

**THE MINUTES OF THE 511th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
11 March 2005**

**1515 Arch Street, Room 18025
Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair**

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
Warren Huff, Director of Urban Design, City Planning Commission
Sara Merriman, Special Assistant to the Director, Department of Commerce
Kathleen Murray, Special Assistant to the President of City Council
David Perri, P.E., Chief Code Official, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Harris Steinberg, AIA
Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.
Norman Tissian
Scott Wilds, Deputy Director, Office of Housing and Community Development

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Jonathan E. Farnham, Historic Preservation Planner
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Lawrence Copeland, Esq., Senior Attorney, Law Department

Also

John Leggett, JDA Associates
Robert Cassway, SPG3
Amy Talvacclvia, TCOC
T.P. Callan, 339 South 21st Street
Haleh Kadkhoda, 668 North 19th Street
Kathleen Jordan, 1930 B Green Street
Rosina Feldman, 1926 Green Street
Amy Talvacchia, 4301 Main Street
George Thomas
Timothy Trzaska, Philadelphia School Improvement Team
Jessica Pisapia Margulies, USA Architects Planners Interior Designers
Paul R. Schwartz, USA Architects Planners Interior Designers
David O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighbors Association
Diane Fine, Queen Village Neighbors Association
Marian Buczek, Queen Village Neighbors Association, 909 Bodine Street
Don Ventresca, 238 Christian Street
Marjorie Stern Jacobs, Esq., Fox Rothschild, LLP.
Alexandra Buczek, 900 Bodine Street
Craig Deutsch, Harmon Deutsch Architects, 432R Sedgwick Street
Dawn Levi, 226 Fitzwater Street
Daniel Mehan, Mehan Custom Builders, 327 South 2nd Street
Bill Murphy, 2019-23 Green Street
Joe Duffy, 2019-23 Green Street
Diane Fink, Queen Village Neighbors Association, 903 Bodine Street

Christina Carter, AIA, John Milner Architects
Charles Evers, AIA, 213 Catharine Street
Edwin Rivera, 213 Catharine Street
Amy Rivera, 213 Catharine Street
Hugh Zimmers, Zimmers & Associates
Martin McNamara, 339 South 21st Street
Kevin Angstadt, Qb3, LLC
Stephen Mileto, Qb3, LLC
Andrew J. Kordor, Mattioni, Ltd.
Eagan Lakhmna, 120-30 New Street
Wayne Davis, 2008 Chancellor Street
Jan Rubin, 2026-30 Chancellor Street
S. David Fineman, Esq., 2026 Chancellor Street
Frank Kakos, Kakos Architects, 1525 Pine Street
Chris Tranchetti, K. Hovnanian, Bread Street
Tom Barton, Barton and Associates, 113-33 Bread Street
Todd Lean, 213 Chestnut Street
Rich DiPasquale, Rittenhouse Developers, 2008 Chancellor
Maleda Berhane, Chestnut Hill Academy
Joy Donnelly, 3625 Hamilton Street

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 511th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:05 a.m.

Minutes of the 510th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Upon a motion made by Mr. Tissian and seconded by Ms. Murray, the Commission voted to approve the minutes of the 510th Stated Meeting, 11 February 2005, as corrected, Michael Sklaroff, Chair. Mr. Steinberg abstained.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 22 February 2005

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair

668 North 19th Street

Haleh Kadkhoda, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1885

PROPOSAL: Legalize vinyl windows

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron presented the application, which proposes legalizing vinyl windows installed at the second floor of this corner rowhouse. The houses in this row originally featured Queen Anne wood windows.

Ms. Kadkhoda, the property owner, stated that she replaced seven of the 13 second-story windows with one-over-one vinyl windows because the old wood windows were drafty. She claimed that the draftiness of the windows caused pipes to freeze and burst, damaging the interior. She reported that she was not aware that a building permit was needed to replace windows. She asserted that the vinyl windows matched the replaced windows in every detail except material. She implored the Commission to legalize her windows.

Mr. Tissian noted a letter from the Spring Garden Civic Association asserting that the applicant was aware of the historic designation at the time of the window replacement. After learning that a copy of the letter had not been sent to the applicant, Mr. Sklaroff suggested that his fellow Commissioners disregard the letter. He then explained to the applicant that she would have been advised of the Commission's policies and procedures including the hardship provision if she had complied with the §14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code and *Rules & Regulations*, and had submitted a standard application.

Ms. Murray directed the Commission's attention to photographs of the illegal windows. The applicant explained that the window work had not been completed and that it would offer a pleasing appearance when it was completed. Ms. Murray asked if the dimensions of the windows or the openings had changed. The applicant responded in the negative. Mr. Steinberg stated that the new frames appear much thicker than the older frames. The applicant explained that this appearance resulted from the incompleteness. Mr. Steinberg asked Mr. Baron if the new windows adequately replicated the historic windows. Mr. Baron replied that they did not; he stated that the second-floor windows should be Queen Anne windows. The applicant interjected that she had not removed Queen Anne windows; she added that there were no Queen Anne windows on the second-story when she purchased the building in 1999. Mr. Sklaroff commented that she had replaced non-historic windows with non-historic windows. Mr. Baron noted that the windows that had been replaced were wood. Mr. Sklaroff acknowledged Mr. Baron's point and stated that "the work should be true to history." He then asked Mr. Baron to explain the differences between wood and vinyl windows. Mr. Baron clarified that vinyl windows, unlike wood windows, are shiny. Also, they have no putty slope and therefore no depth.

Mr. Huff asked about the windows at the time of designation. Mr. Baron replied that they were one-over-one wood windows. Mr. Tyler added that the Commission requires a return to the historical appearance whenever work is undertaken, regardless of the existing conditions. Mr. Sklaroff contended that the critical question before the Commission was whether it would have required Queen Anne windows if it had reviewed an advance proposal. Mr. Sugrue said that the Commission would never have approved the vinyl windows.

Mr. Tissian suggested that the contractor should have sought a permit before beginning the work. Ms. Kadkhoda explained that the contractor was a friend. Mr. Sklaroff pressed for the name of the contractor. She stated that his name is Robert F. Guerin of Jenkintown. Mr. Sklaroff asked if he is licensed. Ms. Kadkhoda stated that a nearby church has similar windows.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation denying the legalization, pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 8 to 1. Mr. Huff dissented.

1930 B Green Street

C. Kathleen Jordan, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Legalize vinyl windows

The Architectural Committee recommended denial pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron presented the application, which proposes legalizing vinyl windows at the second-story level of the front façade of a rowhouse. The second story is occupied as a condominium unit. The condominium owner's contractor installed the windows without a building permit. Multi-unit buildings require permits for windows even when they are not listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The historic windows were segmentally arched two-over-two wood windows, not the illegally-installed square-head one-over-one vinyl windows. A violation has been requested for a second unit in the building with vinyl windows.

Ms. Jordan, the owner, explained that the replaced windows were drafty and deteriorated. She added that a neighbor to the east had the same contractor install the same windows. She also noted that the third-floor unit owner had replaced windows. She asserted that square-head windows are common in the neighborhood and claimed that arched windows are not "environmentally friendly." She added that the work was done without a permit.

Mr. Wilds reminded the Commission that designation notice letters were sent to Ms. Jordan, the applicant, in 2000, when the district was created explaining that she needed Commission approval to replace the windows. He stated that this was "a clear cut case."

Mr. Sklaroff requested the contractor's name. Ms. Jordan stated that it was James Irwin Builders of Merchantville, New Jersey.

Ms. Jordan stated that she had spent \$3,000 for power washing and a new railing last year. She explained that Randall Cotton of the Preservation Alliance, which holds an easement on the property, had approved the work and did not note the illegal vinyl windows. Commission members asked if the power washing and railing had been approved by the Commission. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the Preservation Alliance co-owns the building and is therefore also in violation.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation denying the legalization, pursuant to Standard 6. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 8 to 1. Mr. Huff dissented.

4301 Main Street

R. Talvacchia, Owner

Patty Perlstein, Applicant

DATE: c. 1845

PROPOSAL: Legalize vinyl windows

The Architectural Committee recommended denial pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron presented the application, which proposes legalizing one-over-one vinyl windows installed without a permit. The windows were installed several years ago, but did not come to the Commission's attention until very recently when a building inspector

visited the site for other reasons. The building originally had wood two-over-two windows.

Amy Talvacchia, one of the building owners, stated that the vinyl windows were installed before she purchased the building in 1994. Mr. Steinberg directed the Commission to an estimate for new, historically appropriate windows from Matus Windows. Ms. Talvacchia reported that the cost for the new windows was estimated at \$23,000.

Commission members asked how this building had been placed under the Commission's jurisdiction. Mr. Tyler responded that it had not been designated by the Commission, but had been placed under its jurisdiction by the Manayunk ordinance.

Mr. Wilds asked if the staff had determined what windows were in place at the time the Manayunk ordinance became effective. Mr. Baron displayed the designation photograph, which revealed that the building had one-over-one wood windows when the Commission assumed jurisdiction.

Mr. Sklaroff inquired about the review standards mandated by the Manayunk ordinance. Mr. Wilds and Mr. Tyler stated that these standards are more stringent than those required in the Commission's ordinance. They asserted that the ordinance requires exact duplications of historic features.

The applicant noted that the vinyl windows had been installed by the previous owner at the time she purchased the building. Mr. Sklaroff suggested that the Commission table the application to gather more information.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to table the proposal until the Commission meeting of 8 April 2005. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 8 to 1. Mr. Huff dissented.

2136 Ritner Street, Edgar Allen Poe School

School District of Philadelphia, Owner
Armand Christopher, Architect/Applicant
DATE: 1913

PROPOSAL: Auditorium and gymnasium additions on the rear

The Architectural Committee recommended an approval in concept with the restoration of the doors, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Baron presented the application, which proposes the addition of an auditorium and school cafeteria/gymnasium onto this school building. The new construction would be a curved form faced with green and blue masonry panels. It would attach to the red brick and cream limestone Jacobean Revival building.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion.

Timothy Trzaska, of the Philadelphia School Improvement Team, Jessica P. Margulies and Paul R. Schwartz of USA Architects, and George Thomas, a consultant, represented the application. Mr. Schwartz offered an overview of the project.

Mr. Wilds opined that the new design is "first rate."

Discussion turned to the doors in the historic building. Mr. Schwartz reported that the missing historic doors would cost \$45,000 per set to replicate. Three sets would be needed. He added that the replication of the historic leaded glass in the doors accounted for most of the cost. Mr. Sklaroff asked about the extant doors. Mr. Schwartz explained that they were metal non-historic doors; he also noted that the school district now does not want to replace them. Mr. Thomas criticized the Commission for requiring the \$45,000 doors. Commission members clarified that it was not and could not require changes outside the proposed scope of work. The non-historic doors were in place at the time of designation and are therefore grandfathered until such time as the owner wishes to replace them.

Ms. Murray asked the applicants if they had solicited comments from the community. Mr. Schwartz stated that they had met with the community and would hold another meeting. Ms. Murray and Mr. Sugrue asked if they could remove the modular building from the site. Mr. Schwartz stated that they could not; he explained that the school needed the space and did not have the funds to incorporate the space into the new construction. Ms. Murray asked if the project would require zoning variances. Mr. Schwartz reported that it would.

Mr. Sklaroff asked if the addition would result in the obscuring or removal of any historic fabric. Mr. Schwartz replied that, in response to a staff comment, they had shifted the addition back slightly to avoid obscuring the returns of the belt courses. Mr. Thomas noted that the façade of the historic building where the addition will attach was originally left blank to allow for a later addition.

Mr. Steinberg inquired about the exterior materials for the addition. Ms. Margulies presented samples of the materials to the Commission. Mr. Steinberg also asked for clarification on the site plan and landscaping. About the fence, Mr. Schwartz explained that they would retain the existing brick piers, but would replace the non-historic metal fence.

Several Commission members suggested that they give final, not in-concept, approval to the project. They asserted that the plans were adequately detailed for final approval. Mr. Perri and Mr. Steinberg contended that the plans were not detailed enough for final approval. Ms. Murray objected to a final approval, stating that the community should have a second opportunity to comment on the project. Mr. Baron noted that the applicants has presented two designs one in their packet and one on the easel. He asked the Commission which design it was considering for approval. He also stated that the staff had not yet received copies of the plans presented at the Commission meeting and therefore would not be able to verify later with certainty that the construction drawings corresponded to the approved drawings. Mr. Schwartz promised to provide Mr. Baron with a complete set of the plans presented at the Commission meeting. Mr. Sugrue asked if the Commission would have the opportunity to review the final plans if they deviated in any way from the plans presented at today's Commission meeting. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the final plans must be submitted again to the Commission for review if they deviate from those presented today.

Mr. Sugrue and Mr. Tissian withdrew their motion. Mr. Sugrue made a motion to approve the application as presented at the Commission meeting of 11 March 2005. Mr.

Wilds seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 8 to 1. Ms. Murray dissented.

238 Christian Street

Green Park Properties, Owner

Don Ventresca, Applicant

DATE: c 1825

PROPOSAL: New wall and fence with rolling gate; install three HVAC units in rear yard
The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the HVAC units in the yard;
Committee members were split regarding the wall.

Mr. Baron presented the application, which proposes a stuccoed CMU wall along the eastern edge of this property. It would have a 10-foot wide opening with a rolling wood gate for a vehicle to enter a parking area from Bodine Street. The Commission approved a version of this project at an earlier meeting. While working on the existing CMU wall, the applicant discovered that it was unstable because it lacked a foundation. He therefore demolished and rebuilt it with a foundation. The Commission revoked its approval of the alterations to the wall because the work exceeded the approval. It directed the applicant to apply for approval of the expanded project. The application also proposes the installation of three HVAC units in the yard.

Attorney Marjorie Stern Jacobs accompanied Don Ventresca, the developer.

Mr. Sklaroff noted that the Committee recommendation provided little guidance for the Commission. Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Baron to clarify the history of the project. Mr. Baron noted that the wall would be reduced in height from the originally proposed 54 inches to 42 inches to meet the building code. Mr. Tyler asserted that Bodine Street is not a legally opened street. Mr. Perri countered that the Department of Licenses & Inspections treats it as a street for zoning purposes regardless of its legal status. He added that any proposal for a wall taller than 42 inches along the street would require a variance from the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Ms. Jacobs stated that her client would build a wall of any height approved by the Commission.

In response to questions about the history of Bodine Street, Mr. Tyler explained that the Belgian block cartway is approximately 90 to 120 years old. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the street dates to the time of William Penn. Mr. Tyler thought not.

Mr. Wilds contended that the Commission must be consistent. He stated that the Commission should approve this proposal if it approved a similar version at an earlier meeting.

Several community members objected to the proposal, claiming that the increased traffic would damage Bodine Street; they had not been notified of meetings, and automobiles could hit and damage the houses on the east side of the street. Mr. Sklaroff remarked that the use of the street is not within the Commission's jurisdiction. Mr. Tissian asked how the street is currently used. Community members stated that it is used as a walkway. Mr. Sklaroff reiterated that the Commission has no jurisdiction over use. He added that this site is not in a historic district.

Community members asked if they could view the plans. Commission members noted that all applications are available to the public in the Commission's offices. David O'Donnell, the president of the Queen Village Civic Neighbors Association, objected to

the proposed roll-down gate. Ms. Jacobs corrected that it is a cedar gate that rolls sideways. It will slide side to side, not roll up and down. Community members noted that the parking had been changed from perpendicular to the street to diagonal. They suggested that the parking should not be approved because it deviated from the previous plan. Ms. Fink stated that the backing of automobiles concerned her. Ms. Jacobs explained that the parking space angle had been changed to appease the neighbors. The diagonal parking space would reduce the amount of turning necessary to maneuver a car into the parking space.

Discussion returned to the wall. Mr. Perri stated that his Department would have ordered the original CMU wall demolished because it had no foundation. He noted a recent death caused by a faulty CMU wall and concluded that Mr. Ventresca's demolition of the faulty wall was appropriate. Community members disputed the contents of the application. Mr. Baron passed Mr. Ventresca's application form to Mr. Sklaroff, who verified that it noted the wall and gate. Mr. Steinberg agreed that the old wall had a poor foundation and needed to be demolished.

After further neighbor comments, Mr. Sklaroff reiterated that the Commission has no jurisdiction over the use of the street. It was noted that the block of Bodine is part of the Historic Street Paving District, but that the application does not propose any work to the cartway. Ms. Spina clarified that the designation of the street does not include the curbs.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the proposal with the new wall, either 42 or 48 inches in height, with a 10-foot opening and a rolling wood gate. Mr. Perri seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 7 to 2. Mr. Tissian and Ms. Murray dissented.

900 Bodine Street aka 238 Christian Street

Green Park Properties, Owner

Don Ventresca, Applicant

DATE: C. 1825

PROPOSAL: New construction of 3-story house

The Architectural Committee recommended approval subject to the alteration to the Montrose Street façade to include a narrower garage and a pedestrian door, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron presented the application, which proposes the construction of a new house on the rear portion of the 238 Christian Street lot. Attorney Marjorie Stern Jacobs accompanied Don Ventresca, the developer. The developer is subdividing a very deep lot, which historically extended from Christian to Montrose Streets with an eastern frontage along Bodine Street. Atlases reveal that a carriage house formerly sat on the rear portion of the site about ten feet north of Montrose Street. The proposed neo-traditional house would have a garage on Montrose Street and a front door on Bodine Street.

Mr. Sklaroff noted that the term should be neo-traditional, not pseudo-traditional. Mr. Steinberg opined that the design was inappropriate for the Queen Village neighborhood and that the execution of the detailing and proportion appeared "heavy-handed." He believed that the house should have a more contemporary design.

Commission members asked about their jurisdiction over the vacant lot, which was subdivided from the 238 Christian Street property to the north. Mr. Sklaroff replied that one “cannot subdivide out of history.” Ms. Jacobs questioned the Commission’s assumption of jurisdiction. Mr. Sklaroff assured her that the Commission has full jurisdiction. Regarding the design, he stated that it is “way over the top” and “pretty extreme.”

Mr. Tissian objected to the garage and noted that the Committee’s recommendation was too vague. Of the garage façade, Mr. Wilds stated that it was “not a very happy look for a house.” David O’Donnell, the president of the Queen Village Civic Neighbors Association, asserted that the garage is not required by the zoning code. Mr. Perri confirmed that infill buildings can get waivers from the garage requirement. Mr. Ventresca conceded that there are currently no garages on this block of Montrose Street.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee’s recommendation. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 5 to 4. Messrs. Sklaroff, Steinberg, Sugrue and Tissian dissented.

213 Catharine Street

Edwin Rivera, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830, addition 1923

PROPOSAL: Legalize partial demolition and new windows; new shed roof on rear

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

Mr. Baron presented the application, which proposes legalizing a rear car port created by demolishing the first floor of a 1923 addition on the back of this house. The parking area faces a street which includes garages as well as house fronts. The application is a modification of a proposal for work done without a permit, which was previously denied by the Commission. The applicant would like to remove the first-floor rear wall and support the second floor on a beam which they have already installed spanning the width of the lot. They propose to build a pent awning to hide the horizontal support beam over the new parking area.

Edwin Rivera, the owner, and Charles Evers, his architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Evers explained that the rear of the house dates to 1923 and is not distinguished.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to adopt the Architectural Committee’s recommendation. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 8 to 1. Mr. Tissian dissented.

226 Fitzwater Street

Dawn and Steve Levi, Owners

Craig Deutsch, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1807

PROPOSAL: Construct rear addition

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9, and Roofs Guideline.

Mr. Farnham presented the application, which proposes a third-story addition at the rear of the rear ell of this brick rowhouse. Most of the rear ell is already three stories in height. The addition would bring the rear section of the ell, which is currently two stories in height, up to three stories. The addition would include a hipped roof, large windows and doors, and a balcony. Also, the roof of the historic section of the ell would be raised and a skylight added. This section of the ell roof retains its historic half-gable shape. The ell is visible from Fitzwater and Fulton Streets as well as Concordia Place, a small alley with four historic houses.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Deutsch, the architect, if he had accepted the Committee's suggestion to redesign the addition. Mr. Deutsch explained that he could not design the "master suite" sought by his clients with the ceiling-height restrictions imposed by the Committee. He also explained that the rear of the rear ell is an addition and that the Commission recently approved new windows and doors for it.

Mr. Sklaroff asked the staff to clarify the Committee's reasons for rejecting the proposed design. Mr. Farnham explained that the Committee deemed a third-story addition at the rear acceptable, but had objected to the height and hipped roof of the proposed addition. Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Deutsch if he would be willing to revise the plans as the Committee suggested. Mr. Deutsch answered that he would compromise on the shape of the roof, but not on its height.

Mr. Steinberg opined that the proposed addition is not sufficiently differentiated from the historic fabric. He suggested using a facing material other than stucco for the addition.

Mr. Deutsch stated that the addition would only be visible from a parking lot. Mr. Sklaroff countered that it would be visible from public rights-of-way. Mr. Farnham noted that it would also be visible from a nearby pedestrian street lined with four historic buildings. Mr. Wilds asked if Commission members would oppose the proposal if the property was situated in the middle of a row. Several Commission members replied that they would not oppose the proposal in that case.

Mr. Sklaroff summarized the deliberations, stating that the project would make the property more livable, that the Committee opposed the proposal, and that perhaps the design should be revised.

Mr. Tissian asked Mr. Steinberg if he objected to the height of the addition, which would extend above the historic roofline. Mr. Steinberg stated that he deemed the height acceptable. He added that the new should be further differentiated from the old. Mr. Tissian suggested that the Commission approve the proposal, provided that the design is better differentiated, with the staff to review the details. Mr. Sugrue expressed his opinion that it should be reviewed again by the Committee because of the many uncertainties.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and deny the proposal. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion, which failed with a vote of three to five. Messrs. Sugrue and Perri and Ms. Merriman voted for the motion and Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to approve the design with the proposed massing and height, but with a facing material that better differentiates the added from the existing materials, with staff to review details. Mr. Huff seconded the motion.

Mr. Sugrue objected to the vagueness of the motion and the burden it would place on the staff.

Messrs. Tissian and Huff withdrew the motion.

Ms. Murray made a motion to approve the proposal in concept, provided the facing material is revised. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion.

Several Commission members objected to the motion. Some urged final approval; others suggested modifications to the design.
Mr. Wilds questioned the appropriateness of an approval in concept.

Ms. Murray offered to withdraw her motion, but Mr. Wilds, who seconded, did not agree initially. After additional discussion, Mr. Wilds agreed to withdraw his second.

Ms. Murray made a motion to approve the proposal including the massing and height, provided the facing material is better differentiated from the existing rear ell, with the Architectural Committee to review details. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which passed with eight votes. Mr. Wilds dissented.

327 South 2nd Street

Beverly Blynn, Owner

Daniel Mehan, Applicant

DATE: 1965

PROPOSAL: Enclose roof deck – final approval

The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

Mr. Farnham described the application for final approval.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee and approve the proposal. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2019-23 Green Street

Green Street Collaborative, LP, Owner

Joseph Duffy, Applicant

DATE: 1860, significantly altered 1922 and 1959 – non-contributing to Spring Garden Historic District

PROPOSAL: Demolish building, construct 3-story multi-unit building with parking

The Architectural Committee recommended approval provided the keystones at the door surrounds and garage jack arch are deleted, one-over-one windows are substituted for the nine-over-nine windows, and the cornice is simplified, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham gave a short history of the property and described the proposal. He explained the Committee's recommendation for a more simplified design.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and to approve the demolition and new construction provided the keystones at the door surrounds and garage jack arch are deleted, one-over-one windows are substituted for the nine-over-nine windows, and the cornice is simplified, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

235 South Camac Street

Philadelphia Sketch Club, Owner

Christina Carter, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1825, converted to clubhouse 1902

PROPOSAL: Add fire escape, cut window into door

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, provided door design is predicated on historic window with staff to review details pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal for the Sketch Club. Christina Carter, the architect for the project, noted that the Club has security concerns with a glazed door and requested a six-panel door, similar to those in other openings in the building.

Mr. Huff made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted, with staff to review details. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

120-30 New Street

Eagan Lakhamna, Owner

Hugh Zimmers, Architect/Applicant

PROPOSAL: New construction on vacant lot

The Architectural Committee commented that the design should be revised to respond better to its context, which includes the Benjamin Franklin Bridge and several historic warehouse and manufacturing buildings.

Mr. Farnham described the proposal for new construction on a vacant lot. He noted that the Commission's jurisdiction is 45-day review and comment. Hugh Zimmers, architect for the project, summarized the site and distributed a revised design based on the Committee's comments.

Mr. Sugrue commended Mr. Zimmers for responding to the Committee's

recommendations. Mr. Steinberg found the metal louvers at the ground floor problematic, but better than open piers as previously proposed.

Eagan Lakhamna, the project's developer, noted that he will landscape PennDOT's right-of-way by the Benjamin Franklin Bridge with trees and bushes.

Mr. Steinberg applauded the architect for revising the design and making it stronger, more contemporary, and more contextual. Mr. Sugrue seconded the comment, which passed by eight votes. Ms. Murray abstained.

339 South 21st Street

Tom Callan and Martin McNamara, Owners

Stephen Mileto, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1860; garage added, 1921; storefront added, 1926; 3rd story removed, 1939

PROPOSAL: Demolish garage, construct new garage with rooftop terrace, add skylights, railings and grates

The Architectural Committee recommended approval provided the connection between the old and the new is better articulated, with staff to review details.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal.

Mr. Steinberg and Mr. Sugrue opined that the alteration would be a good addition to the streetscape. Mr. Wilds countered that the Commission struggled over the decision to allow the changes to the window in the historic bay and now the owner wants to completely alter it. He emphasized the visibility of the corner and called the new application a "bait and switch." Mr. Sugrue said that he would have preferred to see something like this application to begin with and did not think the bay was essential to building.

Martin McNamara, one of the owners, said that the proposed revisions to the approved design were devised after construction started. After investing in the property, he and his partner believe that the 1920s garage does not have the integrity of the rest of the building and they are wrestling with other code issues with the rear exit. Also, much of the rear bay had been rebuilt. Therefore, they decided to seek a different solution than reconstruction of the porch and bay.

Mr. Steinberg believed that the proposed design maintains a sense of the porch. Mr. Wilds thought the new design is too jarring for the streetscape and would stand out along the row. He believes that the loss of historic fabric would be significant. Mr. Steinberg countered that historic districts must be open to good contemporary architecture.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion, which passed with eight votes. Mr. Wilds dissented.

2008 Chancellor Street

Michael Murtha, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Legalize rooftop penthouse and deck

The Architectural Committee recommended legalization of the penthouse and deck, provided the deck is relocated with front and rear setbacks matching the neighboring deck at 2006 Chancellor Street, with staff to review details.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal for legalizing a rooftop penthouse and deck. Wayne Davis, the contractor for the project, passed out revised drawings showing the new deck with a set back as requested by the Committee.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

2026-30 Chancellor Street

Jan Rubin, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1895

PROPOSAL: Cut windows and garage door on rear

The Architectural Committee recommended approval or reopening an historic window, with staff to review shop drawings, pursuant to Standard 6, but denial of cutting a garage door and new window, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina described the proposal. The application was represented by Jan Rubin, the owner, and David Fineman, the attorney for the owner. In response to a question, they noted that the front windows were existing at the time of designation. The projecting housing on the rear garage is the subject of a legal dispute between this applicant and a new owner of that unit. Ms. Rubin hopes to have it corrected. The green paint was something she applied several years ago on top of Salmon colored paint that existed when she bought the property.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, which was seconded by Mr. Wilds.

The applicant made the argument that St. James Street is a back alley and the building has little integrity on the rear. Commission members, after much discussion, agreed. They also thought that the building lacked integrity on the rear. Commission members thought that a new garage would be acceptable if the two garages were of approximately the same height, but allowing the jackarch of an existing window opening to remain. They said that the illegal paint should be handled under a separate application.

Messrs. Steinberg and Wilds agreed to withdraw the previous motion and to make a new motion to approve the proposal with the garage to be of similar height to the existing, but with an internal housing and retention of the brick arch. The motion passed unanimously.

1525 Pine Street

Driscoll and Greene, Ltd, Owner

Frank Kakos, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1865-66, Charles MacAlester, developer; 5th floor added, c. 1870

PROPOSAL: Deck on rear ell with trellis, basement door

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the roof deck and four-panel basement door with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

Ms. Spina briefly described the proposal for the roof deck and trellis and a new basement door. Frank Kakos asked if the material of the deck could be Trex, which he thought more durable. The Commission agreed.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to approve the proposal and the alternate material. Mr. Wilds seconded the proposal, which passed unanimously.

113-33 Bread Street

K. Hovnanian Philadelphia I, LLC, Owner

Tom Barton, Architect/Applicant

PROPOSAL: Revised design for 10-story tower – new construction on vacant lot, 45-day review and comment

The Architectural Committee commented that the color contrasts should be moderated and that some of the gold brick should be replaced with red brick.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal for the new 10-story building on the west side of the National Products Building development. Mr. Wilds questioned whether the Commission had jurisdiction for a new 45-day review and comment since they had seen a previous design for this project. Larry Copeland, counsel to the Commission, said that, since the new design differed substantially from the initial application, it constitutes a new application for which the Commission gets a new comment period.

Tom Barton, project architect, and Chris Tranchetti from K. Hovnanian explained the changes, saying that they came about in the zoning process and with discussions with the civic association.

Commission members praised the design.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to approve the proposal without the Committee's changes in the brick. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed with eight votes. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

213 Chestnut Street

Eli Gabay, Owner

Todd Lean, Applicant

DATE: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: Legalize kitchen fan

The Architectural Committee recommended tabling the application for a period not to exceed six months to allow for an assessment of the code requirements and options.

Ms. Spina noted that the Committee asked for the proposal to be tabled so that more information may be gathered.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to approve the Committee recommendation to table the proposal for a period not to exceed six months. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT of the Financial Hardship Committee, 2 March 2005

Scott Wilds, Chair

Mr. Wilds briefly summarized the meeting of the Committee and noted that the Committee will meet again on 22 March 2005 at 10:00 a.m. in the Commission's offices.

Mr. Steinberg said that he hopes the applicant will explore the idea of a new building facing the field because it could in fact be an opportunity for a spectacular building, not just a utilitarian structure.

Mr. Huff explained that he looked into the assertion on the part of Chestnut Hill Academy that the Planning Commission had denied permission to build along the hillside. He said that Mr. Soffer had reviewed the idea and had turned it down at staff level, but that the applicant always had the option to take the issue to the Planning Commission itself, which they declined.

THE REPORT of the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, February 2005

Mr. Tyler introduced Jorge Danta, a new Historic Preservation Planner who will perform the federal reviews for the Neighborhood Transformation Initiative Program. Mr. Tyler also noted that in 2004, the office experienced a thirteen percent (13%) increase in permits over the previous.

Mr. Sklaroff asked that the staff work with Mr. Perry to see what can be done about the two contractors who worked without licenses on several historic buildings reviewed at the meeting. In response to a question about districts, he said that the Commission should await the report coming out of Councilwoman Blackwell's Committee.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 noon.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron
Jonathan E. Farnham
Laura M. Spina