

**THE MINUTES OF THE 498TH MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
13 February 2004
City Council Caucus Room, 4th Floor, City Hall
Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair**

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
Duane Bumb, Deputy Director, Department of Commerce
Warren Huff, City Planning Commission
Kathleen Murray, Special Assistant to the President of City Council
David Perri, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Vincent Rivera, AIA
Denise Smyler, Esq.
Harris Steinberg, AIA
Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.
Norman Tissian
Scott Wilds, Deputy Director for Policy and Planning, Office of Housing Community Development

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

Lawrence Copeland, Esq., Senior Attorney, Law Department
Eileen Quigley, Esq., Assistant City Solicitor, Law Department

Also

Paul Badger, Badger Enterprises
Jean Haskell, Haskell Associates
Gersil N. Kay, Building Conservation International
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Katie Mantey, Arc Wheeler
Hal Wheeler, Arc Wheeler
Roger Friedman, Arc Wheeler
Martin McNamara, 339 South 21st Street
Tom C. Callan, 339 South 21st Street
Eric Berley, 116 Market Street
Brian Barrabee, 106 and 108 South 20th Street
Jonathan Myerow, 123 South 18th Street
Ryan Berley, 116 Market Street
Stanley Tang, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Michael Wakely
Neil Sklaroff, Ballard Spahr Andrews and Ingersoll
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance
Maksym Szpilczak, 259 North 3rd Street
Margaret Harris, 228 South 21st Street

Dotty Giordano, KB Consultants
Craig Charlton, 434 Pine Street
Elise Vider, Center City District
Sandy Cadwalader
Joanne Phillips, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews and Ingersoll
Stuart Feldman, 1830 Rittenhouse Square
Joseph Duffy, Duffy/Murray Developers
David S. Traub, 2217 Pine Street
Diane M. Fiske, 725 Walcott Drive
Daryl Baker, Schwam Architects
Barry Brommer, Schwam Architects
Cathy Harris, Mural Arts Program
Evy Simon, 1901 John F. Kennedy Boulevard
Michi Tashjian, 2416 Spruce Street
Ben Frank, CCPA
Marvin Gerstein, Temple University
Jon Belisonzi, 610 South 9th Street
Martin Dorph, Temple University
Alan Krigman, KRF Corporation
Anthony West, Friends of Clark Park

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 498th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:05 a.m.

Minutes of the 497th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Upon a motion made by Mr. Wilds and seconded by Mr. Tissian, the Commission unanimously approved, as corrected, the minutes of the 497th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held 9 January 2004, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

THE REPORT of the Committee on Financial Hardship, 23 January 2004
Scott Wilds, Acting Chair

Mr. Sklaroff recused himself from both projects heard by the Committee on Financial Hardship. Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue. Mr. Tyler noted that the representatives from Temple University had requested that their application be scheduled at the end of the meeting's agenda. Mr. Sugrue surveyed the Commission members about when these projects would be reviewed. The members concurred that the projects would be reviewed in the order set by the agenda.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 27 January 2004
Vincent Rivera, Chair

1801-03, 1805-09, 1811-13 Walnut Street; 126-32 South 18th Street; 1812 Sansom Street

Philadelphia Rittenhouse Investors, Owner

Neil Sklaroff, Esquire, Applicant

DATE: 1801-03 Walnut Street, Van Rensselaer Mansion, built 1896-98, Peabody & Stearns, architects, significant

1805-09 Walnut Street, Alison Building, built c.1910, Paul Davis, architect, contributing

1811-13 Walnut Street, Rittenhouse Club, built 1900, Newman, Woodman & Harris, architects, significant

1812 Sansom Street, built c. 1970, non-contributing

126-32 S. 18th Street, built c.1840; 126 refaced c. 1915; 132 refaced c. 1926 by Ralph Goldberg, architect; all contributing

PROPOSAL: Demolish 126-32 South 18th St. and 1812 Sansom St.; demolish all but façade of 1811-13 Walnut St.; construct 27-story tower

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposal as submitted, including the option of complete demolition of the four buildings on 18th Street, provided all exteriors to be altered or demolished including the wall at the Van Rensselaer Mansion are documented with HABS-quality photographs and deposited with the Historical Commission, with the staff and Architectural Committee to review the details of the revised design at a public meeting.

This application proposes the demolition of 126-132 S. 18th Street in whole or significant part, the total demolition of 1812 Sansom Street, and the demolition of all but the front façade of 1811-13 Walnut Street. The applicant may rebuild or retain the façades of 126-132 S. 18th Street. The fence around the rear yard of 1801-03 Walnut Street would be rebuilt to move the entrance opening. The mechanical penthouse of 1805-09 Walnut Street would be removed. The new construction involves the erection of a 320-foot or 390-foot residential tower set behind and cantilevered over the Alison Building at 1805-9 Walnut Street. The tower would be set back 14 feet from the 18th Street building line and would not reproduce the dormers or roof line of the existing buildings. Although the plans propose retaining only the façade of the Rittenhouse Club on Walnut Street, the tower would be set back substantially from that historic façade. The plan stipulates a storefront, garage entrance ramp, and loading dock on Sansom Street. The applicant has presented a demolition argument based on economic hardship. The Commission voted on 8 November 2000 to approve a comparable project in concept for the site; however, that conceptual approval has expired.

THE REPORT of the Committee on Financial Hardship, 23 January 2004
Scott Wilds, Acting Chair

Mr. Wilds presented the findings of the Committee on Financial Hardship. He noted that the submission and discussion of the proposal persuaded the Committee that a hardship would be sustained if the buildings were retained.

Patricia Mattern, representing the Center City Residents' Association, said that the Association met with the applicant. As a result of this meeting, Center City Residents' Association drafted a letter stipulating that demolition cannot occur without the funding in place and the necessary permits and approvals acquired. She noted that the Center City Residents' Association's support is predicated on the applicant's acceptance of the provisions stated in the letter.

Mr. Tissian inquired if the provisions of the letter from the Center City Residents' Association should be considered as part of the application for financial hardship or design review. Mr. Wilds opined that the Commission should not adopt a series of conditions with regards to this project, but that it should keep its findings clean, letting the project stand on its own merits. Mr. Tissian pointed out that the letter's only intent is to assure that demolition does not occur prior to the start of construction, but he conceded and

withdrew his amendment to the motion to include the letter's proviso. Mr. Steinberg thought that the letter relates more to the Architectural Committee's findings. He asked about ownership of the properties to determine if the hardship was self-inflicted. Mr. Wilds noted that the Committee inquired into the same issue and found that the applicant was not responsible for the condition of the properties.

Gersil Kay stated that the proposed demolition would destroy the streetscape. She believes that the four buildings to be demolished could be incorporated into the design of the new construction. Additionally, she said that historic tourism is an important aspect of the city.

Stuart Feldman and Michael Wakely submitted written testimony expressing opposition to the project. Mr. Wakely noted to the Commission that the Center City Residents' Association only represents a portion of the area's residents, and he believes that other residents do not endorse the project. He presented photographs taken in 1996 as well as those taken in 2003 to show the neglect of the property. Mr. Wakely believes that the buildings can be saved and that the new construction should be confined to the portions of the 1805-09 and 1811-13 parcels.

Mr. Wilds pointed out that the Commission's jurisdiction does not extend to the interior and visually there would be no change to the Walnut Street façade since the proposed construction would be set back.

Jean Haskill, a Center City resident, expressed outrage that the buildings, which represent the ambience of Rittenhouse Square, would be demolished. She cited Beijing, a city that has sustained an enormous amount of demolition, in the hope that it does not happen to Philadelphia.

Mr. Tissan made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee on Financial Hardship, with the understanding that the Architectural Committee will discuss the design of the new construction. Ms. Murray seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Ms. Smyler abstained and Mr. Sklaroff recused.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 27 January 2004
Vincent Rivera, Chair

Mr. Baron explained the proposal. Neil Sklaroff, Esq., the applicant for the project, said that the Sansom Street and 18th Street facades have been redesigned in response to the Architectural Committee's comments. Graham Wyatt, the architect, used two models to show how the new construction would relate to the remaining Alison and Van Rensselaer buildings and the surrounding streetscape. He explained that the Van Rensselaer mansion and courtyard would be restored. Its granite wall would be realigned to match the new entrance to the tower, which would be through the mansion's courtyard. The tower's materials of brick and cast-stone would be chosen to harmonize with the materials of the Alison building.

Mr. Steinberg questioned the parking, and Mr. Sklaroff pointed out that all parking would occur underground with the entrance and exit on Sansom Street. Mr. Steinberg asked about the height and massing. It was disclosed that two different heights of the tower are being considered: 320 feet and 390 feet. The model represented the 390-foot version. The proposed setbacks at ground level would be 100 feet behind the Rittenhouse Club and 14 feet at the 18th Street location.

Mr. Rivera said that the issue of the 18th Street façade had been discussed at length at the Committee meeting. The Committee thought the architect's efforts to save the façades of the buildings admirable,

but without the roofs and dormers, the retention of the façades did not make much sense. Also, Committee members saw this as an opportunity for the architects to design a base for the tower.

David Traub, a Rittenhouse Square resident, expressed his opposition to the proposal and submitted a letter stating such.

John Gallery, of the Preservation Alliance, believes that the merits of the properties in question were thoroughly considered. He commented that it is important to have a balance between the architectural merits of the buildings and the financial constraints that their preservation would cause. The Preservation Alliance supports the project. Mr. Steinberg concurred with Mr. Gallery on this balance and remarked that Rittenhouse Square deserves a well-designed development like the one proposed.

Commission members then discussed whether the Committee and staff or just staff need to review the final details of the design along the 18th and courtyard façades.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation with the inclusion of the provisos found in the letter of the Center City Residents Association including that demolition does not occur until the time of construction. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion which carried with 10 votes. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

118 South 20th Street

Demetrious Paraskevopoulos, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Legalize vinyl windows, replace other windows, close window openings

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 2, Standard 5, Standard 6, and the Window Guideline.

Mr. Baron presented the application. The proposal calls for the legalization of six vinyl windows and the panning of the associated frames installed without a permit, the approval of the installation of six additional vinyl windows and the panning of the associated frames, and the approval of the infilling of two windows. All windows are highly visible owing to the building's prominent corner location. In response to numerous complaints during the window installation, a Historical Commission staff member visited the property and witnessed the illegal work. Subsequently, an inspector from the Department of Licenses and Inspections investigated and issued violations. This building contains numerous commercial and residential units and would, therefore, require a building permit regardless of its listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The front windows, which have been replaced illegally, are segmentally arched. The Commission's designation photograph shows the original segmentally arched 2/2 wood windows in place until this illegal work. The new vinyl windows are square-headed, disrupting the lines of this important building. Commission members concurred with the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

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

116 Market Street

Letitia Place, LLC, Owner

Ryan Berley, Applicant

DATE: c. 1895

PROPOSAL: Illuminated and painted signs

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and Standard 10.

Mr. Baron described the proposal for adding a wood single-light door and a projecting sign in the form of an ice cream cone to this storefront. Painted signage would also be added. The Commission concurred with the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

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

18-22 Letitia Street and 33 South 2nd Street

EFL Partners V, LP, Owner

Paul Stewart, Applicant

DATE: 18-22 Letitia Street, built c. 1855; 33 S. 2nd Street, built c. 1905

PROPOSAL: Build 8-story stair tower connecting buildings, roof deck, balconies with new doors, infill and move window and door openings on Black Horse Alley, remove shutters, install new windows

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the stair tower, roof deck, balconies, balcony doors, door infill plans as submitted, the interior blocking of windows, the replacement of vinyl windows, and the replication of missing shutters, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and Standard 10; but denial of the window infilling and window relocation on Black Horse Alley, the removal and replacement of historic windows, and the removal of historic shutters, pursuant to Standard 2.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal and noted that the building is contributing to the district. The application calls for several renovations and additions to two adjacent buildings, one on Letitia Street and one on S. 2nd Street. It proposes the construction of a stair tower linking the two buildings; the construction of a roof deck as well as balconies with new doors cut from windows; and several alterations to windows and doors on Black Horse Alley, a narrow street that runs along the north sides of the properties. The additions will be visible from public rights of way. The window and door alterations are all visible and include moving one window opening, infilling two window openings, infilling two door openings, installing new windows, and removing shutters. Mr. Baron noted that several options were offered by the applicant for alterations to the upper floor window. Ms. Spina remarked on the uniqueness of the fifth floor window and that the Architectural Committee members believe that the window should be retained.

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

123 South 18th Street

Michael Singer, Owner

Jonathan Myerow, Applicant

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: New storefront windows and door

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of bi-fold windows or a fixed storefront window with operable transoms in the existing opening, with staff to review details.

Mr. Baron explained this application. The proposal calls for the alteration of the 18th Street storefront window at this commercial property, which is being converted into a restaurant. The extant single-light fixed glass pane would be replaced with a fixed glass pane of glass at the bottom and casement windows above. The staff has approved the alterations to the door and side windows as well as the addition of awnings and new paint, all of which appear on the plan, pursuant to section 6.3.c of the *Rules & Regulations*. Commission members agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

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

1521 Pine Street

Robert Clemmer, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1865-66 for Charles MacAlester, developer

PROPOSAL: Legalize glass block in basement window

The applicant withdrew the proposal.

339 South 21st Street aka 2041 Pine Street

Thomas Callan and Martin McNamara, Owners

Lisa Neely, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1870; storefront added, c. 1900

PROPOSAL: Remove and rebuild rear porch; new storefront, doors and windows

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the rebuilding the rear bay with porch, provided the new exactly match the existing; the replacement of the large storefront windows and the storefront doors, provided they match the historic windows and doors; and the replacement of the six-panel door with an appropriate four-panel door, with staff to review details. It did not reach a consensus on the storefront transoms. It voted to recommend denial of the clad, simulated-divided-light windows, pursuant to Standard 6.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. This application proposes several alterations. First, the storefront retains its original transoms, but the original storefront windows have been replaced with large plate glass windows. The owners wish to remove the entire storefront, including the historic transoms and install new transoms and storefront windows that match the original configurations. Second, the double-leaf storefront doors have deteriorated. The proposal calls for removing the doors, transom and frame and replacing them with new components to match. Third, all of the new 4-over-4 windows in the building will be replaced with aluminum clad windows with 7/8-inch simulated-divided-light muntins. The

existing windows include the correct, wood, true-divided-light muntins with the wider vertical and thinner horizontal muntins. Fourth, the door on the Pine Street façade has six panels. The proposal calls for replacing it with a new six-panel door; the appropriate door would be a four-panel door. Fifth, the bay at the rear, which has wood clapboard and a small porch, has deteriorated. The application proposes demolishing and rebuilding this element; however, the new bay with porch depicted in the drawings does not match the existing. The dimensions and location of the window should be verified and the railing should be wood only without any metal elements.

Ms. Spina noted that, since the Architectural Committee meeting, the owner stated that he does not wish to match exactly the historic rear porch in design. The owner would like to move the rear window in the porch and make it smaller than the existing bay window. This was not discussed at the Committee meeting. Mr. Sklaroff inquired if the Architectural Committee had seen the revised design. The drawings before the Commission match the ones before the Committee, but the Committee did not discuss the altering of the design; they required that the design exactly match the original in detail. Martin McNamara and Tom Callan were present. Mr. McNamara said that the issue of the bay was not discussed at the Committee meeting, but he does not want to replicate the existing. In response to Mr. Steinberg's query about the proportions of the window, Mr. McNamara said that the height is very low and the room would be a bathroom.

The Commission then addressed the second floor windows. Mr. Callan commented on his preference for a clad simulated window, which is more durable. In addition, he said that there is not much difference between a clad window with a baked finish and a wood window, which is not as durable. Mr. McNamara believes that at a distance the clad window would be perceived as wood. He presented a sample of the proposed window, which he said is used on historic buildings in Paris.

Mr. Baron pointed out that the frame details of the existing window would be nearly impossible to achieve in metal. Mr. McNamara said that they propose to reproduce the brick molding in cedar. Mr. Rivera said that the details of the proposed window are flattened. Mr. Sklaroff asked for clarification of the differences between the proposed window and a Pella window; it was noted that the jamb liner is visible. He also questioned the difference between the proposed window and Weathershield; the Weathershield's muntin profile is different. Mr. McNamara presented photographs to show that the existing windows need repair. Ms. Spina noted the two different sizes of muntins on the existing windows, a unique element that will be lost with the proposed windows. Mr. McNamara said that cost is not an issue, and that the proposed window is of an excellent quality. Mr. Wilds remarked that the Commission makes judgments all the time, but it should be considered on an individual basis.

Mr. Sugrue suggested that the Commission vote on the windows and rear bay separately and the other Commission members agreed.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to approve the replacement of the storefront windows and doors as proposed, and a new four-panel door, with staff to review details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Discussion turned to the rear bay and porch. Mr. Steinberg opined that the proposed alterations to the rear bay will destroy the picturesque look that it exemplifies.

Mr. Rivera made a motion to approve the alterations to the rear bay as proposed. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Steinberg, Mr. Sugrue and Mr. Sklaroff opposed the motion.

Discussion returned to the second floor windows. Mr. Steinberg expressed concern about setting a precedent. Mr. Sklaroff asked Hyman Myers to give his thoughts on the proposed windows. Mr. Myers responded that it should not be seen as an issue because every property should be addressed on a case by case basis. After the lengthy discussion regarding window replacement, Mr. Sklaroff recommended the creation of a sub-committee to consider a window policy.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to deny the windows. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which failed with a vote of 5 to 6. Mr. Steinberg, Mr. Sugrue, Mr. Tissian, Mr. Bumb, Ms. Murray and Mr. Huff opposed the motion.

Mr. Bumb made a motion to approve the windows as proposed. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which passed with six votes. Mr. Perri, Ms. Smyler, Mr. Rivera, Mr. Wilds, and Mr. Sklaroff opposed the motion.

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

1518-20 Green Street

Paul Badger Jr., Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1861-65, Stephen Button, architect

PROPOSAL: Façade rehabilitation, new windows, doors, handicap ramp, lighting and canopy

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposal with the door and canopy revisions, provided the tower windows are redesigned as arch-head 1/1 windows, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6; Standard 9; and Standard 10.

Ms. Spina summarized the proposal. The applicant proposes to rehabilitate this former church building as condominiums. The interior will be greatly altered. The sanctuary will be subdivided with another floor to house additional units. The site will be improved. Enhancements will include a simple, metal picket fence along the side, a new handicap-access ramp leading to the front door, modern pole light fixtures to illuminate the garden area, and a new stairwell in the rear of the building.

On the east façade, the windows in the lower level will be replaced in kind. A single, stained-glass window remains; the owner wishes to move it to the front façade. The remainder of the windows in the sanctuary is missing. The proposal calls for new windows that take design elements from the windows in the lower level and have operable sash. On the front façade, the plans call for installing a new oculus window. Two options are provided for the windows in the tower. One stained-glass window has survived on the front façade; the developer will retain it. Another stained-glass window has survived on the side façade; the developer will move it from the side façade to the central opening in the front facade. Windows like those proposed for the side façade will be installed in the front openings. Original doors remain in the two front flanking entrances; the plans call for replacing some of their wood panels with glazing to allow light into the residential units. Several alterations are proposed to the main entrance. The historic doors and transom no longer exist. The plans include two proposals, both with double transoms. A barrel-vaulted canopy that would sit below the brownstone door surround is proposed for the entrance. Commission members concurred that the revised canopy is more in character with the building.

Mr. Rivera made a motion to accept the revised proposal. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried with 10 votes. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

1243 Lombard Street

G. Clare Kahn, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1830 by George Harmstead, carpenter

PROPOSAL: Legalize skylight in dormer, install storm/security doors on front and basement doors
The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend the legalization of the skylight and approval of either louvered wood storm doors or simple fully-glazed wood storm doors, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Ms. Spina described the proposal. This application calls for two items: legalizing a skylight installed in the roof of a dormer, and installing storm doors on the front 1st-story and basement doors. The skylight has been in place several years. The owner recently replaced the skylight's glass, which brought it to the attention of the Historical Commission. The house presently has a simple security door on the front door, installed without Commission approval. The owner wishes to replace the door with one of a highly decorative design and install a similar storm door on the basement door, which does not now have a storm door. Mr. Wilds inquired if the Commission had ever allowed metal storm doors and the response was in the negative.

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

106 and 108 South 20th Street

Brian Barrabee, Owner

Harold Murray, Applicant

DATE: c. 1870

PROPOSAL: Roof decks on rear ells.

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposals as submitted pursuant to Standard 9 and Standard 10.

The application proposes installing roof decks on the rear ells of these twins. Both will be visible from Ionic Street, a service street. One may be minimally visible from 20th Street. Commission members agreed with the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

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

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue. Mr. Sugrue reiterated that the Temple project would be reviewed in the order set by the agenda. Mr. Sugrue passed the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

1317 Market Street and 1319-25 Market Street aka 1 East Penn Square

1317 Market Street – Wil Rappaport, SR Developers, Owner

1319-25 Market Street – Granite Penn Square Holding Corp, Owner

Cathy Harris, Mural Arts Program, Applicant

DATE: Showell, Fryer & Co. Building, Edgar Seeler, architect, 1902 (1st building at site of 1319-25 Market Street)

Showell, Fryer & Co. Building reclad in terra cotta, c. 1915

Showell, Fryer & Co. Building demolished except east wall and south corner, c. 1930

Market Street National Bank constructed by Ritter & Shay, 1930 (present building at 1319-25 Market Street)

PROPOSAL: Legalize mural

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend legalizing the mural

Mr. Farnham summarized the application. The proposal calls for the legalization of a mural painted without Historical Commission approval or a building permit. The mural, commissioned by the Mural Arts Program and painted by Michael Webb, is titled "Tree of Knowledge." It was completed in November 2003.

Questions have arisen regarding the location and ownership of the wall on which the mural was painted. Research has revealed that the mural was painted on a relic of a former building that once stood at 1319-1325 Market Street, also known as 1-21 N. Juniper Street. That address has been listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places since 18 December 1985. The relic, an unusual wall, stands at the east property line near Market Street between a parking lot to the east and the former Market Street National Bank to the west. When the bank was designed and built about 1930, the architects set the facade of the tower back several feet from the east property line in order to include windows on the façade. For reasons unknown, they left standing a piece of the building that was demolished for the bank. The demolished building was built in 1902 and clad in white terra cotta about 1915. The relic is a remnant of the 1902 building with its 1915 cladding. It is not simply the west wall of the Centennial Bank Building, which once stood at 1317 Market Street and was two stories taller than the relic.

Cathy Harris of the Mural Arts Program in response to a question said that Wil Rappaport, the owner of 1317 Market Street, owns the wall and gave the Mural Arts Program authorization for the mural. Mr. Sklaroff asked her to verify that information before a permit is issued for the mural. Mr. Wilds noted that the mural is an improvement over the blank stucco wall. However, he took issue with the large advertising banners hung on the building and acknowledged that the Mural Art Program did not have an involvement with the banners. Mr. Sugrue asserted that the issue of murals remains an unresolved topic for the Commission.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to legalize the mural. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried with 10 votes. Mr. Perri dissented.

1216 Arch Street

Young Smyth Field Condominium Association, Owner

Stanley Tang, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1902, Field & Medary, architects

PROPOSAL: Modify balconies

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the mesh as proposed, with staff to review details, including a mock-up of the proposed paint scheme.

Mr. Farnham described the proposal, noting that the Young Smyth Field Building is one of the few

surviving examples of an important type of industrial loft building that once dotted the landscape north of Market Street. Small balconies on the front façade at the second to eighth stories link the interior spaces to the fire stair. The existing metal balcony railings do not meet code. This application, the second for these balconies to come before the Historical Commission, proposes to bring them up to code. At its August 2001 meeting, the Commission approved an application that included alterations to make the existing balcony railings code-compliant. Since that time, the architect has determined that the approved design, which was based on horizontal stainless steel cables, is not feasible. The architect now proposes a new design based on welded wire mesh with a pipe frame. The mesh would be attached to the existing railings. The Commission thought the proposed alterations appropriate.

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

2019-23 Green Street

Miguel Leon, Owner

Joseph Duffy and William Murphy, Contractors/Applicants

DATE: c. 1860 with major alterations c. 1922 and 1959

PROPOSAL: In concept – Demolition of 1-story building, construction of 3 or 4-story 9-unit building with parking

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend tabling the project for a period not to exceed six months.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal. This application in concept originally proposed the demolition of all but the 1st-story front façade and side party walls of a 2-story building and the construction of a 3 or 4-story, 9-unit, residential building with parking at 2019-2023 Green Street. A few hours prior to the review of their proposal by the Architectural Committee, the applicants amended their application via fax. After meeting with the Spring Garden Civic Association, interviewing a builder, and commissioning an inspection by engineer Robert Rosen, the applicants decided that it would not be financially feasible to retain the front façade. They therefore amended their application in concept to stipulate the demolition of all but the side party walls.

The property has a long history. About 1860, three 3 or 3½-story rowhouses like those to the east were constructed on three separate parcels. About 1922, the rowhouses were consolidated into a single 4-story apartment building. At that time, a Classical Revival-style facing was applied to the 1st-story front façade to tie the three buildings into one. In 1959, the apartment building was converted into a social club. For that conversion, the entirety of the building excepting the lower two stories of the front façade was demolished and a 1-story building was erected behind the façade. The front façade openings were infilled and a new central entranceway was added. The existing building is classified as Contributing to the Spring Garden Historical District. The historic limestone façade at the 1st story warranted this classification. In place of the existing building, the applicants seek to erect a 3 or 4-story, 9-unit residential building with parking. Nine or more parking spaces would occupy the 1st story, which would be depressed below grade. The garage would be entered from Green Street, the property's only street frontage.

Mr. Sklaroff explained the role of the Committee on Financial Hardship and noted the importance of retaining the historic streetscape. Mr. Murphy stated that the limestone cornice would be retained, but the limestone facing below it would need to be replaced. He noted that Committee and staff apprised him of

his options. Mr. Sugrue commented that the applicant should return to the Architectural Committee.

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

259 North 3rd Street

259 Third Street Development, Owner

Maksym Szpilczak, Applicant

DATE: c. 1785 with major alterations c. 1910 and c. 1950

PROPOSAL: Demolition of front and rear façades, installation of new façades

The Architectural Committee recommended tabling the proposal for one month for the applicant to return with additional information.

Mr. Farnham described the project. This application proposes demolishing and rebuilding the front and rear facades of the building at 259 N. 3rd Street. A 2½-story building dating to about 1785 and known from an illustration in the 1860 Baxter's Panoramic Directory once stood on this site. It is unclear whether any of that 1785 building survives. The 2-story brick facades date to about 1910; the storefront dates to about 1950.

This rehabilitation project began before the Commission acquired jurisdiction over the property. The Commission's jurisdiction began with the posting of the Old City Historic District notice letters in July 2003. Prior to July 2003, the applicant received a building permit to construct two new stories on the building. The framing for the new stories can be seen in the photos of the property. This building permit covered the construction of front and rear facades, but, because of the demolition moratorium in place in Old City at the time, it did not cover the demolition of the existing facades. The current permit requires that the applicant retain the existing facades and incorporate them into new facades. The applicant proposes demolishing the existing facades and constructing entirely new facades.

The applicant proposes constructing a 3-bay front façade with a storefront at the ground floor and one-over-one windows above. The façade will be topped with a cornice. At the rear, on Bodine Street, the applicant proposes constructing a 3-bay façade with small metal balconies at the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th floors.

Mr. Wilds inquired if it was the applicant's intention to complete the work prior to the distribution of the notice letters for the pending district. He also questioned the demolition. Mr. Rivera believes that additional information should be submitted. Mr. Szpilczak explained that some of the façade alterations are dictated by the extensive ADA requirements.

Mr. Rivera made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation to table the proposal for a period not to exceed one (1) month. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

434 Pine Street

Craig Charlton, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1960

PROPOSAL: New garage door and lattice on garden wall

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the application, provided a door with rectangular lights and panels is substituted for the proposed door, with staff to review details,

pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham described the proposal for an addition of a wood garage door at the rear of the property. A 2'-tall wood lattice would be added to the 6'-6"-tall brick walls flanking the parking area to support and hide the garage door tracks. Owing to the property's location at the southeast corner of 5th and Pine Streets, the door and lattice would be highly visible. Mr. Rivera voiced his concern about the structural issues with regards to the proposed alterations.

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

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

1800-18 Park Avenue aka Liacouras Walk

Temple University, Owner

Hyman Myers, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1872, David A. Woelpper, builder

PROPOSAL: In concept – Rehabilitation of 1800 Park Avenue; substantial demolition at 1802-1818 Park Avenue; retention of historic facades and mansards of 1802-1818 Park Avenue; construction of 5-story building set back behind front facades of 1802-1818 Park Avenue

THE REPORT of the Committee on Financial Hardship, 23 January 2004

Scott Wilds, Acting Chair

Mr. Wilds explained that on 23 January 2004 the Committee on Financial Hardship reviewed a petition asserting that the adaptive reuse of these buildings would constitute a financial hardship and, therefore, is not reasonable. At that meeting, the Committee concurred with the petition and recommended that the Commission find that preserving and reusing these building would constitute a hardship. Mr. Steinberg said that he was impressed with the presentation made by the Temple University representatives at the financial hardship meeting. He believes that the proposed alterations will restore life in the buildings.

Tony Forte, attorney for Temple University, and Hyman Myers, the architect for the project, attended the meeting.

Mr. Gallery expressed support for the proposal and commended Temple for presenting the opinions of outside developers on potential alternative uses for the properties.

Mr. Bumb made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Financial Hardship Committee. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried with 10 votes. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 27 January 2004

Vincent Rivera, Chair

The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend approval of the proposal in concept, with the north façade to be redesigned.

Mr. Farnham explained the application for approval in concept, which proposes the rehabilitation of 1800 Park Avenue; substantial demolition at 1802-1818 Park Avenue; the retention of the historic facades and mansards of 1802-1818 Park Avenue; and the construction of a 5-story building set back behind front facades of 1802-1818 Park Avenue. The rowhouses at 1800 to 1946 Park Mall on the campus of Temple University were designated as the Park Avenue Historic District in 1990. The buildings at 1800 and 1804-1818 Park Mall are listed as “contributing” to the district; the building at 1802, the home of David A. Woelpper, the builder of the row, is listed as “significant.” In 1998 the Commission approved the demolition of 1820-1830 Park Mall.

Mr. Wilds remarked that he appreciates the fact that the proposal would maintain the historic relationship between the buildings and Park Avenue; a less satisfactory rehabilitation to similar rowhouses on the 1900-block altered the relationship of the buildings to the street. Mr. Gallery noted his support of the application. Mr. Sugrue asserted that the proposed alteration is a much a better solution than complete demolition. Mr. Tyler commented that the proposal is indicative of Temple University’s reappraisal of the significance of preservation.

Mr. Rivera made a motion to accept the Architectural Committee’s recommendation. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which carried with 10 votes. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

OLD BUSINESS

128 Bainbridge Street

Michael Samschick, Owner

Joanne Phillips, Esquire, Applicant

DATE: c. 1780

PROPOSAL: Revised design for addition

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommends denial. It suggests that if the owner makes a hardship application, it be referred to the Committee on Financial Hardship.

Mr. Farnham summarized the project. This application proposes alterations to an addition that was legalized by the Commission in 2001. The project has appeared before the Commission on three occasions. In November 2000, the Commission approved in concept a 3-story addition at the rear of the historic building, provided the façade was restored. The design stipulated that the top story of the addition be set back from the historic building to prevent it from looming over the older building.

Following the conceptual approval, the owner erected a 4-story addition without Commission approval or a building permit. In July 2001, the owner applied to the Commission to legalize the addition. After reviewing that application, the Commission remanded it to the Architectural Committee, stating that the design documentation was incomplete and that neighbors’ complaints needed to be addressed.

In September 2001, the Commission reviewed revised plans. At that time, it compromised and legalized the 4-story addition with a front deck at the 3rd-story level and a setback at the 3rd and 4th-story levels, provided the front façade of the historic building was restored and the historic chimney preserved. Again, the setback was mandated to prevent the addition from looming over the older building.

The current application seeks the approval of a new design for the front façade of the addition. The new design stipulates a front deck at the 4th-story level, not the approved 3rd-story level; it also proposes a

setback only at the 4th-story level, not at the 3rd and 4th-story levels, as previously approved by the Commission.

Mr. Farnham noted that when he introduced this application to the Architectural Committee at its 16 December meeting, he presented it as a legalization application because the staff mistakenly believed that the work had already been completed. He stated that it is not a legalization. All of the work performed to date at 128 Bainbridge was legalized by the Commission in 2001. It is a new application for work not yet undertaken. Confusing plans and ambiguous photographs led to the misinterpretation. He added that as soon as the staff's mistake was exposed at the Committee meeting, he immediately corrected it and apologized to the Committee and applicant.

Joanne Phillips, counsel for the applicant, and Janice Woodcock, the architect, attended the Commission meeting. Ms. Woodcock explained the application proposes to extend the 3rd floor of the addition 6 feet forward towards the front of the building. It also proposes modifications to the approved window design. She noted that the restoration of the front façade has not been undertaken, but it will be completed as stipulated by the earlier Commission approval. Ms. Phillips presented photographs that showed a mock-up of the new addition wall.

Mr. Wilds asserted that the proposed railing would be intrusive. Ms. Woodcock said that she is willing to change the railing. Mr. Steinberg asked that the history of this project be clarified. Ms. Phillips described the evolution of this project. Mr. Rivera questioned whether the project should be sent back to the Architectural Committee. He pointed out that the Committee denied the proposed design and that the only revision since the Committee meeting is a new window configuration. Mr. Rivera thought that there should only be two windows instead of three at the 3rd-floor addition level and that the railing should be in wood. Mr. Huff asked if interior conditions dictated the location of the window. Ms. Woodcock stated that a closet prevented shifting the 3rd-floor west window to align with the 2nd-floor window.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the revised submission with the elimination of the tea cup window, with the staff to review stucco colors and details. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which carried with 10 votes. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

THE REPORT on the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, January 2004

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

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to approve the expenditure of \$26.44 for the Architectural Committee lunches.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to approve the expenditure. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

Bill No. 040003 amending Section 14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code

Commission members discussed City Council bill #040003, a proposed amendment to §14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code, and heard the remarks of John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance on this bill. The Commission reached a consensus that the Chair should contact Mayor John F. Street and Councilwoman Jannie Blackwell.

As corrected 12 March 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary