick above. However, paint covers the brick.

Evan Brody and Lanny Liebowitz were present to answer questions and explain the proposal. Mr. Liebowitz presented photographs which showed later brick in front of older brick. The Committee stated that the old brick facade could have been covered with new bricks. The fact of there being four inches of brick beyond the face of the brick above would lead to this conclusion.

Mr. Baron stated that there is more than the question of the original material. If the original design is a residential design, then the design should also be protected.

The Committee recommended a site visit to determine if historic fabric remains. The Committee also suggested taking the window apart and looking at the jams. If there is entirely new materials, then the proposed project can move forward with the Committee's approval. If there are actual remains of historic windows and masonry openings, then this should be preserved.

Judith Eden spoke on behalf of the Center City Residents Association and stated that the property is zoned residential. The residential appearance shall be kept and there is a proviso to restrict the restaurant's cooking, owing to its inadequate ventilation.

The Architectural Committee recommended a site visit to determine if historic fabric still remains. If the fabric is missing they recommended in favor of a new storefront, if the historic fabric remains behind the new brick they recommended denial.

1707 Pine Street

Glenn Krotick, Esq., Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1860, 1890

PROPOSAL: Legalize vinyl windows, replace door

The applicant seeks to legalize the vinyl windows he installed without a permit. He also wishes to install a new non-historic door in place of a non-historic door.

Glenn Krotick was present to answer questions and explain the proposal.

The staff researched this property and the adjoining property in an atlas to determine that these two buildings are early to mid-nineteenth century row houses and that almost certainly the original windows were six-over-six. They have been altered and a Queen Ann type window has been added on the first floor with small panes and frame around the window. At the time of designation, the house had one-over-one wood upper floor windows. The historic door was also replaced.

The staff suggested making a compromise and allowing the non-historic door in exchange for the restoration of the windows on the upper floor to wood one-over-one sash.

The applicant stated that the wood windows had holes and were greatly deteriorated and he believed that he was replacing the windows with a very similar window. He also suggested painting the vinyl windows. The applicant expressed concerns over other houses on the block which have vinyl windows. Mr. Thomas stated that at the time of designation whatever is present stays, but everything gets upgraded in time and restrictions will be administered at that time.

Mr. Baron stated that *The Standards* prescribe that where possible historic material should be used for replacement features. Vinyl windows do not have the set back putty slope of historic windows. The question of painting the windows was rejected owing to paint not adhering to vinyl.

The applicant stated that the wood frame remains and that the vinyl sash had been put into the frame. He also stated that he kept the old wood windows, which he did not think were very old. Mr. Baron was asked to inspect the wood windows that were removed.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the door. The Committee asked to table the window issue pending Mr. Baron's inspection of the old windows.

834 Chestnut Street, SE corner 9th Street, Benjamin Franklin House

Benjamin Franklin House Association, Owner
Allen Roth, Applicant
DATE: 1923-25
PROPOSAL: Masonry repair

This proposal involves repairing masonry on the former Benjamin Franklin Hotel. The applicant seeks to repair the masonry and terra cotta with patches and a Keim coating. The work calls for temporary scaffolding and test borings.

The third floor cornice has been covered with netting and the purpose of this proposal is to patch, make molds where there are large pieces to be replaced for stabilization, and re-point. The joints will be re-pointed and all the new and existing terra cotta will be coated with Kiem. The applicant expressed two reasons for the coating: a lot of the terra cotta is crazing or showing its age, and that once balustrades are replaced in cast stone instead of terra cotta, the coating will make it uniform and will protect against water infiltration.

The applicant stated that the joints will be taped to preserve their appearance.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with samples to be reviewed by staff.

201-203 North 3rd Street, a.k.a. 245-49 Race Street

Michael Yaron, Owner

Albert Taus, Applicant

DATE: c. 1853

PROPOSAL: Alteration to visible rear stuccoed facade

This is a proposal for a building on North 3rd Street with a blank stuccoed north wall. The adjacent building is quite low rendering this wall quite visible. The proposal is to put four windows on the north facade. The staff's concern is about the horizontal nature of the panes. It believed that since these are new windows, one-over-one windows would be better. The windows on the other side are casements. The Committee thought the new condition should match. The Committee suggested narrowing the windows to make the panes more vertical which would be more in character. Other openings will be narrowed where there is presently glass block.

The Committee suggested that the applicant raise the sills to match the sills on the front. They also stated that the window height should be the same. They also stated that the windows should be true divided light.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval conditioned upon the windows matching the same sill height and proportion of the front windows.

The meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Diane M. Hughes