

**THE MINUTES OF THE 491st STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

11 July 2003

**City Council Caucus Room, 4th Floor, City Hall
Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair**

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair

William Fox, Assistant Director, Department of Commerce

Gary Hack, Chair, City Planning Commission

Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property

David Perri, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections

Robert Pervidi, Chief Counsel, Office of City Council President

Vincent Rivera, AIA

Harris Steinberg, AIA

Denise Smyler, Esq.

Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.

Norman Tissian

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist

Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary

Jonathan Farnham, Historic Preservation Planner

Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner

Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Larry Copeland, Senior Attorney, Law Department

Also

Florence Bruy

Peter Bruy

Tim Brennan, Weichert Realtors

Fred Tropea, Ruggiero Development Group

Joe Ippolito, Ruggiero Development Group

Ivor L. Moore, 1501 Spruce Street

Gary Gevurtz, 4050 Main Street

Hugh Zimmers, 1514 Waverly Street

Jerry Roller, J. K. Roller Architects

David Schmidt, J. K. Roller Architects

William Caton, 241-43 Chestnut Street

Carl Primavera, Esq., Beck Street

Jay G. Crammer, 227 South 6th Street

Stephen Verner, 227 South 6th Street

David O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighbor's Association

Ned d'Entremont, 227 South 6th Street

Dianne Chambliss, 239 South Quince Street

Alan Goldstein, 239 South Quince Street

Steve Wu, 310 South Front Street

Robert Powers, Powers and Company

David Amburn, Amburn/Jarosinski Architects

Doug Seiler, Seiler and Drury Architects
Schaunn McKamey, Woodway Construction
Jon Wagner, 814 Chestnut Street
Jay Tackett, WPEN Building
Catharine Califano
Salvatore D'Angelo
Brian Wengenroth, 238 Philip Place
United Masonry, 627 North 16th Street
Roderick Foxworth, 506 Catharine Street
Eric Brown, 506 Catharine Street
Jose Hernandez, J. K. Roller Architects
Richard Thom, 8-10 Letitia Street
J. Phillips

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 491st Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:00 a.m.

Minutes of the 490th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Upon a motion made by Mr. Steinberg and seconded by Mr. Rivera, the Commission voted to approve the minutes of the 490th Stated Meeting, 13 June 2003, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 24 June 2003
Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair

4050 Main Street

Gary Gevurtz, Owner

David Schmidt, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850 for Roxborough Mills

PROPOSAL: Façade alterations, signage

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the entrance doors, ramp and steps, signage, and banners, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. The Committee recommended denial of the windows as proposed, but recommended approval of wood windows with details to match the existing, pursuant to Standard 6, and was split on the two-toned painting of the stucco.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal, which includes the overall rehabilitation of the façade. The owner proposes to repaint the façade, but leave the brick arches over the windows exposed; install new metal four-over-four segmentally arched windows on the first and second floors with applied muntins; remove infill in some of the window openings and install new windows; and create new concrete steps with metal railings at the two existing doors. The two main changes to the building include the conversion of the central loading dock to an entrance with new double-leaf glazed doors and concrete ramp with metal railing, and a mesh metal sign band above the first floor with internally-illuminated plastic letters over the two entrances. The sign band forms a mounting platform for fixtures to light the façade. Banners will replace the existing ones between the windows at the second floor. Ms. Spina, also noted that the owner wishes to paint the façade two different colors, but the Committee did not reach a consensus on the issue.

Gary Gervurtz, the owner, and Jerry Roller, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Roller informed the Commission, that he pursued the Committee's recommendation with regards to the

windows. He presented a sample of a Kolbe and Kolbe window simulated divided-lights, which will have the appearance of true-divided-light. The Commission members thought the proposed window appropriate. Commission members discussed the issue of the two-toned painting of the façade. Mr. Gervurtz thought it important to retain the two-toned façade because it establishes prominence to the façade and differentiates the commercial businesses on either floor. He also said that the chosen colors are soft and complementary.

Mr. James made a motion to approve the proposal with the inclusion of the proposed wood windows, with the staff to approve details, but not the two-toned painting. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to approve the two-toned painting of the façade. Mr. James seconded the motion, which failed with a 5 to 5 vote. Ms. Smyler, Mr. Steinberg, Mr. Rivera, Mr. Sugrue and Mr. Hack opposed the motion.

Mr. Sklaroff informed the applicant that if the two-toned painting issue is not acted upon within sixty (60) days, then the applicant could acquire a permit for the proposed alteration.

223 South 42nd Street

Clay and Clara Armstrong, Owners/Applicants

DATE: 1868-69, John D. Jones, developer, for William Montelius

PROPOSAL: Cut wall for parking pad, install wrought iron gate

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposed or of a double-leaf gate set at the line of the wall, with the staff to review details.

This mansion, built for William Montelius, a miner and coal shipper, has a 19th century random ashlar brownstone and wrought-iron wall around the property. The owners wish to demolish a section of the wall between two pillars (approximately 11'-7") and install a wrought-iron, picket sliding gate to have access to a parking pad in the rear yard.

Mr. James questioned the removal of historic fabric. Mr. Sklaroff clarified that the proposed alterations are for convenience, not a necessity. He pointed out that from a design aspect, this is an important building. Mr. Steinberg remarked that parking in this area is impossible. Mr. James noted the brick sidewalk, and Ms. Spina said that the applicant intends to retain the brick sidewalk. Mr. James emphasized the importance of not setting a precedent. Mr. Hack interjected that all the properties on this block have driveways except for the corner houses. Some members of the Commission believed that the proposed alterations would disrupt the flow of the sidewalk.

Mr. Rivera said that the Committee's decision was based on safety issues for the owner, and that the removal of historic fabric would be minimal.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried with 6 votes. Mr. Previdi, Mr. James, Mr. Tissian and Mr. Sklaroff opposed the motion.

12 Queen Street, 19 Christian, unit block of Beck Street

Fred Tropea, Equitable owner

Jose Hernandez, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830, permastone façade, c. 1955

PROPOSAL: Conceptual approval for complete demolition, new construction, and widening of Beck Street

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the demolition of 12 Queen Street, but conceptual approval of the development on 19 Christian Street and the widening of Beck Street, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

The land bordered by Swanson, Queen, Interstate 95 and Christian Streets has a mix of vacant lots, factories and rowhouses. The developer would like to demolish the remaining buildings and construct 50 townhouses. 12 Queen Street, one of the remaining rowhouses, stands at the northwest corner of the development; the house at 19 Christian Street was demolished in 1985.

The development will also incorporate several, smaller streets, including the unit block of Beck Street. Beck Street appears on the Philadelphia Register as a part of the Historic Street Paving Thematic District. The plans call for widening these streets. For Beck Street, the developers propose to keep the historic street paving, but install asphalt paving from the original curb-line to the new curbs.

The new construction will consist of 2½-story houses with raised basements, brick veneers, and multi-light windows. The top floors will have gabled roofs with large dormers and front and rear decks at the corners. All of the houses will have garages in the basement areas, but with entrances in the rears from within the development. The overall design of the houses will vary slightly to give visual interest.

Carl Primavera, Esq., and Jerry Roller, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Primavera said that the only issue is the demolition of 12 Queen Street. He noted a letter from the Queen Village Neighbor's Association supporting the project. Mr. Sklaroff inquired about the need for the demolition of 12 Queen Street. Mr. Roller commented that the retention of the said property, owing to the depth of the house and lot, would mean the loss of three of the proposed houses. He said that the developer will not purchase the property, if the Commission denied the demolition.

Florence Bruy, the owner, urged the Commission to consider the demolition. She opined that the property could not sustain the disturbance encountered with further construction.

David O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighbor's Association, expressed concern with the continuing loss of historic properties in the area. He hoped that a compromise could be reached, which would retain a majority of the historic fabric, but the allowance of removing the rear additions. Mr. Roller thought that the developer might consider a partial demolition, which would retain the front façade.

Mr. Sklaroff concluded that the issue of a partial demolition could not be considered at this meeting, but referred to the Architectural Committee. Mr. Hack commented that the designation of this property was part of an intact streetscape, which now is a weak argument for retention.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to approve in concept the development on 19 Christian Street and the widening of Beck Street. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to deny the demolition of 12 Queen Street. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which passed with 6 votes. Mr. Hack, Mr. Perri, Mr. Fox, Mr. Steinberg and Mr. Sklaroff opposed the motion.

781 South 2nd Street Rear

Tim Levin, Owner

Chris Antico, Applicant

DATE: 1831, altered c. 1980

PROPOSAL: Alter two-story window

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with a stucco spandrel, pursuant to Standard 9.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal for the rear property of 781 South 2nd Street; however, owing to the configuration of neighboring properties, it is visible from 2nd Street. The west wall has a two-story window in a room with an atrium ceiling. The owners would like to install a floor at that level, bisecting the window. The proposal includes installing a stucco spandrel and banks of casement windows at the 1st and newly created 2nd floor. The opening will retain the arched shape, with a new two-light arched transom.

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

506 Catharine Street

Roderick Foxworth, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: 2nd–story addition with roof deck, install garage, rebuild sidewall with new windows

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of rebuilding of the wall in brick, with the proper bargeboard, pursuant to Standard 6; cutting the window openings on the west façade, subject to their alignment away from the chimney; an addition on the rear ell, with a deck with an open picket railing, and cutting down one third-story window for a single-leaf door, with the retention of the other window, pursuant to Standard 9. It recommended denial of the rear extension and garage, and the alterations to the 3rd floor rear as proposed.

Ms. Spina explained this application, which involves several pieces. First, the west wall has some structural problems, which can not be solved with star bolts. The owner would like to rebuild the wall with stucco-covered CMU. The plans show also new window openings in the wall in line with the historic chimney. The fireplaces on each floor will be demolished, but the plans do not show how the chimney will be supported at the roof.

Second, the proposal includes creating a garage in the rear ell. This includes demolishing the west wall of the rear ell and extending it 1½ feet into the sidewalk. The garage would have a paneled overhead door.

Third, the application calls for a second-floor addition on the rear ell with a roof deck leading from the 3rd floor. The addition will have stucco to match the rest of the façade and the parapet wall for the addition will be high enough to serve as the railing for the deck. On the rear façade of the third floor, the proposal calls for removing the historic windows, closing one opening and widening the other for a double-leaf sliding glass door.

Roderick Foxworth, the owner, and Eric Brown, the contractor, attended the meeting. Mr. Brown informed that Commission that proposed garage and extension, which was an issue, has been

eliminated from the proposal. The owner submitted new drawings that reflected the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to approve the revised proposal, which eliminates the garage. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which carried with 10 votes. Mr. James dissented.

929 Clinton Street

Alan Goldstein and Dianne Chambless, Owners

Alex Rice, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: 5th-story addition and façade rehabilitation-final approval

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the windows, door, shutters, and cornice with staff to review shop drawings, pursuant to Standard 6. It also recommended approval of the 5th floor addition with the ridgeline moved toward Clinton Street, with staff to review details.

The Committee and Commission approved the restoration of the 5th floor and a rear roof deck previously, on the condition that the architect works with staff to find a suitable roof shape and pitch. After several site visits, staff has determined that the pitch of 10-to-12 will result in a gabled roof that reaches the mid-point ridgeline at 18 feet in height. The historic pitch of the roof was approximately 5.5-to-12, reaching the ridgeline at 9'-9" high. On the rear, the roof will have a shallower pitch to accommodate the doors that lead to the rear roof deck. The revised proposal does differ from the conceptual concerning a major feature. The plans have eliminated the dormer, a feature in the historic roof, and instead call for three flat skylights and five solar cells.

The plans include replacing the replacement bricks at the upper story, new wood windows and door, new shutters and a new cornice. Alterations are also proposed for the rear, which the Committee and Commission had not seen previously. The proposal now calls for new double-leaf doors with transoms leading to the stair tower, new single-leaf multi-light doors on the rear of the rear ell leading to balconies and new vinyl, one-over-one windows on the second floor of the rear ell's east façade. However, the plans do not include details for any of these elements.

Ms. Spina explained the Committee's discussion of the proposal. The Committee agreed to having a steeper pitch of the roof to accommodate the desires of the owner, and to move the ridgeline closer to Clinton Street. This compromise would lower the roof to approximately ten feet. Ms. Spina summarized the revised proposal, which includes a dormer in the design of the 5th floor addition. Commission members inquired if the proposed height would conform to the neighboring houses.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to approve the revised proposal, which includes a dormer. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

12 South 12th Street, PSFS Building

Loews Hotel, Owner

Robert Powers, Applicant

DATE: 1930-32, Howe & Lescaze, architects

PROPOSAL: Illuminated signage

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10

Ms. Spina presented this proposal, which calls for new signage for the restaurant at the PSFS building. The existing, non-historic neon and stainless steel letters will be removed. New stainless steel channel letters with neon will be installed, along with stainless steel rings. The entire assemblage will be attached to the stainless steel fascia and tied into an existing electric system.

The Commission concurred with the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which carried with 10 votes. Mr. Sklaroff did not participate in the discussion, nor did he vote.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

902 Spruce Street

Briar Management Company, Owner

Hugh Zimmers, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1831-33, Thomas Ustick Walter, architect, John Savage, developer, c. 1867, rear addition with bay

PROPOSAL: Demolish roof of rear ell, build 4th floor addition

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the basement alterations and denial of the roof alterations, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

This application is for the rear ell of a house on Portico Row. The rear ell has an addition that pre-dates an insurance survey from 1867. The proposal calls for removing the hipped, shingled roof and building a fourth-floor addition. The addition will be sheathed in cement-fiber board and have three sets of four, double-hung windows on the west side. Two treatments are proposed for the south elevation, one has no fenestration in the addition and the other proposes one double-hung window.

The application also includes excavating the area along the west wall of the basement and installing a patio with two sets of sliding glass doors. This work will be minimally visible from a public right-of-way because of vegetation.

Ms. Spina informed the Commission that the applicant submitted a revised drawing that proposes a shed dormer, which was not seen by the Committee. Commission members concurred that the revised design should be remanded back to the Architectural Committee.

Mr. James made a motion to remand the application to the Architectural Committee. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

200 block Philip Place

Various owners

Brian Wengenroth, Applicant

DATE: 1962, I. M. Pei, architect

PROPOSAL: Replace sidewalk

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of replacing the sidewalk with the retention the general design using herringbone brick borders and 12 x 12 inch pavers of a contrasting color in the squares, with the staff to review details.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal for the sidewalk in front of the houses along Locust Street have herringbone-patterned brick. The sidewalk on the courtyard side has large squares of concrete bordered by herringbone-patterned brick. The owners wish to remove the sidewalk and install new brick, again in a herringbone pattern, without the concrete pads. The residents claim that the difference in settlement between the two materials causes a tripping hazard.

Brian Wengenroth attended the meeting to represent the twelve individual owners. He said that the owners' preference is for smaller pavers, which will eliminate the existing concrete slabs. He also noted that the sewer and electrical components exists beneath the slabs.

Mr. Rivera opined that the pavers should be a minimal of 12 x 12, in the spirit of the architect's design. Mr. Wengenroth concluded that the owners could research the design and work with the staff for details. Mr. Sugrue asked if it is possible to retain the same type of concrete pavers. Mr. Hack said that unit pavers are more resistant to cracking.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to approve a modified proposal with pavers which are compatible in size, shape and color to the original design, with the staff to review details. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Rivera opposed the motion. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

310 South Front Street

Dolores Sloviter, Owner

Steve Wu, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1970, Louis Sauer, architect

PROPOSAL: Infill two-story recess at entrance

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal.

Ms. Spina presented the application, which involves this contemporary rowhouse with a two-story recess at the front entrance. The application calls for infilling the recess at the second floor to expand the living space. The recess has an angle. The new design will square-off the recess and glaze the brick opening. The new windows will have single-light casements.

Mr. James inquired if the proposed alterations are consistent with the streetscape of this block. Ms. Spina responded that similar alterations occurred prior to the designation of the district. Mr. Sklaroff opined that the proposal would change the character and balance of the façade, which is very important.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which carried with 10 votes. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

227 South 6th Street, Lippincott Building

MCW Enterprises, LLC, Owner

Stephen Verner, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1900, William Prichett, architect

PROPOSAL: Replace metal windows with wood

The Architectural Committee recommended final approval of all windows, but the ones in the arched openings on the Locust Street façade. The Committee recommended approval in concept of the operable windows in those openings, but the details should return to the Committee.

This building has three different kinds of windows. On the Sixth Street façade, the windows are wood with a one-over-one configuration and highly decorative brickmolds on the upper floors. On the Locust Street façade, the one-over-one windows are metal, with a simpler brickmold. On the Randolph Street and north facades, the metal windows have a two-over-two configuration and segmentally arched sash.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal, which calls for new wood windows on all sides, with simulated-divided-lights on the Randolph Street and north facades. The arched windows on the first floor of the Sixth Street façade will remain. The Committee and Commission previously approved single-pane fixed windows in the arched openings in the middle of the Locust Street façade. The application now includes making these operable by installing a transom bar and then awning or hopper windows below.

Stephen Verner, the architect, explained that in the arched windows on the Locust Street facade, the applicant has decided to keep the single paned windows, but make the center outswinging or pivoted. He pointed out that there are no new elements being introduced.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to approve the proposal with single-paned. windows in the arched openings. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

600 South Washington Square

Gene and Sueyun Locks, Owners

David Amburn, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1923, Earl Nelson Edwards, architect

PROPOSAL: Stair and elevator towers

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the glazing on the west façade, but denial of the stairtower and elevator tower and lobby, pursuant to Standards 9, 10 and the roofing guideline.

The Committee previously saw an application for this property that included a very large rooftop addition with a sculpture garden. The Committee recommended denial as proposed, but the owners withdrew the application before the Commission made a decision.

Ms. Spina explained this application, which returns with part of the previous submission. The owners are now replacing the roof and wish to install a stairtower and elevator tower at the same time. The stairtower will stand 12 feet tall at the west side of the roof. This would be visible from Washington Square. The elevator tower and lobby will wrap around the chimney at the south side and stand 20 feet above the roof, with the chimney extended an additional four feet. These elements prove highly visible from 6th Street.

The proposal also includes removing non-historic infill on the west façade and installing glazing with aluminum frames.

David Amburn, the architect, explained the proposal for a rooftop terrace and sculpture garden. At the Committee meeting the owners noted that they wanted the additions to facilitate the roof repairs and said nothing of having a terrace or sculpture garden. Mr. Amburn said that the areas with the additions are party walls and that the adjacent buildings had been demolished. He said that elevator would allow sculptures and artwork to be taken to the roof for an outdoor gallery.

Mr. Amburn apprised the Commission of the Society Hill Civic Association's support of the proposal. Mr. James stressed the importance of the applicant's presentation to the Committee.

Mr. Hack made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which carried with 9 votes. Mr. James dissented. Mr. Sklaroff did not vote.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

256-58 South 20th Street

Salvatore D'Angelo, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1840, storefront at 258 c. 1885

PROPOSAL: Storefront alterations

The Architectural Committee recommends legalization of the removal of the old awning; legalization of the storefront window alterations, provided the panels immediately below the windows are removed; legalization of the new transom; denial of the legalization of the covering of the single-leaf door, which should be restored; no position on the shortening of the double-leaf door until further information is provided; denial of the legalization of the paneling below of the storefront window, which should better approximate the original paneling in the recessed doorway; no position on the granite step covering until further information is provided; no position on the awning until further information is provided; with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10 and Restoration Standard 7.

Mr. Farnham explained this application, which seeks the legalization of some storefront alterations already completed and the approval of others not yet executed at 258 S. 20th Street, which, together with 256 S. 20th, forms D'Angelo's Restaurant. A violation was issued on 25 February 2000 for the work performed without a permit. The application proposes legalizing the removal of the storefront awning; legalizing the removal of a storefront window and security grate and its replacement with a fixed window and wood panels; legalizing the addition of a transom approximating the original Queen Anne transoms; legalizing the covering of an original single-leaf glazed and paneled Queen Anne door in the recessed doorway and its replacement with plywood infill articulated with molding; legalizing the shortening of an original double-leaf door to accommodate a floor-level change; legalizing the addition of plywood articulated with molding below the storefront window; the covering of all steps with "Marina Pearl" granite; and the addition of a new storefront awning.

Commission members concurred that the applicant should meet with the staff to determine which issues are still in conflict. The application would then return to the Commission for its review.

Ms. Smyler made a motion to table the proposal for a period not to exceed 90 days, to allow the

applicant to meet with staff to determine which issues are still in conflict. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

2019 Chancellor Street

Alon Barzilay, Owner

Jonathan Broh, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1870

PROPOSAL: Façade alterations

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the arched entrance restoration; the garage door; the entrance door; the multi-light doors, provided the glazing follows the arch of the opening; the guardrail, provided it is restricted to the existing masonry opening; and the window change, provided both 2nd-story flanking windows are replaced with wood, double-hung, true-divided-light windows, with staff to review details.

Mr. Farnham presented this application, which proposes the rehabilitation of the front façade of the carriage house at 2019 Chancellor Street. The rehabilitation will include the restoration of the original arched entrance opening; the installation of an overhead wood garage door and multi-light arched wood transom; the replacement of a non-historic flush door with a four-light wood door; the replacement of a central window with new wood multi-light doors at the 2nd story; the addition of a central metal guardrail at the 2nd story; and the replacement of a flanking window and infill with a new fixed single-light window at the 2nd story. The questions of the infilled 1st-story openings as well as the paint on the brick façade are not raised by the application, but should be discussed.

Commission members concurred with the Committee's recommendation. Jonathan Broh, the architect, also agreed.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which carried with 10 votes. Mr. Sklaroff did not vote.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

2018 Locust Street

Ellen Varenhorst, Owner

Richarad Conway Meyer, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1890, extensively altered c. 1925

PROPOSAL: Review in concept of windows, doors, rear balcony, demolish garden wall

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

Mr. Farnham explained this application, which proposes several alterations to the front and rear facades at 2018 Locust Street. The building will be converted from one commercial and four residential units to a single-family residence. Originally a Queen Anne townhouse built about 1890, the building was converted for commercial use about 1925. At that time, the front façade was extensively remodeled in the Art Deco style. Although not original, the Art Deco façade has acquired historic significance in its own right.

On the front façade, the application proposes the installation of a new front door; the division of the large single-light fixed storefront window into three lights; the replacement the recessed 2nd and 3rd-story windows with a multi-light, multi-story projecting steel window system; the restuccoing of the façade; and the restoration of the stone trim.

On the rear façade, the application proposes the addition of a 2-story metal bay with aluminum windows; the addition of a balcony atop the new bay with double-leaf aluminum doors, sidelights, and transoms; and the addition of a new entry stair with single-leaf door, which would necessitate the demolition of a rear garden wall.

Commission members agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

1501 Spruce Street

Parkway Corporation, Owner

Liz Pisano, Applicant

DATE: 2002

PROPOSAL: Legalize illuminated signage

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the legalization.

Mr. Farnham presented this application, which proposes legalizing two large illuminated signs installed without a permit. They hang on a chain restaurant in a parking garage at the corner of 15th and Spruce Streets. Each sign is neon with plexiglass faces, is 26'-6" x 4'-8", and hangs above the storefront at the 2nd-story level.

Mr. James noted that the signage is attached to the parking area and not in the area of the restaurant and expressed concern about using the area for future advertisements. Mr. Sugrue cited the problem of decks constructed without permits and suggested that the Commission be consistent when handling legalization applications.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to approve the legalization. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Steinberg and Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

2212 Walnut Street, WPEN Building

Sant Properties, Owner

Jay Tackett, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1928, Ralph W. Bencker, architect

PROPOSAL: Roof deck and rooftop screening fence

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the roofs guideline.

Mr. Farnham explained this application, which proposes a deck with a combined stair tower and storage closet on the roof of the WPEN Building at 2112 Walnut Street. Owing to the width of Walnut Street, the proximity to the corner with 22nd Street, the large open gas station at the northwest corner of 22nd and Walnut Streets, and the diminutive neighboring building at 2110

Walnut Street, this important building is highly visible from many locations. To minimize visibility, the applicant has set the deck back from the front (north) and east facades. The stair tower is set back to the rear of the deck. The applicant should clarify whether the rooftop fence around the mechanical equipment is existing or proposed.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

8-10 Letitia Street

Gie Lien, Owner

Patrick Dewey, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1885

PROPOSAL: Replace canopy

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal.

Mr. Farnham presented this application, which proposes the replacement of a barrel-arched awning at 8-10 Letitia Street. The awning extends over the sidewalk and is held aloft with poles. The Commission has no record of an approval of this awning. The building was designated on 7 October 1976. The existing and proposed awnings are arch-shaped; all of the storefront openings at this loft building are square-headed. The staff contends that an arch-shaped awning is inappropriate, but would recommend approval of a square-headed shed awning without poles.

Mr. Steinberg opined that the awning should be square heads.

Mr. Hack made motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion, which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Sugrue and Mr. Steinberg dissented. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

241-43 Chestnut Street

Carolyn Caton, Owner

Douglas Seiler, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 241, c. 1857, Stephen Button architect, 243, c. 1897, Wilson Eyre, architect

PROPOSAL: Storefront restoration at 241, HVAC at 241, two-story addition to 243

The Architectural Committee recommends approval of the storefront restoration; approval of the HVAC equipment; and approval of the 2-story rear addition at 243, provided that the canopy is deleted from the design; with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and Restoration Standard 7 and the Roofs Guideline.

This application proposes additional pieces of the ongoing rehabilitation at 241-243 Chestnut Street. The Commission approved some aspects in concept including the 2-story rear addition at 243 Chestnut in April 2003. In May 2003, it gave final approval to fire escape modifications at 241, the 6-story addition at 241, and the basement access at 243. At that meeting, it denied the proposed 2-story rear addition at 243. Mr. Farnham noted that the owner has appealed the decision to the License and Inspection Review Board (LIRB) has not scheduled a hearing.

Commission members thought that the issue should be tabled pending the outcome of the appeal. Larry Copeland, counsel for the Commission concurred. Ms. Smyler contended that if the applicant is presenting a new design, the appeal should be withdrawn before the Commission reviews it.

Doug Seiler, the architect, and William Caton, the owner attended the meeting. Mr. Caton said that he believes that the Commission is hindering his efforts to move forward with his project.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to table the proposal for a period not to exceed six (6) months. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

241 Chestnut Street

Carolyn Caton, Owner

Jon Wagner, Architect/Applicant

DATE: C. 1857, Stephen Button, architect

PROPOSAL: Storefront alterations

The Architectural Committee recommends approval of the windows, provided each casement is divided into three lights; approval of the frameless door system; approval of the steps and the cast iron and bullet glass sidewalk panels; denial of the canopy; with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 7.

Mr. Farnham explained this application, which proposes several alterations to only the easternmost three bays of the four-bay storefront at 241 Chestnut Street. This application proposes replacing the existing fixed storefront windows with paired wood casement windows; replacing the existing door and infill with a frameless glass single-leaf door, transom, and sidelights; replacing the existing concrete step and flush steel bulkhead doors with concrete steps flanked by cast iron and bullet glass sidewalk panels; and adding a steel canopy over a segment of the storefront.

An 1857 insurance survey documents that the four-bay storefront originally had double-leaf doors with two-light windows in each leaf in bays 1 (westernmost) and 3. This application proposes a frameless door system for bay 3. The door system is incompatible with the historically appropriate doors proposed for bay 1 by the other application on this month's agenda. The insurance survey also documents that the storefront originally had 6-light storefront windows in bays 2 and 4. This application proposes paired single-light casement windows for bays 2 and 4. If divided with muntins into three lights each, the casements would approximate the original storefront windows. The proposed cast iron and bullet glass sidewalk panels will replicate original panels.

Jon Wagner, the architect, presented a revised design for the canopy. Commission members agreed that the Committee should review the new canopy design.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to approve the door system, sidewalk panels, concrete step, and storefront windows, provided they are divided into three lights each; and to refer the revised canopy design to the Architectural Committee. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

103-07 Church Street

Woodway Construction Company, Owner

Hugh Zimmers, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1848

PROPOSAL: Windows, doors, rear decks, 5th-story addition with decks, roof deck

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the revised proposal as submitted, subject to the receipt of sight-line studies, with the staff to review details.

Mr. Farham presented this application, which proposes numerous alterations to the easternmost three of five Greek Revival warehouses built by the Girard Estate on Church Street in 1848. The Committee reviewed an earlier conceptual version of the proposal at its May 2003 meeting. At that meeting, the Committee recommended denial of the rooftop additions for reasons of visibility. The applicant withdrew the first submission during the Commission's June 2003 meeting. The current application proposes restoring the front facades; constructing a 5th-story stucco addition with decks on the existing roof; constructing a large roof deck with elevator and stair tower on the rooftop addition; excavating the basement at the rear, cutting openings, and installing windows and doors; infilling two door openings at the 1st-story rear; installing new windows in all existing rear openings; installing decks with French doors and transoms at the 2nd-story rear.

The existing building is 46'-8" tall; at its highest point, the modified building would be 84'-8" tall. Since the first submission, the applicant has moved the easternmost 5th-story unit back 19'-10" to reduce visibility from Front and Church Streets. Nonetheless, the deck railings at the 5th-story level remain set back only 2'-0" from the cornice of the original building.

Mr. Farnham said that the sight-line study presented to the Commission depicts the sight-lines for locations directly front of the buildings on Church Street. Mr. Baron made a site visit to determine visibility and said that the study as submitted does not accurately portray the visibility of the proposed additions from Front Street.

Shaunn McKamey, the owner, and Hugh Zimmers, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Zimmers said that the previous sight-line study did not take into consideration the cornice. However, the revised study encompasses the cornice. Commission members concluded that that, with the proposed setback, visibility would be limited.

Mr. James made a motion to approve the revised proposal. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

625 North 16th Street

Jonathan Oler, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c.1859

PROPOSAL: Build retaining wall, pergola, basement bulkhead

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal.

Mr. Farnham presented this application, which proposes adding a metal basement bulkhead and wood pergola at the rear of the rear ell and a CMU retaining wall between the rear yards of 625 and 627 N. 16th Street. All additions would be visible from Wallace Street, which runs along the southern boundary of the property. Although not proposed, the retaining wall may necessitate a fence along the top to meet the building code.

Jonathan Oler, the owner, said that he did not attend the Committee meeting because he believed that the application was straightforward and would therefore not need further explanation.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation but noted that the applicant could resubmit the proposal without prejudice. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

627 North 16th Street

Peter Kura, Owner

Leroy Sterling, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Concrete back yard

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal.

Mr. Farnham presented this application, which proposes placing a 20'-3" x 35'-6" concrete pad at the rear of 627 N. 16th Street. The pad would occupy most of the rear yard and would be visible from Wallace Street. Please reference the photos from the previous submission at 625 N. 16th Street, which shares a rear yard with this property.

Mr. Hack questioned the Commission's jurisdiction since the proposed alteration is just the paving of one's backyard. Mr. Tyler clarified about a site and its appurtenances. Mr. Perri emphasized the requirement of approval from the adjoining owner.

Mr. James made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation for denial. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which failed with 5 votes. Mr. Perri, Mr. Fox, Mr. Sugrue, Mr. Tissian, Mr. Steinberg and Ms. Smyler opposed the motion.

Mr. Hack made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which carried with 7 votes. Mr. Rivera, Mr. James, Mr. Previdi, and Mr. Sklaroff opposed the motion.

1701 Green Street

Jerome Donovan, Owner

Sabrina Soong, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859, storefront c. 1895, storefront renovated 1991

PROPOSAL: Window replacement

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

Mr. Farnham presented this application, which proposes replacing fixed windows with operable windows on the 17th Street façade of the commercial space in the row house at 1701 Green Street. Replacements would be made in seven groups of triple windows. Additionally, the eight transoms closest to Green Street would be converted from fixed to operable.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Perri asked that after the summarization of each proposal that the minutes reflect whether the applicant agrees or disagrees with the Committee's recommendation.

CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMENT ON NATIONAL REGISTER

**Upper Roxborough Historic District (Boundary Increase)*

Mr. Steinberg inquired if the upper and lower reservoirs would be included in the boundary change and asked if the inclusion would be a burden on the City. Mr. Tyler noted that the reservoirs meet criteria A and B for the National Register and said that the community is concerned about the development of the sites. Commission members believed that the City should have an opportunity to consider this matter and thought that the issue should be revisited at the August Commission meeting. Mr. James recommended that the City as well as City Council be apprised of the designation. Mr. Hack thought it important not to rush into a decision but give the State the guidance from all parties involved. Mr. Sklaroff appointed a sub-committee, which would include Mr. Hack, Mr. James and Mr. Tyler to review the implications of the designation. After the discussion, the original motion for approval was withdrawn.

Mr. Previdi made a motion to table any decision until the August Commission meeting. Mr. Hack seconded the motion, which carried with 10 votes. Mr. James abstained.

THE REPORT of the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, June 2003

Commission members did not have any questions for Mr. Tyler regarding the report of the activities of the Historical Commission.

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to approve an expenditure of \$31.27 for Architectural Committee lunches.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to approve the expenditure. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

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

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary