

**THE MINUTES OF THE 486th
STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
14 February 2003 at 9:00 a.m.**

**City Council Caucus Room, 4th Floor, City Hall
Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair**

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
Melissa Heller-Batzer, Director of Economic Development, Office of City Council President
James Brown, IV
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
Andres Perez Jr., Commissioner of Public Property
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, Office of Housing and Community Development

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

Lawrence K. Copeland, Esq., Senior Attorney, Law Department

Also

Dave Kuncas, Our Lady of Loreto Church
David Blumenfeld, Metro Development Company
David Amburn, Amburn/Jarosinski Architects
Andres Perez Jr., Public Property
Robert Powers, Powers and Company, Incorporated
Arlene Matzkin, Friday Architects
Michael Stern, Community College of Philadelphia
Geraldine Trainor
Karen Faul, 618 Catharine Street
Joseann Murphy, Our Lady of Loreto Church
Jerry Roller, J.K. Roller Architects
John Cluver, Voith and Mactavish Architects
Eric Rymshaw, Voith and Mactavish Architects
Jim Fulton, Voith and Mactavish Architects
Ev Custer, CB Development Services
Elden Stoltzfus, The Krabb Partnership Architects
David Seltzer
Nan R. Gutterman, Vitetta Group
Jason Stevens, Capital Programs Office
Brett Feldman, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg and Ellers LLP
Richard Thom, R. W. Thom, AIA
Aileen Bannom, R. W. Thom AIA

Vincent Durso
Rick Tullio
Rick Shaffer
William G. Schwartz, Esq., Obermayer Rebmann Maxwell and Hippel LLP
William Alesker, AIA
Van Strother, New Covenant Church
Neil Sklaroff, Esq., Sprint Spectrum LP
David Grasso, Metro Development Company
Andrew Hamilton, Dane Décor
Mr. and Mrs. Albert Caporali
Tony Dragan
Anna Maiarano
Julia Gagliardi
Michael Fuchs, 1608 Mt. Vernon Street
Kevin T. Boyle, Esq., Our Lady of Loreto Church
R. J. Pisani, 3224-26 Powelton Avenue
J. Christopher Frey, Preservation Consultant, Noble Preservation Services, Wingohocking Hall
Victor Antes, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
A. Robert Torres, Art Design Collaborative
Donna Farrell, Archdiocese of Philadelphia
Frank Kakos, Kakos Architects
Daniel Alessandrino, Our Lady of Loreto Church
Margaret Ursic, Our Lady of Loreto Church
Sylvia Mango, Our Lady of Loreto Church
Haeley Horan, Our Lady of Loreto Church
Summer Horan, Our Lady of Loreto Church
Ida Mango, Our Lady of Loreto Church
Anna Marie D. Horan, Our Lady of Loreto Church
John Andrew Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Jason Mango, Our Lady of Loreto Church
Mike Marciano, Our Lady of Loreto Church

Mr. Sklaroff, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

Minutes of the 485th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission. Upon a motion made by Mr. Wilds, the Commission unanimously approved, the minutes of the 485th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held 10 January 2003, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

Mr. Brown reiterated to the Commission members about the ceremony commemorating the re-installation the marker for Ebenezer Don Carlos Bassett on the site of his home on 24 February 2003.

THE REPORT of the Committee on Historic Designation, 29 January 2003
Thomas Sugrue, Chair

3637 Locust Street, St. Anthony Hall of the Fraternity of Delta Psi

Delta Alumni Association, Owner

DATE: 1907, Cope and Stewardson, architects

The Committee unanimously recommended designation.

Ms. Spina gave an illustrated presentation and said that the Delta Psi St. Anthony Hall building stands on the University of Pennsylvania campus. The building exemplifies Jacobethan architecture, which is a revival mix of Elizabethan architecture as seen in the oriels, bays and chimneys and Jacobean architecture as executed in its regularity and details. The important Philadelphia firm of Cope and Stewardson, the architects of the building, are regarded as the major designers of the Collegiate Gothic Style. The building meets criteria a, c, d, and j as described in the ordinance.

M. Lippincott, the architect, attended the meeting to represent the fraternity. He expressed his appreciation to the Commission for its consideration of the designation.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to designate 3637 Locust Street to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Heller-Batzer seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

6214 Grays Avenue, Our Lady of Loreto Roman Catholic Church

Archdiocese of Philadelphia, Owner

DATE: 1938, Petrillo and Neely, architects

The Committee unanimously recommended designation.

Ms. Spina gave an illustrated presentation explaining that the building is a unique and complete example of the Moderne Style. The streamlined building is an extremely rare example of this style used for a church building. Constructed in 1938 in Southwest Philadelphia, the building is named after the patron saint of aviators and features murals and decoration replete with flying machines. The façade is constructed of cast stone and has a tile mural imported from Italy. The church is the work of the Philadelphia firm of Frank Petrillo and Richard Ross Neely, which designed mostly commercial and residential buildings. The building meets criteria a, c, d, h and j of the ordinance.

Kevin Boyle, counsel for the archdiocese, attended the meeting. He said that this parish has suffered from a dwindling population and the church will be closed July 2003. He stated that the archdiocese is not against preservation; however, it believes it carries an unfair burden, because all parishes have a unique history and under this ordinance could be designated. The archdiocese believes that the windows and religious artifacts belong to the church, raising the issue of the separation of church and state. Mr. Boyle told the Commissioners that the archdiocese believes that it is not proper for a church to come before a public governing body for permission to operate or dispose of its own property. Mr. Boyle said that the school is owned and operated by the School District of Philadelphia. The District has right of refusal to purchase the church and it might not want to operate in a building with religious artifacts and designs. He reiterated that he strongly disagrees with the designation and recommended the tabling of the designation for six months.

Mr. Sklaroff commented that Mr. Boyle raised serious issues; however, the basic thrust of the designation is the historical preservation merits of the church. He also thought that provisions should be worked out to preserve treasures. Mr. Tissan inquired if the designation is delayed, how would this impact the removal of the artifacts. Mr. Wilds asked if the church could be sold. Mr. Boyle responded that if the school district chooses not to exercise its option, then it could be sold to another church.

Monsignor Louis A. D'Addezio said that his office was established to stop the flow of religious artifacts into non-secular establishments. He described the Ecclesiastical Exchange, which salvages religious artifacts for re-use in other church locations. Monsignor D'Addezio said that it is the church's practice to remove all Catholic identity from the parish, such as the cross at the top of the church. He opined that this could conflict with the Historical Commission's policy.

Mr. Sklaroff said that the interior contents of the church are beyond the Commission's jurisdiction; however, the stained glass windows could be an issue. He opined that it is the intent of the Commission to be sensitive to the archdiocese. He said that the designation would not stop the sale or reuse of the building or consideration of the issuance of permits for alterations to the building.

Michael Stern, the preparer of the nomination, has worked with congregations of all faiths for the possible reuse of ecclesiastical architecture. He said that this is a unique church, for its architecture and has added significance since the immigrants raised the money to build it. He believes that the designation is appropriate.

Jason Mango, sexton for the church, asked that this important landmark in the Southwest community be designated. He said that he would not like to see the church taken apart piece by piece.

Anna Marie Horan said that she believes that the exterior of the building should be preserved. Since the parishioners initially paid for the windows, she would not like to see the church receive additional money for the windows. She stressed that the church is worthy of designation. Ms. Horan commented on the interior artifacts, which were previously thrown in the trash, which lessens her trust in the archdiocese's processes.

Andres Perez, Commissioner of Public Property, asked the Monsignor if in rare instances, the artifacts are demolished. Monsignor responded that the unused artifacts are professionally stored as well as photographed. In response to Ms. Horan's distress about the trashed artifacts, the Monsignor said that the artifacts were thrown away without the knowledge of the archdiocese.

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance, said that the Alliance supports the designation of this church, which is a unique example of architecture. He pointed out that the designation applies to the exterior of the building, which should not inhibit the sale of the property. He thought that the mural and windows are encompassed in the designation.

Mr. Wilds asked if those in attendance who support the designation would raise their hands; about 25 persons did so. In addition, some one hundred and fifty letters and a petition with four hundred signatures were received in support of the designation. Ms. Smyler remarked that the Commission should focus on the designation purely for the architectural merits. Mr. Steinberg concurred. Mr. Sklaroff commented on a book entitled Icons and Aliens, which discusses historic preservation and the relationship between familiar treasures of the built environment and the psychological well-being of the community.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to designate 6214 Grays Avenue, Our Lady of Loreto Church to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Heller-Batzer seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

114-120 North 2nd Street

National Products, Incorporated, Linda Levin, Owner
The Committee unanimously recommended rescission.

Ms. Spina gave a presentation and explained that these three properties are vacant lots; the historic buildings were burned in an arson fire in 1998. The staff signed the demolition permits for the buildings after the Department of Licenses and Inspections deemed them Imminently Dangerous. As a result of the proposed Old City Historic District, the lots may be re-listed at a later date.

Mr. Wilds asked when the designation notice letters for the proposed historic district would be mailed to property owners. Ms. Spina said that the letters should be mailed some time in the spring. Mr. Sklaroff asked about the significance of the rescission of the designation. It was noted that the rescission of this designation would give the owner relief from the Commission's processes for several months.

Brett Feldman, counsel for the owner, believes that the Commission should not have jurisdiction, because the properties currently are vacant lots. A developer is considering a new building for the site.

Commission members discussed at length the ramifications of not rescinding the designation, because it did not want to see the proposed development fail. Mr. Tyler clarified the Rules and Regulations for the rescission of a property. If the current vacant status remains upon designation of the proposed district, then the Commission would only have review and comment of the new construction. Commission members commented that this property was not designated in conjunction with the National Products building.

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance, said that this is an extenuating circumstance. Since the Old City nomination is imminent, he believes that the Commission should continue its jurisdiction over the property with the designation remaining in place.

Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association, remarked that the Association has not taken a position on this matter. He said that if the property is allowed to be de-designated the owner could construct a building before the creation of the historic district, which would not meet the Commission's approval.

Mr. Sklaroff reiterated the workload put upon the Commission's staff in the creation of new districts. Mr. Sugrue expressed concern in putting so much emphasis on a new district, which is only speculation at this point.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation for the rescission of 114-120 North 2nd Street. Mr. Brown seconded the motion which carried with 7 votes. Mr. Sugrue and Mr. Sklaroff dissented.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 28 January 2003
Suzanne Pentz, Acting-Chair

613-621 Catharine Street

United Communities Southeast Philadelphia, Owner
Shaffer Group Incorporated, Applicant

DATE: c. 1838

PROPOSAL: Partial demolition, rehabilitation and new construction in concept
The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept of the proposal.

The Committee recommended denial of the first submission, asking for a revised site plan that would allow the view of the historic building from Catharine Street. The Commission received a revised proposal that moved the driveway to the west, in front of the historic building. However, that plan only had a 37-foot opening for a view to the historic building. At the Commission meeting, members asked the developer to remove two houses in order to maintain the presence of the historic building from Catharine Street.

The revised submission eliminated one house, but still has one house on the 619 Catharine Street property (four total along Catharine Street). The view of the historic building is still partially obstructed.

Ms. Spina explained the revised proposal and noted that the renderings presented are from the side not dead on.

William G. Schwartz, counsel for the developer, said that the elimination of two townhouses would result in the project failing. In addition, he reiterated that the threat of unauthorized persons using the open space is a real issue.

Tom Kirk, 623 Catharine Street, stated that he supports the project with as many houses as possible. He believes that the development will enhance the neighborhood.

Karen Faul, who lives directly across the street, is in favor of two townhouses eliminated, and believes that as much open space as possible should be retained. In addition, she said that since the property is now in private hands, the public view is even more important.

Grey Cecil, 623 Catharine Street, believes that the proposed view corridor is sufficient.

Mr. Baron expressed concern about the construction of the rear walls on the Marshall Street facade. Mr. Steinberg commented that the doors on this facade should perhaps copy the doors on the front facade. Mr. Sklaroff stressed that the removal of two townhouses is important because the view corridor should be respected and not sacrificed.

William Alesker, the architect, remarked that he restudied the proposal and that the removal of three houses creates a void in defining the space. However, the elimination of one house still keeps the view corridor, therefore he believes that the revised submission is better.

Mr. Schwartz argued that ten additional feet does not make such a large difference but that the more compelling issue should be security. He requested that the Commission table the proposal for thirty days. Commission members did not agree. Mr. Schwartz asked that the application be withdrawn. Mr. Sklaroff said that the Commission would vote on the motion which was on the table.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion which failed with only 2 votes. Mr. Steinberg, Ms. Heller-Batzer, Mr. Wilds, Mr. James, Mr. Brown and Mr. Sklaroff opposed the motion.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve in concept the development of the site with the rehabilitation of the historic building, nine townhouses along the rear of the property and three townhouses along Catharine Street on the former lot of 611 Catharine Street. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Sugrue dissented.

2220 Brandywine Street

Fern Polaski, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Legalize roof decks

The applicant requested a one-month continuance.

1608 Mt. Vernon Street

Michael Fuchs, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Revised façade rehabilitation

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

The front façade of this building needed structural repairs in the upper stories. The Commission previously approved the rebuilding of the façade. Through the course of construction, the masonry subcontractor had a dispute with the contractor and destroyed over half of the historic bricks and all of the marble lintels and sills. The contractor tried to salvage older bricks from other buildings, but could not recover enough for the entire façade. The owners have since changed contractors and the new contractor wishes to finish rebuilding the façade with new bricks and to install marble lintels that are only 2 inches deep (with a 2-inch backing of limestone or steel) rather than the historic dimension of 4 inches.

The Commission concurred with the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

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

829 North 29th Street

Robert Ryan, Equitable owner

William Alesker, Owner/Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1874

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation and addition in concept

The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept with the addition of more dormers on the addition pursuant to Standard 9.

This application in concept calls for a three-story addition along the rear of the building to convert this building to apartments on the upper floors. To make this narrow building feasible for apartments, the addition will house the stairwells. Entrances to the individual units will be through the new construction. The addition will differ from the historic building by having stucco walls and a standing-seam metal mansard roof. The historic rear wall will remain at the first two floors, with the current window openings cut down into doors, but the cornice, mansard and dormers along the entire rear façade would be demolished.

Mr. Steinberg expressing concern with the change in material, he asked if the proposed mansard roof would mimic the historic features. Ms. Spina noted that the proposed standing seam roof would differentiate the mansard so as not to mimic the historic feature. In addition, she said that the window treatments have a different shape, with details forthcoming.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the proposal in concept. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1701, 1703 and 1705 North Street

Sean Trainor, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1701 and 1705: 2002, 1703: c. 1875

PROPOSAL: Rear decks

The Architectural Committee recommended approval pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

The owner wishes to install rear decks at the second floor of these houses. Double-leaf sliding glass doors will lead out to the decks. Once the planned construction along North 17th Street occurs, the rears of these houses will no longer remain visible.

Commission members agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Brown made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

1901 Walnut Street

Firsttrust Bank, Owner

Robert Rabinowitz, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: 1926, McLanahan & Bencker, architects

PROPOSAL: Alter storefront, install glass enclosure

The applicant withdrew the proposal.

1428-34 Chestnut Street aka 111-15 South 15th Street

111 South 15th Street Associates, LP, Owners

Victor Antes, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1922, Ritter & Shay, architects

PROPOSAL: Awnings, canopy, rooftop decks, new paving, new doors

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the following:

- 1. Approval of the service door on the Sansom Street façade;*
- 2. Approval of new doors with bronze frames on the 15th Street façade;*
- 3. Approval at the 24th floor changing windows to multi-paned wood doors with transoms;*
- 4. Approval of cutting down windows into doors and roof deck with a metal railing at the 26th floor;*
- 5. Approval of new sidewalk paving and planters;*
- 6. Approval of the legalization of the removal of the cooling tower;*
- 7. Approval of the canopy, and*
- 8. Approval of the awning with a skirt and positioned below the transom bars.*
With the staff to review all details.

This application has a number of parts. For the 15th Street elevation, the owner wishes to install awnings at each window and a wrought-iron canopy over the entrance doors. The awnings have open sides and start at the transom bars. The owner wants the awnings to provide signage for the building. The canopy will have a glass roof and its pattern is influenced by the iron details on the original gates on Chestnut Street. Also, the application includes new frame-less sliding glass doors.

On the Sansom Street elevation, the application calls for an awning over the doors leading to the office space on the lower floors. The revised first floor plan requires an additional service door.

The plan includes a new double-leaf service door next to the existing double-leaf service door.

The upper floors have the typical setbacks found on high-rise buildings of this period. At the 24th floor some of the windows had been changed to doors in the past. The application calls for changing all of the windows to multi-paned, wood doors with transoms, leading out to the rooftop balcony. Frosted, tempered glass panels will separate the individual units along the balcony. The 26th floor will feature common space. Here, the application includes cutting down windows into doors and creating an outdoor deck. The railing of the parapet does not meet code, so the application includes a metal railing installed on the inside of the parapet wall.

The proposal also includes new sidewalk paving and planters along Chestnut, 15th and Sansom Streets and the legalization of the removal of the cooling tower structure.

Victor Antes, the architect, said that the existing bollards would remain with the replication of new bollards where needed; however, the planters are a new feature. He stated that the Center City Residents' Association has not seen the proposed plans.

Mr. Wilds pointed out that radical changes have already been allowed to this building. Mr. Sugrue thought that the proposed canopy mimics historic features and its massing is too large. Mr. Steinberg concurred and believes that the canopy should be redesigned and decreased by a third in size. Mr. Wilds cited the canopy on City Hall Annex, which takes a modern approach. Mr. Antes pointed out that the canopy would provide coverage at the entrance. In addition, it is intended to provide prominence and enhancement to the building.

Robert Powers, historic consultant, cited the canopy at the Phoenix, which is comparable but with a flatter design.

Mr. Wilds noted that the proposed canopy is 9 x 6 feet, and inquired about justification for its intrusion on the sidewalk and its close proximity to the bollards. Most of the members concurred that the scale of the canopy is overwhelming and the applicant should consider a reduction in its size. It thought that it should be reduced by a third, since the plans show it in thirds. Mr. Sklaroff recommended that the canopy not exceed 7 ½ feet. Mr. Steinberg believed that more details about the attachment should be submitted. Mr. Grasso said that the canopy would be attached inside the arched entryway by the cutting the stone on the arch, not into the metal spandrel. Members agreed that the staff could review the details of the attachment.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation with the canopy projecting no more than 7 ½ feet. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion which carried with 7 votes. Mr. Steinberg dissented. Ms. Heller-Batzer abstained.

1717 Pine Street

Rick Tullio, Owner

Frank Kakos, Architect/Owner

DATE: 1914, new façade, Henon & Boyle, architects

PROPOSAL: New steps, railing, alterations to doorway

The Architectural Committee was split in its recommendation. Two members agreed with the staff recommendation. Two members recommended approval of a modification to the steps provided that the remainder of the façade is retained.

This application proposes installing new front steps with a landing and railing at the Georgian Revival row house at 1717 Pine Street. The installation would require a change in sill height, which would, in turn, require alterations to the doorway. The extant single step would be

removed and limestone steps with two treads as well as a landing would be installed. The steps would be oriented perpendicular to the front façade, changing the path to and from the doorway. The landing and steps would be 7' by 3'-8" and would rise 1'-7" above the sidewalk. A painted, steel railing with simple balusters and balls on the newel posts would run along the landing and down the steps. The connection of the railing to the front façade is not detailed. The railing should not mount to the limestone watertable. The original door would be repositioned higher in the doorway. The transom would be reduced in size to accommodate the relocated door. The original transom frame would be reused, but its height would be reduced. The original transom bar would be reused if possible. If not, a new transom bar to match the existing would be fabricated. The existing metal security grille would be removed from the door. The application does not specify whether an existing oil fill pipe in the front façade would be repositioned. If it is, it should be moved in a way that protects the limestone watertable.

Frank Kakos, the architect, and Rick Tullio, the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Kakos said that the owner believes that visually the present condition is very weak. It is the owner's belief that the proposed alterations will give presence to the entrance, as well as eliminating the trash, which collects in the corner.

Mr. Wilds questioned the alterations to the transom in relation to the floor height of the interior and it was noted that on the interior exists a vestibule with two steps. Mr. Wilds opined that the existing conditions should remain. Mr. James inquired about the number of houses on the block with similar steps. Mr. Steinberg thought the proposed alterations radically change the façade. Mr. Sklaroff remarked that this façade was rebuilt in 1914 with the existing features.

Mr. James made a motion to deny the application. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion which carried with 6 votes. Ms. Heller-Batzer, Mr. Tissian and Mr. Perri dissented.

1929 Sansom Street

Project H.O.M.E., Owner

Sarina Rose, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1925, Arthur L. Harson, architect

PROPOSAL: Awning on 20th Street

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the revised shed-type design lowered to a height above the top of the door.

This proposal calls for an awning at the handicap entrance on 20th Street. The proposal offers three different versions. The first, the one the owner prefers, is a semi-circular canvas awning. The other two versions copy the canopy at the police station on the same façade; one spans the entire storefront and the other sits over the door only. At the Committee meeting the applicant submitted a revised cloth awning in a shed-type design.

Commission members concurred with the Committee's approval of the revised design.

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

226 South 16th Street

Allan Domb Real Estate, Owner

Gordon Fluke, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1929-30, Grant Simon, architect

PROPOSAL: Alter parapet at 18th floor

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal as submitted or an alternate design with continuous glass.

This application returns to Committee and Commission as requested. At the 18th floor, the architect proposes to lower the parapet wall and coping to 30 inches. To bring the railing to the 42 inches required by code, the proposal includes glass panels set into channels in the coping, topped by metal rails.

The Commission asked the applicant to clarify his preferred choice of material for the railing. In response, Gordon Fluke, the architect said that a metal railing with capping glass panels is preferred.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

City Hall, Broad and Market Streets

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Nan Gutterman, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1871-1901, John McArthur, architect

PROPOSAL: Bird netting

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the project as proposed pursuant to Standard 7 [Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.] and Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.]

The Committee and Commission approved bird netting on the columns and pediments of the pavilions and central portals in the past. However, birds are congregating on the windowsills and meeting rails as well. This application calls for bird netting on the windows of the pavilions and the central portals. An example of the netting is already installed on the northeast pavilion.

Mr. Brown made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Heller-Batzer seconded the motion which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Steinberg abstained.

200 South Broad Street, Palm Restaurant

Bellevue Associates, Owner

A. Robert Torres, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1902-1913, G.W. and W.D. Hewitt, architects

PROPOSAL: Signage

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the exterior sign as proposed pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and suggested an interior sign, behind the transom, at the same location.

This application proposes installing a 41" diameter back-lit circular logo sign for the Palm Restaurant in the Bellevue Hotel building at 200 S. Broad Street. The aluminum sign would mount on an extant transom on the Broad Street façade of the building. This transom, the furthest north in the restaurant, is the only one without leaded glass. It would stand 8" in front of the

window and would attach with 4 bolts to the transom's wood frame. It would be dark bronze in color with ivory push-through acrylic graphics.

The applicant submitted a revised proposal for an interior, illuminated sign. Some Commission members believed that this dignified building already has too much signage.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Brown seconded the motion which failed with 4 votes. Mr. Perri, Mr. Tissian, Mr. Wilds, Mr. James and Ms. Heller-Batzer dissented.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the revised sign design. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion which carried with 6 votes. Mr. Sugrue and Mr. Steinberg dissented. Mr. James abstained.

1617 John F. Kennedy Boulevard, Suburban Station

Suburban Station Associates, Owner

Nayan Shah, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1930, Graham Anderson Probst & White, architects

PROPOSAL: New doors, signage

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the project with the 3M Scotchcal ElectroCut Crystal window film, blended sidewalk, revolving door (alternate#2) and signage as proposed.

This application proposes new doors and signage for a pharmacy at the corner of 17th Street and JFK Boulevard in the Suburban Station building. At its August 2002 meeting, the Commission reviewed a similar application for this site. Included in that application were a revolving door on JFK Boulevard and an automatic sliding door, ramp, and transom box sign on 17th Street. The Commission approved the application with the condition that the proposed plastic face of the box sign be replaced with a metal face with plastic lettering. The current application includes a ramp (previously approved), an automatic swinging door, and a transom box sign (previously approved) at the 17th Street entrance and an automatic sliding door (alternate 1) or a revolving door (alternate 2, previously approved) at the JFK Boulevard entrance. It also includes signage at all 17th Street and JFK Boulevard windows, none of which has been approved. On the 17th Street façade, 3M Panaflex film with the Walgreens logo would be applied to several windows, an unspecified "Hallmark" sign would be mounted behind a storefront window near the door, and the previously mentioned box sign would be mounted in the transom above the door. On the JFK Boulevard façade, 3M Panaflex film with the Walgreens logo would be applied to several windows, a second unspecified "Hallmark" sign as well as a large neon mortar and pestle would be mounted behind storefront windows, and several red neon signs would be mounted in the transoms behind the glass.

After looking at photographs of the proposed location, Mr. Tissian inquired if all the existing signage had been approved. All signage was installed prior to designation of the building.

Jerry Roller, the architect, commented that the signage is necessary to create a viable commercial property in this location.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Brown seconded the motion which carried with 6 votes. Mr. James, Mr. Sugrue and Mr. Steinberg dissented.

1225 Pine Street

Robert Epstein, Owner

Arlene Matzkin, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Enlarge rear dormer

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the project as proposed.

This application proposes enlarging the rear dormer and adding a rear balcony on the rowhouse at 1225 Pine Street. The new dormer would extend almost the entire width of the house and would include two sets of double-leaf doors opening onto a shallow balcony. The new dormer and balcony would be minimally visible from S. Camac Street between Pine and Panama Streets.

Mr. Sklaroff cited another property with a similar proposal, which was denied. He opined that the removal of historic fabric from this 1830s house is not a good precedent for the Commission to establish. Mr. Steinberg commented that the necessitation for more space in this small house could be balanced with a sensitive conversion. Mr. Sugrue concurred and pointed out that the façade has already been altered.

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

911-13 Clinton Street

Michael Carosella, Owner

David Amburn, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1835-1843

PROPOSAL: Front façade rehabilitation, elevator tower, decks, new windows and doors at rear
The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal, with the inclusion of site plans for the air conditioning units, pursuant to Standard 9, with the staff to review details.

This application proposes the conversion of four Clinton Street row houses into a residential complex with 15 condominiums. The front façades, which retain their original fabric, would be cleaned and repaired. The details of this work can be reviewed at the staff level. A great number of changes are proposed for the rear facades, which face onto Cypress Street and are minimally visible from 9th and 10th Streets. The 900 block of Cypress Street is a service alley populated by fences, garages, and secondary facades. No buildings front onto Cypress Street. The alterations would include the demolition of a 1-story garage addition at 911 and a wall at 917 as well as the construction of a large elevator tower, rooftop additions, a garage addition. Changes would also include a door enlargement and the lowering of a section of roof. Nine decks, seven doors, four windows, two garage doors, and three gates would be added. Seven windows would be converted into doors. Two doors would be converted into windows. Ten windows and two other openings would be partially or fully infilled or blocked. Scant details have been provided. Details including materials, colors, and configurations of new doors, garage doors, windows, railings, and gates must be provided for review.

Proposed alterations to 911 Clinton Street:

- demolish a 1-story garage building at the rear for 2-car parking pad
- partially infill three window openings on east façade of rear ell
- convert door into window on east facade of rear ell
- add deck on rear addition at 2nd-story level and convert window into door
- add deck on rear ell at 4th-story level and convert dormer window into door
- add deck at rear of rear ell at 2nd-story level and add new double-leaf door on east façade of 913
- add deck at rear of rear ell at 3rd-story level and convert window into door
- add single-leaf steel gate at rear

Proposed alterations to 913 Clinton Street:

- add deck on rear ell at 4th-story level and convert window into door
- raise part of roof at rear ell
- build addition on roof at rear ell
- partially infill two windows at 3rd-story level
- infill one window on west façade of rear ell
- add door on west façade of rear ell
- block two windows from the inside on the west façade of the rear ell
- install new sliding doors in existing openings on west façade of rear ell
- infill opening at north façade of rear ell
- add garage door in north façade of rear ell

Proposed alterations to 915 Clinton Street:

- partially infill two windows at 3rd-story level
- lower sill height and enlarge door on east façade of rear ell
- cut new window on east façade of rear ell
- convert door into window on east façade of rear ell
- add new single-leaf door on east façade of rear ell
- add deck railing in eight openings at 2nd and 3rd-story levels of rear ell
- add deck railing at 4th-story level of rear ell
- add 1-story extension and garage door to rear ell for garage

Proposed alterations to 917 Clinton Street:

- demolish a brick wall along Cypress Street and create a 2-car parking pad
- add deck on rear ell at 4th-story level and convert window into door
- add deck at 3rd-story level of north façade of rear ell and convert window into door
- add deck at 2nd-story level of north façade of rear ell and add double-leaf doors on west façade of rear ell at 915
- infill large porch at north façade of rear ell
- partially infill opening at west façade of rear ell and add triple window
- convert window into door on west façade of rear ell
- lower roof for deck at 4th-story level on rear ell and add pair of double-leaf doors on west façade of rear ell at 915
- add single-leaf steel gate at rear

Other proposed alterations:

- add 4-story elevator tower in shared side yard between 913 and 915
- add double-leaf steel gate in shared side yard between 913 and 915

Mr. Sklaroff inquired if the facades would change as a result of the proposed alterations. Mr. Farnham responded that the Clinton Street façade would be restored to its historic feature, which is a pure restoration, and it could be reviewed at staff level. Mr. Wilds asked whether both Clinton Street as well as Cypress Street would be the primary entrance, and if the decks would have visibility. Mr. Sklaroff also inquired about the removal of historic fabric.

David Amburn, the architect, said that the property presently is a boarding house and would be converted to a 13-unit building with all entrances on the Clinton Street façade. He noted that the existing bricks are in good condition and that the only new portion would be the elevator tower, which would be extended into the courtyard. He has agreed to work with the staff for guidance for the best solution for the new structure, whether three or four stories, which would be located between the rear ells. Mr. Amburn emphasized that the sills would be removed; however, the windows would be replicated as they now exist. He also said that the proposed deck's placement

in the courtyard would limit visibility.

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

315-19 Arch Street

Philadelphia Management Company, Owner

Andrew Hamilton, Applicant

DATE: 1916,, Sauer & Hahn, architects

PROPOSAL: Projecting sign

The Architectural Committee recommended approval provided that the applicant redesign the lower mounting bracket, realigning the bolts horizontally, with the staff to review details.

This application proposes signage for the *dane decor* store on the first floor of the Schmidt Building at 315-319 Arch Street. This application is limited to the signage labeled sign D in the elevation drawing titled "exterior signage." Signs A, B, and C have been approved at the staff level. The type D sign, with the store's name, would consist of a fabric banner with applied red and white vinyl lettering and an aluminum mounting system. The sign would be mounted at the top to the brick façade and at the bottom to a joint in the terra cotta storefront. The third, top arm of the bottom mounting brackets can be deleted from the design if necessary without compromising the structural stability.

The applicant submitted a revised proposal, which reflects the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

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

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Vice-chair, Mr. Sugrue.

121-35 Walnut Street, NE corner of 2nd Street

Renaissance Properties, Incorporated, Owner

Richard Thom, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 121-25: 1830s; 127: between 1796-1835, new façade – c. 1875; 129-35: 1961

PROPOSAL: Final approval of addition and rehabilitation

The Architectural Committee recommended final approval of the project as revised, pursuant to Standards 5,6, and 9.

This development returns to the Committee and Commission for final approval for the rehabilitation of the buildings along Walnut Street and the new construction at the rear. Overall, the historic buildings will be cleaned, the bricks spot-pointed, and the cast iron repainted.

On 121 Walnut Street the storefront with the stained-glass transoms will be kept and all of the windows on the upper floors will have six-over-six, true-divided light windows. The drawings show louvered shutters on the second floor, but paneled on the third & fourth. On the east façade, the fire-escape will be removed and the doors changed to windows with infill below.

123 Walnut Street will have new six-over-six windows and paneled shutters on the second floor. The storefront will remain, but the door will be replaced with a glazed and paneled door.

The first floor of 125 Walnut Street will be altered. The vestibule that exists does not meet ADA

requirements. The proposal calls for rebuilding the vestibule slightly larger to accommodate a wheelchair. The now missing historic wrought iron canopy will be reconstructed in fiberglass with internally illuminated stained glass panels. The new design is based on historic photographs. A roof deck will be installed on the rear.

The cast-iron building at 127 will have the most changes. The proposal calls for repairing the cast iron; however, the abacus details at the 2nd floor are beyond repair. These elements will be reconstructed in fiberglass to match the originals. Floors 3, 4, and 5 may have had wood casement windows originally, but non-historic aluminum double-hung windows and infill were installed a number of years ago. The proposal includes new, wood double-hung windows at these floors. Also, the top of the window opening at the 5th floor had a cast iron band with a central rosette. The proposed design is to install a two-light transom in its place. The proposal also calls for new double-hung windows installed in the side elevations. The rear will also receive a roof deck.

Only two changes will occur on 129-35: the paneled door will become glazed to match the sidelights and a dormer will be installed on the west elevation in the rear addition.

The new construction consists of a seven-story addition at the rear of the property. The facades will have brick panels interspersed with terra cotta colored stucco panels. Grey concrete spandrels will divide the floors. The windows will be aluminum and many will have aluminum balconettes. The main entrance on 2nd Street will have multi-light aluminum doors.

Mr. Wilds inquired if six-over-six windows existed historically, and the reason for not replacing the band on the exterior of 127 Walnut Street. Richard Thom, the architect, responded that it is a reasonable assumption that six-over-six windows existed historically and agreed to replace the band. Mr. Wilds inquired if the proposed deck on this property is visible, Mr. Thom said that the deck has since been deleted from the proposal. Mr. Steinberg commented that the proposed development has been very well executed.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation for final approval, with the staff to review details. Mr. Brown seconded the motion which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

7500 Germantown Avenue, Wingohocking Hall

New Covenant Church, Owner

Van B. Strother, Applicant

DATE:1890-92, Wilson Brothers, architects

PROPOSAL: Addition, elevator tower and skylights in concept

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the additions on the hypens with a modified design and the elevator tower pursuant to Standards.9 and 10. It recommended denial of the roof replacement and the skylights as submitted pursuant to Standards 5 and 6.

This application is for the conversion of Wingohocking Hall of the Pennsylvania School for the Deaf to senior housing for the New Covenant Church. This building sits near the rear of the property along West Gowen Street and has three parallel 4½ -story sections connected at the middle with hyphens, which are three stories high.

The western, 3-story hyphen will receive an addition to bring it to the full height of the rest of the building. The original proposal called for windows that match the rest of the section and

clapboarding. PHMC reviewed the project for tax credits and asked for the addition to be glazed instead.

The property requires an elevator to all floors, so the application calls for installing an elevator tower on the rear of the eastern hyphen. This addition will have brick facing, but no windows or articulation. The treatment on the northern façade will match the work on the western hyphen.

The proposal also calls for removing the slate roof and installing asphalt shingles, but lacks details about the shingle type. Also, the plans include the installation of 25 skylights throughout the building, but no details are included. The floor plans show units at this fifth floor level, but the only source of light and air will be the skylights. The roof is steeply pitched so the skylights will be highly visible.

Ms. Spina presented the application. Mr. Steinberg thought that the skylights could be done sensitively.

Van Strother, the applicant, said that the proposed project of converting a vacant building into senior citizen housing is under time constraints and needs to commence within the next 60 days. Chris Frey, the historical preservation consultant, was hired to work with the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission as well as the National Park Service to achieve a design, which meets with their approval. Bonnie Wilkinson, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, did not take exception to the skylights. Mr. Strother said that the skylights are needed for the bedrooms on the upper floor. There are 25 skylights proposed.

Mr. Sklaroff inquired if the skylight's visibility would effect the roof's slope, since they are not situated behind the chimneys and if the removal of the slate roof is prompted by the installation of the skylights. In response Mr. Strother said that the slate in the valley with flashing is failing and the insulating of the rafters will further deteriorate the slate. He commented that a slate-line shingle is proposed with the depth, texture and profile of the existing slate. It was pointed out that the skylights are only visible from Gowen Street. Ms. Spina said that the drawings show skylights on the front hip of the roof. Commission members noted that they should be tinted to match the shingles. Mr. Baron noted the revised design on top of the hyphens because the Pennsylvania Historical Commission thought that the glazing on the hyphens should be eliminated and it should be stuccoed to match the stone. Mr. Sklaroff noted that the hyphen's design in particular may evolve and said that the approval would be made with the trust that the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission would be sensitive to the historic structure.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to accept the revised proposal, including the replacement of the slate roof in asphalt and the installation of 25 skylights, with the staff to review details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

108-10 Levering Street

Levering Street Associates, Owner

Melissa Cooke, Applicant

DATE: c. 1885

PROPOSAL: Rooftop telecommunication equipment

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal as submitted, but offered the applicant suggestions for an alternate location, pursuant to Standard 9: [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and

massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

The application proposes the installation of telecommunications equipment on the rooftop of the Archview Apartment building at 108-110 Levering Street in Manayunk. The installation would consist of two primary units, a 14'-8" tall antenna pole and a set of equipment cabinets hidden behind a wooden stockade fence. The fenced cabinets would be located on the roof of the 3-story section along the Gay Street façade. The fence would be 8' tall and enclose a 17'-11" by 31'-2" area. Two safety lights and a GPS antenna would rise from within the fenced area above the level of the fence. The large, 4'-square antenna pole enclosing six antennas would be located on the roof of the 4-story section of the building near the Levering Street façade. The pole would be disguised as a chimney. Cable trays painted to match their surroundings would run up from the ground on the façade, to the equipment cabinets, across the roof, up the secondary façade, and to the antenna. The Bureau for Historic Preservation has conducted a Section 106 review of the project and concluded that it would have no effect on historic and archaeological resources.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal and said that he and Mr. Baron made a site visit and determined that the antennas are highly visible. He also said that the mounting beams would be visible directly above the cornice. Mr. Sugrue inquired about the fencing. It was noted that it would be wood with a flat top. Mr. Wilds expressed dismay at the State's comment that the proposed antennas would not have any affect on the historic resource.

Neil Sklaroff, counsel for the project, said that the eighteen-inch mounting beam which the staff saw at its site visit, has been redesigned to minimize visibility. The equipment has been redesigned smaller and would be set back from the Gay Street facade. The cabinet to conceal the equipment has been redesigned to a non-descript flat wood, which can be painted a possible city lights color, which will fade into its surroundings. Mr. Sklaroff noted that the installation of the fence and faux chimney with faux walls to hide the antennas was the result of earlier negotiations with the State.

Mr. Sugrue asked about the cable tray on the facade and noted that the antennas are very large and problematic. Mr. Sklaroff said that it could not be put on the interior, but suggested putting it on the return. In relation to the cable on the return, Mr. Wilds inquired if the tray could intervene on another property. Mr. Sklaroff said that other locations have been explored; however, this is the only location, which would keep the antennas to a minimal length.

Mr. Tyler remarked that the faux chimney is inappropriate. Mr. Baron said that telecommunications sometimes co-locate, which increase the number of installations on a building. Mr. Sklaroff responded that in order to co-locate, the antennas need to be at least ten-feet apart and the roof structure could not sustain the additional weight. Mr. Steinberg inquired if there is an overall policy with regards to the installation of antennas and it was noted that there is no overall comprehensive policy because there are few applications. Mr. James said that this proposal is a modest application which cannot be modified, and that the antennas will be visible. He said that because it was previously a factory, then chases should exist and asked if the platform was needed. In response to Mr. Tissian's query about how this building was selected, Mr. Sklaroff explained that it was selected owing to its height and structure.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation and approve the revised proposal with the elimination of the faux chimney, subject to removal of all equipment when it becomes obsolete, with the staff to review details. Mr. Perri seconded the motion which carried with 7 votes. Mr. Wilds dissented. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

724-26 Pine Street

Lisa Roberts, Owner

John H. Cluver, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1830; 724 Pine altered c. 1930; 726 Pine altered c. 1940

PROPOSAL: Façade rehabilitation, new windows and doors

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the following:

1. *Approval of the restoration of the front facades as submitted with the elimination of the portico;*
 2. *Approval of the windows as submitted, subject to painting the exterior, and*
 3. *Approval of the redesigned addition at 721 Addison Street.*
- It recommended that the applicant work with staff to develop the railing details, with the staff to review all details of the proposal.*

At its June 2001 meeting, the Commission approved in concept an application for properties at 724 and 726 Pine Street as well as 721 and 723 Addison Street. The application proposed the removal of stucco on the front façade of 724 Pine, the removal of the twentieth-century brick façade on 726 Pine, and the reconstruction of both facades to their 1830 appearances but with an added portico that never existed. It also proposed demolition and new construction at the rears of the Pine Street properties and alterations to 723 Addison Street as well as new construction at 721 Addison. At its September 2002 meeting, the Commission gave final approval to all aspects of the project except the Pine façade restoration. This application proposes the rehabilitation of the front facades at 724 and 726 Pine Street. Also note that the façade at 721 Addison, which is new construction, has been changed from what was approved at the September 2002 meeting. The applicant has not specifically applied to the Commission for a review of this change to the design, but it should be reviewed as part of the current application.

At the 721 Addison Street façade, the previously approved design has been amended. The approved, pitched standing-seam roof has been replaced with a flat roof and parapet wall. Also the casement windows at the 2nd-story level have been reconfigured as a triple window and a metal railing has been added below the window. The remainder of the design is unchanged.

John Cluver, the architect, thought the portico's design is compatible with the proposed restoration of the facades. He presented a letter from the Society Hill Civic Association giving support to the portico. He agreed that the portico is a new element, but it would not effect the historic character of these buildings.

Mr. Sugrue inquired if 726 Pine is a ghost of the original and if the trim above the fanlight shows any indication that these properties were connected, therefore the accurate moldings should be restored. Mr. Baron stated that porticos do exist; however, not on a building of this style. He referenced an insurance survey for 724 Pine which indicates the design including the dormer, but mentions no portico. Mr. Steinberg thought that the design of the entrance should be contemporary and not mimic the historic features. Mr. Wilds said that these are two totally separate buildings and the portico will destroy the concept of individuality. Mr. Steinberg disagreed because he believes that expansion in the city should be allowed. Mr. Tyler opined that there is no basis historically for the portico. Mr. Wilds remarked that this is a prime block in the Society Hill Historical District, and the allowance of the portico would disguise the historic fabric. After a lengthy discussion, most of the Commission members concurred that the portico is inappropriate and an unnecessary addition, which changes the historic character.

David Seltzer, the owner, said that he has compromised with the staff on a majority of the controversial issues. He believes that it is important to the appearance that the houses read as one, which will enhance the facades.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted, except for the portico at the front

door. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried with 7 votes. Mr. Steinberg abstained. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

OLD BUSINESS

3224 Powelton Avenue

Ida Washington, Owner

R. J. Pisani, Applicant

DATE: c. 1880

PROPOSAL: Legalize rebuilt porch

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 6 and the entrance guideline.

This fall, Drexel University instituted Renaissance Day to help the Powelton Village neighborhood. The program included cleaning vacant lots and other activities to revitalize properties throughout the community. Without a permit or Historical Commission approval, volunteers rebuilt the porch shared by 3224-3226 Powelton Avenue. Several parts do not match those of the historic porch at the neighboring house, 3222 Powelton Avenue. The railings have a Classical profile, rather than the Queen Anne/Eastlake profile of the originals. The porch posts have turnings similar to the neighboring porch, but do not have striations and the top portions are not long enough to accommodate the historic brackets. The angle of the roof does not match the neighboring porch and the asphalt shingles should be three-dimensional to better mimic the slate that was used originally.

David Gentalli attended the meeting to explain the circumstances of the porch repair. He said that he was overseer of the students who performed the work. He was of the opinion that Drexel University who paid for the materials had acquired a permit. Mr. Gentalli said that one of the porches had totally collapsed. Mr. Sklaroff inquired about the ramifications of the denial of the proposal. Mr. Perri said that a violation was issued which will remain with the property until the violation is cured. Mr. Baron noted that neighboring houses were made to rebuild their porches when first done incorrectly. Mr. Sugrue commented that he is uncertain who is responsible, but the work was done absent a permit.

Mr. Gentalli said that he is willing to rebuild the porch to its correct specifications. Commission members thought that the matter should be tabled to allow Mr. Gentalli to confer with staff before proceeding to get guidance for the correct replication of the porch.

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

3226 Powelton Avenue

Bart Carprario, Owner

R. J. Pisani, Applicant

DATE: c. 1880

PROPOSAL: Legalize rebuilt porch

The Architectural Committee recommended Denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 6 and the entrance guideline.

This fall, Drexel University instituted Renaissance Day to help the Powelton Village neighborhood. The program included cleaning vacant lots and other activities to revitalize properties throughout the community. Without a permit or Historical Commission approval, volunteers rebuilt the porch shared by 3224-3226 Powelton Avenue. Several parts do not match the historic porch, which still exists on the neighboring house at 3222 Powelton Avenue. The railings have a Classical profile, rather than the Queen Anne/Eastlake profile of the originals. The porch posts have turnings similar to the neighboring porch, but do not have striations and the top portions are not long enough to accommodate the historic brackets. The angle of the roof does not match the neighboring porch and the asphalt shingles should be three-dimensional to better mimic the slate that was used originally.

David Gentalli attended the meeting to explain the circumstances of the porch repair. He said that he was overseer of the students who performed the work. He was of the opinion that Drexel University who paid for the materials had acquired a permit. Mr. Gentalli said that one of the porches had totally collapsed. Mr. Sklaroff inquired about the ramifications of the denial of the proposal. Mr. Perri said that a violation was issued which will remain with the property until the violation is cured. Mr. Baron noted that neighboring houses were made to rebuild their porches when first done incorrectly. Mr. Sugrue commented that he is uncertain who is responsible, but the work was done absent a permit.

Mr. Gentalli said that he is willing to rebuild the porch to its correct specifications. Commission members thought that the matter should be tabled to allow Mr. Gentalli to confer with staff before proceeding to get guidance for the correct replication of the porch.

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

2063 Brandywine Street

Jerel Hopkins and Tracy Shannon Hopkins, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Decks on 2nd and 3rd floor, conceptual review

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the deck on the rear ell and conceptual approval of the deck on the main building, with a twelve-foot setback at the front façade and a five-foot setback from the side façade. Subject to receipt and approval of scale drawings and details by the staff on Thursday, 1 August 2002. The recommendation would then be for final approval.

This application proposes the construction of two roof decks, one on the rear ell and one on the main body of the Italianate rowhouse at 2063 Brandywine Street. Both the main body and rear ell are highly visible from public rights-of-way because the rowhouse stands at a corner. At the August Commission meeting, the Commission tabled the proposal for a period not to exceed six months. It recommended that the applicants re-submit the proposal with detailed drawings of the upper deck.

Brett Feldman, Esq. attended the meeting to represent the owners.

Mr. Tissian thought that the Architectural Committee should review the revised design. Some Commission members questioned the proposed setback on the rear and accessibility to the roof deck. Mr. Feldman said that access to the roof deck would be acquired by means of a spiral

staircase. Mr. Wilds noted that the spiral staircase is very visible. Ms. Steinberg asked Commissioner Perri about the requirements for the allowance of the spiral staircase. Mr. Perri said that he believes that it is allowed for a single-family dwelling.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the deck on the rear ell, but denial of the roof deck on the main building and the spiral staircase. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMENT ON NATIONAL REGISTER

419 South 19th Street, Philadelphia School of Occupational Therapy, Medical Services Building

Mr. Tyler said that several aspects of the statement of significance for this building is its emphasis on its place in the extraordinary history of medicine and medical training in Philadelphia. From the 18th century to the present, this history includes important innovations and advances, as well as, particularly in the nineteenth century, quackery of the first order. In this historical context, the Philadelphia School of Occupational Therapy satisfies criterion A for listing on the National Register. The building, as architecture and the role of Georgina P. Yeatman in its design and the architectural profession in Philadelphia, meets criterion C.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to recommend this nomination for listing on the National Register for Historic Places. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

THE REPORT of the Activities of the Historical Commission staff, January 2003.
Mr. Tyler asked if members of the Commission had any questions about the report. There were none.

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to approve the expenditure of \$25.68 for the Architectural Committee lunches.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to approve the expenditure. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

In response to a question, Mr. Tyler gave an update on the current condition of the Naval Home; he reported that although the roof suffered damage, the main building is in sound condition.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Perri seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary

As corrected 3/03