

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

**Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Commission Offices, One Parkway, 13th Floor, 1515 Arch Street
28 May 2002**

Present

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Tony Atkin, AIA
Suzanne Pentz

Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Jeffrey Barr, Historical Research Technician
Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Also

Kevin Green, Nason and Cullen, Incorporated, 116 Fountain Street
Jim Nolen, Fountain Street Partners, 116 Fountain Street
J. Walsh, Superior Scaffold Service
Robert Hytha, R.J. Hytha & Associates, 4401 Cresson Street
Jamie Kokenberger, JKJ Construction, 4401 Cresson Street
Derek Davis, 4417 Main Street
David Amburn, Amburn/Jawosinski
Jeff Groff, Wyck, 6026 Germantown Avenue
Larry McEwen, Lawrence D. McEwen Architects, Wyck
Matt Rover, Lawrence D. McEwen Architects, Wyck
Joseph Fischgrund, PA School for the Deaf
Al Fuscald, Ballard Spahr Andrews and Ingersoll, LLP, Pennsylvania School for the Deaf
Bruce Thompson, Kelly Maiello Architects, Pennsylvania School for the Deaf
Terry Kennedy, Kelly Maiello Architects, Pennsylvania School for the Deaf
Kelly Maiello, Kelly Maiello Architects, Pennsylvania School for the Deaf
Meir Seidenwar, 227 Market Street
Tim Peters, Woodcock Design, 168 North 3rd Street
Scott Menkle, MCW Enterprises, 227 South 6th Street
Jay Crammer, MCW Enterprises, 227 South 6th Street
Mike Menkle, MCW Enterprises, 227 South 6th Street
Stephen Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
J. Holmes, Queen Village Neighborhood Association
David O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighborhood Association
Nan Gutterman, Vitetta Group, City Hall
Jason Stevens, Capital Program Office, City Hall
Anthony Weiser, Architect
Elizabeth Judge, Owner, 2112 Mt. Vernon Street
Anthony Tsirantanakis, Architect, Foster's Reading Terminal Market
Paul Steinke, Reading Terminal Market

Ken Foster, Proprietor, Foster's Gourmet Cookware, Reading Terminal Market
 C. Evers, Atkin Olshin Lawson Bell & Associates, Reading Terminal Market
 Glenn Mueller, Proprietor, Chocolate by Mueller, Reading Terminal Market
 Delano Shane, Armstrong Kaulbach Architects
 Marc Brookman, Esq., Duane Morris & Heckscher, 1914-16 Rittenhouse Square Street
 Wesley Wei, Architect, 1914-16 Rittenhouse Street
 William G. Schwartz, Esq., Obermayer rebmann Maxwell & Hippel
 Rachel Schade, Schade and Bolender Architects, 2201 St. James Street
 Christopher Beardsley, Christopher Beardsley Architects
 Raymond Rola, Architect, 1728 Chestnut Street
 Jerry Slipakoff, 1832 Delancey Street
 Lyman Simpson, 2127 Porter Street
 Michael Hauptman, Brawer and Hauptman Architects, 2100 Porter Street
 Brett Powell, Brawer and Hauptman Architects, 2100 Porter Street
 Joseph Orlando, 1024 South 2nd Street
 Lawrence Gilbert, 735 Bainbridge Street, Architect, 126-128 League Street

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m.

116 Fountain Street

Fountain Street Partners, LLP, Owners

Kevin Green, Applicant

DATE: c. 1920

PROPOSAL: Window replacement and infill, demolish chimney and water tower structure

Mr. Baron explained the lack of a quorum and offered the applicants the chance to have the proposal heard at another time. Kevin Green and Jim Nolan agreed to proceed.

This proposal revisits a project seen last month. The proposal includes additional information regarding the poor condition of the chimney and water tower base. The proposal now calls for metal panels with applied muntins on the ends of the buildings in the upper stories. The long facades of the building would have double-glazed windows with muntins sandwiched between the glass. The muntin configuration will match the historic windows.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the demolition of the chimney, construction of the window and panel system. Repair the water tower base. All with staff to review details.

Ms. Pentz and Mr. Rivera agreed that the chimney is deteriorated beyond repair and that the water tower base could be retained, with the failing concrete shaved off. Mr. Tyler noted that complete demolition of the water tower base may prove more expensive than simply shaving it to sound concrete and repairing the new edge.

Mr. Baron thought that the drawings for the windows showed an applied muntin, as with the panel, not a sandwiched muntin. He questioned the proposed sandwiched muntin for the glazing, rather than the applied muntin. Mr. Green stated that applied muntin will add considerable cost to the project. Mr. Nolan said that if the building's use changes to commercial or residential, then an applied muntin can be added later. Mr. Tyler said that since the building stands in the Manayunk District, regulated under a different City ordinance, and that the Committee recommends approval of the proposal, staff may stamp the drawings without the application proceeding to the

Commission.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the demolition of the chimney, replacing the glazing with windows with sandwiched muntins on the long façade and panels with applied muntins on the short façade, and repairing the water tower base to make it safe, with staff to review details for approval.

LMS

4401 Cresson Street, NE corner of Carson Street

Robert Morganstein, Owner

Jamie Kokenberger, Applicant

DATE: c. 1890

PROPOSAL: New addition

Mr. Baron explained to Jamie Kokenberger and Bob Hytha that the Committee lacked a quorum. The applicants agreed to proceed.

This proposal involves an addition to the front façade of the train station. The new proposal attaches below the level of the existing roof canopy, as suggested by the Committee at the last meeting.

Staff recommendation: Approval because the boundary of the district runs through the site.

Ms. Pentz suggested a simplified design of the addition, such as eliminating the quoins, so that the addition does not read as part of the original building. Mr. Kokenberger stated that they intentionally designed the addition so that it does not look like an addition. Mr. Baron noted that this does not follow the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards*, which call for additions to be similar but not a copy of the original building. However, since the addition does not stand within the boundaries of the historic district, the Committee's comments on the addition are not binding. Mr. Baron stated that since the building stands in the Manayunk District, regulated under a different City ordinance, and that the Committee recommends approval of the proposal, staff may stamp the drawings without the application proceeding to the Commission.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal.

LMS

4417-19 Main Street

Derek Davis, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Legalize removal of storefront and installation of new storefront

David Amburn, architect, and Derek Davis and Alan Newman represented the proposal. Mr. Baron explained the lack of a quorum and the applicants agreed to proceed.

Without a permit or Historical Commission approval, the applicant demolished two historic

storefronts and replaced them with new storefronts of a different design. Designation photographs of the two buildings show storefronts with transoms and large plate glass windows on the first floor. The corner building, 4419, has multiple, vertical, operable windows with transoms, though the transoms do not match the historic dimensions. 4417 originally had transoms above the large windows, but the new windows do not have them. The applicant also installed new fixed awnings above the doors and retractable awnings over the windows with four, large, suspended heat lamps. Also, the granite step at the corner entrance was removed and the sidewalk sloped to accommodate handicapped access.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standards 2, 5, 6, & 9.

Mr. Newman explained that the floor levels of the two buildings differed. To meet code on the interior of the restaurant, the floor level of 4419 was dropped, necessitating the lowering of the windows' sills. Also, the applicant removed the granite stoop to provide a handicap access ramp. Committee and staff questioned the need to remove the transoms to install the new windows. Mr. Davis said that 4417 did not have transom windows when he changed the windows. Mr. Baron noted that the staff did not object to operable windows, but their configuration should better approximate the historic window pattern. Ms. Pentz agreed. She also stated that the applicant should have come to the Commission before he did the work. Mr. Newman admitted that they had a permit for interior alterations only, but decided on site to perform the exterior changes.

The Architectural Committee split on the issue. Ms. Pentz stated that the new windows should reflect the historic storefronts, with transoms in 4417 and less vertical mullions. Mr. Rivera thought the changes should be legalized as built.

LMS

6026 Germantown Avenue, Wyck

Wyck Charitable Trust, Owner

Jeff Groff, Applicant

DATE: c. 1690

PROPOSAL: Construct two new structures, renovate garage, and site-work in concept

Mr. Baron noted the lack of a quorum and offered the applicant a chance to be heard at another time. Jeff Groff, executive director of Wyck Charitable Trust, and Larry McEwen and Matt Yoder, architects for the project, agreed to proceed without a quorum.

This proposal in concept involves adding two wooden structures to the yard of Wyck house museum for toilets and renovating the garage for group teaching facilities. The new structures will be built along the line of an historic fence, separating the historic garden from the wood yard. Also, the garage will be altered to accommodate a new seminar room.

Staff recommendation: Approval per Standards 9 & 10.

Mr. Groff noted that major foundations, including Pew Charitable Trusts, William Penn Foundation and the Connolly Foundation, have provided almost all of the funding for the project. Mr. McEwen described the changes to the garage. One wall of the garage was originally a retaining wall for the barn area and dates to circa 1796. The rest of the garage structure was built

in 1935, but significantly rebuilt in the 1960s after suffering hurricane damage. The changes include raising the roof to allow clerestory windows installed above the stone wall and replacing the pedestrian door with another hinged door that matches the existing bi-fold doors. The roof may extend several feet in front of the bi-fold doors to provide shelter; however, the roof pitch will remain the same.

The two proposed bathroom buildings will have vertical board walls, mimicking a garden wall. There will be an arbor between the buildings, allowing access to flow from the rose garden to the area of the garage and barn. The historic axis leading from the barn's front door to the end of the rose garden will remain. These buildings will have the same scale as the other auxiliary buildings on the site, including the icehouse, smoke house, chicken coop and privy. Mr. Groff stated that they have performed several borings to sample possible archaeology in the area of the proposed buildings, and will continue to test the site before actual construction.

Mr. Baron stated that since the plans included details, he believed that the approval should be final, rather than in concept.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with staff to review details.

LMS

143 (131-41) West Coulter Street, Philadelphia School for the Deaf

Philadelphia School for the Deaf, Owner

Emanuel Kelly, Architect

PROPOSAL: Construction of new two-story school building in concept

This proposal involves seeking conceptual approval for the construction of a school building. Last year, the Historical Commission approved the demolition of 143 Coulter Street subject to review and approval of the design of the new school building and its site as well as the preservation of 151 Coulter Street. The new design differs significantly from that seen before, for the School retained new architects for the project. The proposed new building has the look of an institutional building with long flat areas along the front facade facing Coulter Street, with round windows that do not relate to the streetscape. In addition, the front lawn has now become a vehicular drop-off lane, and the building is faced with brick rather than stone. The applicant also wishes to receive a permit for the demolition of the historic building and for the foundation of the new facility based on a conceptual approval of this design rather than a review and approval for the design of the whole site as specified in the Commission's 14 March 2001 conditional approval.

Staff recommendation: Denial of this design per Standards 9 & 10. The staff recommends the following changes:

1. removal of the drop-off lane in the front of the new building,
2. reorganization of the street façade to render it more symmetrical, possibly with two gable ends, and for the door to read as a front entrance on Coulter Street,
3. at least some use of stone to match neighboring houses, and
4. for the fenestration to follow the verticality of neighboring buildings.

A majority of the staff does not recommend approval of the demolition and foundation permit at this time based on this design.

Mr. Baron described the submission and the staff recommendation and Mr. Baron explained that the Committee lacked a quorum and gave the applicant the opportunity to be heard at a later date. The applicant consented to proceeding without a quorum.

Emanuel Kelly, architect, informed the Committee that the community has seen the revised proposal and has endorsed it. He also observed that the present plan has a smaller footprint than the scheme previously approved in concept. He then said that this design, including the flat roofed section, better responds to the scale of the neighborhood than the earlier submission. Mr. Kelly discussed the use of materials and noted the use of stone and stucco in other buildings on West Coulter Street. The budget simply will not permit construction in stone or even a stone veneer. Brick of the same palette as the stone, however, will provide contextual compatibility and will distinguish the avowedly contemporary new structure from the older ones on the block. The porch on the street elevation of the gabled portion of the new facility will further complement and respond to the historic streetscape. He added that the drop-off lane will serve only to deliver and pick up students safely, not parking. Moreover, an iron hairpin fence with shrubbery at the property line will mitigate the introduction of this lane. In response to a question, he demonstrated the infeasibility of another location for the drop-off lane.

During the course of the discussion, Joseph Fischgrund, Head Master of the School, confirmed that the Board of Directors had authorized going forward with the development and that he had filed with the Commission the required certification that the School had all the funds in place to erect the new facility. Mr. Tyler observed the unlikelihood of the School's incurring the costs of laying a foundation and then abandoning the project, leaving a vacant lot.

Members of the Committee responded favorably to the submission. They did suggest, however, the use of the darker gray brick for the entire façade of the gabled section of the building to give greater emphasis to it and its relationship to its context. Similarly, they urged a hip on the western edge of the porch.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept of the plan as submitted with dark gray facing on the gabled section of the building and a hip on the western edge of the porch roof. It further recommended the approval of the issuance of a demolition and foundation permit.

RT

151 West Coulter Street

Robert McCormac, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c 1845

PROPOSAL: New faux-slate roof

This application involves removing the badly damaged slate roof from this house shell and installing Majestic rubber faux-slate.

Staff recommendation: Approval per Standard 6, however, the applicant should provide a drawing showing the roof coursing with the banding of the saw tooth tiles

Mr. Baron introduced this submission and he explained that the Committee lacked a quorum and

gave the applicant the opportunity to be heard at a later date. The applicant consented to proceeding without a quorum.

Mr. McCormac showed the Committee a sample of the Majestic rubber faux-slate and described the coursing of the differently shaped tiles.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of this proposal with staff to review and approve details.

RT

227 Market Street, aka 216 Church Street

Ilan Seidenwar, Owner

Mary Ann Duffy, Architect

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Legalize storefront on Market Street and masonry work on Church Street

This proposal involves the legalization of work that exceeded the approval given by the Historical Commission. This work includes the installing of visible exhaust vents on the roof, the covering of the marble storefront columns with cement on the Church Street property, and the rebuilding of the storefront on Market Street set back a number of inches within the property contrary to the approved plans as well as failing to match the historic details. The applicant shows drawings to modify the new storefront to match better the original details.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the rooftop exhaust as the building under construction next door will partially hide them. Denial of the set back storefront and the cement on the storefront columns per Standards 2, 4, 5, 6, and 9.

Mr. Baron introduced this application and he explained that the Committee lacked a quorum and gave the applicant the opportunity to be heard at a later date.

The Committee first discussed the Church Street issues. The members determined the owner must remove the cement from and restore the marble columns and entablature at the first floor. They also agreed that the building under construction on the adjacent lot would conceal adequately the vents on the roof of 216 Church Street. Mr. Tyler added that such exhausts necessarily accompany conversion from loft commercial to residential use, a goal long espoused by the City and neighborhood.

It then turned to the Market Street elevation. Mr. Rivera observed that ground floor openings are subject to change over time. Mr. Tyler responded that the shop fronts form a character defining feature of Market Street in Old City and that the work as executed does not conform to the approved drawings.

The Committee and applicant discussed the existing treatment and the question of the structural strength posed by replication of the original design; the previously approved introduction of an additional door to provide access to the apartments on the upper floors may make such restoration unsound.

The Architectural Committee recommended:

1. *the denial of the legalization of the cement coating of the Church Street marble columns and entablature,*
2. *the approval of the roof vents subject to the restoration of the Church Street marble columns and entablature,*
3. *the approval of the Market Street shop front as built subject to the application of moldings to match those shown in the previously approved drawing and the historic photographs, and*
4. *the approval of the Market Street transom as built subject to the application of a molding at the top of the transom*
with staff to review and approve details.

RT

163 North 3rd Street, SW corner of Race Street

Lisa Hwang, Owner

Janice Woodcock, Architect

DATE: c. 1805, 1830

PROPOSAL: New door and ramp

Mr. Baron explained that the Committee lacked a quorum and gave the applicant the opportunity to be heard at a later date. The applicant consented to proceeding without a quorum.

This proposal involves adding a ramp and new door to create handicap accessibility for this corner store.

Staff recommendation: Approval, per accessibility guideline.

Mr. Baron described this submission.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of this proposal with staff to review and approve details.

RT

227 South 6th Street, Lippincott Building

MCW Enterprises, LLC, Owner

Stephen Verner, Architect

DATE: 1900, William Pritchett, architect

PROPOSAL: New underground garage, two-story penthouse, rooftop terraces and gardens

Mr. Baron explained that the Committee lacked a quorum and gave the applicant the opportunity to be heard at a later date. The applicant consented to proceeding without a quorum.

This proposal returns to the Commission for final approval. Following a meeting with neighbors, the architect has revised the rooftop additions to show a hipped roof, without the historic looking dormers, and with modern fenestration. The applicant also seeks to modify the rear (east) façade

with a garage opening, a new door and alterations to doors to create windows.

Staff recommendation: The Commission approved the concept of the two-story rooftop addition on 12 September 2001. Approval of the façade changes per Standard 9 because the alterations involve mostly changes to the rear façade. The front façade work involves a fire egress stair.

Mr. Baron introduced this submission which the Committee and the applicant discussed briefly. The Society Hill Civic Association has endorsed this proposal.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of this proposal with staff to review and approve details.

RT

227 Fitzwater Street

Colleen Puckett, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1825

PROPOSAL: New light fixture

This proposal involves installing a very large lantern over the door of this rowhouse. The owner has purchased the lantern and her shutters preclude placement beside the door.

Staff recommendation: Denial per Standard 9. The staff recommends a small down light attached to the bottom of the transom bar.

Mr. Baron explained the lack of a quorum and gave the applicant the opportunity to be heard at a later hearing.

Mr. David O'Donnell represented Ms. Puckett and agreed to proceed without a quorum. He showed pictures of the placement of other lights above doors.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposed light.

RB

City Hall, Broad and Market Streets

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Jason Stevens, Applicant

DATE: 1871-1901, John McArthur Jr., Architect

PROPOSAL: Bird netting

This proposal involves installing birdnetting on the facades of City Hall. While initially the applicant proposed netting of the column capitals, now they propose netting in front of the whole columns. This will be more visible but also provides substantially more protection.

Staff recommendation: Approval pending site visit. The samples of the two different amounts of netting remain on the columns to either side of the south portal. The staff recommended that

Committee and Commission members visit the samples to help them make a decision.

Mr. Baron explained that the Committee lacked a quorum and gave the applicant the opportunity to be heard at a later date. Nan Gutterman, the architect for the project, agreed to proceed without a quorum.

Ms. Pentz recused herself.

Mr. Rivera recommended approval of the more extensive netting proposal.

RB

642 North Broad Street, NW corner of Wallace Street

Philadelphia Corporation for the Aging, Owner

Christian Busch, Architect

DATE: 1903, William Steele, architect

PROPOSAL: Extend elevator penthouse

This application is for extending the elevator penthouse. The penthouse is made of brick; the proposal calls for painted CMU.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the extension, but denial of the material, per roofing guideline. The extension should be made of brick to match the existing penthouse. If the material cannot be brick, then the extension should be set back from the wall plane and stuccoed CMU, rather than painted.

No one attended the meeting to represent this project, however Mr. Busch called to explain that he could not attend but that they would be happy to comply with the Committee and staff recommendation.

The Architectural Committee recommended in favor of extending the shaft in brick and demarcating the new brick with a beltcourse or other detail to be worked out with staff.

RB

Mr. Atkin arrived, creating a quorum.

2112 Mt Vernon Street

Eli Nelson & Elizabeth Judge, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1855, Oliver Parry & Nathaniel Randolph, builders

PROPOSAL: Rear addition and roof deck

This building has a typical rowhouse plan. The main part of the house has three floors and a “flat” roof. The two-story rear ell has a half-gabled roof, which is the mirror image of the neighboring house. The proposal calls for removing the roof of the rear ell and adding a third floor that sits higher than the roof of the main house. The owners wish to replace the doors that lead out to the existing second-floor deck and install another deck at the third floor and a third deck on the roof.

Staff recommendation: Denial, per Standard 9. Although this is the rear of the property, it is visible from a public right-of-way and radically alters the scale and massing of the house and the streetscape.

Mr. Rivera and Ms. Pentz thought that the proposal altered the original rear ell of the house to too great an extent. They showed the architect how the addition could be pulled back from the rear wall to preserve the shape of the rear gable end and still achieve the new room. They asked that the roof be lowered to keep it in line with the front roof section. Mr. Atkin did not agree and thought that the existing design was acceptable.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the current proposal, but made suggestions for a modified proposal that they thought would be acceptable.

RB

1113-31 Market Street, Foster's, Reading Terminal Market

Pennsylvania Convention Center Authority, Owner

Anthony Tsirantonakis, Architect

DATE: 1891-93, Francis Kimball and Wilson Brothers, architects

PROPOSAL: New enclosed store

This proposal calls for a new, enclosed store within the Reading Terminal Market. Foster's has an enclosed store already in the Market, but it sits along an exterior wall. The proposed store will sit in the middle of the Market's open space and replace one of the few areas of common seating.

Staff recommendation: Denial, per Standard 9. A large part of the Market's appeal is the open-air stalls throughout the space. If individual stalls become enclosed stores, then the building will take on a "mall" effect.

Ken Foster, owner, Paul Steinke, Market Manager, and Anthony Tsirantonakis, architect, attended the meeting to represent the project. Mr. Baron explained the staff position that the character of the Market is defined, in part, by the open stalls. Many merchants would prefer to have enclosed secure spaces and allowing additional enclosed stalls within the Market will destroy this open character. The staff has reviewed multiple applications for new or altered market stalls and has consistently attempted to maintain the historic openness of the "farmers market". The staff feels that, if approved, there will be many more applications for enclosed stalls in the future.

Mr. Tsirantonakis explained that this gourmet cookware store needs the enclosure for security and wall space for display. The owner desires a larger space and a more visible location. The architect based the design on his design for the existing store reviewed and approved by Historical Commission staff in 1995. The existing store stands along the Arch Street exterior wall in the northeast corner of the Market. The new store will replace a seating area adjacent to the existing demonstration kitchen.

Mr. Steinke explained that this proposal will incorporate and re-use the demonstration kitchen, combining two attractions into one, and bolstering a historically weak corner of the Market. He stated that he shares the staff's concerns about too much enclosure but the nature of this particular store requires more security. Mr. Steinke added that the fully enclosed Down Home Diner

occupied this same location previously. The Market has studied the seating and the loss of seating resulting from this proposal will be made up with the addition of 48 seats elsewhere.

The Committee discussed the design. Mr. Atkin understood the design approach and program needs but stated that anything that could be done to make the store less enclosed would be an improvement. The Committee discussed the front of the store. The owner explained that the proposed display window gave the entrance a “storefront” appearance at front and was needed for merchandising. Mr. Rivera agreed with Mr. Atkin that, conceptually, the design approach was fine but the execution was too enclosed. The Committee suggested eliminating the upper panels behind the floating beam and “opening up” the barn door and storefront area.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the project, subject to changes including the elimination of the solid upper panels, glazing of the barn door, and reduction of the solid storefront area by increasing the glazing, or open area, at front.

JRB

1113-31-Market Street, Mueller’s Chocolates, Reading Terminal Market

Pennsylvania Convention Center Authority, Owner

DATE: Glenn Mueller, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Expand enclosed store and kitchen

This proposal is for extending an enclosed kitchen within the Reading Terminal Market. The Commission approved a small, enclosed kitchen in 1999 tucked into a corner of the Market, along an exterior wall. The owners now wish to expand the kitchen with a two-story addition, which will wrap around a wall and be highly visible from one of the doors on 12th Street.

Staff recommendation: Denial, per Standard 9 and interiors guideline.

Glenn Mueller Jr. and Sr., owners, Paul Steinke, Market manager, and Charles Evers, architect attended the meeting to represent the project. Mr. Baron explained the project and the staff position regarding enclosed stalls. Mr. Evers explained the proposal to extend the existing enclosed space around the corner of the stairwell and add usable space for an office on the second level. To mitigate the solid wall of the expanded enclosed space, the architect proposes mirror glass at the transom level.

Mr. Steinke explained that the Muellers produce their chocolates in this space that is visible to the public behind glass. The Market values this attraction and wants the business to stay and grow within the Market. He added that the existing bookstall will be relocated to an improved stall within the market and the existing information booth will be redesigned and shifted over towards the 12th Street doors adjacent to the new expanded Mueller’s Chocolate space. Mr. Mueller stated that the enclosure is required to maintain constant temperature and humidity and they do not need additional unenclosed space.

Mr. Atkin and Ms. Pentz understood the program needs. Mr. Rivera understood the staff’s concerns regarding enclosed stalls but observed that the Market can be perceived as a series of little streets and some enclosure can help define the “streets”.

Mr. Atkin abstained.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the project as submitted.

JRB

1214 Arch Street

Theresa Stigale,, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1907, Milligan & Weber, architects

PROPOSAL: Cut new side windows and infill window openings

This proposal calls for infilling 14 historic window openings and cutting new openings for windows on the east façade of the building. The existing window openings have segmental-arched openings with 9/9 windows with square-head glazing. The proposed windows are 9/9 square-head windows in square-head openings.

Please note that an historic painted sign on the façade was painted over with red paint without a permit or Commission approval.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the new window openings, per window guideline, but denial of infilling the six window openings on the northern end of the façade, per the window guideline. These openings should remain glazed, but closed from behind.

No one attended the meeting to represent the project. Mr. Baron explained the proposal. The Committee agreed that the six windows towards the front should be retained and could be closed up from the inside. Mr. Baron explained that the painting over of the sign was not a part of the application.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal with the condition that the front six windows are retained and closed up from the inside, if necessary, with staff to review details.

JRB

1914-16 Rittenhouse Square Street, aka 1917-19 Manning Street

Henry McNeil, Owner

Marc Brookman, Esq., Applicant

DATE: c. 1859, entrance addition, c. 1940

PROPOSAL: Revised Manning Street elevation

The Committee and Commission previously approved the demolition of the entrance pavilion and the construction of a four-story addition. This proposal calls for a revised Manning Street façade. The façade approved by the Commission had numerous casement windows in a three-story section and a one-story section with a garage. The proposal now calls for the same massing, but uses larger windows that wrap around the corner of the three-story section, includes both brick and stucco for the walls and calls for solid roll-down doors instead of open ones that allowed a view into the garden.

Staff recommendation: Staff split on the proposal. Two staff members recommend approval since the design meets Standard 3. They thought that the contemporary design reflected the fact that this is all new fabric and it still relates to the rest of the block in scale and massing. Two staff members recommend denial, per Standard 9. They thought the addition should only have brick, a more vertical orientation and more traditional fenestration.

Marc Brookman, Esq., and Wesley Wei, architect, attended the meeting to represent the project. William Schwartz, Esq., attended the meeting representing Miles Kelly, a neighbor. Mr. Schwartz requested a continuance. Mr. Tyler stated that the Architectural Committee is not a decision making body and the Committee only makes recommendations and advises the Commission. Mr. Tyler stated that only the applicant or, in some cases, the staff, may request a continuance. Mr. Brookman expressed their desire to proceed. The Committee agreed to review the submission and advised Mr. Schwartz to attend the Commission meeting.

Mr. Tyler explained that Mr. Wei is now the architect for this project and the design of the Manning Street façade has been revised. Ms. Spina explained the split positions of the staff. Mr. Wei stated that he came into this project late and realized that the Commission had approved the earlier design by Walter Chatham. Mr. Wei explained the design approach to create something modern while maintaining the spirit of the existing buildings on Manning Street.

Mr. Atkin thought the design had been improved.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the project as submitted.

JRB

2201 St. James Street, NW corner of 22nd Street

Daphne and Edgar Holzman, Owners

Rachel Schade, Architect

DATE: c. 1870, attributed to Frank Furness

PROPOSAL: Rear door and deck

The owner wishes to install a rear deck off the first floor of the house, cutting a window down to a door. The brick garden wall hides the deck itself, but the window is visible from 22nd Street.

Staff recommendation: Approval of Option C, per Standards 9 and 10.

Rachel Schade, architect, attended the meeting to represent the project. Ms. Spina described the proposal. Ms. Schade explained the design approach and reviewed the three options submitted to the Committee. The Committee agreed that the visible top of the new door opening should match the existing window. The Committee thought that, of the three, option B was preferable.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of Option B with staff to review details.

JRB

1728 Chestnut Street

Elan Zaken, Owner

Raymond Rola, Architect

DATE: 1914, Frank H. Keisker, architect

PROPOSAL: Rear addition

This long vacant building will be rehabbed into a commercial space with apartments above. The building has a four-story front with a long one-story rear ell that extends to Ionic Street (now known as Stock Exchange Way). The proposal calls for building a three-story addition onto the rear ell along Ionic Street, and a two-story addition on the connection between the front building and the rear. The Ionic Street façade will keep the extant brick wall and window openings and have stucco on the additional floors with contemporary fenestration.

Staff recommendation: Approval in concept, per Standard 9, but denial of the design. The addition should have a setback from the plane of the first-story wall, a more vertical orientation and more traditional fenestration.

Raymond Rola, the architect attended the meeting to explain the proposal.

The Committee discussed the proposal and concurred with the staff that a slight setback to the stucco would differentiate the new structure from the existing structure. Ms. Pentz thought the addition should be on the same plain as the existing wall, but that the design should be flat and simplified with the deck set back. In addition, she thought that the projecting balcony should be eliminated. Committee members believed that the logia at the top of the addition relates to the front façade.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of a flattened and more simplified design in a brick color stucco with the elimination of the window surrounds, and the staff to review details; however, one member thought the projecting balcony should be eliminated, while two members approved the proposed balcony.

DMH

1832 Delancey Street

Jerald Slipakoff, Owner

Christopher Beardsley, Architect

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Rear addition, cut garage, roof deck

This property on Delancey Street has a two-story rear ell with a leaded glass window on the first floor and an ornate copper bay on the second. The proposal is to remove the wall at the basement level and install a roll-up garage door, creating on-site parking. The owners also wish to add a small addition on the rear of the main building, tucked into the corner of the rear ell, at the first floor, and a deck on the roof of the rear ell.

Staff recommendation: Denial of the garage and one-story addition as proposed, per Standard 9.

Staff recommends approval of a garage door that spans the width of the rear ell only, and retaining the eastern wall of the rear ell and the pedestrian door onto the street. Approval of the deck on the rear ell, per roofing guideline but the joists should sit on the brick parapet and the railing should follow the lines of the brick wall, recessed behind the two bays.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal and expressed concern about the removal of the rear ell which is an important historic feature of this property.

Christopher Beardsley, the architect, and Jerald Slipakoff, the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Beardsley said that the bay extends only to the 1st floor, it does not continue below grade, which he does not propose to cut below. He stated that his intent is to support the existing historic components from the 1st floor above with a beam. He noted that the proposed location is a back alley with a mixed streetscape of full and single width garages. In addition, he said that the proposed garage is in scale with the existing streetscape. He also said that he proposed to restore components such as the bricks and bays which are in poor condition; however, he will keep as much brick as possible at the structure lines of the windows, add new beams and then put the garage behind this. He said that the sightlines from the alley will not change. Mr. Slipakoff said that the street is very narrow and emphasized the need for as much swing as possible.

Ms. Spina noted that absent structural plans, she expressed concern about the proposal structurally with the removal of the side wall. Ms. Pentz expressed concern with the visual sense when the corner of such a large building is cut out. Mr. Atkins questioned the staff's concern about the brick removal. He said that visually making two windows, relates to what existed previously, but thought that a center post is needed. He finally concluded that since the original fabric is brick, and it is on a back alley, he believed that the proposal is acceptable.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the following:

1. *A stucco addition with steel at the rear and a modern door;*
2. *the garage as proposed, and*
3. *The roof deck, with the deck following the lines of the brick parapet.*

2127 Porter Street

Lyman Simpson, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1914, James & John Windrim, architects

PROPOSAL: Remove slate roof and install asphalt shingles

This proposal involves removing the slate roof and replacing it with asphalt-fiberglass shingles that mimic slate.

Staff recommendation: Denial as proposed, per Standard 6 and roofing guideline. The front slope, at least, should retain the slate.

Lyman Simpson, the owner, attended the meeting and stated that he is on a fixed income and emphasized the hardship that a slate roof would cause.

Committee members concurred that this is a possible financial hardship consideration and apprized

the applicant of the procedures for a financial hardship application. They also thought that the applicant should present estimates for an entire slate roof as well as an estimate for slate on the front and asphalt shingles on the side and rear. The Committee also made the applicant aware of the possibility of the re-use of existing shingles if their condition allowed it.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial and thought the proposal should be referred to the Committee on Financial Hardship and the Committee gave the applicant options on how to proceed.

2100 Porter Street, aka 2101 Shunk Street, Gentilhommiere

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Brett Powell, Architect

DATE: Main House: c. 1760; central brick portion, 1798-1803; west wing, c. 1825

Auxiliary Buildings: c. 1810, steps added and one converted to bathrooms, 1901

PROPOSAL: New metal-shingle roof on main and auxiliary buildings

This proposal calls for installing a metal-shingle roof on the main house as well as the two auxiliary buildings.

Staff recommendation: Denial, per Standard 6. These extremely important buildings should have architecturally appropriate wood-shingled roofs.

Michael Hauptman and Brett Powell, architects, attended the meeting, and said that the Department of Recreation asked that they present the proposed sample. Mr. Hauptman said that the suggested shake shingles are not within the departments budget.

Committee members concurred that a 1760's building would not have had a standing metal seam roof. They also believed that if the existing roof has open lathe, then this would hamper the use of the proposed material. Members thought that other options as well as cost should be investigated, therefore they believed that the application is incomplete. Members also reiterated that the material of choice is cedar shakes.

Mr. Hauptman said that he is willing to withdraw the application to allow for the investigation of other options for presentation; however, that will be the Department of Recreation's decision.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal, owing to the incompleteness of the application.

126-28 League Street

126-128 League Street

History: c. 1810

Applicant/Owners: Michelle and Joseph Orlando

This application seen in 2001 involves demolition of the rear portion of these Imminently Dangerous row-houses and the addition of a two-story addition on the Washington Avenue side of the structures. The applicant now informs us that he wishes to demolish the chimney of the house to free up the interior space. He also has concerns about retaining the roof because of the

difficulties supporting it, however he has explained that he will try.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the partial demolition and new construction, denial of the removal of the chimney.

Joseph Orlando, the owner, and Lawrence Gilbert, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Gilbert said the building has substantial decay, which necessitates the removal of the chimney and its demolition will make a larger space. He said the intent of the proposal is to replicate portions as they exist, replace the asphalt shingles, replace the clapboard and re-use the window frames. Mr. Gilbert said that the front windows will be milled and duplicated with new moldings as well as the duplication of the cornice. After the applicant cleared the rear which gave clarity to the building's condition, the applicant now believes that the front no longer can be saved because the floor joists go front to back instead of side to side. In addition, the basement joists are rotted. He believes that trying to save the front wall could be dangerous to the workers.

Mr. Atkin thought that building a new rear wall could stabilize the structure. Ms. Pentz questioned whether the masonry mass of the chimney extends to the ground and the response was in the affirmative. Mr. Atkins stated that very few wooden buildings exist and that the chimney is an important feature to this historic facade. Ms. Pentz concurred that this building should be preserved and protected, and suggested framing it as a facade, and the applicant responded that some of the framing is in poor condition. Mr. Atkin suggested that the chimney is probably the soundest part of the structure and a base for supporting the front wall.

The applicant does not wish to work around the chimney. Mr. Rivera said that the applicant should work with the chimney as a spacial element, which will allow the framing to be kept. He also noted that the previous approval did not discuss the details of the proposal.

The Committee finally concluded that the only way to know what is there and how to proceed and still keep the chimney would require a site visit by the Committee and staff. Ms. Pentz reiterated that before making a final decision, she needs to investigate the structure. The Committee noted that the proposed drawings were based on the existing condition before the rear demolition occurred.

Mr. Gilbert said that he is willing to keep the chimney by re-creating it with ½ inch brick veneer at the top, but keeping the chimney down the center will not work because the joists have to be cut. He also said that since the rear is open with the rear brick wall bulging, he believes it is structurally unsound but he would be willing to work with Ms. Pentz for guidance and he is willing to modify his proposal based on the outcome of the site visit's determination.

The Architectural Committee recommended a site visit to determine how to proceed but approved the proposal in concept with the retention of the chimney.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary