

**THE MINUTES OF THE 410th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
9 October 1996**

**City Council Caucus, Room 401 City Hall
Wayne S. Spilove, Chair**

Present

Wayne S. Spilove, Chair
David Brownlee, Ph.D.
Duane Bumb, Deputy Director, Department of Commerce
Frances Egan, Commissioner, Department of Licenses and
Inspections
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
Arlene Matzkin
Michael Sklaroff, Esq.
Robert Vance, Chair, City Planning Commission
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing and Community Development
Caroline Wischmann
Stephanie Wolf, Ph.D.

Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer
Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Jeffrey R. Barr, Historic Preservation Technician
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Specialist

Also, with affiliation and/or project

Angelo Procaccino
Renato Russo
Stephen Kennerly, Stephen Kennerly Architects
James Kenkelen
Erik Schreiman
Frank Herz, Esq.
Bernard Nearey, Rittenhouse-Fitler District
Lolly LaGreca, Rittenhouse-Fitler District
Larry Snyder, Fairmount Park Historic Preservation Trust
Jane Jacobs, Rittenhouse-Fitler District
Pat Henningoen, Rittenhouse-Fitler District
Rhona Schreiman, Rittenhouse-Fitler District
Bobbie Burke, Preservation Alliance
Megan McCrea, Rittenhouse-Fitler District
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents Association
Wendy Rosen, Friends of Rittenhouse Square
Robert Thomas, Campbell-Thomas CTC

Wayne S. Spilove, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 410th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 10:05 A.M.

MINUTES of the 409th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission. Upon a motion made by Mr. Brownlee and duly seconded, the Commission unanimously approved the Minutes of the 409th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held on 11 September 1996, Wayne S. Spilove, Chair.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE REPORT, 24 September 1996,
Arlene Matzkin, Chair

Ms. Matzkin read the Committee's recommendations before the discussion of each proposal.

Mr. Spilove passed the gavel to Ms. Wolf, Vice-Chair, for the first proposal on the agenda.

135 South 18th Street

Rittenhouse Management Corporation, Owner

Adam Ritter, Applicant

DATE: 1913

PROPOSAL: Awning, new door

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of a barrel-type awning and approval of the door.

Ms. Matzkin explained that while the Committee usually does not approve the barrel-type style, it believed that consistency of awning types on the building's facade was important. The owner did not object to the barrel-type awning, acknowledging that he would keep the existing framework. Mr. Tyler noted that the work, replacement-in-kind, conforms to the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards*.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Ms. Wolf returned the chair to Mr. Spilove.

3 Bank Street and 230 Market Street

Paul Rimmer, Owner, 3 Bank Street

J & M Newbauer, Owner, 230 Market Street

Michael Lipton, Applicant

DATE: c. 1830 for each building

PROPOSAL: Lighting and conduit; also, clean brick, paint masonry and replace glazing on 3 Bank Street

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval to paint the first floor columns to match the color of the lintel. The Committee asked the applicant to explore the option of running

the conduit on the interior of the buildings at the second story and provide information on its feasibility. If this proves infeasible, the Committee will recommend approval of an exterior MI conduit that will run on top of the lintel at 3 Bank Street with the smallest light boxes possible. The Committee also asked the applicant to return with specific lighting fixtures for review.

The applicant has not returned with additional information on the conduit and lighting fixtures so only the cleaning and painting are before the Commission for approval. Mr. Tyler noted that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards require that the cleaning be done by the gentlest means possible and the color be an appropriate color.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to approve the cleaning of the masonry and the painting of the first floor masonry to match the stone lintel. All other aspects of the proposal must return to the Architectural Committee. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

#4 Boathouse Row

United States Rowing Association, Owner

Anthony Weber, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1870; 1912 - 2nd story addition

PROPOSAL: Facade alterations

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval on the condition that the garage doors are painted brown.

Ms. Matzkin explained that the owners are raising money to restore the facades. Until the restoration takes place the owner needs to install temporary stairs for safety reasons. Also, the garage doors were installed when the owner restored the stone piers between them. Mr. Tyler noted that the proposal conforms to the Standards because they deal with life-safety codes. Also, the paint of the doors should be compatible.

Ms. Egan made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried by unanimous vote.

6014 Chew Street

Penny Lancaster, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1886

PROPOSAL: Masonry fence alteration

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval on the condition that a pier is built on the east side of the driveway entrance to match the pier on the west.

Ms. Matzkin described the removal of part of the fence to create a driveway entrance. Mr. Tyler noted that the *Standards* provide guidelines for on-site parking.

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

235 South Camac Street

Philadelphia Sketch Club, Owner

Robert Grooms, Applicant

DATE: c. 1825

PROPOSAL: Repair dormers and skylight; new roof, downspouts and gutters

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with staff to approve dormer details

Ms. Matzkin noted that the skylights are extant, but not in the sightline of pedestrians. Mr. Tyler stated that the proposal conforms to the *Standards*.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

785 South Front Street

Rosa Marino, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1795; c. 1860 - new facade

PROPOSAL: Facade restoration, new roof

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with two stipulations. First, the owner is to investigate the windows and the door transom. If any of the windows are true-arched, the replacement windows must be true-arched. Second, all windows should be two-over-two. The Committee voted to recommend approval of awning and hopper windows for the basement.

The Commission discussed the dates of the building, its alterations and the proper windows which reflect the building's history. Mr. Baron stated that the front facade has a running bond pattern, proving that it was rebuilt entirely in the 1860s.

Mr. Tyler noted that the proposal is consistent with the *Standards* which recognize significant alterations.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which passed by unanimous vote.

1701 Addison Street

Robert Larsen, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Facade restoration

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with staff to approve pointing and cleaning samples.

Mr. Baron stated that Permastone was removed from another house on this street, without causing major damage to the brick facade. Much of Society Hill was covered with Permastone or stucco that was later removed when the area was restored, often revealing substantial damage on the brick facades. Even with the gouged bricks, the buildings seem greatly improved over the stuccoed condition. Since that time the bricks on various buildings have not deteriorated further. Mr. Tyler noted that the restoration of the original brick facade conforms to the *Standards* because it removes an unsympathetic addition.

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

319-327 South Broad Street, Chambers Wylie Memorial Church

Vincent Bruno, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: 1900

PROPOSAL: Cleaning, pointing

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with staff to approve cleaning and pointing samples.

Mr. Tyler noted that the *Standards* call for cleaning with the gentlest means possible and the correct mortar composition.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Ms. Wolf seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

108 South Front Street

Historic Landmarks for Living, Owner

Bill Link, Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Basement door

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Matzkin described the gate the owner wants to install. Mr. Tyler noted that the *Standards* recommend installing security measures to protect a building from arson and vandalism.

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

1035-1037 Spruce Street, Roberts-Quay House

Historic Landmarks for Living, Owner

Bill Link, Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Brownstone repair, storm windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the brownstone repair, denial of the new storm windows. The Committee noted that the new storm windows should be changed to true-arched storm windows that divide at the meeting rail of the building's windows and are painted to match the frames.

Ms. Matzkin stated that the Committee acknowledges that removal of the coating would destroy the brownstone underneath.

Mr. Tyler noted that the *Standards* do not address the repair of the coating since it should not have been applied in the first place. Mr. Wilds questioned the jurisdiction of the Commission over storm windows. Mr. Tyler stated that exterior storm windows must have Commission approval and should be compatible with the existing window shape and style. Also, the *Standards* recommend exterior storm windows that match the extant windows in shape and color. The present storm windows will be in violation until they are removed or changed.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which carried. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

1107 Spruce Street

John Dahl and Eric Shanowski, Owners/Applicants

DATE: 1889

PROPOSAL: New dormer roof

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Tyler noted that the proposal conforms to the Secretary of Interior's *Standards*.

Mr. James made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Ms. Egan seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Ridgeland Mansion

City of Philadelphia, Owner

James Ruckman, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1800

PROPOSAL: Porch glazing alteration

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Matzkin explained that large wood stiles are required to accommodate the weight and stress of the glass. The proposal

calls for using metal stiles instead. Mr. Tyler noted that the *Standards* allow the enclosure of a porch to accommodate a new use, but the enclosure should be compatible with the historic character of the building.

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

1921-1923 Panama Street

Carl Gunter, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1950

PROPOSAL: Storm doors

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Proposal: installing exterior storm doors on the French doors, which conform to the *Standards*.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion which passed by unanimous vote.

132 South 18th Street

Aglio Restaurant, Owner

Myrna Mendoza, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850; c. 1926 - facade alterations

PROPOSAL: Facade alterations

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of all alterations except the number of posts in the masonry fence and the new bay window on the second floor. The original bay must remain.

Ms. Matzkin described the submission. The Committee also decided that the rail dimensions of the proposed iron fence should match that of the extant gate. Ms. Matzkin emphasized that the arch over the gate with the garlic motif will be attached to the awning framework, not the historic fence. Mr. Tyler noted that the *Standards* allow installation of new windows in former party walls and non-character defining elevations. The *Standards* recommend against replacement of reparable existing historic features and windows. Mr. Sklaroff questioned the approval of the metalwork on the historic stone fence. Ms. Matzkin stated that the metalwork is compatible with the fence in design. Mr. Baron noted that the proposal includes new windows in the one-story brick building from the 1940s.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee with the addition of the windows in the one-story building. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

2042 Rittenhouse Square Street

Jennifer Breslow, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1890; c. 1955 - facade alterations

PROPOSAL: Paint masonry

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Tyler noted that the *Standards* allow painting in colors that are compatible to the building and the district.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

The architect for the Guardhouse on Rittenhouse Square, Robert Thomas, had not arrived so the item was postponed to the end of the meeting.

2229 Spruce Street

Anthony Mezzarroca, Owner

Renato Russo, Applicant

DATE: c. 1880; c. 1950 - 1st floor alterations

PROPOSAL: Facade alterations

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the application with several changes. First, the awnings should be a shed type. Second, the rear fence should be wood. Third, the windows should be changed to be compatible with the second and third floors in size and style possibly retaining the present openings but with new infill windows. Fourth, a cornice could be installed at the top of the stucco to create a line between the first and second floors. Fifth, the doors are to have single panes of glass. Sixth, the roof plan should show the exhaust ducts installed to minimize the visibility from the street.

Ms. Matzkin stated that the applicant has submitted new drawings reflecting the changes required by the Committee.

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

2131-2133 Pine Street

Hong Hyon Ko, Owner

James Cho, Contractor/Applicant

PROPOSAL: New storefront, roll-down gates

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the new windows and denial of the roll-down gate.

Ms. Matzkin explained that new storefront windows and solid exterior roll-down gates were installed without Commission approval. A permit for the work had been issued in error and then revoked. The Committee advised the owner of three options for which it would recommend approval: complete removal of the gates; installation of open grill, exterior gates with installation and maintenance of awnings to cover the housing; or open grills on the interior of the glass windows. Mr. Baron stated that since submission of the proposal to the Commission the owner has illegally installed two large signs which the Commission should review.

Frank Herz, Esq., representing Hong Hyon Ko, testified that the owner wants to comply with the Commission's requirements. Mr. Herz emphasized that the changes were made with a building permit. The roll-down gates were custom-made and cost the owner \$5,000. To change the solid gates to open grills may cost as much. Mr. Hong is willing to work with the staff to reach a compromise that satisfies the Commission and does not cost the Mr. Hong a great deal of money.

The Commission noted that Mr. Hong should apply separately for approval of the new signs. Ms. Matzkin restated the Committee's recommendation of approval of the windows and disapproval of the roll-down gates.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to approve the windows and disapprove the roll-down gates. The owner should work with the staff for a solution that would satisfy both the guidelines of the Commission and the safety requirements of the owner, with final review by the Committee. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion.

Bernard Nearey of the Rittenhouse-Fitler District testified that many neighbors of the building are against the exterior gates. Mr. Tyler explained that the Commission planned to approve the storefront windows and disapprove the roll-down gates. A proposal for the signs will also go to the Committee and Commission for approval. Mr. Baron asked, if an interior solution is reached, should the proposal return to the Committee for approval. The Commission discussed whether the staff, the Committee, or the Commission itself would have final review. The Commission decided that it will have final review of any compromise reached by staff and Mr. Hong. The signs will be treated separately and must go to the Committee and Commission for approval.

Mr. Herz stated that he and Mr. Hong will keep Mr. Nearey and the residents advised on the changes that will be proposed to

the Committee and Commission.

Eric Schneiman, a neighbor, asked if the application will be reheard by the Commission next month. Mr. Baron stated that the Commission will vote on the proposal when it is submitted; it may not be next month. Mr. Schneiman asked if there is a time limit for the illegal roll-down gates. The residents are concerned that the present gates will remain for many months without any changes. Mr. Tyler stated that the applicant has 60 days to return to the Commission with a new proposal. If no submission has been received by the Commission after 60 days, the Department of Licenses and Inspections will enforce the violation in the courts.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to amend the previous motion by having the solution of the roll-down gates return to the Commission, from the Committee, for final approval. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion to amend the first motion. The Commission voted unanimously to carry the motion as amended. The Commission determined that any change to the roll-down gates, including interior installation, would return to the Commission for approval.

Guardhouse - Rittenhouse Square

Robert Thomas, Architect/Applicant

PROPOSAL: Replacement

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the concept of a new guardhouse but suggested that the history of the site and the final design need review again by the Committee before recommending final approval.

Robert Thomas, the architect for the project, described the history of the proposal. The Victorian Society found a guardhouse from the Centennial Exposition and raised money to have it restored and placed in Rittenhouse Square. Several years ago Craig Morrison, another architect, made detailed drawings of the guardhouse for the restoration. Unfortunately, the guardhouse is now deteriorated beyond repair. The Friends of Rittenhouse Square, in conjunction with the Victorian Society, have contacted several companies that manufacture solariums and similar structures and they are able to reconstruct the original guardhouse. Following the advice of the Committee, Mr. Thomas researched the landscape plan of the Square and did not find evidence of any structures in the center of the Square in the Victorian period or the time before the implementation of the present Beaux Arts design. He offered various plans from these periods for the Commission's review.

[At the Architectural Committee meeting, Mr. Thomas noted the structure will have several differences from the plans. First the foundation will be cast stone or concrete, not granite.

Second, only two windows will be operational. Third, the doors will have larger windows to allow a broader view from the interior.]

Mr. Wilds questioned the new location of the guardhouse which would be off the center axis of the main walkways. Mr. Thomas explained that that location was part of the site plan designed by Craig Morrison. However, the new structure will not follow that plan and will be in the center of the square. The building and zoning permits will reflect the center location. Mr. Spilove noted that the off-center location was first suggested by the Victorian Society. Mr. Thomas explained that the wiring for the electricity and computers will be installed underground while the walkways are removed to repair the fountain.

Mr. Sklaroff stated that the new guardhouse creates a false historical impression. Since the original Victorian guardhouse will be replicated almost exactly, people will mistake it for an old building rather than new construction. The new guardhouse should reflect the architectural style of 1996 and, perhaps, the Beaux Arts design of the Square. Mr. Thomas noted that the Friends of Rittenhouse Square is following the advice of the Committee and erecting a plaque that bears the date of construction which will erase the confusion. Mr. Sklaroff countered that the plaque is not enough to establish the fact that the building is new construction. The Beaux Arts design of the Square was implemented in 1913 and eradicated all Victorian or Gothic style elements that may have existed on the Square. Mr. Sklaroff questioned the decision of the Committee to allow the reintroduction of these elements in a period dominated by modern design in a Beaux Arts landscape. Traditionally, the Commission has only approved construction indicative of its period.

Mr. Wilds stated that the original theory was to save a Centennial guardhouse and provide a home for it on the Square. While the building itself is not being saved, the design and memory of the building will be saved in the new construction. Mr. Sklaroff did not agree. Ms. Wolf, in concurring with Mr. Sklaroff's position, noted that the new construction should reflect the times. If a plaque is used to give the date, an interpretive statement also should be included to describe the dispersment of the many guardhouses after the Centennial Exposition.

Mr. Brownlee also agreed with Mr. Sklaroff. However, the context of the Square is a landscape. While it was designed in the Beaux Arts style, the nature of a landscape is elastic and allows changes. For the design of the building itself, the present period is enamored of all things Victorian. An authentic

design of the 1990s may be a faithful replica of an 1876 structure. Mr. Sklaroff disagreed, calling this proposal mimicry.

Mr. Thomas reiterated the view of Mr. Wilds. The design of the original guardhouse would be saved in its recreation. Instead of being preserved on paper, a two-dimensional representation, that may be kept in the archives of the City or the Historical Society, the recreation will provide a three-dimensional, solid, tactile experience of the Centennial for visitors to the Square. Mr. Baron asked if any elements from the original guardhouse could be incorporated into the new construction. Mr. Thomas stated that to try to incorporate any fragments from the original would not be feasible.

Mr. Vance noted that the present guardhouse, which was installed in the last few decades, is a minimalist building that does not divert people's attention away from the landscape. The new guardhouse would become the center of attraction.

Bobbie Burke, an architectural historian, agreed with Mr. Sklaroff. However, Rittenhouse Square was a square before Paul Cret. Many residents on the Square were instrumental in the success of the Centennial Exposition and lived in mansions that were built in the Victorian period. This guardhouse would connect the Square to that period and show visitors that the Square has a history that is older than the Beaux Arts period. The interpretation should be expansive. Ms. Wolf concurred that the marker should show more than the date of construction and offer a full interpretation of the Victorian history of the Square and the Centennial guardhouses. Mr. Sklaroff noted that the guardhouse will be a focus not just for the Square but for the city, therefore the design should be more ambitious rather than a recreation.

Mr. Brownlee reiterated the idea that the proposal is for a landscape which can tolerate additions and changes. The Commission discussed the essence of a landscape and the elasticity of the Rittenhouse Square design.

Mr. Thomas noted that the main purpose of the guardhouse is to provide security. The Victorian Society wanted this design because it provides visibility on six sides and is large enough to accommodate a computer system.

Mr. Thomas, in answering a question, stated that the organization and the architect had not considered a more modern design for the guardhouse when it became apparent that the original guardhouse could not be restored. The Commission then discussed, without resolution, the vocabulary that would be used if the architect created a new design.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation and to disapprove the replacement guardhouse. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion.

Ms. Wolf stated that the Square is an historic landscape and she did not believe that the new guardhouse, even with an interpretive plaque, was appropriate for the Square. Mr. Sklaroff stated that other design options should be explored. Wendy Rosen of the Friends of Rittenhouse Square testified that the Friends and the Victorian Society are in favor of the project. Mr. Spilove noted that the community raised the funds with this design in mind. The funds to redesign the proposal do not exist.

Lenore Millhollen explained that the Victorian Society found the abandoned guardhouse on Lincoln Drive. It raised funds to have the building stored inside and had Craig Morrison draft the drawings. The Society later arranged to have the building located on Rittenhouse Square. Mr. Wilds noted that it is a shame that the original guardhouse has been lost to neglect after these organizations had worked for a dozen years to save it.

Ms. Egan called the question. The motion to reject the Committee's recommendation and to disapprove the replacement guardhouse failed with a vote of three in favor, six against, and one abstention. Mr. Brownlee then made a motion to approve the design as discussed, with the location of the guardhouse in the center of the square. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried. Six voted in favor of the motion, Messrs. Sklaroff, Vance, and James dissented, and Ms. Wolf abstained.

Ms. Egan introduced Michael Fink, Chief of Construction Services at the Department of Licenses and Inspections. She reminded the applicant to file for all necessary permits with the Department.

The Report of the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, September 1996, Richard Tyler.

Mr. Tyler, in answering a question, stated that the personnel office had not scheduled the Civil Service examination for the two Preservation Planner positions. In fact, because the positions had not been filled, the Personnel Office was in the process of eliminating the positions. Fortunately, the staff received notice of the elimination and stopped the process. The Historical Commission and the Department of Streets are pressuring the Personnel Office to act as quickly as possible to fill the two positions.

U.S. Naval Home

Toll Brothers, Inc., Owner
Andrew Terhune, Applicant
PROPOSAL: Development of site

Mr. Tyler introduced the report of the special Architectural Committee meeting held on 17 September 1996 with Arlene Matzkin, Chair. He explained that Toll Brothers has not formally applied for a building permit to develop the site, but is applying to revise the existing RC-6 zoning which requires a vote by City Council. The meeting of the Architectural Committee provided a forum for the Committee members, Commission members, and the public to comment on the proposed development so that the Planning Commission could make a recommendation to the City Council for the change in zoning.

Mr. Tyler also read a letter from the Preservation Alliance to the Chair of the Commission announcing its application for a grant from Preservation Pennsylvania to address issues concerning National Historic Landmarks in the city. The U.S. Naval Home could be a part of the study. Mr. Brownlee noted that he strongly opposes the demolition of the two dependencies. The preservation of all three buildings, the decorative wall and the landscaping around these is essential to any development plan that the Commission may approve.

The Commission took no action on the proposal.

The meeting adjourned at 11:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura M. Spina