

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

**Vincent Rivera, Chair
Commission Offices, Room 578, City Hall
30 March 2004**

Present

Vincent Rivera, Chair
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Herbert Levy, FAIA
Suzanne Pentz

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jonathan Farnham, Historic Preservation Planner
Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner

Also

Mary Fingerote
Lori Aument, AIA
Wesley Fisher
Samuel Gordon
Charles Capaldi, B Five Studio Architects
Kiki Bolender, AIA, Schade & Bolender Architects
Richard DeMarco, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers
Oskar J. Udel, AIA, 321 Chestnut Street
Alessandra Kelly, National Liberty Museum
Marilyn Cohen, National Liberty Museum
D.S. Nichols
Dave Magrogan, Kildare's Irish Pub
David Kleckner, architect
Margaret Armstrong Robb
Charlie Berman
Jeff Wyant, Wyant Architecture
Richard Stokes, Stokes Architecture
Joost Langeveld, Wyant Architecture
Michael Silver, 413 South 3rd Street
Michael Palermo, Starr Restaurant Organization
Richard Cole, architect
John Woynicki, architect
Victor Keen
Jeane Ruddy
Alan Heilman
Allen Rubin, Spring Garden Civic Association
Art Plaxton
Jack Britton
Frank Kakos, Kakos Architects
Jerry Wallis, 1510 Green Street
Kalyan Som, Som Architects
Msgr. John A. Close, Cathedral of SS Peter and Paul
Michael D. McCoy, T-Mobile
John Clausen, T-Mobile
Robert Blasscyk, Cunard & Bass

William Hernandez, 1725 Porter Street
Randy Cotton, Preservation Alliance

Vincent Rivera, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

1805 Delancey Street

Daniel Cohen, Owner

Samuel Gordon, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Additions to 2nd, 3rd, and 4th floors on the rear

Mr. Baron presented this proposal, which calls for building additions onto the 2nd, 3rd and 4th floor rear of this wide rowhouse. The applicant also proposes two rear decks. The additions would involve the removal of a metal bay. The additions would be visible from 18th Street and Cypress Street. The metal bay is not highly visible but the staff suggests it should be included on the proposed addition rather than demolished.

Staff recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

Samuel Gordon, the architect, disclosed that the proposed two-story bay of painted black wood will replace the existing bay. He noted that the rear would be constructed of new brick, which would extend to the face.

Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the lower cornice and the affect on the mansard. Mr. Gordon responded that the cornice would be retained and that the construction would occur behind the mansard.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal as submitted, with staff to review details, 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 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.].

200 South 19th Street aka 1904 Walnut Street, Church of the Holy Trinity

Church of the Holy Trinity, Owner

Peter Ryker, Applicant

DATE: 1857-59, John Notman, architect

PROPOSAL: Replace sandstone steps with granite

Mr. Baron explained this proposal, which calls for the replacement of the brown sandstone steps of the church with granite. The brownstone has an elaborate bullnose detail. The damage to the step appears to be from the rusting of the post for the handrail.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6. The steps should be patched with cast stone or replaced with real brownstone, which is now readily available. Care should be taken with installation of the rail to design a solution, which prevents the rusting problem.

Lori Aument, the architect, presented a sample of the proposed granite. She said that durability is the driving force for the replacement in granite. The existing brownstone has been covered with cast in place brown cement. Ms. Aument researched the different types of granite. Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the condition of the existing steps. Ms. Aument said that patching

the steps would be a band aid repair, and that the steps underneath are in poor condition. She noted that the decorative areas to the side of the steps would be repaired in Portland brownstone and the step replacement would have the same profile as the original.

Committee members concurred that the granite was not a good color match for the replacement steps. They thought that cast stone is a more appropriate material, owing to its durability and its ease of color match. It was noted that this solution has recently been approved for the Union League. The Committee remarked that German brownstone is much harder and although pinker can be tinted to match the Portland cement.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the granite steps but approval of the replacement of the steps in either a brownstone or cast stone material, 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.].

252-56 South 22nd Street

Wesley and Regine Fisher, Owners

DATE: c. 1840, alterations c. 1920

PROPOSAL: Legalize 3rd floor window

Mr. Baron explained this proposal, which involves legalizing the installation of a vinyl window in place of a coupled six pane wood casement window. The violation was originally requested following a citizen complaint. The applicant inherited the windows and the violation from the previous owner.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 6.

Wesley Fisher, the current owner, said that he is willing to install the correct window at a reasonable price. He disclosed that he has contacted window manufacturers; however, they have not responded back yet with price estimates. Mr. Fisher noted that he has to provide a solution to the court by 29 April 2004.

Committee members sympathized with the applicant; however, they noted that violations do travel with the sale of the property. They explained that title insurance exists for this type of problem. They could not justify the legalization of the current window based on the Commission's design criteria. They offered the applicant the suggestion of applying to attain a permit to install the correct wood casement window, which would give the applicant time to secure shop drawings of the correct window and cure the violation. Mr. Riviera produced a drawing of the appropriate window for the applicant.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the legalization, 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.].

1611 Pine Street

Doug Wilberding, Owner

Joseph Morrison, Applicant

DATE: c. 1891, William Decker, architect
PROPOSAL: Roof deck

Mr. Baron presented this proposal, which calls for the construction of a two level roof deck on the visible rear of this rowhouse. The deck will be visible from Pine and Smedley Streets. A tall stair house would be constructed to access the deck and the rail will feature a planter and copper-clad solid wall instead of a light vertical picket.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 & 10. The staff would favor a deck with light rail pulled away from the chimney so that it does not need to be altered, and a lower access way to the roof.

Charles Capaldi and Doug Wilberding attended the meeting. Mr. Capaldi presented photographs showing that the building is taller in the front and slopes toward the rear, additionally that the lower corner building allows for visibility. He said that the deck would be situated on the rear portion of the building, with the lower support structure of the deck sitting below the parapet level to lessen visibility and a planter design which wraps around two sides. Mr. Capaldi noted that the chimney, which is in poor condition, would be reconstructed and raised three feet. He asserted that the roof is copper, therefore he proposes to use copper sheathing for the planters, which will give privacy to the deck. He also said that a hatch with a spiral staircase already exists, but he believes that the proposed staintower, which would be painted, in this location is safer and more appropriate.

Mr. Rivera believes that the proposed planter compromises the party wall and Mr. McCoubrey concurred. The Committee recommended that the planter be pulled inward four to eight inches from the party wall.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval subject to pulling back the planter four to eight inches from the party wall, with staff to review details, 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 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 Standard 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 property and its environment would be unimpaired.]

1830 Delancey Street

Acorn Property Development, Owner
Kiki Bolender, Architect/Applicant
DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: New doors, brick sidewalk, post lantern, railing on front, rear window and door replacement

Mr. Baron presented this proposal, which calls for alterations to the front and rear facades of this rowhouse. The applicant wishes to install new double-leaf solid-panel front doors to replace the existing glazed doors. Ms. Bolender also proposes a new front railing, shutters, wood windows and a front post mounted lantern. For the rear the drawings show a raised brick parapet, new windows with an applied muntin and altered pane pattern. Although they are described, the drawings are currently missing the front railing, shutters, and front windows. The application for the railing should be considered incomplete without a drawing.

Staff recommendation: Approval, with staff to review drawings and details when they become available, pursuant to Standard 9.

Kiki Bolender, the architect, presented photographs of railings in the neighborhood; however, she could not find a precedent for a short railing. The building requires a short railing owing the single step at the front. The Committee agreed with the installation of a railing, but thought that it should be of a simple design. They accepted the other alterations, owing to the alley in the rear.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the 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 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 property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

319 Market Street

Markanni Enterprises, Incorporated, Owner

Gerry Gutierrez, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1815 with new front façade c. 1850

PROPOSAL: New storefront windows, door and awning; extend cornice on front; 2nd floor addition and cut new door on rear

This proposal calls for alterations to the front and rear of this brick commercial building with upstairs apartments. On the front façade, the applicant proposes to

1. extend the awning across the façade and a piece of the adjoining alleyway
2. extend the cornice across the whole facade
3. convert the storefront with operable casement windows
4. replace the beadboard alley door with a hollow metal door
5. alter the steps
6. add a metal and canvas cube sign

On the rear façade the proposal calls for a second floor addition on the rear ell and the construction of a chimney exhaust vent for the kitchen.

The staff thought that the historic cornice should not be altered and that the awning should cover only the area of the door and window since it sits under the cornice and between the two historic piers. The staff recommends using the historic sign band area for a flat wood sign that accords with the design of this building.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the work on the rear, the café windows, and alteration to the step. Denial of the other work on the front façade, pursuant to Standards 9 & 10.

No one attended the meeting to represent the proposal.

Ms. Pentz thought that the historic cornice should not be altered. She also stated that the awning should cover only the area of the door and window because it would be situated under the cornice and between the two historic piers. The Committee concurred on using the historic sign band area for a flat wood sign that accords with the design of this building. It recommended that the drawings be revised to reflect the recommendations.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the rear alterations including a second floor addition on the rear ell and the construction of a chimney exhaust vent for the kitchen and approval of the café windows on the front façade and alteration of the step, with staff to review details. It recommended denial of the other work on the front façade, 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 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 Standard 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 property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

114 Chestnut Street

Michael Samchick, Owner

Gerry Gutierrez, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Metal canopies

Mr. Baron presented this proposal, which calls for the removal of existing awnings and the installation of flat metal awnings. The applicant also wishes to pin mount metal letters into the existing marble frieze.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the removal of the awnings, Denial of the other elements pursuant to Standard 9. The staff recommends that the letters be attached to a backup panel to avoid damaging the stone.

No one attended the meeting to represent the proposal.

The Committee discussed the proposal and concluded that the installation of the metal awnings would be inappropriate. Additionally, it recommended against the signage, owing to the need for extensive penetrations into the marble.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the removal of the existing awnings, but denial of the proposed awnings and signage, 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 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 Committee recommended that the letters be attached to a backup panel to avoid damaging the stone.

4417-4419 Main Street

OWNER: Kildare's Inc.

APPLICANT: Liz Riccardi

DATE: c. 1855, bay and storefront added c. 1895

PROPOSAL: Add fire escape, cut windows into doors

This application proposes cutting two windows into doors, one at the 2nd story and one at the 3rd story, and adding a fire escape. The proposed doors are flush metal with applied mouldings. The alterations would be made to the west or Conarroe Street façade and would be highly visible from Main Street.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, unless this is the only means of satisfying the fire safety requirements, pursuant to Standard 9. Alternative, less deleterious solutions to the fire code issues should be sought. If a fire escape at this location proves to be the only viable solution, the doors should be redesigned to be more appropriate.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Richard DeMarco, architect David Kleckner, and owner Dave Magrogan represented the project. Mr. DeMarco contended that the fire escape was the only viable solution to the restaurant's egress problem. Mr. Kleckner summarized the building's egress plans. Mr. McCoubrey and Mr. Rivera of the Committee inquired about the egress requirements of the third floor, which will house a small office. The architect replied that he may be able to secure a variance from the second means of egress for the third-floor office, but absolutely needs the fire escape to meet the egress requirements of the second-floor restaurant space. Committee members then suggested deleting the fire escape between the second and third floors from the plans, leaving only the required fire escape between the ground and second floor. They noted that this would have several advantages. Not only would it obviate the necessity of the window-to-door conversion at the third floor and the stairs between the upper floors, but it would also allow the width of the fire escape and the encroachment into the alley to be cut in half. The applicants accepted the compromise reducing the size of the fire escape. Committee members then suggested moving the fire escape one bay further away from Main Street to reduce its visibility. The applicants agreed that this was feasible as well. Committee members inquired about the door to the fire escape. The architect explained that it did not need to be fire rated. Committee members then suggested revising the door design to include glazing to match the surrounding windows. The applicants agreed that the door revision was acceptable.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of a counter-balanced fire escape between the ground and second floor and the cutting of a second-floor window into a door provided the fire escape is relocated from the first to the second second-floor window back from Main Street and the door is redesigned to include glazing to match the surrounding windows.

321 Chestnut Street

OWNER/APPLICANT: Irvin Borowsky

DATE: E.W. Clark Bank, 1905, architect T.P. Chandler

PROPOSAL: Expand side enclosure for handicap access

This application proposes expanding an enclosed entranceway with ramp at the Liberty Museum at 321 Chestnut Street. The entrance stands on the east or Orianna Street façade of the building. Numerous visitors to Independence National Historical Park use this section of Orianna Street to access Franklin Court, which borders the museum to the north. The Historical Commission approved the addition of the extant glass and aluminum entranceway and ramp in 1980. The extant glass and aluminum entranceway occupies a single bay of the museum building; the new entranceway would span several bays and obscure the views of several compound pilasters. The applicant states in a cover letter that the larger enclosure is needed to shelter visitors waiting to enter the museum.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Oskar Udel along with Alessandra Kelly and Marilyn Cohen of the National Liberty Museum represented the proposal. Ms. Pentz and Mr. Rivera of the Committee inquired about the existing and proposed structures, which appear to extend beyond the museum's east property line into the bed of

Orianna Street. Mr. Udel explained that the existing and proposed structures do and will extend beyond the property line. He added that he does not know who owns the Orianna Street bed, but that he had been informed that it had been stricken from the City Plan. Committee members asked that the applicant seek clarification of the ownership.

Mr. Levy of the Committee asserted that the size of the new enclosure should be reduced to prevent it from overlapping onto the projecting portion of the building. He noted that the enclosure as proposed would not only obscure several decorative pilasters, but would look awkward where the sloping roof would intersect the projecting portion of the façade. He added that the narrow space in the new enclosure where the historic building bows would not accommodate many uses. Mr. McCoubrey agreed and asked how the new space would be used. The applicants explained that it would shelter groups as they entered the museum. Committee members expressed confusion, noting that the groups would pass by the entrance doors to the museum to move into the new section of the enclosure. Ms. Pentz stated that the existing enclosure was inappropriate and remarked that adding to it would only compound the problem. The architect explained that the color and shape of the enclosure would be changed, making it more appealing. Mr. Rivera compared the existing enclosure to a fast food restaurant. Ms. Pentz and Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Mr. Levy that the size of the new enclosure should be reduced. They suggested that the expansion should be limited to one bay, not two bays, to the north. In other words, in elevation it should be terminated at the point where the enclosure roof slopes downward; in plan, it should be terminated at the northern edge of the trap door that will be removed. They also suggested that, as a compromise, a canopy could be added to the front of the enclosure if needed for more sheltering.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend the approval of a new shelter with a canopy over the landing at the top of the ramp, provided the new shelter is limited to the location of the existing shelter and the one bay to the north and does not extend onto the projecting section of the historic building, with staff to review details.

118 Cuthbert Street

OWNERS/APPLICANTS: James and Barbara Earle

DATE: Jacob Cooper House, 1755, Jacob Cooper and Henry Harrison

PROPOSAL: Rear addition and deck

This application proposes demolishing most of the rear section of an eighteenth-century gambrel roof as well as a modern, rear, 3rd-story addition and deck. In their places, a larger addition and smaller deck would be constructed. The western edge of the addition and deck would be visible from Cuthbert Street across a parking lot. The historic roofline would be memorialized with a barge board at the west on the former party wall.

This house and the three others on the block are among the earliest and most significant eighteenth-century buildings to survive in the City and the nation. They are more unique and historically important than the nearby, highly significant Elfreth's Alley buildings. For example, a fireplace and paneling from the adjacent house at 116 Cuthbert Street is now on display at the Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum in Delaware, the nation's most distinguished collection of eighteenth-century American decorative arts.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10. If additional space is necessary, it should be added to the insignificant, 1970s rear addition, not the highly significant, 1755 portion of the building.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Diana Nicholas, the

architect, represented the applicants. The Committee asked the architect to clarify what historical fabric would be removed for the addition. She explained that a non-historic addition and deck as well as most of the remaining historic rear roof would be removed. She noted that the floor plan shows the new addition spanning the entire width of the rowhouse, but the section, which is more up-to-date, shows that the addition will be slightly set back from the west façade of the building. Committee members then asked about visibility. Ms. Nicholas first stated that the addition would not be visible, but then agreed that there would be some visibility from Cuthbert Street across a small parking lot. Ms. Pentz contended that the entirety of the historic roof should be preserved. She stated that the gambrel roof was extremely rare 1755 fabric, which should not be lost for the addition of a small bathroom. Mr. McCoubrey agreed and asked if the existing dormer-like addition could be continued back to a new bathroom addition at the rear on the extant, 2-story, 1970s addition. Mr. Rivera then sought a compromise that would allow an addition while preserving as much eighteenth-century fabric as possible. He and Mr. McCoubrey asked the architect if she could design an addition within the limitations of the existing dormer. She replied that she could not; it was too narrow. She also stated that it would add structural complexities to the design because the new bearing wall would not sit on the outer bearing wall to the west. Mr. McCoubrey contended that the small addition on the narrow building would not require an extraordinary structure. He asserted that the addition should be limited to a six-foot wide strip along the east party wall. The architect countered that six feet was too narrow to be usable. The Committee then agreed to an eight-foot wide addition. Mr. Farnham asked for a clarification of the acceptable height of the addition. The Committee stated that it would accept an addition that was taller than the extant dormer, but lower than the ridge line.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of a 3rd-story addition and deck provided the addition is limited in width to an eight-foot strip along the east party wall and in height to a point below the ridge line, with staff to review details.

210 West Washington Square

OWNER: 210 Washington Square Associates

APPLICANT/ARCHITECT: Jeff Wyant for the Starr Restaurant Organization

DATE: N.W. Ayer Building, 1929, architect Ralph Bencker

PROPOSAL: Remove fence and fountain, cut windows and doors, add fence, decking, trellis, canopies

This application proposes a series of alterations to the ground-floor south façade and the garden at the N.W. Ayer Building on Washington Square. Much of the ground floor as well as the garden to the south are being converted to a restaurant with outdoor seating.

The application proposes cutting four windows in the central section of the south façade, which is stucco, not limestone. It also proposes converting an original steel tripartite window into a double window with door; this section of the façade is brick. No details have been provided for the new windows and door.

In the garden, which runs between the Ayer Building and the newly renovated Saunders condominium building to the south, the application proposes the removal of an ornate wrought iron fence along the sidewalk, the bluestone paving throughout the garden, and a fountain. The improvements to the garden including the granite faced Ayer Building doorway, paving, fountain, and arced garden walls were added about 1955. The date of the ornate wrought iron fence is unknown, but it must postdate 1929, when the rowhouse on the site was demolished for the construction of the Ayer Building.

In place of the fence, the application proposes a tall frosted glass and stainless steel wall along the sidewalk. Behind the wall, a new deck for tables, benches, and bars is proposed. Metal grids for ivy standing more than 20 feet tall would be erected along the north wall of the Sauders Building and the south wall of the Ayer Building. A metal panel system would face the west wall of the garden. Large canvas canopies would be stretched over the garden between the two buildings. No attachment details have been provided. Lights and other features would also be added.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the four new windows; the removal of the fence, fountain, and paving, provided they are stored on site; the green screen, provided it is reduced in height and covered with non-invasive plants; the metal panel system at the west; and the lighting; with staff to review details. Denial of the frosted glass wall, which should be redesigned to harmonize with its context; the canopies, which may damage the facades; and the conversion of the rear tripartite window into a double window and door, but approval of a new door adjacent to the window; pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Michael Palermo of the Starr Restaurant Organization and architects Richard Stokes and Jeff Wyant represented the project. Ms. Pentz of the Committee inquired about the canopies, which would stretch across the outdoor space. The applicants stated that they are intended to provide a screen from the sun, prevent noise from propagating up to the windows above, and to give the tall, narrow space a better scale. They also presented attachment plans and noted that the canopy mountings would be limited to the mortar joints between the brick and stone. They added that the canopies would be an open mesh and would be removed in the winter. They presented a sample of the canopy material to the Committee.

Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the glass wall at the sidewalk line. He asked how the height was determined. The architects answered that its height was based on the articulations of the brick on the Saunders Building. They further explained that the frosted glass was intended to correspond to the limestone of the Ayer Building. Mr. McCoubrey contended that height, 12 feet, was too tall. The architects explained that the wall was not intended to be a strong presence, but to recede. They added that the civic association had approved of it because it would reduce the noise carrying into the square. Steven Wexler of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that the association approved of the wall as well as the canopies. He added that his group is encouraging development that will bring life to Washington Square. Peg Robb, a neighbor, stated that she considers the proposed canopies and wall intrusions to the square. She reminded the audience that a sacred gravesite stands directly across 7th Street from the restaurant. She concluded, contending that the proposed additions are “not tasteful.” Ms. Pentz opined that the proposed wall troubles her. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the wall would touch the two historic buildings. The architects answered that it would not; the wall would stand about one inch from each façade. They also noted that it would be recessed at the door near the Ayer Building, revealing the limestone return on the south façade. The Committee concluded that it should review samples of the frosted glass to assist in selecting the best option.

The Committee and applicants discussed the fountain, paving, and fence and decided that their removal was acceptable, but that they should be retained. The applicants offered to restore the garden accessories to their original positions after the restaurant’s lease expires. The Committee also determined that the new door and windows would be acceptable given that the openings were removed from the street and that no cuts were required in the limestone, but only in stucco and brick. Finally, they approved of the green screen with lighting, provided it is attached to the buildings at mortar joints only.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposal as submitted, provided that the fence, fountain, and paving are retained and restored to their original locations at the termination of the restaurant's lease; and that the frosted glass wall is reduced in height from 12 feet to 10 feet or less, with the Committee and staff to review details including the frosted glass.

413 S. 3rd Street

OWNER: Michael Silver

APPLICANT/ARCHITECT: Richard Cole

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Four new window openings in south facade

This application proposes cutting four new window openings and installing 6-over-6, wood, true-divided-light windows in the south façade of this rowhouse at the northeast corner of 3rd and Stamper Streets. The south façade faces Stamper Street. The south, brick façade is unfenestrated (except the half-round attic window) and entirely original.

This building was constructed in the early nineteenth century as part of a row of speculative houses. Speculative builders did not typically fenestrate the exposed, side facades of the buildings at the ends of rows. Two factors prompted the builders' decisions to leave the end walls unfenestrated. First, the double chimneys precluded fenestration in large portions of the walls; closets were typically installed on the chimney walls. Second, when erecting a row, the builder worked from a standard plan that defined each building in a row, regardless of its position; obviously, mid-block buildings did not include side windows.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 3.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Richard Cole and John Woynicki and owner Michael Silver represented the project. Mr. Silver claimed that he needed the windows for "safety" reasons. He stated that delinquents sometimes urinate, break bottles, and paint graffiti on Stamper Street. He added that a car was once abandoned on the street. He asserted that he could immediately call the police to report the illegal activity if he could look out onto the street through the new windows. Currently, he is unable to report the crimes until the following morning, when he inspects the street. Committee members asked about street lights in the area. Mr. Silver responded that the street was lighted, but not sufficiently. Ms. Pentz stated that she was opposed to the cutting for the windows and suggested that the owner install exterior lighting to counteract the criminal activity. Ms. Pentz added that urine is fleeting, but the cuts in the monumental wall would be permanent. Peg Robb, a neighbor, stated that her house includes windows that look out onto a similar street, but scoundrels continue to urinate publicly in her alley.

Committee members inspected the plans. They noted that the windows proposed for the first story were situated at a new stairway to the basement. Mr. Silver explained that he was converting basement to livable space and wanted the natural light from the windows. Committee members also asked about the chimney, which now stands where Mr. Silver would situate his new basement stairs. The architects explained that they would remove the existing fireplace to make room for the stairs, but would erect a steel structure to support the chimney above the first story.

Mr. Rivera, Mr. McCoubrey, and Ms. Pentz emphasized the importance of the monumental brick wall visually and historically. Mr. Silver displayed photographs of several similar walls to which windows have been added. Ms. Pentz stated that she would like more information on the

alterations and wondered if the changes had been made prior to designation. Steven Wexler of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that his organization promotes improvements to properties, but added that this particular unfenestrated brick wall was “invaluable.” Mr. Rivera proposed a compromise; he suggested that the owner add three small windows, one on each floor, centered on the wall, to the façade. His fellow Committee members rejected the proposal, stating that any new opening would entail a great loss of historic fabric.

The Architectural Committee voted two to one to recommend denial of the proposal, 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 3 [Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.].

2027-2029 Mt. Vernon Street

Victor Keen and Jeanne Ruddy, owners

Alan Heilman, Contractor/applicant

DATE: c. 1875

PROPOSAL: Rooftop addition and deck

This application proposes the addition of a sun room with elevator and roof deck on the main block of the rowhouse at 2027-2029 Mt. Vernon Street. The west façade of this property is visible owing to the garden at 2029 Mt. Vernon Street.

The Historical Commission approved several alterations to this property in 1975. The sun room would replace a non-historic clerestory straddling the main block and rear ell added at that time. The sun room would open onto a roof deck on the main block of the row house. The elevator tower would also stand on the main block.

The Historical Commission reviewed and denied this application at its October 2003 meeting. It denied the application for three reasons: first, the plans were incomplete and contradictory; second, the deck on the main roof violated the Commission’s longstanding preference for decks on rear ells; and third, additions would have been visible from the street across the garden. The applicant appealed the Commission’s denial to the Board of Licenses & Inspections Review. Seeking a compromise prior to the hearing before the BLIR, the Commission’s Litigation Committee, at the urging of the Commission’s legal counsel, determined that a new application with complete, coherent project plans could be reviewed without prejudice. This application results from that compromise.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9, and the Roofs Guideline. Any new rooftop structures should be added to the rear ell, not the main body of the rowhouse.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. The owners Jeanne Ruddy and Victor Keen and contractor Alan Heilman attended the meeting. Mr. Heilman explained that his clients wanted a deck on the front section of the building because they wanted to be able to watch events on the Parkway from their rooftop. He added that they had no interest in a deck on the rear ell because the view was not pleasing. He advocated for the elevator, arguing that his clients and their visitors were aging and needed convenient access to the upper floors and roof.

Allen Rubin of the Spring Garden Civic Association expressed his organization’s support of the

project. He asserted that the Commission's prohibition against decks on the main bodies of rowhouses with rear ell was not long-standing, but was only instituted when the current Commission Chair was elected. He contended that it was not an appropriate standard. He added that the Commission was penalizing the owners for their garden, across which the additions would be visible. He stated that they would not be visible if a rowhouse stood on the site of the garden. He also objected to the Commission's refusal to approve elevators generally. Committee members countered this assertion, noting that the Commission routinely approves the addition of elevators to historic buildings in cases where there is little or no adverse impact on historic resources.

Mr. Heilman noted that his confusion over the Committee and Commission's previous decisions in this matter. He asked for clarification. He stated that he was under the impression that the Commission had voted to approve the proposal, but then reversed itself. Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission had voted on a motion to approve the project at its October 2003 meeting, but that the motion did not pass. He added that the Commission's second motion, to deny the application, did pass. Mr. Heilman also asked about procedures related to the Committee meeting and the notification of meetings. The staff answered his questions.

Ms. Ruddy and Mr. Keen advocated for the approval of the proposal. Committee members were convinced that the deck would be minimally visible or not visible at all from the street. They also found the changes to the clerestory acceptable because it is not historic. Committee members noted that the elevator tower might need a variance because of its height. They also remarked that the new sun room might require an additional variance if the elevator was its only means of egress. They also suggested that the west wall of the elevator tower be brick to match the lower façade.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposal, provided the west face of the elevator tower is faced with brick to match the west façade, with staff to review details.

1937 Spring Garden Street

OWNERS/ APPLICANTS: Betty and Charles Berman

DATE: c. 1875

PROPOSAL: Legalize priming and approve painting of unpainted brick façade

This application proposes the legalization of the priming and the approval of the completion of the painting of the front brick façade and brownstone details at the rowhouse at 1937 Spring Garden Street. The priming was recently undertaken without the Commission's approval. The brick façade was unpainted until priming.

The contractor explained that he painted the façade to hide stains on the brick. Photographs of the façade taken just prior to the painting show efflorescence stains on the upper portions. The stains provide irrefutable evidence that the façade is suffering from water penetration. The paint will trap moisture in the façade and lead to more serious water damage. The primer should be removed, the water infiltration points repaired, the efflorescence stains removed, and the brick repointed.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 5, 6, and 7, and the Masonry Preservation Guideline.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Jack Britton represented the owner of the building. Ms. Pentz inquired about the stains. Mr. Britton stated that a leak in

the roof had recently been repaired. Arthur Plaxton and Allen Rubin of the Spring Garden Civic Association addressed the Committee. They remarked that the building stands in a very prominent location, should not have been painted, was in very poor condition, was owned by absentee landlords, and should be restored. They advised that the paint be removed as part of the restoration. Committee members stated emphatically that they could not recommend approval of the painting, which could lead to further deterioration. They advised Mr. Britton to repair the building to prevent all water penetration and remove the paint. They cautioned Mr. Britton to remove the paint carefully only with the approval of the Commission and the guidance of the staff.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the proposal, pursuant to Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.]; 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.]; Standard 7 [Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damages to historic materials will not be used.]; and the Masonry Preservation Guideline: [Not recommended: Applying paint or other coatings such as stucco to masonry that has been historically unpainted or uncoated.].

1510 Green Street

OWNERS: Jerry and Tina Wallis

APPLICANT: Frank Kakos

DATE: 1852-1853, Samuel Sloan and John Stewart, architects

PROPOSAL: Rear doors in new opening, garden wall, landscaping, garage door, pergola

This application proposes several changes to the rear of this rowhouse on Green Street. The rear is visible from Brandywine Street across a large garden. Some of the changes, for example the pointing and windows, can be reviewed at the staff level. Others require Commission review. At the first-story rear of the rear ell, two windows would be removed, the openings enlarged, and sliding glass doors added. A pent eave would be added above the new doors to shelter them and hide utility lines. A porch and steps down to the garden would also be added at the doors. The rear portion of the rear ell is not original; it is a later addition.

Along the east, rear property line, the application proposes the construction of a six-foot tall stucco garden wall with a stone coping. At the rear or south, along Brandywine Street, it proposes a tall brick wall with wood garage and pedestrian doors. A pergola would be erected inside the garage wall to support the roll-up door. Several garage doors already exist on this portion of the Brandywine block.

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

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Jerry Wallis and architect Frank Kakos represented the application. Mr. Kakos explained the project to the Committee. Committee members deemed the design appropriate. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that brick salvaged from the cut for the sliding doors be used for repairs to the façade. Allen Rubin voiced the Spring Garden Civic Association's support of the project. Victor Keen, the owner of the building on Brandywine Street to the west, which was recently restored, asked that his historic building be respected when the rear wall is connected to it. During the discussion of the wall and its connection to the neighboring building, the architect revealed that the proposed

additions at the west actually encroaches onto the neighboring properties at 1512 Green Street and 1513 Brandywine Street. The Committee and staff advised the applicant to seek the neighbors' support for the application before the Commission meeting.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval, provided the neighboring property owners support the application in writing, with staff to review details, 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.].

2028-30 Fairmount Avenue

Savaas Navrosidis, Owner

Kalyan Som, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859; new brick on 2030, c. 1980

PROPOSAL: Façade rehabilitation

The Committee and Commission previously approved the rehabilitation of these two buildings with new storefronts that replicated the 19th century storefront next door at 2026 Fairmount Avenue. The civic association, on the other hand, approved their zoning conditioned upon the removal of the storefronts and installation of residential fronts. There is no evidence that these buildings ever had residential uses on the first floor; the building next door has a storefront that dates to the construction of the building and almost all of the buildings on the block have storefronts.

The plans call for completely demolishing the existing façades. The new façades will have new brick facing with cast stone lintels and sills; two-over-two, wood windows; and bracketed, wood cornices. However, the first floors of the buildings are very low so the doors are set with only a single step. Residential buildings of this time period have their doors set at least three or four steps up, so the proportions of the doorways are incorrect.

Staff Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10. This is another instance where the community group puts constraints on the owner through zoning that is counter to the interests of the Historical Commission and the historical character of the building. Perhaps the Chairman could write a letter to Mr. Auspitz to discuss the issue.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. She explained that the buildings have an old steel beam above the storefronts that would have to be removed or cut in order to build the proposed residential fronts. Kaylan Som, the architect for the project, said that the owner went to the Zoning Board of Adjustment with the design that the Historical Commission approved, but the civic association would not support the zoning variances unless the design was changed to residential fronts.

Allen Rubin of the Spring Garden Civic Association said that the civic association pushed for the residential design. The civic association fought to have Fairmount Avenue rezoned to residential in 1974 because the commercial life on the street was hopeless. The avenue is the border of two neighborhoods and Mr. Rubin believes the only chance of renewal is in the 1700 block. These particular buildings have held failed businesses in the past and he opined that they would not hold viable commercial properties. The civic association did not approve the design of the storefront on the first floor because it did not think the owner would build the storefront as designed, but would simply use any lumber he could buy at Home Depot. They wanted a simplified design because they did not have confidence in the owner's dedication to constructing

a well-built structure. Also, the association believes the owner would have problems renting the first floor as a residence if it had large open windows as a storefront. Committee members noted that many of the former, corner stores throughout the neighborhood are now residences and people can have privacy through a number of measures.

Mr. Som pledged to take great care in measuring the details of the historic storefront at 2026 Fairmount Avenue for the plans for the storefronts and to work with the Historical Commission staff throughout the rehabilitation of the buildings.

The Committee unanimously recommended denial of the proposal pursuant to Standard 1 [A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.], Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.], Standard 3 [Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historic development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other properties, will not be undertaken.], Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.], Standard 6 [Deteriorated 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.], Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.] and Standard 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 unimpaired.]. The Committee reiterated its previous recommendation of approval for the previous design of replicating the storefront of 2026 emphasizing that the details should match exactly in plan and execution, with staff to review details.

2032 Fairmount Avenue

Savaas Navrosidis, Owner

Kalyan Som, Architect/Applicant

PROPOSAL: New construction on vacant lot

Since this is a vacant lot the Commission only has forty-five days review and comment. The Committee and Commission previously approved a building with a storefront on the first floor. The design now calls for a residential building like those proposed for 2028 and 2030 Fairmount Avenue.

Staff recommendation: Three staff members voted approval of the design of the house, though it should be more contemporary rather than a supposed recreation, perhaps using one-over-one windows. One staff member recommends approval as proposed. One staff member objected to the precedent of changing the commercial nature of the architecture along Fairmount Avenue to residential and thought it should have a storefront.

Mr. Som explained that he redesigned the building to match the 2028 and 2030 Fairmount. Mr. McCoubrey questioned the position of the first floor and said that the door should be raised by two or three steps and the door surround should be of cast-stone.

Mr. Rubin of the Spring Garden Civic Association asked that the watertable be made of cast-stone rather than brick. Mr. Rivera agreed and believed the basement should have two-light windows as well.

The Committee unanimously recommended approval of the proposal with three or four steps leading to the front door, cast-stone watertable and door surround, and two, two-light basement windows.

209-25 North 18th Street, Cathedral of SS Peter and Paul

Archdiocese of Philadelphia, Owner

Monsignor John Close, Applicant

DATE: 1846-64, John Notman, John Mahoney & Napoleon LeBrun, architects

PROPOSAL: Replace bird-netting

This application calls for replacing the copper bird-netting with modern bird-netting like that on City Hall. Although the present netting has been in place since the 1920s, the proposed netting will allow observers to once again see the architectural details of the building.

Staff Recommendation: Approval as long as they use the same attachment holes where possible, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Monsignor Close, rector for the Cathedral, attended the meeting. Committee members noted that the copper bird netting may itself be historic, but agreed that revealing the architectural details of the building is more important.

The Committee unanimously recommended approval 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 a property.] and Standard 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 unimpaired.].

1635 West Diamond Street

Eastern Mennonite Board of Missions and Charities, Owner

John Clausen, Applicant

DATE: 1906, John T. Windrim, architect

PROPOSAL: Cellular phone antennas, equipment cabinet and fencing

This applications calls for cellular phone antennas and related equipment on the roof of this building. Six antennas would hang on the outside of the brick stairtower at the southeast corner of the building, with each measuring almost five feet in length and painted to match the brick background. Another three antennas would attach to a sled mounted at the southwest corner of the roof. The cables for all of this equipment would run down the north façade of the stairtower, which is visible from Diamond Street, along a cable bridge to a cabinet located behind the handicap access ramp. The bridge will be approximately seven feet above the ground. The proposal also calls for a stockade fence around the cabinet for security.

The plans do not include the north façade of the building, so there are no details of the cable run along that façade. It appears that the cable will enter the building under the ornate stone cornice and then exit the building again behind the antennas at the stairtower. This will require a large penetration under the cornice.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the antennas themselves on the condition that they are

removed at the time they become obsolete, pursuant to Standard 9. Denial of the cable run, cable tray and cabinet position as proposed, pursuant to Standard 2, Standard 9 and Standard 10. A less conspicuous position for these should be explored, such as putting them on the interior of the stairtower or on the south side rather than on the north. Approval of a bead-board or shadow box fence, pursuant to Standard 9.

The meeting was attended by John Clausen, the applicant with Mike McCoy from T-Mobile and Robert Blasscyk from Cunard Bass Engineering. The Committee members discussed various designs to better hide the new elements and avoid damage to the building. It was determined that the cable could not run up the opposite side of the stair-tower because of the fire-balconies and lack of ground owned by the church on that side of the building. The applicant agreed to several changes to the design including:

1. revision of the orientation of the cabinets on the ground to run in a narrower band along the side of the building,
2. running much of the cable tray underground rather than seven feet above ground,
3. running the visible vertical cable tucked more into the corner of the stair-tower and into the building via a hole created by the removal of a brick rather than the coring of a hole,
4. revision of the stockade fence into a shadowbox or vertical board type with horizontal cap.

The Committee unanimously recommended approval of the proposal with those revisions, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 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 property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

1725 Porter Street

Anthony Citino, Owner

William Hernandez, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: 1906, James & John Windrim, architects

PROPOSAL: Build garage

This proposal calls for building a freestanding garage at the rear of the yard, facing Roseberry Street. The garage would measure 20 feet by 22 feet and have CMU sidewalls with stucco facing on the north wall. Although the rear yards have garden fences, almost none of the houses have freestanding buildings infilling the garden areas of this suburban-like setting.

Staff recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

Ms. Spina presented the project and noted a letter from the Girard Estate Area Residents Association (GEAR) in opposition to the proposal.

Susan Citino, the owner, and Bill Hernandez, the contractor, attended the meeting. Mr. Hernandez explained that there is one garage and one porte-cochere built along the back of these houses, although these were constructed before the district. He explained that he wishes to build a structure to store equipment such as snowblowers, mowers etc. The building of the structure would allow the applicant to remove the portable sheds that now houses equipment. The applicant would plant the remainder of the lot for a garden.

The Committee members noted other applications for garages in Girard Estate have been denied, owing to the preservation of the gardens and suburban-like quality of the open space, which is a significant feature of the district. They said that approving one garage would set a precedent for many and change the essential open, green space character of the district.

If not a garage, Mr. Hernandez asked the Committee would allow a structure with three sides, so that they have a roof to protect their equipment from the elements. Again, the Committee members thought a permanent, roofed structure would be too invasive in the open space.

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 a property.].

1701 Arch Street aka 100 North 17th Street

Robert Morris Building Association, LP, Owner

John Pace, Applicant

DATE: 1914-15, Ballinger & Perot, architect; upper 8 stories added, 1921-22, Ballinger & Co., architect

PROPOSAL: Bird-netting

This proposal calls for bird-netting on the entire building like that used on City Hall. All netting would be attached in the mortar joints. On the roof of the building the repellent would be wires attached with lexan plates and adhesive.

Staff recommendation: Approval pursuant to Standards 5, 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal and explained the severe bird problem that has plagued the building since the new netting has driven the birds from City Hall. The contractor, John Pace, and the building manager, Shelley Cohen, attended the meeting. Randall Cotton of the Preservation Alliance attended the meeting because the Alliance holds an easement on the building. He said that the Alliance's approval would be conditioned upon the repair of any masonry units upon the removal of the netting. The Committee members looked at the netting and cables and inquired about the width of the sheets, the color of the cables and the distance of the netting from the building. Mr. Pace explained that the silver wire is the most invisible and that all attachments will be placed in the joints not in the terra-cotta blocks.

The Committee unanimously recommended approval, pursuant to Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.]; Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 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 unimpaired.].

The meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron
Jonathan Farnham
Diane M. Hughes
Laura M. Spina

