

**THE MINUTES OF THE 468th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
8 August 2001**

**Commission Conference Room 18th Floor, 1515 Arch Street
Wayne S. Spilove, Chair**

Present

Wayne S. Spilove, Chair
Melissa Heller Batzer, Office of City Council President, Director of Economic Development
David Brownlee, Ph.D.
James J. Cuorato, Director and City Representative, Department of Commerce
Warren Huff, Urban Design Director, City Planning Commission
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Public Property
Michael Sklaroff, Esq.
Robert Thomas, AIA
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing and Community Development, Deputy Director of Housing
Carolyn Wischmann

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

Also

Bruce Dearnley, BVI Incorporated, Asian Bank
Joseph Costanzo, 1900 Shunk Street
Christina Carter, John Milner Architects
William Epstein, Amtrak
Ignatius C. Wang, Asian Bank
Anthony Bionoi, Asian Bank
Stan Tang, Bower Lewis
Ann Moyer
Steve Lazin, 507 North 21st Street
Scott Craven, Christopher Beardsley Architects
Joel Spivak, 616 Carpenter Street
Michael Samschick, 614 South Front Street
Burkart Stelzer, 606 South Front Street
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance
Donald P. Johnson, 134 Bainbridge Street
William Dorsey, 131 Bainbridge Street
Judith Eden, Center City Residents' Association
Michael Jacobs, MRC
Dana Spain-Smith, 141 League Street
Philip Scott, Kise Straw Kolodner Architects
Rob Nicholls
Greg Berzinsky, Architect
Manuel Delgado
Cynthia Tori, Esq.
Jaimie Rivera, Nextel
Wilma Johnson
Jacqueline Kruetzer, 2416 Delancey Street

Christian A. Busch, The Sullivan Company
C. Rosenfeld, The Barclay
J. Pearl, Law Department

Wayne S. Spilove, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 468th Stated meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:10 a.m.

Minutes of the 467th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Brownlee and duly seconded, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the 467th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held 11 July 2001, Wayne S. Spilove, Chair, as corrected to reflect that Mr. Sklaroff accepted the motion made by Mr. Hack to accept the Committee's recommendation to approve the Belmont Mansion proposal with a friendly amendment to allow a continuance for a period not to exceed sixty days and Mr. Wilds, not Ms. Wolf having made the motion to approve an expenditure from the Harry A. Batten Memorial Fund owing to her absence. Mr. Sklaroff inquired into the scheduling of a meeting of the sub-committee on the 63rd and Vine Streets proposal. The Commission approved a continuance of one month of its consideration of the nomination to the Philadelphia Register of the Wanamaker *Eagle* to afford counsel to the owner, the May Company, an opportunity to review the matter. It approved a like continuance of the nomination of the 30th Street Station World War Two owing to a miscarriage of the letter of notice.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 31 July 2001

1706 Delancey Street

Jeffrey Yablonovitz, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Revised roof and rear decks

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the submission subject to:

1. *the elimination of the rear overhang of the roof deck;*
2. *the realignment of the rear of the deck to coincide with the plane of the rear wall of the house;*
3. *the removal of the exterior iron stairs*
4. *the relocation to the west of the east railing of the deck, and*
5. *the relocation toward Delancey Street of the north end of the deck a distance not to exceed two feet (2').*

The Committee made this recommendation for approval with the understanding that this is a single-family residence as represented on the building permit application and that the Building Code does not require a stair house.

This application calls for further revisions to roof and rear decks and a stair tower that have previously received a violation. The applicant now proposes removing the existing upper rear porch deck and metal stair tower entirely. Plans show the lower 2nd floor rear porch deck retained and access to the roof deck through an internal stair. The roof deck dimensions have been shortened to a length of 15 feet and the rail has been pulled away from the east elevation by several feet. The staff recommended approval under Standards 9 and 10.

The applicant was not present; however, the revised submission addresses the concerns of the immediate neighbors.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

2401 Pine Street, NW corner of 24th Street

Bruno Calabretta, Owner

Robert Boothroyd, Applicant

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: Window replacement

The Architectural Committee recommended the denial of this application under Standards 5 and 6.

This application calls for the installation of ten new vinyl windows and one casement window on this corner row house. The applicant proposes 6/1 vinyl windows with sandwich muntins. These windows possess a high level of visibility from Pine and 24th Streets. The staff recommended denial per Standard 6. The staff recommended the use of wood, true divided light 6/6 windows.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

2414 Delancey Street

Jackie Kruetzer and Rob Nicholls, Owners

Christopher Beardsley, Architect

DATE: c. 1850; 2416 refaced c. 1970

PROPOSAL: Addition and garage

The Architectural Committee recommended:

- 1. approval in concept of the construction of a two-story building with a garage at the first floor on this vacant lot;*
- 2. approval of the design for the rear elevation as submitted, and*
- 3. approval of the proposed garage treatment;*
- 4. approval of the design for the front elevation subject to a) the separation of the new at 2414 Delancey from the old at 2416 Delancey by a recess of one wythe of brick or a notch, b) the revision of the cornice in a form not duplicative of 2416 Delancey Street, and c) use of one over one sash or paired casement windows in the second floor openings, with the Chair of the Committee and the staff to review details.*

This application calls for a two-story addition to 2414 Delancey, a vacant lot currently used for parking for 2416 Delancey Street. Photographs show the front façade of 2414 Delancey Street as concrete paved to accommodate two cars with an approximately 6-foot CMU wall. Behind the wall exists a patio landlocked from view by the rears of houses fronting on Panama Street. The applicant proposes the construction of a two-story infill on the empty lot. Plans show the first floor, front façade of the addition with a flat panel, metal roll-up garage door and brick piers. A metal cornice and lintel with decorative bolts separate the first and second floors. The brick second floor has two, 12/12 true divided light wood windows with fixed shutters. Both the shutters and the windows match the profiles of those at 2416 Delancey Street. A new metal cornice will match the height and profile of those at 2416 Delancey Street. Plans show the rear façade of the new addition as stucco on CMU with aluminum windows and doors, galvanized metal coping, and a patio. The rear of the building lacks visibility from a public right-of-way.

The staff recommended approval of the addition in concept, but denied as submitted per Standard 9. Staff recommends differentiating the addition by not matching the windows, cornice and brick to 2416 Delancey Street.

The applicant presented revised drawings to reflect the Committee's recommendation.

Commission members thought the addition appropriate in scale and size and that it fit the streetscape; however, it recommended that the box-bay window have one-over-one sash. In addition, the cornice should not be a flat type molding. Mr. Huff thought that more articulation is better regarding the design. Some members also thought the overhang would reduce the appearance of the garage.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the revised submission with one-over-one sash in the box bay with the staff to review details. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1711 Rittenhouse Square Street

Peter Ryan, Owner

Thomas J. Vanleer, Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Window replacement

The Architectural Committee recommended:

- 1. approval of the windows as submitted for the interior atrium not visible from a public right-of-way, and*
- 2. denial of proposed windows on the principal facades.*

This application calls for the installation of wood replacement windows and the retention of existing frames. The applicant proposes the use of 6/6 Pozzi wood windows with a ¾" muntin profile. Detail drawings show the windows as simulated divided light with applied wood muntins on the interior and exterior with a spacer bar between the glass. The applicant proposes four windows on the front façade, first and second floors only; the remaining windows are in an interior courtyard that has no visibility whatsoever. The staff recommended approval for the courtyard windows owing to no visibility from a public right-of-way and denial of façade windows per Standard 6. The front façade windows should be wood, true divided light sash.

Mr. Wilds questioned the difference between the proposed windows and the existing windows.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

237 South 18th Street, NE corner of Rittenhouse Square Street

Barclay Condominium Owners Association, Owner

Christian Busch, Architect

DATE: 1928

PROPOSAL: Window replacement

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal with the staff to review details.

This proposal has many intricacies. The original windows in the Barclay had single-glazed one-over-one double-hung sash. The condominium association plans to refurbish many of the windows, keeping the original configuration. However, individual unit owners may apply to change their windows, if they wish. Several months ago, the Committee and Commission approved a new window for one of the units, which matched the original window except it had double-glazing. The new windows approved previously have been installed. The double-glazing is highly reflective and appears almost mirror-like in certain lights. Also some unit owners, without approvals, have installed films on some windows to lower UV damage and increase the

window's energy efficiency. The staff expressed concern that all of the different glazing and films would produce a mottled effect across the façade of the building, rather than a uniform appearance. This proposal calls for installing new single-glazed sash and replacing glazing in sash throughout the building.

The condominium management intends is to repair the glazing instead of replacing it, wherever possible. The possibility of double-glazing was discussed but the preferred glazing is a single pane. The existing windows are a mix owing to the glazing coatings or a mix of single and double glazing but the wood of the sash conform to its historic appearance.

A lengthy discussion by the Commission culminated with the members giving the Historical Commission staff guidance for future staff level approvals of Low-E and UV glazing treatment. Mr. Sklaroff questioned the Commission's jurisdiction over window coating.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

237 South 18th Street, NE corner of Rittenhouse Square Street

Hal Pote and Linda Johnson, Owners

Chris Heller, Architect

DATE: 1928

PROPOSAL: Legalize window replacement

The Committee voted to recommend approval.

The owners have already installed double-glazed windows, which match the originals in material and profile. The owners wish to install a clear 3M Low-E film on the windows.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

237 South 18th Street, NE corner of Rittenhouse Square Street

Ellis and Peggy Wachs, Owners

Christina Carter

DATE: 1928

PROPOSAL: Window replacement

The Committee voted to recommend approval

This proposal involves the owner's wish to replace eight of the eleven windows in the unit. The replacements will match the originals in profile and material, but have double-glazing and a clear 3M UV film. The owners also wish to install the film on the remaining original windows in the unit.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1715-1717 Walnut Street

Midwood Management Corporation, Owner

Michael Schade, Architect

DATE: Mid 19th Century; refaced c. 1950

PROPOSAL: Demolition and new building

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the demolition, on the condition that the owner has secured financing and obtains a building permit for the new construction. It also recommended approval of the new construction as modified.

The proposal involves a property that originally consisted of two rowhouses, the rear ell of one of these remains visible in the rear. In the 1950s or '60s, a new brick façade, combining the two buildings, was added. The inventory lists the property as “non-contributing.” The proposal calls for demolition of the building and the construction of a new two-story structure.

Mr. Wilds questioned whether the conditions of the approval would prevent the developer from moving forward and if the owner is agreeable to the conditions, even though the conditions are in the public interest. Mr. Huff stated that the Planning Commission has façade review of the property.

Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association, expressed concern that without the conditions, a vacant lot could be created.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

256 South Van Pelt Street

Clinton Hewes, Owner

Arthur Wilson, Applicant

DATE: c. 1910

PROPOSAL: New front door

The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

The proposal involves installing a new front door. The applicant proposes to replace the existing non-original door with a door that references the garage door. He could find no historic records to document the original door.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1927 Brandywine Street

Brian McLelland, Owner

Greg Berzinsky, Applicant

DATE: c. 1867

PROPOSAL: Façade renovations

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with the following changes:

- 1. The front door should have a vertical four-panel design,*
- 2. The first floor window should follow the 7 pane or 4 pane design visible in the 1985 photograph of 1925 and 1927 Brandywine Street from the Commission's file*
- 3. The staff should review details, particularly in the design of the garage transom bar and shutters which need some modification.*

The proposal involves renovations to the façade of a former carriage house including: replacement of a garage door with a new sectional roll down door to mimic the historic cross-buck design, a new front door, windows in the transom of the garage door, as well as the first and second floor, and new shutters. Mr. Baron explained that when the Commission designated the building individually in 1985, pictures showed a design for the first floor window and transom

over the garage, removed by a former owner without a permit and not reflected in the current design proposal. In addition the Commission possesses an insurance survey from 1867 which describes a four-panel front door. The insurance survey in part conflicts with the 1985 photograph particularly in terms of window patterns.

The applicant presented a revised submission to reflect the recommendations of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Sklaroff questioned the design of the door.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the revised submission with the staff to review details. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1612 North Street

Mary B. Mallon, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1886

PROPOSAL: Partial demolition and addition

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the rear ell removal, the three-story rear addition and the rear deck. The Architectural Committee recommended approval of reducing the roof angle on the front façade to lower the slope of the roof and approval of a penthouse box all with staff to review details.

This application calls for the construction of a new three-story rear addition with a two-story sloped addition to the existing house. Plans show an existing one-story rear ell removed. The Commission approved restoration work to the front façade, including the windows and doors, at the 11 October 2000 meeting. On the front elevation, two skylights penetrate the two-story fiberglass shingle sloped addition. The applicant's sightline study indicates that the sloped addition does not have visibility from North Street. A site visit by Mr. Tyler and Ms. Brennan confirmed, however, that the addition would be visible from North Street, 16th Street and Wallace Street. The sloped addition culminates in a one-story stucco-clad penthouse with two skylights. Plans show the penthouse having three, double hung 1/1 windows on the west elevation and a door and window on the rear elevation. On the rear façade, a wood roof deck extends approximately 17 feet behind the penthouse. The deck's railing, the rear of the penthouse, and the new three-story stucco addition all have visibility from the rear façade owing to vacant lots on Wallace Street. In addition, plans show new glass doors and double hung 1/1 windows on the addition's rear elevation. Staff recommended denial as submitted per Standard 9.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1614 North Street

Michael and Catherine Treacy, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1886

PROPOSAL: Partial demolition and addition

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the rear ell removal, the three-story rear addition and the rear deck. The Architectural Committee recommended approval of reducing the roof angle on the front façade to lower the slope of the roof and approval of a penthouse box all with staff to review details.

This application calls for the construction of a new three-story rear addition with a two-story sloped addition to the existing house. Plans show an existing one-story rear ell removed. The Commission approved restoration work to the front façade, including the windows and doors, at the 11 October 2000 meeting. On the front elevation, two skylights penetrate the two-story

fiberglass shingle sloped addition. The applicant's sightline study indicates that the sloped addition does not have visibility from North Street. A site visit by Mr. Tyler and Ms. Brennan, however, confirmed that the addition would be visible from North Street, 16th Street and Wallace Street. The sloped addition culminates in a one-story stucco-clad penthouse with two skylights. Plans show the penthouse having three, double hung 1/1 windows on the east elevation and a door and window on the rear elevation. On the rear façade, a wood roof deck extends approximately 17 feet behind the penthouse. The deck's railing, the rear of the penthouse, and the new three-story stucco addition all have visibility from the rear façade owing to vacant lots on Wallace Street. In addition, plans show new glass doors and double hung 1/1 windows on the addition's rear elevation. Staff recommended denial as submitted per Standard 9.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Cuorato seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1616 North Street

Spring Garden Community Development Corporation, Owner

Manuel Delgado, Applicant

DATE: c.1886

PROPOSAL: Legalize penthouse and roof deck, rear alterations

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of legalizing the three-story rear addition, the roof decks, and the penthouse box all with staff to review details.

This application calls for the legalization of a one-story, fourth floor penthouse and two roof decks and the approval of additional rear alterations. The Commission approved restoration work to the front façade, including the windows and doors, at the 11 October 2000 meeting. On the front elevation, a sightline study indicates that the nearly 13 foot long and 12 foot wide penthouse, as well as the roof deck railing which spans the width of the house, does not have visibility from North Street. A site visit by Mr. Tyler and Ms. Brennan proved, however, that the penthouse and decks had visibility from North Street, 16th Street and Wallace Street. The stucco-clad penthouse houses the entrance to a stair tower. On the rear façade, a wood roof deck extends approximately 17 feet behind the penthouse. The deck's railing, the rear of the penthouse, and the building's rear all have visibility from the rear façade owing to vacant lots on Wallace Street. In addition, plans show new glass doors and a stucco finish on the building's rear elevation. The double hung 1/1 vinyl windows shown on the rear have been previously reviewed by staff. Staff recommended legalization of the penthouse and roof decks per Standard 9. They also advocated approval of the remaining rear alterations per Standard 9.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of PECO's request to place all meters on the front façade of 1612, 1614 and 1616 North Streets.

Mr. Delgado then presented a request by PECO to place all of the meters on the front façade of 1612, 1614 and 1616 North Streets.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation with the staff to review details but to deny PECO's request for meter placement on the front facades of 1612, 1614 and 1616 North Streets. Mr. James seconded motion which carried unanimously.

507 North 21st Street, SE corner of Brandywine Street

Carol Kaminski, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c.1855

PROPOSAL: Rear deck and rear dormer

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the third floor deck and approval of a modified dormer design with a shed roof, all brackets to remain and the new dormer to fit between the original brackets with a single door, all with staff to review details.

This application calls for a new dormer and a third floor roof deck on the rear of this corner property. Plans show a gable roofed dormer on the rear of the house constructed of wood siding with rubber roofing to match the existing roof material. The proposal also includes aluminum clad french doors that open onto the new third floor deck from the front of the dormer. The third floor deck utilizes wood decking and rails. Plans show a screen and pergola on the new deck. The deck and dormer have visibility from Brandywine Street. Staff recommended approval of the rear deck per Standards 9 and 10 and denial of the dormer per Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Sklaroff stated that this is an extraordinary building and landmark, thus altering the roofline would be a major change to the building. The defining character of this building is its roofline. Mr. Brownlee thought a shed roof dormer with a smaller door and lower railing more appropriate. The proposal as submitted markedly changes the contour of the roofline. The Commission thought the recommendation for approval of the introduction of a visible roof deck represented an attempt at compromise by the Committee. Mr. Sklaroff strongly opposed the roof deck and dormer, which alter the original contour of the roofline. Some members believed that some of the roof deck's visibility will be hidden by the large brackets. The rear ell does not extend outward owing to the existing porch and another railing would give consistency. However, the additional railing should be simpler and pulled back to help minimize visibility. The Commission discussed at length its policy on visible roof decks and their denial.

Steve Lazin, the owner, said that the building has had major alterations. In addition, he said that the two brackets in question are in very poor condition. His proposal would replace the existing brackets and put a double door between them. He argued vehemently for this aspect of the proposal along with the peaked roofs.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation with the incorporation of the simple railing pulled back two feet. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried with 5 votes. Four members opposed the motion with Mr. Cuorato noting his opposition owing to the changing of the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

1216 Arch Street

Young Smyth Field Associates, Owner

Michael L. Prifti, Architect

DATE: 1902

PROPOSAL: Exterior alterations, rooftop installation

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the perforated metal panels on the Arch Street façade with staff to review details including materials and color.

This application calls for several building modifications to this eight-story structure. First, the applicant proposes replacing solid metal panels at the base of the Arch Street storefront window with perforated metal panels painted to match the existing trim. This perforated panel would serve to screen the intake louver of a new heat pump unit located in the building's interior. Second, plans show the addition of cable railing behind the existing metal rail on all seven Arch Street exit balconies. The cable railing height meets code and would wrap all three balcony sides. In addition, plans show a new railing on the building's rear balconies. Third, the application calls for the installation of a metal armature to support future antenna placement. Plans show metal tubes attached to an existing steel parapet brace. The armature would serve to support antennas proposed in separate building permits. The Telecommunications Committee met on 6 October

2000 to review an armature design and on 11 October 2000, the Commission denied the previously proposed placement of antennas on a similar armature. Finally, the applicant proposes replacing an existing pair of egress doors on Cuthbert Street with two separate, single leaf egress doors. The new door proposal shows the opening widened, and the original brick soldier course lintel removed and replaced with a steel lintel. Staff recommended denial of the perforated metal panels per Standards 6 and 9. Staff further recommended approval of the cable railing per Standard 9 with staff to review details of the cable color and texture. Staff recommended denial of the deck rails on the rear façade per Standard 9 with a recommendation for the same treatment as the Arch Street balcony rails. Owing to the Commission's decision on 11 October 2000, staff recommended denial of the armature placement. Staff recommended approval of the egress doors per Standard 6 with a recommendation that the lintel be placed behind the original soldier course lintel.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the cable railings on the Arch Street balconies with staff to review details including materials and color.

The plans show the Cuthbert Street balconies with a different rail from that of the existing Arch Street balconies. The plans of the existing condition were not drawn correctly, and the Cuthbert Street balconies are already altered and built to code. The black, stainless steel cable rail on the Arch Street balconies would allow the balconies to meet code.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept of an antenna zone to be determined with technical input and perhaps a mock-up.

The proposal also includes an armature to solve compliance issues for Nextel and other antenna providers. The armature design is a hybrid of new design and of the previously reviewed design. The applicant proposes to designate an antenna zone with the armature hidden by the parapet return. The Telecommunications Committee looked at several mock-ups to make their 6 October 2000 recommendation.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the egress doors as proposed with staff to review details.

The applicant also proposes new egress doors on the Cuthbert Street elevation. The new doors, with a wider doorway, would provide a dedicated entry for the basement tenant and would separate the upper and lower stairwells while adding security.

Cynthia Tori, Esq., attorney for Nextel, stated that her client is willing to work with the building's management in the placement of the antennas, but the building management does not want anything attached to the front parapet. The proposed location's angle would bring it closer to the front parapet, thus presenting an issue of interference with other carriers' antennas. The Commission said that the interference issue is not under its jurisdiction.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1008-1010 Arch Street

Asian Bank, 1008 Arch Street, Owner

Liz Ricciardi, Applicant

DATE: 1902

PROPOSAL: Night deposit box

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal

The proposal involves the installation of a night deposit box in the front window of the Asian Bank facing Arch Street. The façade, first altered in the 1940s received alterations approved by the Historical Commission a few years ago, which converted a former door into the window. The bank will use this twice-altered window as a location to install the box.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Cuorato seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

128 Bainbridge Street

Michael Samschick, Owner

Joel Spivak, Applicant

DATE: c. 1771-1792

PROPOSAL: Legalize rear addition and façade renovations

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the current proposal based on Secretary of the Interior Standards 9 & 10.

The proposal seeks to legalize the substantial demolition of this late 18th century half gable wooden house and the construction of a four-story addition without a permit. The owner, Michael Samschick, submitted a conceptual design for the renovation of the existing house and construction of a three-story addition last November. That design received conceptual approval in November 2000 with the condition that the front façade be restored in wood with window openings based on further research. The owner recently proceeded without a permit to demolish much of the wood house, which he explained had termite damage, and build an addition which exceeds the size of the structure formerly seen by the Commission. The applicant explained that his four-story structure exceeds the former three-story concept by about three feet because of lowered ceiling heights. The bulk of the building, however, rises above the roof ridge of the historic house at 17 feet back from the front property line, rather than the formerly approved 24 feet. From the street this makes the addition loom above the smaller historic house. The Committee explained that it could not recommend approval of the proposed design, but urged the applicant to submit a redesign of the addition that maintains a 24-foot setback for the third and fourth floors. It did not object to the rise of three additional feet above the historic roof ridge at a setback of 24 feet. The Committee emphasized that any recommendation for approval of an addition would be subject to restoring/reconstructing the wood façades in their historic plane.

The applicant presented revised drawings which reflect the November's Committee recommendation; however, the height is higher than previously approved.

Mr. Brownlee questioned the demolition without the issuance of a permit. Members also questioned the window configuration on the side.

Don Johnson, William Dorsey and a few other neighbors attended the meeting. The neighbors had met with the applicant and said that this could be a good development; however, they expressed concern about the single-family dwelling issue which the Commission stated is a zoning matter. The neighbors thought that since the design has changed it should receive the normal review process and be re-submitted to the Architectural Committee. The neighbors gave the applicant a lengthy document addressing their concerns, which the applicant said that owing to time constraints, he had not read the document.

Absent the side elevation showing the window configuration, the Commission believed the drawings incomplete. It also had concerns about the overall height of the addition, in as much as it is higher than previously approved. Therefore the Commission thought the applicant should be

allowed time to address the concerns of the neighbors and submit full plans including side elevations.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to remand the new proposal to the Architectural Committee owing to the incompleteness of the plans and to allow the applicant time to address the neighbor's concerns. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried with 6 votes. Mr. Wilds abstained and Mr. Cuorato opposed the motion.

1934-36 Park Mall

Temple University, Owner

Chris Zoog, Applicant

DATE: c. 1870

PROPOSAL: Exterior ductwork

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the kitchen exhaust chimney, as proposed, and louvers with staff to review details.

At its March meeting, the Commission voted to refer the proposed kitchen exhaust at the rear of the buildings back to the Committee. At that time the applicant had not established exact locations of the tenants that required kitchen exhaust ducts. Now, two restaurant tenants are located adjacent to one another and the kitchen exhaust chimneys can be placed at one location, on the new stucco infill wall, between 1934 and 1936 Park Mall. The exhaust ducts will be encased in stucco to match the stucco surface of the infill wall. Louvers are also proposed at the rear in both the new stucco wall and original brick wall at the first floor level.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

141-145 League Street

Dana Spain-Smith, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c.1850; c.1920

PROPOSAL: Façade alterations, roof deck

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with the following conditions:

- 1. six-over-six windows on the visible portions of the side façade, and*
- 2. one pediment above the larger door opening to the main entrance with the smaller opening remaining a simpler design.*

With the staff to review all details.

This application for alterations to an historic schoolhouse turned factory involves cutting down an existing opening, installing new and restoring old windows and building a roof deck. Two new pediments would sit over non-historic doorways. The non-visible windows on the side façade will have a one over one design. The staff recommended approval per Standards 9 and 10; however, any side windows visible to the public should have the original six over six true divided light design and the side pediment window should also match the historic design. This building had large windows which are now bricked up and the doorway was formally in the side yard. The applicant proposes the current loading dock opening with the roll up gate as the main entrance and the smaller door as a secondary entrance with pediments above both entrances.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried with 7 votes. Mr. Thomas abstained.

1900 Shunk Street, SW corner of 19th Street

Joseph Costanzo, Owner

Regina Trama, Applicant

DATE: 1910; James and John Windrim

PROPOSAL: Legalize removal of slate roof, replacement with black asphalt shingles

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal as submitted but approval of the retention of the existing rear asphalt shingles subject to the restoration of the slopes of the front gambrel and dormer with slate.

This application calls for legalizing the removal of the original slate roof and installation of black asphalt shingles without a permit. Staff advised the applicant of the need for a permit shortly after the start of construction. The staff recommended denial per Standard 6. The roofer should install slate on at least the front gambrel on Shunk Street.

Mr. Costanzo, the owner, attended the meeting and intimated that the cost of slate is an issue.

The Commission reiterated to the applicant that slate is an important contribution to the district. It also noted that the rubber alternative is less expensive. Mr. Tyler stated that he visited the site during the removal of the slate, and asked that a stop work order be issued. Nonetheless, the applicant proceeded with the work.

Mr. James made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation; however, the Commission recommended that the applicant explore cost options and then if necessary request referral to the Committee on Financial Hardship. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1412 Diamond Street

Yung King Lou, Owner

Philip Scott, Architect

DATE: 1886; John M. Sharp, Builder

PROPOSAL: Cut down front door

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of door with the vertical divided transom with the staff to review details.

This proposal involves cutting down the entrance of this row house to create a handicap accessible ramp to a new restaurant. The staff recommended approval per A.D.A.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Batzer seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

THE REPORT on the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, July 2001

Mr. Tyler asked if members of the Commission had any questions about the report. There were none.

**CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMENT ON NATIONAL REGISTER
NOMINATION**

Telephone Exchange Building, 8-12 North Preston Street

Mr. Tyler welcomed comments on the nomination for consideration on the National Register of Historic Places. Following a brief discussion, the members agreed unanimously that the North Preston Street Bell Telephone Exchange Building meets Criteria A and C of the National Register and recommended its entry on the National Register.

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to approve the expenditure of \$25.43. for the Architectural Committee lunches.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to approve the expenditure. Ms. Batzer seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Mr. James made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Wischmann seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary