

**THE MINUTES OF THE 499TH MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
12 March 2004
City Council Caucus Room, 4th Floor, City Hall
Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair**

Present

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

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

Lawrence Copeland, Esq., Senior Attorney, Law Department

Also

Tom Barton, Barton and Associates
Tony Forte, Saul, Ewing, LLP
Andrew Shenton
Mary H. Fingerote
Robert J. Hotes, DPK&A Architects
Chris Trancetti, K. Hovnanian
Charles Rue, Matrix
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Joanne Phillips, Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll
Maksym Szpilczak
Nelson Batycki
Allison Lancaster
Neil Sandvold, AIA, Sandvold Blanda Architects
Lenore Millhollen, Preservation Alliance/Rittenhouse/Fitler Historic District
David Matus
David Blumenfeld, Metro Development
Sam Y. Harris, S. Harris and Company
Rachel Royer, S. Harris and Company
Katherine Bottom, Berzinsky Architects
Terry Darami
Jon Wagner
Greg Berzinsky, Berzinsky Architects

Mary H. Fingerote

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 498th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:10 a.m.

Minutes of the 498th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Upon a motion made by Mr. Steinberg and seconded by Mr. Wilds, the Commission unanimously approved, as corrected, the minutes of the 498th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held 13 February 2004, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 24 February 2004
Vincent Rivera, Chair

140 South Broad Street

Union League of America, Owner

Jeffrey McFadden, General Manager, Applicant

DATE: John Fraser, 1864-5, Horace Trumbauer 1910-11

PROPOSAL: Reconstruct cupola, add canopy on Sansom Street, rebuild front steps on Broad and 15th Streets, add security lighting, replace windows

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the cupola; signage; metal awning; security lights; windows on the upper floors; stairs with cast stone risers and treads; but denial of the design for the stair lighting and railing. It offered the applicant suggestions and recommended that the lighting and railing design be resubmitted to the Committee pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

The proposal involves reconstructing the cupola using historic photographs, rebuilding the front steps using a mixture of cast stone and brownstone. The stairs would incorporate lights in the risers. New security lights are proposed for the sides of the building. The applicant also proposes retrofitting windows on the Trumbauer addition with a second layer of glass and new aluminum storm windows.

Mr. Baron presented a revised design, which eliminates the stair lighting and retains the decorative railing. Mr. Wilds questioned the need for an intrusive center railing. Mr. Sugrue concurred with Mr. Wilds that a center railing would detract from the grand stairs.

Robert Hotes, the architect, said that the side rails are not code compliant and that many of the Union League's members are senior citizens. The League would like to add the center rail for the safety of its members and visitors. Mr. Hotes asserted that the center rail could be eliminated with the replacement of the side rails. He said that owing to shortness of the sweeping stone ballustrades, the new rail would not follow the line of the stone rail. Instead of replacing the existing, Mr. Steinberg suggested a free-standing rail situated four inches from the ballasters. Mr. Wilds remarked that although he shares a concern about the center rail, he believes that the proposed railing is the best possible solution. Mr. Steinberg as well as Mr. Sugrue disagreed because of the tremendous intrusion on this extraordinary façade. Some Commission members referenced the existing ADA entrance, which they believe can accommodate the senior citizens. Mr. Sklaroff asserted that the ADA entrance does not allow a dignified entrance. Mr. Bumb asserted that allowing the 15th Street façade alteration already represents a compromise.

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance, said that the 15th Street façade is less significant than the highly important Broad Street façade. The treatment of this façade should be redesigned and re-reviewed by the Committee and Commission.

Commission members concluded that the Broad Street stair treatment should return for further review.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to approve the revised proposal, which does not include the stair lighting, provided the center railing on Broad Street is eliminated. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion, which carried with 7 votes.

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

1612-1618 Locust Street aka 1613-1619 Latimer Street

TC and KY Associates, Incorporated, Owners

Jason Schlesinger, Applicant

HISTORY: 1612-1616, Locust Club, built 1960, Lary, Suponsitz and Demchick, architects,
Non-contributing
1618, Henry Dallett House, later the Charles Custis Harrison House, built c.1855,
architect John Notman, altered 1888, architect Wilson Eyre Jr, Significant

The staff stated that the application had been withdrawn in writing. Joanne Phillips, counsel for the project, asserted that the letter she had sent to the Commission staff requested a continuance, not a withdrawal.

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

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

528 North 21st Street, SW corner of Brandywine Street

Andrew Shenton, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Cut new windows, remove pent eave, replace deck railing, stucco and add molding to garage, paint building

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with two-over-two windows, with staff to review details including the cornice, pursuant to Standard 9.

This proposal calls for a series of modifications to both facades of this corner building. The plans call for removal of the pent eave and adding a cornice in its place. The siding above the garage would also be removed and the wall stuccoed and painted a uniform cream color. A new railing would be installed at the deck to meet code. Mr. Shenton wishes to remove the planter from the base of the front window and open it to its full height with a new two-over-two window. He also wishes to cut two new windows on the side façade and remove the sidewalk planters.

Commission members concluded that the proposed alterations are appropriate.

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

259 North 3rd Street

259 Third Street Development LLC, Owner

Maksym Szpilczak, Applicant

DATE: Original date unknown, façades added c.1910, storefront added c.1950, two stories added, 2003

PROPOSAL: Demolish and rebuild front and rear façades

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal showing the entirely new four-story façades, with the staff to review details.

This application proposes demolishing and rebuilding the front and rear façades at 259 S. 3rd Street. The existing façades were added in the early twentieth century. Prior to the Commission's jurisdiction over the building, the applicant received permits to rebuild the interior and add two stories to the building.

The proposal to construct new façades went before the Committee in January 2004 and was tabled for additional information. The applicant returns this month with a more contemporary design that no longer includes the paired storefront doors and two-over-two windows. The storefront will be clad in sheet metal; metal windows and doors have been substituted for the previously proposed wood ones.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Mr. Szpilczak expressed concern with structural issues if the façade in its present condition is retained. In response to Mr. Steinberg's query about the allowance of the demolition, Mr. Baron explained that the historical integrity of this property has been lost to extensive alterations. Mr. Wilds remarked that the context of the existing building is so jumbled that a simple modern structure should be allowed.

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

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

The applicant requested a 30-day continuance, which was granted.

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

110-112 North 2nd Street

Philadelphia I, LLC, Owner

K. Hovnanian, Applicant

DATE: 1921-22, Jacob Ethan Fieldstein, architect, for Samuel Berkowitz

PROPOSAL: Replace windows

The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Two of the three upper floors retain their original steel industrial windows. The application calls for replacing these with new aluminum, double-glazed windows that replicate the original muntin pattern. However, at places where the sash will be operable, the measurements between new and old will differ by 1-1/8", with the new windows having much thicker members. Also, the proposed windows will have sills that are 1/4" larger than the originals. Horizontally, the proposed windows also have heavier lines: the proposed fixed mullion is 3/8" larger, the proposed vent mullion is 1" and the jamb is 1-1/16" larger. The windows can be replicated exactly if done in steel, but only single-glazing, not the more efficient double-glazing, would be possible.

The building has a five-story rear ell with a two-story side addition. The application calls for extending two of the windows on the third floor into single-leaf doors to lead out to a deck on the roof of the two-story extension. The deck itself will not be visible.

The other proposed changes to the building have been approved at staff level.

Commission members agreed that the proposed alterations are acceptable.

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

128-134 North 2nd Street

Philadelphia I, LLC, Owner

K. Hovnanian, Applicant

DATE: c. 1965

PROPOSAL: Demolish 3-story building (non-contributing) and parking kiosk (non-contributing), construct 6-story residential building

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the demolition of the existing building and the new construction, with the staff to review details including a brick sample and the cast stone color.

This is a non-contributing building in the newly created Old City Historic District. The proposal calls for the complete demolition of the building and the construction of a six-story, multi-unit condominium building. The new building would have brick facing with cast-stone detailing and metal windows. At the north end there would be an archway for a pedestrian entrance leading into the development's courtyard between N. 2nd and Bread Streets. The north and west façades would have similar, but simplified details. The Commission previously approved the proposal in concept.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Mr. Steinberg thought a more contemporary design would be more appropriate. He said that the design should have a stronger street presence. Mr. Wilds deemed the design appropriate.

Tony Forte, counsel for the project, and Tom Barton attended the meeting. Mr. Barton said that it is his intent to create an eclectic mix of architecture and reflect the different styles of architecture found in Old

City.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance concurred with Mr. Steinberg's preference for a more contemporary design. However, he agreed that the design adequately reflects the industrial look of the district. He said that the Alliance supports the project.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Steinberg dissented. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

114-124 North 2nd Street, 113-133 Bread Street

Philadelphia I, LLC, Owner

K. Hovnanian, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Construct five residential buildings on vacant lots (45-day-review-and comment)

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the Bread Street tower and 2nd Street building, but split on the townhouses. Two recommend approval; two suggest that they be revised to be more contemporary

Ms. Spina explained that the application proposes the construction of five residential buildings on vacant lots; therefore, the Commission's purview is limited to a 45-day period of review and comment. The new construction consists of a mix of townhouses and a tower oriented to Bread Street and an infill building at 114-22 North 2nd Street.

The townhouse segment will consist of three buildings at the northwest corner of the development. The townhouses will be finished with brick facing, cast-stone trim, and asphalt-shingled gable roofs. Small metal balconies and projecting bays will break the overall massing of the structures and arched entryways will allow pedestrians into the inner courtyard. Although slightly different from the design approved in concept by the Commission previously, the townhouses keep the overall massing and style that the developer originally proposed.

The ten-story tower will be asymmetrical and oriented to Bread Street. It will be faced with brick and cast-stone. The building will have a metal canopy above the entrance and a metal bay at the upper floors. The Commission approved in concept a 13-story tower with a symmetrical design.

Like the others, the mid-rise building on 2nd Street will be finished with brick facing and cast-stone details. The vehicular entrance to the underground parking will be located in this building; the entrance will mirror the pedestrian entrance at 128 North 2nd Street. The building will have 6-over-6 windows in the upper floors and a symmetrical façade with a shaped parapet.

Tom Barton stated that he endeavored to incorporate the Committee's recommendations into a revised design for the townhouses. He noted that the new design is horizontally oriented. In response to Mr. Tissian's query, Mr. Barton said that some of the stairs are internal. Mr. Barton noted that the townhouses also have elevators that connect the units to the underground garage.

Commission members discussed the two designs for the townhouses and concluded that a simplified version of the original design is more appropriate than the revised design. Mr. Barton noted building #2 will not be visible from either Bread or Second Street and the façade to the west would be cast stone or brick.

John Gallery thought that an excessive amount of discussion occurred for a property over which the Commission enjoys only 45-day review and comment powers. Ms. Smyler asserted that the discussion was appropriate. Mr. Forte expressed appreciation for the comments.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve a simplified version of the original townhouse design. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Steinberg dissented. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

4050 Main Street

Gary Gevurtz, Owner

Dottie Tuccio, Applicant

DATE: c. 1850 for Roxborough Mills

PROPOSAL: Revise signage design

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend the legalization of the sign band as built and the approval of the new signage provided it is restricted to the sign band itself, is metal with cut-out letters and icons, and is halo-lit.

The Commission previously approved signage on a projecting sign band for this furniture store. Drawings approved by the Commission showed individual box signs for each letter; the detail of the sign as submitted showed halo-lit letters. The permit documents, however, provide for individual box signs for each letter and, for the sign over the northern door, a single box sign with plastic facing hanging below. The Manayunk sign ordinance specifically prohibits box signs. For the sign on the second floor over the southern door, the owner wishes to install individual box signs for the main portion of the sign with four, round box signs faced in vinyl hanging below. Owing to the fact that the sign band hangs rather low, these signs will hang over the transoms of the arched doors.

Also, the Commission approved the design of the sign band, which specifically stipulated arches over the windows to expose the soldier-course lintels and arched windows. When the sign contractor came to the Commission office for approval of the signs, his photographs showed that the installed sign band does not have the approved arches and the band actually hides almost all of the arches over the windows on the 1st floor. Therefore, this application also proposes legalizing the sign band as installed.

Jerry Roller, the architect, attended the meeting and explained that the owner was not aware of the significance of the sign band's arches. He acknowledged that it was a bad decision by the owner to install a sign band without the approved arches. Mr. Roller contended that the band without arches only minimally impacts the aesthetics of the building because it stands two feet off the facade. Mr. Steinberg opined that the proposed solution may be better than what was approved, noting that cut outs only align when the viewer sees the building head-on. Mr. James expressed dismay with the legalization. He believes that it sends the message that property owner can work illegally and then expect Commission forgiveness afterward. Mr. Copeland asserted that the work as completed would require a variance since the installed sign exceeds the maximum size allowed by the Manayunk Ordinance. Mr. Steinberg stressed the importance of consistency in the Commission's decisions. Ms. Smyler concurred.

Mr. Sklaroff noted that the Architectural Committee recommended the legalization of sign band without arches, contradicting the Commission's earlier approval of an arched sign band. He asserted that the Committee must uphold the Commission's decisions. He requested that the Committee be instructed to sustain, not contravene, all Commission findings.

Mr. James made a motion to deny the legalization. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Sugrue abstained.

4137-4141 Main Street, NE corner of James Street

Inter Nos BC, LLC, Owner

Nelson Batycki, Applicant

DATE: c. 1850; 4139 & 4141 – Permastone added, c. 1940

PROPOSAL: Enlarge front windows and add front railings, cut rear doors, add rear decks with walkways
The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the addition, decks, and walkway at the rear, provided the addition façade is stuccoed; approval of the windows and railings at 4139 and 4141, provided the railings do not project; and approval of a coupled, double-hung, one-over-one, wood window in the existing opening at 4137, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina presented the project. This property is comprised of three houses along Main Street that have been internally connected. Two were covered in Permastone; one retains its original rubble-stone façade. The application proposes window alterations at the front and several alterations at the rear. For the front, the owner wishes to remove the first-story windows on the three houses and install large bi-fold windows with railings. The first-story windows in the two Permastone buildings have been altered; the third building (4137) retains its original window opening, but not its original window.

On the rear, the two outer buildings (4137 and 4141) have additions on the first floor and all of the buildings have decks. The owner wishes to remove the decks and add a rear room on the middle building (4139) to match the adjacent addition. A new deck would be added to the roof the first-story additions with a staircase leading to the ground. A wooden walkway would connect the decks and stairs to the street. These changes would be visible from James Street.

Commission members deemed the proposed alterations appropriate. Some members inquired about the treatment of the basement windows.

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

1428-1432 Chestnut Street aka 111 South 15th Street

111 South 15th Street Associates, Owner

David Blumenfeld, Esq., Applicant

DATE: 1922, Ritter & Shay, architects

PROPOSAL: Extend temporary legalization of signs

The Architectural Committee split. Two recommend denial; two recommend legalization until 1 June 2004.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal. This application proposes the temporary legalization of four signs on the Packard Building until 1 June 2004. The developer installed three signs at the street level advertising the availability of rental apartments without a permit or Commission approval. The signs were mounted directly to the limestone cladding of the building. In September 2003, the Commission approved the legalization of the three lower signs on the condition that they be removed by 12 December 2003. The developer expected the building to be occupied in a few months, negating the need for the signs. The building still has some vacancies; therefore, the developer is returning to the Commission for permission to extend the legalization for several more months. Also, the developer seeks the legalization of a very large canvas sign installed at the upper portion of the north façade without a permit or Commission approval. This upper sign was not addressed in the earlier application.

David Blumenfeld, counsel for the owner, attended the meeting. Ms. Murray inquired about the timeline for applying to renew the temporary signage. It was determined that the applicant applied only after a new violation was issued. Mr. Sklaroff commented that the applicant should not have waited until he was in violation. He recommended a 90-day reprieve subject to the removal of the extremely large sign. Ms. Smyler concurred. Other members objected to all of the signs.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to deny the legalization of all of the signs. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried with 7 votes. Ms. Smyler, Mr. Wilds and Mr. Sklaroff dissented.

2032 Pine Street

Terry Darami, Owner

Jon Wagner, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Demolish portion of rear ell, construct addition with deck and stairtower on rear ell, add rear balconies with doors, reopen and replace windows

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal, provided that the east wall of the historic rear ell is not stuccoed, historically appropriate wood windows are installed in the historic rear ell, and the non-historic rear addition is faced with a brick red stucco.

Mr. Farnham presented this application, which proposes numerous alterations to the rowhouse at 2032 Pine Street. At the front, in addition to some minor repairs, the applicant would like to install opaque glass in the basement windows to provide privacy. At the rear, which is visible from Capitol and Waverly Streets, the applicant plans to demolish the west façade of a poorly built, non-historic, rear addition to the rear ell as well as the roof and chimney of the rear ell. An engineer has determined that the west facade of the addition is not structurally sound. A 3rd story with roof deck and pilot house would be added to the non-historic, 2-story, rear addition. The new south façade of the addition would include balconies at the 2nd and 3rd stories. The roof of the rear ell would be reconstructed, altering the historic roofline. Two infilled rear ell windows would be reopened and all rear ell windows would be replaced with one-over-one aluminum clad wood windows. The entirety of the rear ell, new and old, would be stuccoed to give it a uniform appearance.

Jon Wagner, the architect, attended the meeting and said that the owner does not agree with the red brick color stucco. Mr. Wilds inquired if the bars on the basement windows would be retained. The Commission concluded that the Committee's recommendation was appropriate, but decided that the stucco could be taupe instead of red in color.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation with a taupe instead of red color for the stucco on the rear addition. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Ms. Smyler left the meeting.

1830 Rittenhouse Square, Unit 17C, SE corner of South 19th Street

Barbara Mishkin, Owner

David Matus, Applicant

DATE 1913, Frederick Webber, architect

PROPOSAL: Replace windows with subframe and reduced sash

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, owing to the proposed subframes, non-historic materials, and reduced daylight openings, pursuant to Standards 2, 5 and 6.

Mr. Farnham presented this application, which proposes the replacement of 12 windows, nine on the south façade and three on the east façade, at the 17th floor of the condominium building at 1830 Rittenhouse Square. The building is bounded by Rittenhouse Square at the north, 19th Street at the west, and Manning Street at the south.

Two options are proposed: a Marvin aluminum clad Ultimate double-hung window and a Marvin fiberglass Infinity double-hung window. Neither replicates the original wood. In both cases a new subframe would be installed within the existing window frame, reducing the size of the daylight opening (DO).

Window	Horizontal DO	Change	Vertical DO	Change	Area	Change
Existing	30"	—	23-3/4"	—	712.5	—
Ultimate	28-5/8"	-1-3/8"	22-5/8"	-1-1/8"	647.6	-64.9
Infinity	29-1/2"	-1/2"	23-7/8"	+1/8"	704.3	-8.2

David Matus, the applicant, asserted that the proposed windows, which would be installed at the 17th story, would not impact the architecture of the building. He also pointed out that this building already includes various types of windows.

Ms. Murray asked if the proposal needed the approval of the condominium association. Mr. Wilds cited a similar case in this building, which was subject to the condominium association's authorization. Mr. Perri asserted that the building owner should be notified. Mr. Baron emphasized that the window configurations in the building should be consistent.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to deny the proposal. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which failed with 3 votes. Mr. Perri, Mr. Bumb, Mr. Wilds, Ms. Murray, Mr. Tissian and Mr. James opposed the motion.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which passed with 6 votes. Mr. Steinberg and Mr. Sugrue opposed the motion. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

1927 Brandywine Street

Brian and Jill McLelland, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1867

PROPOSAL: Construct rooftop addition and decks

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal as submitted.

Mr. Farnham presented this application, which proposes the construction of a rooftop addition as well as two roof decks on the carriage house at 1927 Brandywine Street. The rear of the building faces Wilcox Street, a service alley. The front deck and addition will be visible from Brandywine Street; the rear deck will be visible from Wilcox Street.

Jill McLelland, the owner, Katharine Bottom and Greg Berzinsky, the architects, attended the meeting. Mr. Steinberg questioned the pitch of the roof. Mr. Sklaroff inquired about the deck's location and its visibility. The Commission discussed the visibility of the addition. Members stated that it would make the house more livable. They concluded that most of the two-story carriage houses in the area have a third-floor additions. Mr. Sugrue noted that the addition would not be mistaken as historical.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion which, carried with 8 votes. Mr. Wilds dissented.

4650 Germantown Avenue, Loudon House

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Charles Mottershead, Applicant

DATE: 1796-1801, west section and sun porch, 1829, portico, 1850, rear addition, 1888

PROPOSAL: Reconfigure roof and gutter and replace porch decking

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal as submitted, provided that the existing roof is documented with HABS-quality photographs deposited with the Historical Commission, with the staff to review details.

This application proposes alterations to the roof to enhance drainage and to the front portico to enhance ventilation. Owing to a poorly designed addition, 40% of the rainwater falling on the building is funneled down a single valley to one downspout. The downspout cannot be enlarged sufficiently to accommodate the runoff during heavy rains. Subsequently, the interior has suffered water damage. The application proposes raising a portion of the roof between the main house and the 1888 addition, allowing some rainwater to drain to other downspouts. The new roofing would match the existing metal roofing. A new catch box would be installed to collect the water that drains to the problem point. Rooftop vents would be relocated. The alteration would be visible from the west, but not any other direction. The south façade is the primary façade.

The application also proposes reconstructing the steps and flooring at the front portico. The portico suffers from excessive moisture, which accumulates beneath it. The existing tongue-and-groove flooring, which was installed in 1999, is rotting. The plans for the reconstruction are incomplete, but those submitted do stipulate 6-inch decking with 1/8-inch spaces between the planks. No information about the historic steps or decking has been provided.

Mr. Farnham presented the application and noted that with further investigation the applicants determined that the porch material was historically finished with tongue-and-groove flooring.

Sam Harris and Rachel Royer attended the meeting to represent the proposal and answer questions.

Commission members concurred that the proposed alterations are appropriate.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to approve the roof alterations as submitted and the revised porch proposal with the tongue-and-groove decking, provided that the existing roof is documented with HABS-quality photographs deposited with the Historical Commission, with the staff to review details. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried 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 applicant requested a 30-day continuance, which was granted.

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

Mr. Farnham asked if members of the Commission had any questions about the report. They had none.

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Farnham asked the Commission to approve the expenditure of \$25.84 for the Architectural Committee lunches.

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

Mary H. Fingerote, a concerned citizen, requested the opportunity to address the Commission, which was granted. She then expressed dismay at the proposed demolition of the Rittenhouse Club. Commission members suggested that Mr. Sklaroff recuse himself, owing to the topic of discussion.

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

Mr. Sugrue noted that the circumstances of each and every case are carefully considered. Ms. Murray reiterated to Ms. Fingerote that it was her right to appeal any decision of the Commission.

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

The meeting adjourned at 11:35 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary