

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

**Daniel McCoubrey, AIA, Acting-Chair
Commission Offices, Room 576, City Hall
30 July 2002**

Present

Daniel McCoubrey, AIA, Acting-Chair
Tony Atkin, AIA
Rudolph D'Alessandro
Suzanne Pentz

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

Also

Tim Atkins, Owner/Applicant
Sasha Issenberg, Philadelphia Magazine
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance
Don Marquardt
Kiki Bolender, AIA, Schade & Bolender Architects
Jennifer Hurley, Property owner
David Mehan, Builder
Charles Evers, Atkin Olshin Lawson-Bell Architects
Marc Brookman, Esquire, 1922 Delancey Street
Torsten Kreider
Dennis Hummel
Stewart Chandler
Cecil Baker, AIA, Cecil Baker Architects
Spence Kass, Kass and Associates
Andrew Derrickson, Kass and Associates
Ev Custer, CB Development Services
Jerry Roller, J.K. Roller Architects
Nayan Shah, J.K. Roller Architects
Allan Domb
Alan Heilman
Randy Cotton, Preservation Alliance
Stephen Stack
Stuart Schmidt
Jerel Hopkins
Tracy Shannon Hopkins
Michael K. Kowalchick
Robert Capanna
Jennifer Stark, AIA
Richard Wesley, Wesley Architects
Daniel Magno, Wesley Architects

Daniel McCoubrey, AIA, Acting-Chair, called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m.

924 Irving Street, SW corner of Hutchinson Street

Timothy Atkins, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1853

PROPOSAL: Rear/side addition, alterations

The owner proposes to build a second floor and deck on top of the existing rear ell of this corner rowhouse. The existing rear ell consists of cinderblock with a facing of brick.

Staff recommendation: Approval with staff to review details and masonry samples, 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.*].

Committee members clarified with the owner that the brick will continue around the south side of the new addition on the first floor. The owner also explained that he will infill the walkway that currently runs behind his house, but not the areaway outside his property line.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with staff to review details and masonry samples, pursuant to Standard 9.

R.B.

1221 Rodman Street

Jennifer Hurley, Owner

Kiki Bolender, Architect

DATE: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: Rear addition, full screens on front windows

This application calls for a rear addition visible from Lombard Street through a parking lot. The work involves demolishing an existing rear ell and building a new full width extension. The rear of this house and all the others in the row have been extensively altered and stuccoed, removing any sense of historic context. The owner would also like to install full height screens on the front windows

Staff recommendation: Approval, 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.*].

Staff members were divided on the issue of full versus half screens.

The Committee asked if the owner planned to remove the screens during the winter. She explained that she would.

The Committee recommended approval of the application with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

R.B.

1127 Pine Street, NW corner of Quince Street

Paul Boukidis, Owner

Daniel Mehan, Applicant

DATE: c. 1827

PROPOSAL: New sash with applied muntins

This application calls for the installation of new sash in existing frames. The new Pella sash will have applied muntins and will be installed into the existing frames. These sash only come with a sub frame and therefore, will add to the width of the frame and reduce the glass area.

Staff recommendation: Denial, based on the applied muntin design and the subframe that will reduce the glazed opening, pursuant to Standard 5 [*Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*]; and 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.*].

Mr. Mehan, the contractor, attended the meeting and explained that the Commission approved the Pella windows in the next block. Mr. Baron explained that that house already had incorrect replacement windows whereas this house has its original frames.

Committee members thought that the most important issue is the reduction of the opening; however, they also thought the approval of an applied muntin would set a precedent contrary to the *Standards*.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal pursuant to Standards 5 & 6.

R.B.

804 Lombard Street

Robert and Diane Klein, Owners

Donald Marquardt, Applicant

DATE: c. 1805

PROPOSAL: Rebuild roof, new rear dormer, cut windows inside of house

This application calls for demolishing and rebuilding the gambrel roof on this early house to add living space at the third floor level. The rear slopes of the roof would receive a very wide dormer. The architect claims that reusing the early roof framing would greatly increase the homeowner's costs. He also proposes cutting new windows in the west party wall façade facing the owner's parking area.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the rear dormer set back to decrease visibility and the side windows, 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.*]. Denial of the demolition of the front roof slope pending an engineering/economic assessment of saving parts of the historic roof,

pursuant to Standard 6 [*Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*]. Two staff members thought that none of the roof should be demolished, and Mr. Tyler thought the plan acceptable in its entirety.

Mr. Baron observed that the staff recommended approval of the addition of windows in the party wall looking onto the parking area at 806 Lombard Street. Dr. Tyler noted that the Kleins own the lot at 806 Lombard in addition to the rowhouse at 804. They will seek zoning approval for the party-wall windows. Mr. Baron further stated the project included the rebuilding of the gambrel roof and the addition of a large dormer on the rear of the roof. The dormer, he claimed, would have only a small visibility. Mr. Marquardt, the architect, countered that the dormer would have no visibility from Lombard Street. He presented photographs of a mock-up as evidence. Mr. Baron shifted discussion to the removal and rebuilding of the roof, about which the staff had mixed opinions. The architect noted that removal and rebuilding would be more cost effective than repair of the existing roof. Ms. Pentz inquired about the roof structure. The architect answered that his engineer had referred to it as an “invalid structure,” meaning that it does not function correctly. He added that it had suffered fire damage in the 1970s. Ms. Pentz, Mr. Atkin, and the architect discussed the roof structure and agreed that replacement was the best option. The architect then presented his choice of roofing material, a cement-like material with wood chips, which the Committee accepted. Mr. Baron questioned the Committee on the use of hardy board for the dormer cheek walls. The Committee stated that the hardy board was acceptable provided that the staff approve a sample furnished by the architect. Discussion shifted to the front dormer window. Mr. Marquardt noted that the extant window is not the original and suggested it be replaced with a simulated-divided-light window. Mr. Atkin inquired about the other windows on the front façade, which are all replacement windows. Mr. Baron confirmed the staff’s opposition to simulated-divided-light windows. Mr. Marquardt agreed to use a Kolbe & Kolbe true-divided-light wood window.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the simulated divided light windows for the party wall and rear dormer; the true divided light window for the front dormer; the new roof pursuant to Standard 6; and the new rear dormer pursuant to Standard 9.

JF

1922-28 Delancey Street

Dennis Hummel, Owner

Charles Evers, Architect

DATE: c. 1920 rebuild of older mews into Spanish Revival apartment building.

PROPOSAL: Cut garage door in front façade, windows

This application involves converting an apartment building into a single-family house and cutting a garage into the front façade. The Committee and Commission have seen nearly identical applications for this building before and have denied them in 1999 and 2001. The applicant has drawn the streetscape to show the number of garages on the block as well as documenting past uses of the block and building. Many of those garages are the rears of Spruce Street addresses or are carriage houses no longer used for vehicular purposes. This building’s significance rests on its later Spanish revival reconstruction as apartments and not on its earlier use or form.

Staff recommendation: Denial 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.]; Standard 4 [*Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.*]; and Standard 9 [*New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property.*]. Approving a garage on the front façade of an historic building would set an important negative precedent. The staff has received no information on the proposed windows and therefore does not recommend approval of their replacement pending information to review.

Dr. Tyler requested that Mr. Atkin recuse himself from consideration of the proposal because of his conflict of interest. Mr. Atkin left the room for the entirety of the discussion. During his presentation of the proposal, Mr. Baron asserted that the property, which had once been a carriage house, was significant not as a former carriage house, but as a Spanish Revival residence. Converted to a residential structure in the 1920s, this building is an important example of the Spanish Revival style, which was employed in the Rittenhouse Square neighborhood in the early twentieth century. Standard 4, he noted, should be applied in this case. Continuing his presentation, Mr. Baron noted that the architect had not provided adequate documentation of the proposed windows. More importantly, he noted that two previous proposals for cutting a garage into the façade had been rejected by the Committee and Commission pursuant to Standard 9. He also explained that most of the homes in that area do not have parking yet are nonetheless economically viable because of their location. He concluded by stating that the staff emphatically recommended denial.

Mr. Brookman, the lawyer for Mr. Hummel, the owner, provided an overview of the project. He asserted that his client would rectify several problems with the property. He would renovate the property, which has been vacant for 18 years. He would also transform the property, which last housed 11 units, into a single-family residence. Mr. Brookman presented letters from several near neighbors supporting the project.

Mr. Evers, the architect for Mr. Hummel, presented the history of the area, which had been transformed in the middle of the nineteenth century from a factory zone with small workers' rowhouses to an affluent neighborhood with large houses on the 1900 block of Spruce Street and carriage houses in the rear on Delancey Street. He also noted that the Spanish Revival residence had been designed in the 1920s to fit on the carriage house block; therefore, altering it to include a garage would be compatible with its design. Commenting on his plans for the renovation of the property, Mr. Evers detailed that the windows would be restored, the stucco would be repaired to match the existing, the ironwork would be restored or replaced, and that the insertion of the garage would result in the loss of a small amount of historic fabric.

Mr. D'Alessandro asserted that he could not recommend acceptance of the alteration for the garage. Mr. McCoubrey agreed, stating that the garage was unacceptable regardless of the quality of the remainder of the design. Dr. Tyler concurred, emphasizing the adjective "historic" in the term "historic preservation." Ms. Pentz thanked Mr. Evers for his presentation on the history of the neighborhood, but objected to the project on the basis of the uniqueness of the property. Claiming that the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards* are but "guidelines," Mr. Brookman countered that the Committee was losing sight of the "bigger picture." He contended that it was worth losing "a little stucco" for the renovation of the property. He again pointed to the support letters from the neighbors. Dr. Tyler corrected Mr. Brookman, stating that the *Standards* are not simply guidelines. He also asked the Committee to note the very high degree of integrity of the structure. Mr. Evers then reiterated his position that the design with garage was appropriate for the neighborhood of garages.

Ms. Millhollen of the Center City residents Association stated that her organization was not opposed to the project. She also stated that, this being summer, the Preservation Alliance had not met to take a position on the project.

The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend denial of the project pursuant to Standards 2, 4, and 9.

JF

1601 Locust Street, aka 226 South 16th Street, University Club

Allan Domb, Owner

Penelope Benith, Architect

DATE: 1929, Grant Simon, architect

PROPOSAL: Façade alterations, enlarge windows, new entry and canopy in concept

The new owner of this building wishes convert the building to residential use. The new plans differ from those plans previously approved by the Committee and Commission. First, they wish to change the non-historic doors and add a canopy on the 16th Street façade and reopen the original door opening on the Locust Street façade. However, the plans do not include details, such as materials, types of doors or canopy dimensions. Second, the application includes replacing numerous windows, and restoring others. Third, many of the smaller windows stand within reveals that have stone detailing. The application calls for removing the stone and creating larger window openings. Also several new windows would be cut into the facades.

Staff recommendation: Approval in concept of the new entrances, pursuant to Standard 9 [*Exterior alterations will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works 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 door guideline [*Recommended: designing and construction a new entrance when the historic entrance is completely missing; it may be a restoration based on documentation or a new design that is compatible with the historic character of the building*]. Denial of the window application until the receipt of more information and details; however, the stone details should be retained.

Cecil Baker, Penelope Benith and Spence Kass, architects attended the meeting to represent the project and answer questions. Ms. Spina explained that the Committee previously recommended conceptual approval of the reopening of the Locust Street entrance as well as alterations and installation of a canopy at the 16th Street entrance as part of an earlier hotel development proposal. The new owner now proposes a residential conversion.

The Committee discussion focused primarily on the new window openings and enlargement of certain existing window openings. Cecil Baker described the project and explained that three floors suffer from high, small windows and low ceilings. Dick Tyler observed that the 5th floor window openings are not original. The Committee agreed that enlargement of the existing non-original window openings was acceptable. Ms. Spina questioned the need for a proposed new window opening in the stair tower at the 5th and 6th floors on the 16th Street façade. The architects stated that the northernmost window openings on the 5th and 6th floors were proposed to balance the fenestration on those floors and could be eliminated. The Committee discussed enlargement of windows within the existing original recessed flat surround. Dan McCoubrey stated that this flat recessed surround provides some leeway for enlargement within the panel. Tony Atkin objected to the widening of the southernmost window at the 16th floor on the east and west facades. He had no

objection to the enlargement of certain openings when the enlarged dimension matched the widths of existing openings on the adjacent floors, unifying the façade.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the northernmost stairtower window openings at the 5th and 6th floors on the 16th Street (east) façade pursuant to Standard #9. The Committee voted to recommend denial of the enlargement of the southernmost window opening on the east and west facades at the 16th floor pursuant to Standard #9. The Committee recommended approval of the following:

1. *New entrance doors and canopy in concept pursuant to Standard #9.*
2. *Enlargement of the existing window openings and addition of new windows on the 5th and 6th floors except for the stairtower window openings.*
3. *Restoration the windows on the 15th floor pursuant to Standard #6.*
4. *Enlargement of the existing window openings on the 16th floor except for the southernmost window opening on the east and west facades.*
5. *Re-opening of one window opening on the north façade pursuant to Standard #6.*

JRB

1617 J.F.K. Boulevard, NE corner of 17th Street

Suburban Station Associates, Owner

Jerry Roller, Architect

DATE: 1929-30, Graham Anderson Probst & White, architects

PROPOSAL: New doors and sign

This proposal is for new doors and signage in the storefront at the corner of 17th and JFK Boulevard. The entrance on JFK Boulevard will retain the decorative metal mullions and have a new revolving door. The entrance on 17th Street will include a new glazed, single-leaf sliding door installed in the existing metal mullions. The proposal also calls for a new plastic box sign to hang in the glazed transoms over the door on 17th Street.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the doors, pursuant to Standard 9 [*Exterior alterations will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*] and the door guideline [*Recommended: designing and installing additional entrances in a manner that preserves the historic character of the buildings*]. Denial of the proposed signs, pursuant to the signage guideline [*Not recommended: using inappropriately scaled signs and logos or other types of signs that obscure, damage or destroy character-defining features*]. Staff suggests halo-lit metal letters on an enameled metal background.

Jerry Roller and Nayan Shah, architects, attended the meeting to represent the project. Ms. Spina explained the proposal. Tony Atkin asked if the proposed revolving door would set back within the existing recessed storefront entrance. Mr. Roller responded that the revolving door unit would set back within the opening. Mr. Roller described the proposed ramping of the sidewalk to create and unobtrusive accessible entrance. They intend to retain the existing stone sill and match the existing metal expansion joint on the sidewalk as part of this work. The Committee discussed the proposed plastic box sign. Mr. Roller explained that an earlier sign existed at this location and they intend to suspend the new sign within the opening. Ms. Spina explained the staff recommendation for a flat metal sign with individually mounted letters and halo-lighting. Mr. Roller described an alternative design for a box sign with a metal face and cut lettering.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the storefront entrances with black metal doors as well as the ramped sidewalk pursuant to Standard 9. The Committee voted to recommend approval of a modified metal box sign with cut illuminated lettering.

JRB

2217 Locust Street

Stewart Chandler, Owner

William T. Hannan, Contractor

DATE: 1872

PROPOSAL: Roof deck

This proposal calls for a very large deck on the roof of the building. The rear has a projecting bay that will have a small landing with a spiral staircase that leads to the roof of the rear ell. The deck will extend for the entire rear ell (31-½ feet by 15 feet) and then step up to cover most of the main building (23 by 20 feet). Unlike many other houses we have seen, there is very little difference in the height of the rear ell compared to that of the main building.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the deck on the rear bay and the rear ell. Approval of the deck on the main building, if it's set back far enough to avoid visibility, pursuant to Standard 9 [*New additions will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*] and the roofing guideline [*Recommended: designing additions to roofs, such as decks, so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining details*].

Joe Azarano and Stewart Chandler, owners, attended the meeting to represent the project. Ms. Spina explained the proposal and the staff concern regarding visibility from the front. Randal Baron stated that although the sightline study shows no visibility from directly in front of the property, a 42" railing setback only 6 feet from the roof edge would be visible from any oblique view up or down the block. Tony Atkin suggested a 10-foot setback or a mock-up of the railing for staff to review.

The Committee recommended approval of the roof deck with a 10-foot setback from the front roof edge pursuant to Standard 9.

JRB

2000 Mt. Vernon Street, SW corner of 20th Street

Steven Stack, Owner

Alan Heilman, Applicant

DATE: 1860-1861, Jacob B. Shannon, builder/developer

PROPOSAL: New deck and trellis

This application proposes the addition of a deck on the rear ell of the Italianate rowhouse at the southwest corner of North 20th and Mt. Vernon Streets. The design stipulates a 7-foot high cedar fence along the eastern (North 20th Street) and southern (alley) edges and a 10-foot high trellis along the western edge of the deck. The design also stipulates the removal of a 1983 window and door as well as some original brick to allow for the installation of a tripartite French door for deck

access. The two eastern leaves of the proposed French door will be operable.

Staff recommendation: Approval of the deck, on the condition that the fence height is reduced from seven to four feet, pursuant to Rehabilitation Building Exterior Roofs guideline [recommended: *Designing additions to roofs such decks and terraces so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way...*]. Denial of the cut to create the opening for the French doors because of a significant loss of historic fabric, pursuant to Standard 9 [*Exterior alterations will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment*].

Mr. Farnham described the project. Steven Stack, the owner, and Alan Heilman, contractor, attended the meeting. Mr. Stack stated that he wishes to have privacy while on the deck, hence the proposed 7-foot wall to the east and a 10-foot trellis to the west. Mr. Heilman noted that the eastern wall would not be visible from across the street. The Committee members discussed the sight lines and determined that the wall would be visible from other angles.

Randy Cotton of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Alliance owns a façade easement on the north and east facades of the property. He noted that he would allow a four-foot railing on the east, but that it should be open with pickets or lattice.

Mr. Stack said that he wants a triple door leading to the deck to allow more light into the room. Staff noted that a large amount of historic brick would be removed. Mr. Atkin stated that the door would not be visible.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposed deck, with the east railing at a height of four-foot six inches, pursuant to Standard 9 and approval of the triple door.

LMS

606 North 22nd Street, SW corner of Mt. Vernon Street

Stuart Schmidt, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Cut vents in sidewall, front doors

This application proposes the expansion of a residence into the first-floor commercial space in the Italianate building at 606 North 22nd Street. The project involves the addition of two small vents to the garden façade, the restoration of the 22nd Street storefront doorway to its original dimensions, and the replacement of the existing door with a double-leaf, raised-panel door.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the vents because they will be inserted in a former party wall. Approval of the door, on the condition that an Italianate-style, double-leaf door with bolection molding and glazing in the upper half is installed instead of the proposed raised-panel door without glazing, pursuant to Standard 9 [*Exterior alterations will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*].

Mr. Farnham presented the application. Stuart Schmidt, the owner, stated that the storefront formerly housed a barbershop, but will be renovated as residential space. The two small vents will

provide ventilation in the room, which has very high ceilings. Mr. Farnham noted that the application also calls for reglazing one window. Mr. Schmidt also wishes to replace the non-historic door with a double-leaf paneled door. Staff noted that many double-leaf doors have glazing in the upper panels and it would be more consistent with the glazing of the storefront. Also, the lower panels should have bolelection molding rather than the proposed raised panels. Mr. Schmidt stated that he wanted solid doors for security.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the vents, reglazing the windows and approval of the double-leaf doors with bolelection molding in the lower panels and glazing in the upper panels, pursuant to Standard 9.

LMS

2063 Brandywine Street

Jerel Hopkins and Tracy Shannon Hopkins, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Decks on 2nd and 3rd floor, conceptual review

This application proposes the construction of two roof decks, one on the rear ell and one on the main body of the Italianate rowhouse at 2063 Brandywine Street. Both the main body and rear ell are highly visible from public rights-of-way because the rowhouse stands at a corner.

Staff Recommendation: Approval in concept for the deck on the rear ell. Scale drawings of the deck and railing details as well as any proposed work for the access door (it is unclear whether or not the door exists) are needed for final approval. Denial of the deck on the main body of the building for both visibility and character reasons, pursuant to Rehabilitation Building Exterior Roofs guideline [Recommended: *Designing additions to roofs such as decks and terraces so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way*] and Standard 9 [*New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*].

Mr. Farnham described the project for two decks, one on the rear ell of the property and one on the main building. Both are visible since this is a corner property. Jerel and Tracy Hopkins, owners, attended the meeting. Mr. Baron noted that the drawings are not to scale and lack adequate information, including elevations with railing details, the door leading to the deck on the rear ell, and the means of reaching the deck on the main building. Ms. Hopkins stated that she has tried to draw the roof plan several times. The Committee discussed the visibility of the upper deck. Mr. Atkin thought that a setback of twelve feet from the front (Brandywine Street) façade and a setback of five feet from the west (21st Street) façade were sufficient. Staff noted that the Commission consistently disapproves decks on the main buildings, not only because of visibility but also the historical precedent is only for decks on the rear-ells. Ms. Hopkins noted that eight other houses on the block have the double decks and since the building is a duplex, they do not have access to the rear yard.

The Committee discussed the support system for the decks. Mr. Baron noted that the deck on the rear ell will use the parapet walls as support, so the entire deck system will be visible, not just the railing. Ms. Hopkins stated that the cornice on the main building may hide some of the joists for the upper deck.

Mr. Hopkins stated that they will install a ladder to reach the upper deck. Staff noted that a ladder may not meet code, in which case Mr. Hopkins said they would install a spiral stair. When asked about the door leading to the rear ell, Mr. Hopkins said that it already exists. He also explained that they wish to install a picket railing for both decks. Mr. Baron noted that the lack of these details underlines the need for better drawings and that the application should only be in concept. Mr. Atkin told the owners to have the completed drawings to the staff by Thursday so that they can receive a final approval by the Commission.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the deck on the rear ell and conceptual approval of the deck on the main building, with a twelve-foot setback at the front façade and a five-foot setback from the side façade. Subject to receipt and approval of scale drawings and details by the staff on Thursday, 1 August 2002. The recommendation would then be for final approval.

LMS

410 Queen Street

Settlement Music School, Owner

Robert Wexler, Applicant

DATE: c. 1840, cornice added c. 1885

PROPOSAL: Demolition of rear ell and shed for garden, review in concept

The proposal is for the demolition of the rear ell of this building. The staff considers this an application in concept because of the lack of plans and information. The Settlement Music School owns the large school building as well as the three neighboring rowhouses, including this one. As a part of a larger plan for the complex, the school has demolished the rear ells of 414 and 412 Queen for a three-story addition to the school. They wish to demolish the rear ell of this building to expand a memorial garden.

Staff recommendation: Denial. The application does not include details of the new rear façade of the main building and does not address the viability of the building without its rear ell. Also, the application does not have elevations of the new addition to the school, a landscape plan for the garden or details of the proposed fencing.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal and said that Mr. Tyler and Mr. Baron made a site visit and determined that the context surrounding the property is not very strong. Ms. Spina emphasized the importance of the building's viability without the rear ell. She also reiterated to the applicants that a permit for the legalization of the demolition of 412 should be obtained.

Robert Capanna and Michael Kowalchick attended the meeting to explain the project. Mr. Capanna explained that Queen Street is the public right-of-way and that the rear of the building faces a parking lot. He said that the front façade will not change. Mr. Baron said that although the proposed alterations are to the interior courtyard of the property, there is visibility from Christian Street. He noted that behind 412 and 414 there is already a new foundation and that the proposed alterations for 410 have not been finalized. Mr. Kowalchick said that it is important to get the rear of 410 water-tight for the time being and that he could explain to the Committee what is proposed, but the plans have not been finalized.

Ms. Spina explained that the drawings lack important details such as the proposed cornice and brick and the window details. The Committee concurred that overall basic information about the proposed work on 410 is not shown on the drawings. Committee members stressed that demolition is not taken lightly and it could not in good conscience approve demolition without more

information. Mr. Capanna said that 410 became an issue because the school inherited it very recently. Mr. Baron noted Mr. Tyler's opinion that the demolition is appropriate owing to the context of the proposed location. Committee members agreed that it could not approve demolition without proper drawings and elevations of the existing conditions as well as the proposed addition to the school. They noted that if the demolition was part of a larger project, they wanted to understand the details of that project. The Committee also requested photographs to show the existing conditions and context.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial owing to an incomplete application, and asked the applicant to submit detailed drawings.

DMH

1513-23 Brandywine Street

Jeanne Ruddy Dance, Owner

Kevin Smith, Applicant

DATE: 1513-1519 Brandywine Street, c. 1922

1521-1523 Brandywine Street, c. 1886

PROPOSAL: Façade alterations, windows and doors

This project encompasses the rehabilitation of a series of buildings for use as a dance studio. This application proposes exterior work entailing the removal of brick infill from original door and window openings; repair or replacement of stone and brick to match existing; repointing of brick as needed; repair or replacement of lintels to match existing; replacement of terra cotta coping to match existing; repointing and/or reconstruction of chimneys to match originals; installation of nine doors; installation of guard rails behind the two upper to doors with shutters; installation of 16 windows; the installation of security grills on the six first-floor windows; and the installation of mechanical systems on the roof.

Staff Recommendation: Approval 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*] and Standard 6 [*Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced.*], with staff to review details.

Mr. Farnham presented the project and apprised the applicant that both the permit application and drawings should receive the same address. Committee members inquired about the door details.

Jean Ruddy, the owner, and Jennifer Stark, the architect, attended the meeting. In response to the query about the door details, Ms. Ruddy said that the buildings have distinct differences, which accounts for the variations in the carriage door's design, which includes both horizontal and vertical elements.

Committee members concurred that the overall design is a good design. Ms. Pentz inquired about the mechanics on the roof. The applicant provided a roof plan with a setback area based on sightlines.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval pursuant to Standards 2 and 6, with the staff to review details.

DMH

57-63 North 3rd Street

Michael Yaron, Owner

Daniel Magno, Architect

DATE: 57 North 3rd Street, c. 185059 North 3rd Street, c. 192561-63 North 3rd Street, 1852, John Riddell architect

PROPOSAL: Windows in light and new storefront

The overall project consists of the rehabilitation of three industrial/commercial buildings as a residential complex. This application proposes two separate pieces of the project. The first is the addition of four window openings in the side façade at the rear of 57 North 3rd Street, facing onto a lot recently vacated with the demolition of the building at 246 Arch Street. The proposal stipulates one new tripartite window pursuant to floor on the second through fifth floors. The second is the alteration of storefront at 59 North 3rd Street to serve as the main entrance to the complex. The most significant modification to the storefront is the widening of the doorway, which would no longer correspond to the transom, and the rebuilding of the side windows, brick panels, and bulkhead, all in smaller forms.

Staff Recommendation: Approval of the addition of the windows. Denial of the storefront alterations, pursuant to Rehabilitation Building Exterior Storefronts Guideline [*Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving storefronts from the restoration period-and their functional and decorative features-such as display windows, signs, doors, transoms, kick plates, corner posts, and entablatures.*] and Standard 9 [*New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*].

Richard Wesley and Daniel Magno, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Wesley explained that he inherited the project, which consists of four buildings from another architect. He said that the ADA issue was never addressed. He stated that the proposed plans will provide egress out of 59 North 3rd Street, which can accommodate the ADA specifications. He also said that the current width is a little more than three feet; however, an additional 18 inches is needed for ADA accessibility. Mr. Wesley thought that two options exist, which are either widening the center bay and adding an eighteen-inch side panel with a single door, or widening the center and adding two double doors. In addition, he proposes to rebuild both brick areas beneath the storefront windows, using existing bricks including the brick pattern. With the restoration of the cornice and transom, salvaged pieces of the transom will be used to replicate the profiles of the window details. The applicant said that the option of the double doors will preserve the symmetry of the buildings without touching the cast iron or the brownstone facades. He explained that the egress in the façade of 59 North 3rd Street would accommodate egress for 61 and 63 North 3rd as well. The revised proposal deletes the lightwells but adheres to code requirements for the proposed series of windows. After later construction, this will have less visibility.

Committee members inquired about the door's design, which the applicant said would be glass with painted wood panels and frames. The Committee acknowledged the importance of adhering to ADA requirements and concurred that the proposed design will enhance the streetscape.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

DMH

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary