

**THE MINUTES OF THE 500th MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
8 April 2004
City Council Caucus Room, 4th Floor, City Hall
Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair**

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
James Brown, IV
Warren Huff, City Planning Commission
Kathleen Murray, Special Assistant to the President of City Council
Nathaniel Parks, Department of Commerce
David Perri, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Vincent Rivera, 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

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

Also

Councilwoman Jannie Blackwell
Alisa Orduna-Sneed, Councilwoman Jannie Blackwell's Office
William Stewart Graham, Councilman Frank Rizzo's Office
Wayne S. Spilove
Joe Schiavo
Edward Douglas Wilberding
Samuel D. Gordon
Wesley A. Fisher
Phyllis Sims
Blanche Burton Lyles
Jerrold and Tina Wallis
Marilyn Cohen, National Liberty Museum
D. S. Nichols
Gerry Gutierrez, AIA, Group G, LLC
Frank Kakos, Kakos Architects
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Jeff Wyant, Wyant Architecture
Shelley Cohen, Equivest Management
Kalyam Som, Kalyam Som Architects
Oskar J. Udel, National Liberty Museum

Kiki Bolender, AIA, Schade and Bolender Architects
Charles Capoldi, B Five Studio Architects
Lori Aument, John Milner Associates, Incorporated
Terrance Roper, 1904 Walnut Street, Church of the Holy Trinity
Peter Ryker, 1904 Walnut Street, Church of the Holy Trinity
Neal Quenzel, John Milner Associates
Repsie M. Warren, Chair, Civil Service Commission, Marian Anderson designation
Anthony J. Citino, 1725 Porter Street
Alan Heilman
Victor Keen
Jeanne Ruddy
Carl Primavera, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers
Marcella Hand
John Clausen, T-Mobile
Cass Green, The Church Down the Way
James Earle, 118 Cuthbert Street
David Kleckner, AIA
David Magrogan, Kildare's Irish Pub
Chris Preate
Colen O'Connor
Richard DeMarco, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers
Barbara Botting, 318 North Lawrence Street

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 500th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:10 a.m.

Minutes of the 499th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Upon a motion made by Ms. Murray and seconded by Mr. Tissian, the Commission unanimously approved, the minutes of the 499th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held 12 March 2004, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

In recognition of the Historical Commission's 500th Stated Meeting, Mr. Sklaroff thanked the Commission members and staff for their exemplar work in preservation. He read written remarks by Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer, who was unable to attend the meeting. After reading the written remarks, Mr. Sklaroff asserted that Mr. Tyler has been crucial to historic preservation in Philadelphia.

Former Commission Chair Wayne Spilove congratulated the Commission on its milestone meeting. William Stewart Graham, Chief of Staff for Councilman Frank Rizzo, presented a citation to the Commission on behalf of the Councilman. Councilwoman Jannie Blackwell congratulated the Commission on its 500th Stated Meeting.

THE REPORT of the Committee on Historic Designation, 1 April 2004
Thomas Sugrue, Chair

711-739 Spring Garden Street, Guild House

Friends Neighborhood Guild, Owner

The Committee on Historic Designation voted unanimously to recommend designation of Guild House.

Mr. Farnham presented an illustrated summary of the nomination for Guild House to the Commission. He explained that Guild House, which was designed by architect Robert Venturi and several collaborators including Cope & Lippincott between 1960 and 1964 and constructed in 1965 and 1966, is one of the most important works of architecture of the twentieth century. Perhaps more than any other structure in the world, the 91-unit elderly apartment building marks the paradigmatic shift away from Modernism, the style and ideology that dominated architectural discourse between 1925 and 1975, toward a new architecture. In a broader context, Guild House marks a fundamental epistemological shift away from a heroic, future-oriented, modern world committed to abstraction, technology, innovation, unity, and purity toward a skeptical, even pessimistic, post-modern world that accepted and even embraced convention, tradition, difference, pluralism, complexity, and contradiction.

He further explained that Guild House fulfills Designation Criteria A, B, C, D, E, F, and J, which are delineated in the City's "Historic Buildings" ordinance, making it eligible for listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. In addition to its social significance as an important welfare agency in the East Poplar neighborhood and its historical significance as one of the first federally funded elderly housing projects in the United States (Criteria A and J), it is critically significant to the development architecture throughout the world. It is not simply "associated with an event of importance to the history (Criterion B)," it marks the beginning of the end of the Modern era and the start of a new era in architectural history and, more generally, intellectual history. It not only reflects "the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style (Criterion C)," it was the catalyst for a new style, post-Modernism. It not only embodies "distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style (Criterion D)," Guild House and Mother's House, also by Venturi, were the very first examples of the post-Modern style. It is not simply "the work of a[n] ... architect ... whose work has significantly influenced the historical, architectural, economic, social, or cultural development of the City, Commonwealth or Nation (Criterion E)"; it is one of the most important designs by one of the most important architects of the twentieth century. It not only contains "elements of design ... which represent a significant innovation (Criterion F)," it represents one of the most significant architectural innovations of the last century. Guild House is one of Philadelphia's most exceptional buildings and is eligible for the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Sklaroff commended Mr. Farnham on the nomination. Mr. Wilds asked if the sign above the front entrance was original. Mr. Farnham explained that, excepting the loss of the gold television antenna that once stood on the roof, the building is in its original condition. He also clarified that the one stout column at the entrance is original.

Mr. Rivera moved to designate 711-739 Spring Garden Street as historic and add it to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

762 Martin Street, Marian Anderson House

Blanche Burton-Lyles, Owner

The Committee on Historic Designation voted unanimously to recommend designation of the Marian Anderson House.

Mr. Farnham presented an illustrated summary of the nomination for the Marian Anderson House to the Commission. The Marian Anderson Historical Society prepared and submitted the nomination. He explained that contralto Marian Anderson was, without a doubt, one of the most acclaimed classical singers of the twentieth century. Although she performed throughout the world during her long life, she always returned to her modest brick rowhouse at 762 Martin Street in South Philadelphia. Anderson purchased the house in her childhood neighborhood in 1924, when she was but 27 years of age. She owned the rowhouse for 69 years, until her death in 1993. During those seven decades, Anderson enjoyed a spectacular career and an international following. She sang in the world's most prestigious concert halls for kings, queens, presidents, and even Joseph Stalin. In 1936, Anderson was the first African-American singer to perform at the White House. In 1939, she sang for 75,000 at the Lincoln Memorial; the same year she was awarded the NAACP's Spingarn Medal. In 1955, she made history as the first African-American to perform with the New York Metropolitan Opera. In 1957, she sang "The Star Spangled Banner" at President Eisenhower's inauguration. That year, renowned journalist Edward R. Murrow documented her tour of Asia for the State Department in a film titled *The Lady from Philadelphia*. She sang at President Kennedy's inauguration in 1961 and at his memorial service in 1963. Also in 1963, President Johnson awarded her the Presidential Medal of Freedom. She has also been awarded the United Nations Peace Prize, the New York City Handel Medallion, the Congressional Gold Medal, the Kennedy Award for a lifetime of achievement, the Eleanor Roosevelt Human Rights Award, and a Grammy Award for lifetime achievement in the arts. When not touring the world, she returned to her rowhouse, which she called her "dream house." In 1954, at the height of her career, *Life Magazine* published a photograph of the famous singer sitting with her mother on the stoop of the rowhouse. The singer added the stoop as well as a new front façade in the 1940s. These alterations, which have survived, connect Anderson directly to the historic fabric. Because of its association with Marian Anderson, the house at 762 Martin Street fully satisfies Designation Criteria A of the City's "Historic Buildings" ordinance, making it eligible for listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Ms. Murray stated that she has "worked with these folks [from the Marian Anderson Historical Society] in the 2nd Council District and they do extraordinary work commemorating Marian Anderson and keeping that house in good repair all without any city or state money. I want to commend them."

Mr. Wilds asserted that "Ms. Anderson's life as presented here [in the nomination] almost seems too easy. In fact, it was not. She confronted difficulties time after time after time. She achieved so much and was wonderful at her art. Her difference in my mind goes really to the struggle she went through to achieve these things and I think that we should note that as well."

Mr. Sugrue added that "One of the most decisive moments both for Marian Anderson and for the United States as the civil rights movement grew in national prominence was that moment in 1939 when she sang at the Lincoln Memorial at which she had attempted to sing or was scheduled to sing for the Daughters of the American Revolution, but the Daughters would not let an African-American perform. It was her alliance with Eleanor Roosevelt and her prominence as a national figure that highlighted for many Americans for the first time the systematic exclusion of African-Americans, even famous, prominent African Americans like Marian Anderson, from the mainstream of American life. So, her significance, I would say, in terms of civil rights, is every bit as significant as Robert Venturi's is to architecture."

Mr. Sklaroff agreed with Mr. Sugrue, stating that she is “enormously important.” He also suggested that any motion to designate the site include the requirement that the remarks by Commissioners on Marian Anderson be appended to the nomination.

Blanche Burton-Lyles, the founder of the Marian Anderson House, thanked the Commission and its staff for considering the designation and underscored Anderson’s significance. She stated that she was “overwhelmed with appreciation that this magnificent Historical Commission honors the memory of this great lady of Philadelphia. She exemplifies the cultural and historical legacy of this community. Philadelphia is the birthplace and residence of Marian Anderson. This week is the 65th anniversary of Marian Anderson having sung at the Lincoln Memorial. It was Easter Sunday, 1939.”

Mr. Gallery stated that he supports the nomination. He also asserted that this nomination demonstrates that sites without particular architectural significance but with social and cultural significance are worthy of inclusion on the Register. He urged the Commission to designate other sites for their significance to the City’s social and cultural heritage.

Mr. Huff stated that he was “compelled to underscore the importance of Marian Anderson. She was one of the City’s rich cultural resources in the arts.”

Ms. Murray moved to designate 762 Martin Street as historic and add it to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with the inclusion of the Commissioners’ and Ms. Burton-Lyles remarks in the nomination. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1900 Chestnut Street

1900 Equities, Owner

The Committee on Historic Designation voted unanimously to recommend tabling the nomination to allow for revisions.

Mr. Farnham explained that John Gallery, who prepared the nomination for 1900 Chestnut Street, requested at the Committee on Historic Designation meeting that the nomination be tabled to allow him to revise it.

Mr. Sugrue moved to table the nomination until revised. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2019-2023 Green Street

Hilda Sereira, Owner; Joseph Duffy and William F. Murphy, Equitable Owners

The Committee on Historic Designation voted unanimously to recommend reclassifying 2019-2023 Green Street from Contributing to Non-contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District.

Mr. Farnham explained that this application proposes the reclassification of 2019-2023 Green Street from Contributing to Non-contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District. The property was designated on 11 October 2000 as part of the district. It was not designated individually prior to the creation of the district. The Spring Garden nomination defines the district’s period of significance as 1850 to 1930.

The property has a long history. About 1860, three rowhouses like those to the east were constructed on three separate parcels. About 1922, the rowhouses were consolidated into a single apartment building. At that time, a Classical Revival-style limestone veneer was applied to the 1st-story front façade to tie the three consolidated buildings together. In 1959, the apartment building was converted into a social club. For the conversion, the entirety of the building except a piece of the front façade was demolished and a new building was erected behind the façade remnant. To complete the social club, the front façade openings were infilled and a new central entranceway was added. The surviving piece of the front façade is approximately one and a half stories tall and is made up of 1860s brick faced with 1922 limestone and stucco. The building has been vacant for several years. During the vacancy, the façade has decayed considerably. The limestone veneer is in very poor condition and the wall behind it is not structurally sound. The developers seek the reclassification to allow for complete demolition and construction of a residential building. The Spring Garden Civic Association, which nominated the district, supports the reclassification and demolition.

Mr. Tissian moved to reclassify 2019-2023 Green Street from Contributing to Non-contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 30 March 2004
Vincent Rivera, Chair

1805 Delancey Street

Daniel Cohen, Owner

Samuel Gordon, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Additions to 2nd, 3rd, and 4th floors on the rear

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

Mr. Baron presented this proposal, which calls for building additions onto the 2nd, 3rd and 4th floor rear of this wide rowhouse. The applicant also proposes two rear decks. The additions would involve the removal of a metal bay. The additions would be visible from 18th Street and Cypress Street. The metal bay is not highly visible but the staff suggests it should be included on the proposed addition rather than demolished.

The Commission concluded that the proposed alterations are appropriate.

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

200 South 19th Street aka 1904 Walnut Street, Church of the Holy Trinity

Church of the Holy Trinity, Owner

Peter Ryker, Applicant

DATE: 1857-59, John Notman, architect

PROPOSAL: Replace sandstone steps with granite

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the granite steps but approval of the replacement of the steps in either a brownstone or cast stone material, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron explained this proposal, which calls for the replacement of the brown sandstone steps of the church with granite. The brownstone has an elaborate bullnose detail. The damage to the step appears to be from the rusting of the post for the handrail.

Terrance Roper and Peter Ryker and Neal Quenzel, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Roper noted that the church has an endowment for repairs. He stated that the church prefers to perform quality repairs the first time to ensure that they will not need to be redone.

Mr. Quenzel noted he conducted a complete analysis of the problem. He researched possible materials including Portland sandstone and cast stone. He judged possible materials on durability, aesthetics, and safety. He pointed out that cast stone is problematic, owing to fading; the color lasts with the granite, which is impervious to salt. Additionally, Portland sandstone is not durable, is highly absorbent, and is susceptible to de-icing salts. He remarked that the life of cast stone is short and cited the Victory Theater on 42nd Street. Mr. Quenzel contended that consideration of the material is not purely aesthetic. Mr. Quenzel presented a sample of the proposed granite.

Mr. Wilds remarked that the proposed granite contrasts greatly against the brownstone of the building. Mr. Sugrue was swayed owing to the discoloration of the Furness steps and the fact that brownstone is very porous and susceptible to deterioration. He believes that long-term durability is an important issue. Mr. Tissian asserted that the historic appearance should be retained. Mr. Huff said that he is convinced that brownstone as well as cast stone are problematic and offered his support for the replacement in granite. Ms. Murray concurred. Mr. Baron noted that this building appears in textbooks and that the brownstone is an important facet of its style. He commented on his experience with granite's slipperiness.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which carried with 6 votes. Mr. Huff, Ms. Murray, Mr. Sugrue, and Mr. Parks opposed the motion.

252-56 South 22nd Street

Wesley and Regine Fisher, Owners

DATE: c. 1840, alterations c. 1920

PROPOSAL: Legalize 3rd floor window

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the legalization, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron explained this application, which proposes legalizing the installation of a vinyl window in place of a coupled six-pane wood casement window. The violation was originally requested following a citizen complaint. The applicant inherited the windows and the violation from the previous owner.

Wesley Fisher, the owner, is willing to correct the violation. He has received an estimate for \$1,600.00 for the window replacement. Mr. Fisher's concern is that he has a court hearing regarding this violation on 29 April 2004. Mr. Perri assured the applicant that he would intercede and have the case continued for sixty (60) days to allow time for the owner to contact window manufacturers.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to deny the legalization of the window. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

1611 Pine Street

Doug Wilberding, Owner

Joseph Morrison, Applicant

DATE: c. 1891, William Decker, architect

PROPOSAL: Roof deck

The Architectural Committee recommended approval subject to pulling back the planter four to eight inches from the party wall, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards and 10.

Mr. Baron presented this proposal, which calls for the construction of a bi-level roof deck on the visible rear of this rowhouse. The deck will be visible from Pine and Smedley Streets. A tall stair house would be constructed to access the deck and the rail will feature a planter and copper-clad solid wall instead of a light vertical picket.

Commission members concurred with the Architectural recommendation.

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

1830 Delancey Street

Acorn Property Development, Owner

Kiki Bolender, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: New doors, brick sidewalk, post lantern, railing on front, rear window and door replacement

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Baron presented this proposal, which calls for alterations to the front and rear facades of this rowhouse. The applicant wishes to install new double-leaf solid-panel front doors to replace the existing glazed doors. Ms. Bolender also proposes a new front railing, shutters, wood windows, and a front post-mounted lantern. For the rear, the drawings show a raised brick parapet and new windows with an applied muntin and altered pane pattern. Although they are described, the drawings do not currently include details for the front railing, shutters, and front windows. The application for the railing should be considered incomplete without a drawing.

Mr. Wilds inquired about whether the front door is original. Mr. Baron explained that the door had been altered several times.

Kiki Bolender, the architect, attended the meeting. She disclosed that the sash replacement at the rear would consist of simulated light sash with a spacer bar and applied wood muntins.

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

319 Market Street

Markanni Enterprises, Incorporated, Owner

Gerry Gutierrez, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1815 with new front façade c. 1850

PROPOSAL: New storefront windows, door and awning; extend cornice on front; 2nd floor addition and cut new door on rear

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the rear alterations including a second floor addition on the rear ell and the construction of a chimney exhaust vent for the kitchen and approval of the café windows on the front façade and alteration of the step, with staff to review details. It recommended denial of the other work on the front façade, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Baron presented this proposal, which calls for alterations to the front and rear of this brick commercial building. On the front façade, the applicant proposes:

1. extending the awning across the façade and a section of the adjoining alleyway
2. extending the cornice across the entire facade
3. converting the storefront with operable casement windows
4. replacing the beadboard alley door with a hollow metal door
5. altering the steps
6. adding a metal and canvas cube sign

On the rear façade the proposal calls for a second-floor addition on the rear ell and the construction of a chimney exhaust vent for the kitchen.

Jerry Gutierrez, the architect, attended the meeting and stated that he concurs with the Committee's recommendation.

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

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue

114 Chestnut Street

Michael Samchick, Owner

Gerry Gutierrez, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Metal canopies

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the removal of the existing awnings, but denial of the proposed awnings and signage, pursuant to Standard 9. The Committee recommended that the letters be attached to a backup panel to avoid damaging the stone.

Mr. Baron presented this proposal, which calls for the removal of existing awnings and the installation of flat metal awnings. The applicant also wishes to pin mount metal letters into the existing marble frieze.

Jerry Gutierrez, the architect, asked for clarification about the back-up panel's usage for the signage. Mr. Baron suggested attaching a wood panel to the frieze in the corner, with the lettering mounted on the panel, which would reduce the amount of attachment holes in the stone facade. Mr. Gutierrez said that the new owner is seeking to establish a presence for his restaurant; this is difficult because the main entrance, which is shared with the upper floors, is recessed. He pointed out that the existing awnings cover the fan transoms of the windows. Mr. Gutierrez disclosed that the attachment would occur in the stone columns with four points of anchorage and that the owner is flexible about the awning's design.

Mr. Rivera thought that the method of attachment should return to the Committee for its review. Mr. Wilds thought that the applicant could work with staff regarding the attachment details. Mr. Huff believes that the proposed awning with a smaller profile is more appropriate, since it allows more of the building to be exposed and it removes the signage from the building itself.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation for denial of the awnings. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which failed unanimously.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to approve the proposal with a revised design for the awnings and the staff to review details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

4417-4419 Main Street

OWNER: Kildare's Inc.

APPLICANT: Liz Riccardi

DATE: c. 1855, bay and storefront added c. 1895

PROPOSAL: Add fire escape, cut windows into doors

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of a counter-balanced fire escape between the ground and second floor and the cutting of a second-floor window into a door provided the fire escape is relocated from the first to the second second-floor window back from Main Street and the door is redesigned to include glazing to match the surrounding windows.

Mr. Farnham explained this application, which proposes cutting two windows into doors, one at the 2nd story and one at the 3rd story, and adding a fire escape. The proposed doors are flush metal with applied mouldings. The alterations would be made to the west or Conarroe Street façade and would be highly visible from Main Street.

Richard DeMarco, counsel for the applicant, said that his applicant agreed with the recommendation of the Architectural Committee.

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

321 Chestnut Street

OWNER/APPLICANT: Irvin Borowsky

DATE: E.W. Clark Bank, 1905, architect T.P. Chandler

PROPOSAL: Expand side enclosure for handicap access

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend the approval of a new shelter with a canopy over the landing at the top of the ramp, provided the new shelter is limited to the location of the existing shelter and the one bay to the north and does not extend onto the projecting section of the historic building, with staff to review details.

Mr. Farnham presented this application, which proposes expanding an enclosed entranceway with ramp at the Liberty Museum at 321 Chestnut Street. The entrance stands on the east or Orianna Street façade of the building. Numerous visitors to Independence National Historical Park use this section of Orianna Street to access Franklin Court, which borders the museum to the north. The Historical Commission approved the addition of the extant glass and aluminum entranceway and ramp in 1980. The extant glass and aluminum entranceway occupies a single bay of the museum building; the new entranceway would span several bays and obscure the views of several compound pilasters. The applicant states in a cover letter that the larger enclosure is needed to shelter visitors waiting to enter the museum.

The Commission discussed the proposal including the possibility that the new enclosure would extend beyond the property line into the Orianna Street bed. Mr. Perri concluded that he is not aware of construction allowance outside the property line. Mr. Wilds thought that, when closed, the street reverts to the adjacent owners. Mr. Sklaroff asked Oskar Udell, the architect, to comment on street ownership. Mr. Udell asked for more time to research the answer. Mr. Sklaroff emphasized the importance of the ownership issue, since the owner of the street is an interested party.

Mr. Udell noted that the proposed enclosure and ramp would accommodate the handicapped as well as school children. Additionally, more space is needed to accommodate visitors. He believes that the existing ramp stands within the property line.

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

118 Cuthbert Street

OWNERS/APPLICANTS: James and Barbara Earle

DATE: Jacob Cooper House, 1755, Jacob Cooper and Henry Harrison

PROPOSAL: Rear addition and deck

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of a 3rd-story addition and deck provided the addition is limited in width to an eight-foot strip along the east party wall and in height to a point below the ridge line, with staff to review details.

This application proposes demolishing most of the rear section of an eighteenth-century gambrel roof as well as a modern, rear, 3rd-story addition and deck. In their places, a larger addition and smaller deck would be constructed. The western edge of the addition and deck would be visible from Cuthbert Street across a parking lot. The historic roofline would be memorialized with a barge board at the west on the former party wall.

This house and the three others on the block are among the earliest and most significant eighteenth-century buildings to survive in the City and the nation. They are more unique and historically important than the nearby, highly significant Elfreth's Alley buildings. For example, a fireplace and paneling from

the adjacent house at 116 Cuthbert Street is now on display at the Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum in Delaware, the nation's most distinguished collection of eighteenth-century American decorative arts.

Mr. Farnham explained the application, in which the applicant offers two options: one complying with the Architectural Committee's recommendation, which would retain one-third portion of the rear roof's contour and second, which proposes removing all but 12 inches of the gambrel roof.

Diane Nicholas, the architect, said that the addition would be visible, owing to the adjacent empty lot. She stated that the addition has been redesigned with a setback of 12 inches. Ms. Nicholas believes that the proposed addition will not destroy the historic integrity. The first option will create plumbing problems, but would preserve the gambrel roof. Mr. Wilds disagreed. He asserted that only the top of the roof would remain and he noted that there are few extant 1755 houses with gambrel roofs. Ms. Nicholas said that the proposed alterations would require the removal of five feet of the roof. She contended that the addition would enhance the property.

Mr. Sklaroff remarked that the roof has already been penetrated by the dormer. He wondered if the loss of more historic fabric would change its character. Mr. Wilds suggested extending the dormer without changing the roofline. Ms. Nicholas said that the dormer is too narrow to provide the functionality her clients desire.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to deny the proposal. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which failed with a 4 to 6 vote. Mr. Sugrue, Ms. Murray, Mr. Tissian, Mr. Sklaroff, Mr. Huff, and Mr. Parks opposed the motion.

James Earle, the owner, commented that his wife, who is seriously ill, would be greatly impacted without the proposed addition, which would allow a bathroom on the 3rd floor. He believes that visually, the house would have the same appearance. Mr. Earle argued for the approval of the first option.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to approve the revised design, labeled "Alternate 1", with staff to review details. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried with 7 votes. Mr. Brown and Mr. Rivera opposed the motion. Mr. Wilds abstained.

210 West Washington Square

OWNER: 210 Washington Square Associates

APPLICANT/ARCHITECT: Jeff Wyant for the Starr Restaurant Organization

DATE: N.W. Ayer Building, 1929, architect Ralph Bencker

PROPOSAL: Remove fence and fountain, cut windows and doors, add fence, decking, trellis, canopies
The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposal as submitted, provided that the fence, fountain, and paving are retained and restored to their original locations at the termination of the restaurant's lease; and that the frosted glass wall is reduced in height from 12 feet to 10 feet or less, with the Committee and staff to review details including the frosted glass.

Mr. Farnham presented this application, which proposes a series of alterations to the ground-floor south façade and the garden at the N.W. Ayer Building on Washington Square. Much of the ground floor as well as the garden to the south are being converted to a restaurant with outdoor seating.

The application proposes cutting four windows in the central section of the south façade, which is stucco, not limestone. It also proposes converting an original steel tripartite window into a double window with door; this section of the façade is brick. No details have been provided for the new windows and door.

In the garden, which runs between the Ayer Building and the newly renovated Saunders condominium building to the south, the application proposes the removal of an ornate wrought iron fence along the sidewalk, the bluestone paving throughout the garden, and a fountain. The improvements to the garden including the granite faced Ayer Building doorway, paving, fountain, and arced garden walls were added about 1955. The date of the ornate wrought iron fence is unknown, but it must postdate 1929, when the rowhouse on the site was demolished for the construction of the Ayer Building.

In place of the fence, the application proposes a tall frosted glass and stainless steel wall along the sidewalk. Behind the wall, a new deck for tables, benches, and bars is proposed. Metal grids for ivy standing more than 20 feet tall would be erected along the north wall of the Saunders Building and the south wall of the Ayer Building. A metal panel system would face the west wall of the garden. Large canvas canopies would be stretched over the garden between the two buildings. No attachment details have been provided. Lights and other features would also be added.

Mr. Tissian inquired into the glass fence along the sidewalk. He asked if it was transparent. Mr. Wyant, the architect, responded that it would translucent, not transparent. He informed the Commission that he is agreeable to the Committee's recommendation.

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

413 S. 3rd Street

OWNER: Michael Silver

APPLICANT/ARCHITECT: Richard Cole

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Four new window openings in south facade

The applicant requested a thirty (30) day continuance.

2027-2029 Mt. Vernon Street

Victor Keen and Jeanne Ruddy, owners

Alan Heilman, contractor, applicant

DATE: c. 1875

PROPOSAL: Rooftop addition and deck

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposal, provided the west face of the elevator tower is faced with brick to match the west façade, with staff to review details.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. It proposes the addition of a sun room with elevator and roof deck on the main block of the rowhouse at 2027-2029 Mt. Vernon Street. The west façade of this property is visible owing to the garden to the west of the rowhouse.

The Historical Commission approved several alterations to this property in 1975. The sun room would

replace a non-historic clerestory straddling the main block and rear ell added in 1975. The sun room would open onto a roof deck on the main block of the row house. The elevator tower would also stand on the main block and connect to the sun room.

The Historical Commission reviewed and denied this application at its October 2003 meeting. It denied the application for three reasons: first, the plans were incomplete and contradictory; second, the deck on the main roof violated the Commission's longstanding preference for decks on rear ells; and third, the additions would have been visible from the street across the garden. The applicant appealed the Commission's denial to the Board of Licenses & Inspections Review. Seeking a compromise prior to the hearing before the BLIR, the Commission's Litigation Committee, at the urging of the Commission's legal counsel, determined that a new application with complete, coherent project plans should be reviewed without prejudice. This application results from that compromise.

At the Commission meeting, Mr. Sklaroff questioned Allen Rubin's statement in the Architectural Committee minute about the connection between the current Chair's election and the institution of a prohibition against decks on the main blocks of rowhouses. Commission members agreed that the prohibition was not instituted recently, but was a longstanding policy. Mr. Sklaroff added that it is not arbitrary, but, as Mr. Tyler has noted, is based on historic precedent. Mr. Sugrue stated that he was opposed to the roof deck because it would set a negative precedent. Mr. Sklaroff noted that the question of visibility is subjective, but that the policy against such roof decks is firm. Mr. Wilds suggested a mock-up to determine visibility. Mr. Sklaroff recommended maintaining the deck policy.

Alan Heilman, the contractor for the project, addressed the Commission. He explained that the owners wanted the deck on the front for the view. Mr. Wilds asked for clarifications. He asked how much the clerestory would be raised to create the sun room. Mr. Heilman discussed the project generally, but did not answer the question about the addition. Mr. Farnham clarified that the application proposed adding approximately 50" to the height of the clerestory. Mr. Wilds stated that the drawings included with the proposal were difficult to understand. Mr. Sklaroff asked if the building already included a deck. Mr. Heilman explained that the residents currently use the roof as a deck. Mr. Sklaroff reiterated his question about the deck. After some coaxing, Mr. Heilman conceded the existence of a rear deck, but asserted that "you can't see nothing" from it.

Victor Keen, an owner, approached the Commission and explained that what was described as a rear deck is in actuality a balcony at the 2nd-story level. Mr. Keen also advocated for an approval of the addition of the elevator, which would be added to the interior at the northwest corner of the main block of the rowhouse and would protrude through the roof as an elevator tower. He added that the front roof deck was the only viable option for a deck on the building. Mr. Sklaroff asked if the elevator would provide access to the roof deck alone or if it would also provide access to every floor of the building. Mr. Heilman answered that it would stop at every floor. Mr. Sklaroff then stated that the elevator could be installed to facilitate access throughout the building with or without the roof deck.

Mr. Heilman claimed that sections of the building are not historic and therefore alterations to those sections should not be subject to the scrutiny of the Commission. Mr. Sklaroff countered that the property is part of an historic district and subject to the Commission's review.

Mr. Wilds asked rhetorically whether Mr. Keen had sought the services of a qualified architect. He contended that an architect, unlike the contractor, might be able to provide acceptable solutions to the many complex design problems. Mr. Keen stated that he had planned to engage an architect when further

along in the design and permitting process. He added that he was compromising with the Commission by proposing a front deck pulled back from the facades.

Mr. Wilds suggested that the Commission deny the application, but allow the applicant to return with a new proposal prepared by an architect and supported by a mock-up that confirms that the deck would not be visible. Mr. Keen stated that he would agree to a mock-up. He added that it was his understanding that the Commission had requested a mock-up during the previous review of this proposal, but later denied the application without a mock-up in a letter. Mr. Sklaroff asserted that the Commission had denied the previous application at its 10 October 2003, in part because the drawings were insufficient. Mr. Huff supported the notion that the drawings were incomplete.

Mr. Tissian moved that the Commission accept the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which failed with three (3) votes. Mr. Brown, Mr. Perri, Mr. Tissian, and Mr. Wilds opposed. Mr. Sklaroff, Mr. Huff, and Mr. Sugrue abstained.

Nathaniel Parks moved that the Commission table the application for a period not to exceed six (6) months to allow the applicant to retain an architect and return to the Architectural Committee and Commission with complete plans. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed with eight (8) votes. Mr. Sklaroff opposed; Mr. Wilds abstained.

1937 Spring Garden Street

OWNERS/ APPLICANTS: Betty and Charles Berman

DATE: c. 1875

PROPOSAL: Legalize priming and approve painting of unpainted brick façade

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the proposal, pursuant to Standards 5, 6, and 7 and the Masonry Preservation Guideline.

Mr. Farnham explained this application, which proposes the legalization of the priming and the approval of the completion of the painting of the front brick façade and brownstone details at the rowhouse at 1937 Spring Garden Street. The priming was recently undertaken without the Commission's approval. The brick façade was unpainted until priming.

The façade was painted to hide stains on the brick. Photographs of the façade taken just prior to the painting show efflorescence stains on the upper portions. The stains provide irrefutable evidence that the façade is suffering from water penetration. The paint will trap moisture in the façade and lead to more serious water damage. The primer should be removed, the water infiltration points repaired, the efflorescence stains removed, and the brick repointed.

Commission members 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.

1510 Green Street

OWNERS: Jerry and Tina Wallis

APPLICANT: Frank Kakos

DATE: 1852-1853, Samuel Sloan and John Stewart, architects

PROPOSAL: Rear doors in new opening, garden wall, landscaping, garage door, pergola

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval, provided the neighboring property owners support the application in writing, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

This application proposes several changes to the rear of this rowhouse on Green Street. The rear is visible from Brandywine Street across a large garden. Some of the changes, for example the pointing and windows, can be reviewed at the staff level. Others require Commission review. At the first-story rear of the rear ell, two windows would be removed, the openings enlarged, and sliding glass doors added. A pent eave would be added above the new doors to shelter them and hide utility lines. A porch and steps down to the garden would also be added at the doors. The rear portion of the rear ell is not original; it is a later addition.

Along the east, rear property line, the application proposes the construction of a six-foot tall stucco garden wall with a stone coping. At the rear or south, along Brandywine Street, it proposes a tall brick wall with wood garage and pedestrian doors. A pergola would be erected inside the garage wall to support the roll-up door. Several garage doors already exist on this portion of the Brandywine block.

Commission members concluded that if the additions will encroach on the neighboring property, all property owners must join in the permit application.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the proposal, subject to the receipt of a new application with all owners' signatures, with the staff to review details. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

2028-30 Fairmount Avenue

Savaas Navrosidis, Owner

Kalyan Som, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859; new brick on 2030, c. 1980

PROPOSAL: Façade rehabilitation

The Committee unanimously recommended denial of the proposal pursuant to Standards 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, and 10. The Committee reiterated its previous recommendation of approval for the previous design of replicating the storefront of 2026 emphasizing that the details should match exactly in plan and execution, with staff to review details.

The Committee and Commission previously approved the rehabilitation of these two buildings with new storefronts that replicated the adjacent nineteenth-century storefront at 2026 Fairmount Avenue. The civic association, on the other hand, approved their zoning conditioned upon the installation of residential fronts. There is no evidence that these buildings ever had residential uses on the first floor; the building next door has a storefront that dates to the construction of the building and almost all of the buildings on the block have storefronts.

Ms. Spina described the revised plans for completely demolishing the existing façades. The new façades will have new brick facing with cast stone lintels and sills; two-over-two, wood windows; and bracketed, wood cornices. However, the first floors of the buildings are very low so the doors are set with only a single step. Residential buildings of this time period have their doors set at least three or four steps up, so the proportions of the doorways are incorrect.

Kalyan Som, the architect, said that changing the buildings entirely to residential façades would require the removal of steel beams above the first floor, which would be problematic. He believes that the storefront can accommodate both commercial and residential uses.

Mr. Sklaroff commented that the Commission should not be asked to reverse its position to accommodate the civic association. He suggested that the applicant return to the Zoning Board with a new application. Mr. Rivera remarked that a storefront does not necessarily indicate a commercial property.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to deny the proposal as submitted. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

2032 Fairmount Avenue

Savaas Navrosidis, Owner

Kalyan Som, Architect/Applicant

PROPOSAL: New construction on vacant lot

The Committee unanimously recommended approval of the proposal with three or four steps leading to the front door, cast-stone watertable and door surround, and two, two-light basement windows.

Because 2032 Fairmount Avenue was a vacant lot at the time of designation, the Commission has forty-five-day-review-and-comment jurisdiction only. The Committee and Commission previously approved a building with a storefront on the first floor. The design now calls for a residential building like those proposed for 2028 and 2030 Fairmount Avenue.

Ms. Spina presented the application and a majority of the Commission members agreed with the proposed design of the new construction.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Perri seconded the motion, which carried with 9 votes. Ms. Murray abstained.

209-25 North 18th Street, Cathedral of SS Peter and Paul

Archdiocese of Philadelphia, Owner

Monsignor John Close, Applicant

DATE: 1846-64, John Notman, John Mahoney & Napoleon LeBrun, architects

PROPOSAL: Replace bird-netting

The Committee unanimously recommended approval of the proposal pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

This application calls for replacing the copper bird-netting with modern bird-netting like that on City Hall. The present netting has been in place since the 1920s. The proposed netting will allow observers to see the architectural details of the building.

The Commission reviewed the application and determined that the proposed solution is appropriate for this building.

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

1632-36 West Diamond Street

Eastern Mennonite Board of Missions and Charities, Owner

John Clausen, Applicant

DATE: 1906, John T. Windrim, architect

PROPOSAL: Cellular phone antennas, equipment cabinet and fencing

The Committee unanimously recommended approval of the proposal with those revisions, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 2, 9, and 10.

Ms. Spina presented this application, which calls for cellular phone antennas and related equipment on the roof of this building. Six antennas would hang on the outside of the brick stairtower at the southeast corner of the building, with each measuring almost five feet in length and painted to match the brick background. Another three antennas would sit on a sled mounted at the southwest corner of the roof. The cables for all of this equipment would run down the north façade of the stairtower, which is visible from Diamond Street. The proposal also calls for several cabinets tucked behind the handicap-access ramp.

The Committee asked for several revisions to the proposal, which the application submitted.

Mr. Huff made a motion to approve the revised proposal. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

1725 Porter Street

Anthony Citino, Owner

William Hernandez, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: 1906, James & John Windrim, architects

PROPOSAL: Build garage

The Committee unanimously recommended denial of the proposal, pursuant to Standard 9.

Ms. Spina explained this proposal, which calls for building a freestanding garage at the rear of the yard, facing Roseberry Street. The garage would measure 20 feet by 22 feet and have CMU sidewalls with stucco facing on the north wall. Although the rear yards have garden fences, almost none of the houses have freestanding buildings infilling the garden areas of this suburban-like setting.

The Commission discussed the proposal and agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

Anthony Citino, the owner, asserted that the proposed garage as designed by the contractor differs from the design which he intended to build; therefore, he asked the Commission to withdraw his application.

1701 Arch Street aka 100 North 17th Street

Robert Morris Building Association, LP, Owner

John Pace, Applicant

DATE: 1914-15, Ballinger & Perot, architect; upper 8 stories added, 1921-22, Ballinger & Co., architect

PROPOSAL: Bird-netting

The Committee unanimously recommended approval, pursuant to Standards 5, 9, and 10.

Ms. Spina explained this proposal, which calls for bird-netting on the entire south and east façades like

that used on City Hall. All netting would be attached in the mortar joints. On the roof of the building, the repellent would be wires attached with Lexan plates and adhesive.

Mr. Wilds asked if the entire building would be encompassed in the bird netting. Ms. Spina replied that every opening on the south and east facades from the roof to the cornice line of the 1st floor would receive the netting. It would be situated close to the building to offer more transparency. Also, the netting will only be installed in the mortar joints, not in the terra cotta panels. It was noted that the Preservation Alliance who holds a façade easement on this property, supports the proposal. Mr. Wilds suggested that a mock-up of a panel be installed to establish the netting's visibility.

Shelly Cohen, representative from the building's management company, said that more than 5,000 birds roost on the building and have become uncontrollable. The birds only began to be a problem when the netting was installed on City Hall.

Mr. Perri made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Wilds abstained.

OLD BUSINESS

318 Lawrence Street, SW corner of Wood Street

Jim Datz and Barbara Botting, Owners

Gerry Gutierrez, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c.1920

PROPOSAL: Demolish 1-story building (contributing), construct 3-story building

Gerry Gutierrez, the applicant, requested a six-month continuance from the Commission. Mr. Baron noted that the staff had already granted a one-month continuance in this matter. He recommended that the Commission limit any further continuance to five months.

Mr. Wilds moved to continue the application for a period not to exceed five (5) months. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

329 South Street aka 324 Gaskill Street

329 South LLC, Owner

Nurit Nachum, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1875

PROPOSAL: Demolish rear additions and construct rear 4-story addition

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the demolition and construction, provided the Gaskill Street windows, door, and cornice are revised to be contemporary rather than falsely historic, with the Architectural Committee and staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

Ms. Spina presented this application, which proposes the demolition of a group of rear additions and the construction of a 4-story addition at 329 South Street. The rear addition would front onto Gaskill Street, a small street running parallel to South Street. The 300-block of Gaskill Street includes an interesting array of buildings of varied styles, types, and sizes. The historic building on South Street would be rehabbed and house commercial space on the first floor and two residential units on the upper floors; the new rear

wing would house three residential units. The property abuts the Society Hill Historic District, but is not part of the district. It is listed individually on the Register. The buildings to the east on Gaskill Street are within the district.

An illegal sign would be removed at the storefront and the front windows would be restored if necessary; no other work is proposed for the South Street façade.

In order to secure its support for zoning variances, the owner entered into a covenant with the Queen Village Neighbors Association. Sections 7 and 8 of the covenant define the design of the Gaskill Street façade. It requires that the façade be red brick; that the penthouse be set back and not visible from Gaskill Street; that the window and door openings, cornice line, and cornice match those of 322 Gaskill Street; that the windows be 6-over-6; and that the door and doorway match those at 318 and 320 Gaskill Street. The buildings at 318 and 320 Gaskill date to 1825 and are Greek Revival in style; the Federal/Greek Revival-style door from these buildings stipulated in the covenant is inappropriate for a contemporary building. The building at 322 Gaskill dates to 1895; the pressed metal cornice from this building stipulated in the covenant is inappropriate. The 6-over-6 windows stipulated in the covenant are also inappropriate. Moreover, the 9-over-9 windows next door at 322 Gaskill, on which the window requirement was based, are entirely inappropriate for the 1895 building. Virtually every aspect of the covenant related to the Gaskill Street façade contradicts Standard 3, which states that features “that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties” are inappropriate. Likewise, Standard 9 states that “new works shall be differentiated from the old.”

Mr. Wilds thought it a bad idea to impose a contemporary design to this proposal. Mr. Tissian asserted that other contemporary buildings exist on this block.

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

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

Ms. Spina asked if members of the Commission had any questions about the report. They had none.

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Ms. Spina asked the Commission to approve the expenditure of \$24.87 for the Architectural Committee lunches. She also asked for the approval of \$339.32 for the refreshments for the 500th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve both expenditures. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned 1:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary