

**THE MINUTES OF THE 464th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
11 April 2001**

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

Present

Wayne S. Spilove, Chair
David Baldinger, Deputy Director, City Planning Commission
David Brownlee, Ph.D.
James J. Cuorato, City Representative and Director of Commerce
Gary Hack, Chair, City Planning Commission
Melissa Heller Batzer, Office of City Council President, Director of Economic Development
David J. Perri, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Michael Sklaroff, Esq.
Robert Thomas, AIA
Scott Wilds, Assistant Director, Office of Housing and Community Development
Carolyn Wischmann

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

Mark Zecca, Esq., Senior Attorney, City of Philadelphia Law Department

Also

Lawrence Gilbert, Architect
Ellen Baer, Owner
Christopher Beardsley, Architect
David Guinn, Artist
Michael Silver
Michael Bannerman, 1708 Addison Street
Elizabeth Graf, Woodlands
John Farrell, J. S. Cornell
Robert Rosen, Engineer, Robert R. Rosen Association
Deena Schneider, Schnader Harrison Segal and Lewis LLP
Ronald Patterson, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg and Ellers
Gail Chapman, Mario Lanza Park
James Cooke, 247 South 3rd Street
Michael Wagner, 1635 Market Street
Roger Doherty, 100 Delancey Street
T. Ashmead, 700 Locust Street
A. Johnson, 700 Locust Street
W. Ciane, 700 Locust Street
M. Jacobs, M. R. C.
Charles Datner, Architect
Paul Kosee
R. Vigderman
Sabrina Soong, Soong Associates, Incorporated

Jean Bryan, 316 South Front Street
Sally Smith, 332 South Front Street
Arthur Smith, 332 South Front Street
Robert Graves, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Linda Rosanio, Catelli
Jan Talamo, Catelli
Sandy Wandelt, Catelli
Fredda Lippes, 1401 Old York Road

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Prior to this meeting, the Commission met in Executive Session to consult with legal counsel concerning the case now at the Board of License and Inspection Review regarding the Dream Garden mosaic mural in the Curtis Center.

Wayne Spilove, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 464th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:40 a.m.

Minutes of the 463rd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Wilds and duly seconded, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the 463rd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held on 14 March 2001, Wayne S. Spilove, Chair.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 27 March 2001.

232-54 Philip Place; 233-55 South 3rd Street; 284-92 St. James Place; 281-93 Locust Street Society Hill Townhouses Common Area

Washington Square Townhouse Council, James Cooke, President, Owners
Sam Olshin, Applicant

DATE: 1962

PROPOSAL: Common area renovation

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the courtyard landscape proposal.

This proposal represents a change from the landscape plan approved for this courtyard at a previous Committee and Commission meeting. The new plan calls for a larger central pedestrian area and new trees as well as a reduced planter around the statue. Staff did not make a recommendation for or against the project.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation for approval of a revised proposal. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion which carried unanimously

700-712 Locust Street, SW corner of Washington Square West

Locust Condominium Association, Owner

Dave Terrell, Applicant

DATE: 1818-1823

PROPOSAL: Fence, gate and dumpster enclosure.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of modified fence and gate with the placement of the dumpster at the edge of the projecting pier.

The proposal involves constructing a fence with two grates and a dumpster enclosure at the rear of the building at the corner of Locust Street and Washington Square West. The staff recommended approval of the fence but denial of the dumpster enclosure as originally proposed.

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

235 Queen Street

Octavia Hill Association Incorporated, Owner

Ariel Bierbaum, Applicant

DATE: c. 1815

PROPOSAL: Mural

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with the retention of the brick coping unpainted at the top.

This proposal involves painting a mural on the stuccoed side wall and brick fence of a remarkable set of houses with rear courtyard. The staff recommended approval of painting a mural on a reduced area that preserves the sense of the double chimney shape without visual interference.

Mr. Wilds questioned whether the windows would be incorporated into the design. Mr. Hack questioned the mural's protection in regards to maintenance. He believed that a policy should be established for its maintenance and that the current property owner should satisfy some obligation of responsibility for its upkeep and this responsibility should extend to the next owner. Some Commission members thought that future mural approvals should have a policy, but this proposal should move forward absent a policy since one is not in place.

Ariel Bierbaum attended the meeting and stated that the Mural Arts Program is responsible for the mural's maintenance.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried with 5 votes, two opposed the motion and one abstention.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to amend the motion to include the owner's responsibility for maintenance. Mr. Hack seconded the motion which was defeated with a vote of 5 in opposition, 2 in favor and 1 abstention.

302 South Front Street

Ellen and Philip Baer, Owners

Christopher Beardsley, Architect

DATE: c. 1970

PROPOSAL: Façade and porch alteration

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of a modified design with glass railings and the staff to review details

This proposal calls for altering the front façade of this rowhouse. The house features a beveled or diagonal façade setback within a porch. The plans show rebuilding the porch wall parallel to the street and replacing a glass railing with a mesh design. The staff recommended denial per Standards 2 and 9.

The Committee based its recommendation on the existing glass railing of a neighboring property; however, since the Architectural Committee meeting the glass railing has been removed, thereby eliminating the precedent for glass.

Owing to the glass railing removal, the applicant would like the second floor railing to replicate the existing first floor railing.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation and approve a metal railing with the design to match the existing first floor railing with the staff to review details. Ms. Batzer seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

238 Stamper Street

Geno Sena, Owner

Sabrina Soong, Architect

DATE: 1785-94; altered 1970

PROPOSAL: Substantial demolition and rear addition

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the following:

- 1. Retention of the front and rear walls;*
- 2. The removal of plaster from the rear wall for a determination of what openings previously existed with the idea that existing historic openings could be cut down into doors to connect the old and new sections of the house;*
- 3. An addition extending to the south;*
- 4. Rebuild the roof to match the original roofline, and*
- 5. Rebuild the exterior chimney supported on steel joists.*
With the staff to review all details.

This proposal involves demolishing these two 18th century houses except for the front wall and constructing a new house that will reach much farther south towards Lombard Street. The applicant proposes to demolish the roof and the original visible rear wall. An engineering report by Robert Rosen as well as an L&I violation cites structural problems with the roof. The plans no longer show the addition of front dormers; however, the applicant proposes to remove the chimney and rebuild it supported on steel joists.

The staff recommended denial and thought the designers should find a way to reinforce the roof structure and retain the original rear wall. They could cut down windows to connect to the addition. The staff recommends approval of the chimney, constructed of modern brick, supported with steel and reconstructed in brick

The applicant wishes to remove the rear wall to access more room space and use the existing openings as entryways between the rooms.

A site visit determined the existence of cracks upon the removal of the plaster.

Robert Rosen, the engineer, presented photographs of the interior of the rear wall and stated that the wall should be condemned owing its being structurally unsound.

Michael Silver, a neighbor, expressed concern about accessing his garage which backs onto Stamper Street.

Ms. Batzer made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation except for the following:

1. *The proposed addition extending to the south;*
2. *Rebuild the roof to match the original roofline, and*
3. *Rebuild the exterior chimney supported on steel joists*
Subject to:
4. *Documentation of the rear wall with photographs and allowance for its demolition with the staff to review all details.*

Mr. Bumb seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

208 Fitzwater Street

Michele Armstrong, Owner

Nicholas Woloshyn, Contractor

DATE: 1790

PROPOSAL: Substantial demolition and new construction

The Architectural Committee recommended demolition owing to the imminently dangerous status and referral of the new construction's design back to the Architectural Committee

This proposal originally called for demolishing the front wall and roof of this 18th century brick house. Licenses and Inspections has cited the house as Imminently Dangerous for its partially collapsed rear roof slope and dormer. The applicant seeks to rebuild the roof and front wall, adding another floor and changing the location of the window openings to match the neighboring house. The applicant owns that house and wants to combine the two.

The staff recommended that the applicant immediately brace the dangerous walls and either repair/restore the existing front wall if that is possible or rebuild it to match the original. A new taller structure could set behind the ridgepole. The window locations should follow their historic placement, clearly visible inside the house.

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

.

2428 Spruce Street

Diane and Theodore Danoff, Owners

Daniel W. Simcox, Applicant

DATE: 1893-94

PROPOSAL: Replacement door

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with the staff to review details.

The applicant seeks to replace a non-original front door with a new door. As well as we can deduce from looking at matching houses on the block, the house probably had an open vestibule without a door at the outside face of the building. The staff recommended approval owing to the lack of historical information and the need for a front door.

Ms. Batzer made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation of a wood door with a large light above and panels at the bottom with the staff to review details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1708 Addison Street

Emily W. Bandera, Owner

Michael Bannerman, Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Storm door

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of a full light door with the staff to review details.

This proposal calls for adding a wooden storm door at the front door of this rowhouse. The applicant has shown two door variations neither with a full glass panel. The staff recommended approval of a full light door only. The door should be painted to match the door color. The specific circumstances of this being a replacement door and a house with a non-original door and no vestibule contributed to this recommendation.

Michael Bannerman attended the meeting to answer questions and explain the proposal. He stated that air infiltration has prompted the need for a new door and that a full light door's mail slot location is inappropriate for the postal service.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation and approve the #1 option painted wood door with the staff to review details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

106, 108 North 2nd Street

205 Arch Street Associates, L.P., Owners

Charles Datner, Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Storefront alterations

The Architectural Committee recommended for 106 North 2nd Street, the restoration of the cornice and the doors with glazed transoms.

The Architectural Committee recommended for 108 North 2nd Street denial as submitted but approval of a modified drawing with the two end bays restored based on the historic image in the Philadelphia Historical Commission file, with the middle bay window to remain.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the painting of the piers at 104 North 2nd Street a granite color.

This application involves work to the storefronts of these commercial buildings. Through an error on the part of the applicant, a permit issued for these properties and the contractor removed a cornice from 106 North 2nd Street. The applicant now seeks to reconstruct a new cornice on that property. In addition, he proposes to construct new versions of the current non-original doors and to add a glass door in place of a window on 108. The staff recommended approval of the cornice restoration, but if the applicant is remaking the doors, they should match the original as shown in the historic image in our file.

The Commission staff received revised drawings; however, they do not reflect the recommendation of the Architectural Committee but show a replication of the door in 106. The Commission thought the submission per the drawings appropriate. Some Commission members believed that restoring one area and not another gives a mix and match appearance in the same façade.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation but to approve the proposal for 108 as submitted. Mr. Hack seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1600 Arch Street, SW corner of South 16th Street

SAS-1600 Arch Street, LP, Owner

Robert Graves, Architect

DATE: 1925

PROPOSAL: Illuminated signage pylons

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the revised submission with the staff to review details.

This proposal involves a new design for signage pylons rejected by the Committee at the last meeting. The revised proposal shows the actual height of the signage at 7 ½ feet above a stone base and situated set back and parallel to the building. The backlit signage will now only show through cut out letters.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion which carried unanimously

100 Delancey Street

Roger and Jeanne Doherty, Owners

Christopher Beardsley, Architect

DATE: c. 1970

PROPOSAL: Rear addition with elevator

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the following:

1. *The revised version of the addition with the mass abutting Delancey Street;*
2. *Rheinzink material for the addition with its height as submitted.*
Subject to:
3. *Retention of the design of the metal on the top of existing brick wall and the gate;*
4. *Retention of the west wall in brick;*
With the staff to review all details.

This elevator addition, seen several times in the past, has now shifted northward to the Delancey Street property line as agreed in the last Committee meeting. The remaining issues include the height of the roofline, which has again exceeded the eave line of the existing house, and the materials.

The staff recommended approval of the placement of the addition; however, the brick of the exposed rear wall, the existing fence gate and metal work should remain. The new addition should again sit lower than the eave line of the existing house. The cladding of the new construction should have a matte or burnished finish to avoid clashing with the existing construction.

The applicant submitted revised plans which showed the addition projecting 2 inches beyond the existing building's garden wall. The staff thought the new addition should be flush with the north wall with a reveal at the juncture of old and new.

Sally Smith, the neighbor, stated that she approves of the addition not projecting past the existing wall; however, the neighbors have not seen the revised drawings. She also questioned the size of the windows in the addition; however the windows are no larger than the existing windows.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation with the change that the addition be flush with the existing building's wall with the staff to review details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1705 North 7th Street, New Greater Straightway Baptist Church

New Greater Straightway Baptist Church, Owner

Reverend William Pinkney, Applicant

DATE: 1886

PROPOSAL: New glass doors

The Architectural Committee deemed the application incomplete owing to the lack of information on historic doors. The Architectural Committee recommended that the applicant submit a design for doors, based on a historic design if possible, that extends the full length of the door frame.

This proposal calls for legalization of glass front doors installed without a permit. Mr. Baron explained the Committee's recommendation that the doors extend the full height of the door frame based on a 1907 photograph of the original doors. He stated that owing to the applicant's absence at the Architectural Committee meeting, the Committee found the application incomplete and lacking in historic research of the doors.

Ms. Wischmann commented that the Commission should deny legalization of the glass doors. Ms. Wolf concurred and stated that denial of the work may prompt the applicant to return and discuss a more historically appropriate design.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to reject the Architectural Committee's recommendation of finding the application incomplete and deny legalization of the present doors. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

4000 Woodland Avenue, Woodlands Cemetery

Woodland Cemetery Corporation, Owner

Elizabeth Graf, Applicant

DATE: 1748-1786

PROPOSAL: Railings on stairs of Woodland Mansion

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of two railings with an open design painted black with square posts and molded top with the staff to review details.

The proposal involves installing metal railings on the north façade steps of the Woodlands Mansion. The staff recommended approval although the design needs refinement.

Elizabeth Graf attended the meeting to answer questions and show a drawing of the proposal. It was pointed out that the drawing does not meet the Committee's requirements.

Mr. Wilds questioned the chain link fence which the Commission did not approve. Mr. Tyler responded that the Commission had requested the issuance of a violation. In addition, Mr. Wilds questioned the installation of gates already approved. The applicant stated that the original gates would be restored.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Wischmann seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Waterworks Engine House, Fairmount Park

City of Philadelphia, Owner

J. Sands Wandelt, Applicant

DATE: 1812 and 1822

PROPOSAL: Awnings and cooler box in concept

The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept the following:

- 1. The cooler box tent;*
- 2. a simple canopy type awning over the door entrance above the transom area with a low arch, and*
- 3. Conceptual approval of some type of covering separate from the building that is seasonal and does not hide the major elements with its design referred back to the Committee. It was stressed that this approval is contingent upon finding an acceptable final design.*

This proposal in concept involves several awning alternatives for the riverside porch. One of these alternatives involves smaller individual awnings and umbrellas at the outside tables. The second alternative, which the applicant prefers, involves a much larger full width single piece awning. On the opposite façade, the applicant seeks an awning over the door to mark the entrance. On a brick platform facing the south garden, the applicant wishes to install a freezer box covered with canvas to look like a tent.

The staff recommends using umbrellas but no awnings on this signature façade. The staff also thought the freezer tent acceptable in concept, but not an attached awning at the front door.

Jan Talamo attended the meeting to answer questions and to explain the project. He stated that in order for the restaurant to survive, there is a need for fine dining as well as a terrace area for moderate dining. In addition, he said that the use of umbrellas and separate awnings present a challenge owing to the wind and rain. He presented renderings of the building with the proposed awnings and stated that they will match the color of the building and the post will extend outward to maintain the integrity of the building.

Mr. Tyler said that the building has already been compromised by enclosing the columned porch and opposed further alterations. Some members stressed the importance of removing the awnings during the off-season and that the awning does not connect to the building.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve in concept the Architectural Committee's recommendation and the conceptual approval of an awning that does not connect to the building and seasonal with its design referred back to Committee with the staff to review details.

4101 Old York Road, Logan House

Fairmount Park Commission, Owner

John Gibbons, Architect

DATE: c. 1775

PROPOSAL: Renovations porch ramp

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of a front stair and rear porch, and a modified placement for the HVAC compressors. The stair railing should have half posts on the top with the staff to review details.

This proposal involves the renovation of a very dilapidated house which had a later porch around it which has since fallen down. The proposal is the restoration of the façades with a front porch and a rear deck with a railing and a ramp for handicapped accessibility.

The compressors will be placed to a less visible side of the building.

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

THE REPORT of the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, March 2001.

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 for the Architectural Committee lunches.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to approve the \$26.73 expenditure. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Batzer seconded the motion which carried unanimously.
Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary