

**THE MINUTES OF THE 445th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
8 September 1999**

**Commission Conference Room, One Parkway, 1515 Arch St., 18th Fl.
Wayne S. Spilove, Chair**

Present

Wayne S. Spilove, Chair
David Brownlee, Ph.D.
Barbara Kaplan, Executive Director, City Planning Commission
Carol Lawrence
Shelly Merhige, Office of City Council President
Steven Mullin, Director and City Representative, Department of Commerce
Andres Perez, Commissioner, Department of Public Property
David Perri, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Michael Sklaroff, Esq.
Robert Thomas
Dennis Ward III
Scott Wilds, Assistant Director, Office of Housing and Community Development
Caroline Wischmann
Stephanie G. Wolf, Ph.D., Vice Chair

Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
R. Scott Jacob, Executive Secretary
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Mark Zecca, Esq., Deputy City Solicitor

Also

Carl Zucker, Esq.
Neil Stein
Nabutaka Ashihara
Marguerite Rodgers
Stephen Pollock, Esq.
Anthony Forte, Esq., Saul Ewing Remick and Saul Attorneys
Janet Potter, Foundation for Architecture
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents Association (CCRA)
Bryan Marton
Sharon Hill, Interarch Inc.
David Singer, Michael Singer Real Estate
Rosa Marino
Michael Onyiah
Aliko Strakes, Preservation Alliance
Judith Eden, CCRA
N. Fukui
Lynne Sarita, Graboyes Windows
Harvey Levitan
Richard Pandolfi

Wayne Spilove, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 445th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:00 A.M.

MINUTES of the 444th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission.

Upon a motion made by Ms. Wolf and duly seconded, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the 444th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held on 11 August 1999, Wayne S. Spilove, Chair.

CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT, National Register Nomination Comment

Mr. Tyler described the nomination of the Pennsylvania Railroad Freight Building for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. He explained the building's architectural and historical significance, and recommended its entry on the National Register.

Mr. Thomas, Mr. Sklaroff, Mr. Brownlee and Ms. Wolf recused themselves from the discussion and the vote owing to their association with the owner of the building.

Ms. Merhige made a motion to recommend the inclusion of the Pennsylvania Railroad Freight Building the National Register of Historic Places. Ms. Lawrence seconded the motion which carried with eight votes. Mr. Thomas, Mr. Sklaroff, Mr. Brownlee and Ms. Wolf recused themselves.

Old Business

123 South 18th Street aka 1735 Sansom Street

Michael Singer, Owner/Applicant

Date: c. 1880

Proposal: legalize removal of chimney and window replacement

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial of the application to legalize the removal of the chimney and the replacement of the windows.

Mr. Thomas explained that the owner, without a permit or Historical Commission approval, removed the chimney, replaced the wood dormer window with a vinyl window and replaced windows along Sansom Street with vinyl windows and vents. Mr. Baron explained that the Department of Licenses and Inspections issued several violations and the owner had actually submitted an incomplete application to remove the chimney in May 1996. The owner wishes to legalize the removal of the chimney and the replacement of the windows. Stephen Pollack, counsel for the owner, stated that the chimney was in great disrepair and that it had to be removed before it fell down. He stated that the owner had a permit for interior alterations when he discovered that the windows were beyond repair, so he replaced them.

Mr. Pollack stated that the owner wishes to offer a compromise solution, involving the removal of the windows in violation and replacing them with the appropriate windows and frames if the Commission will approve the removal of the chimney. The Commission did not agree with the compromise, and wanted all aspects of the violation cured.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation to deny legalization. Ms. Kaplan seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 31 August 1999, Robert Thomas, Chair.

120-122 South 18th Street

Neil Stein, Owner

Carl Zucker, Applicant

DATE: 1898

PROPOSAL: Café doors; storefront alteration; internally-illuminated projecting sign

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for the installation of sliding doors, a large mirror-covered flower box. He stated that the Committee did not think the mirrored flower box appropriate for this building, and also objected to the proposed alteration of the first-floor storefront.

Marjory Rogers, Architect for the proposal, explained that she designed the proposed window treatment to accommodate interaction between patrons on the interior and the exterior of the combination retail and restaurant establishment. As the space is several steps up from street level, the window box will provide a modesty screen for patrons sitting in the front window.

Ms. Rogers explained that only the lettering on the flower box will be mirrored, with a background of matte or brushed metal finish. She also explained that the box will contain sculptural metal flowers.

The owner offered to retain the existing frame, and to restore the existing window treatment should he cease to occupy the space. Mr. Brownlee thought the proposed alterations inappropriate for this building, and asked for a more sympathetic treatment. The rest of the Commission agreed to approve the proposed alterations with the retention of the existing frame.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation, and to approve the proposal, subject to the retention of the existing window frame. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee objected to the proposed projecting sign because it would butt up against the second-floor bay window as presented. He explained that the Committee thought the applicant should use non-internally-illuminated signage, installed in a manner that avoids damaging or competing with the elaborate details of the facade. Ms. Rogers clarified that the proposed sign will not butt up against the second-floor bay window. She also explained that the proposed sign will be illuminated with halo lighting.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation and to approve the proposed sign, with staff to review and approve details.

201 South 18th Street, se corner at Walnut Street, Rittenhouse Claridge

Commerce Bank, Tenant

Stephan Talbott, Vice President of Commerce Bank, Applicant

DATE: 1955

PROPOSAL: New storefront; illuminated signage

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the new door, storefront alterations and installing a long sign band on each facade, but with taller sections where they approach the corner of the building to accommodate the logo requirements, and denial of the cladding proposal. The sign band should have a frame and remain separate from the piers of the storefront.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for renovating several storefronts at the corner of 18th and Walnut Streets to house a new Commerce Bank branch. The bank is not satisfied with the condition of the bricks, and is concerned that more damage will become visible when the existing signs are removed. The bank also wishes to establish a “sleeker” presence in this location, and maintains that the proposed black granite cladding will provide that. The proposal also call for inserting a doorway near the corner. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee did not object to the new doorway or the shopfront alterations, but did object to the cladding aspect.

Mr. Thomas explained that the a new scheme emerged from the Committee’s deliberations, which it found acceptable. It involves the installation of a long sign band on each facade, but with taller sections where they approach the corner of the building to accommodate the logo requirements. The Commission reviewed a drawing reflecting the Committee’s design recommendations. Mr. Baron stated that the applicant does not want to submit that design as a possible option. The bank now proposes a scheme involving cladding on the Walnut Street facade, as in the original proposal, and a sign band over the storefront on the South 18th Street facade. The Commission did not thing this design any better, and some Commission members thought it worse than cladding both sides.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee’s recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which did not carry. Mr. Brownlee, Mr. Thomas, Ms. Wolf, Mr. Wilds, Mr. Ward and Ms. Kaplan voted to accept the Committee’s recommendation. Ms. Wischmann, Mr. Perri, Mr. Perez, Mr. Mullin, Ms. Lawrence, Ms. Merhige and Mr. Spilove dissented.

Mr. Mullin made a motion to approve the proposal as originally submitted, with cladding on Walnut and South 18th Streets. The motion was not seconded or acted upon.

Mr. Brownlee suggested placing two rectangular signs instead of the stepped-up signs recommended by the Committee. Through further discussion, the Commission decided to approve a framed, continuous sign band above the storefronts that wraps around the corner and two rectangular signs on the corner pier.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to approve a framed, continuous sign band above the storefronts that wraps around the corner, two rectangular signs on the corner pier, and the new doors and storefront alterations, with staff to review and approve details. Ms. Wolf seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

2304 Madison Square Street

Madeline Shikomba, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1865

PROPOSAL: Cover front and rear cornices in aluminum

The applicant requested that the Commission continue her application until the next meeting. The Commission agreed.

Mr. Spilove excused himself from the meeting and turned the Chair over to Ms. Wolf.

17 North 3rd Street

Byron Whiting, Tenant/Applicant

DATE: 1840

PROPOSAL: Legalize installation of aluminum and glass doorway

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves legalizing the installation of an anodized aluminum door and a door surround installed without a permit. The applicant explained that he replaced the door and surround for security reasons, as the old wood door could no longer provide the needed protection. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee discussed possible compromises, but ultimately decided to recommend against legalizing the work.

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

Mr. Spilove resumed the chair.

227 Market Street; 216 Church Street

Ilan Seidenwar, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: Facade work; legalize new vinyl windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of:

- 1. the restoration of the fourth-floor window openings by installing six-over-six, wood windows, and legalizing the rest of the vinyl ones;*
 - 2. cutting down the doorway and installing a ramp to provide disability accessibility; and*
 - 3. the storefront alterations, with a simplified transom with one vertical divider, and 7/8 of an inch muntins on the door and window panels as described in the 1863 insurance survey.*
- With staff to review and approve details of all aspects of the proposal.*

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves alterations to the two storefronts, some of which the Commission has previously approved. Although the owner had committed to retaining his existing aluminum windows in the modified openings on Market Street, he replaced them with new vinyl windows, which he now seeks to legalize. In addition, the owner wishes to cut down the doorway and install a ramp to provide handicap accessibility.

Mr. Thomas explained that the second- and third-floor window openings on the Market Street elevation were greatly reduced some time ago, and the recently replaced aluminum windows appeared to date from the 1950s or 60s. The neighboring building matched the subject building, and still retains the original appearance. Mr. Thomas noted that, if the applicant is asked to replace the new vinyl windows with true divided, wood windows, they would go into non-original openings, thus executing a false historic appearance. He described the compromise agreed upon by the Committee to restore the fourth-floor window openings by installing six-over-six, wood windows, while legalizing the rest of the vinyl ones. The Committee also wanted the current soldier course brick sills on the fourth-floor replaced with stone or wood sills to match those on the neighboring building.

Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee did not object to the other aspects of the proposal, with the exception of the glazing details of the Church Street storefront. An 1863 insurance survey describes a "fancy transom" over the storefront. He explained that the Committee and staff preferred installing a simple transom with one vertical divider, and also discussed possible ways to recreate the lights of the storefront door and window panels as described in the old insurance survey. He stated that the Committee agreed to recommend approval, with 7/8 of an inch muntins, and staff to review and approve details.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Wolf seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1629 West Diamond Street

Louise Clark Smith, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1885

PROPOSAL: Legalize aluminum windows and non-historic door

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial of the proposal, but with the recommendation to explore funding options or referral to the Committee on Financial Hardship.

Mr. Thomas explained that the applicant seeks to legalize the installation of six vinyl windows and a single leaf non-historic door. The applicant's now deceased husband installed the windows and door without a permit several years ago. The historic doors of this Furness-designed row house have not been stored, according to the applicant. Mr. Thomas stated that the applicant maintains she cannot afford the work. The Committee and staff discussed possible funding options and referring the issue to the Committee on Financial Hardship.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to deny the proposal, and to refer the application to the Committee on Financial Hardship. Mr. Mullin seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Hedge Street, between Bridge and Brill Streets

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Joseph Syrnick, Department of Streets, Applicant

DATE: 19th century or early 20th century

PROPOSAL: Pave over brick street in asphalt

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial of the proposal, and to approve consolidating the remaining historic bricks into one stretch of the street, perhaps the middle section, with the possibility of laying new brick at the ends.

Mr. Thomas explained that the proposal seeks to pave over this brick street. Apparently, ten percent of the bricks are missing, and thirty percent are in poor or unsalvageable condition. The Department of Streets claims it cannot adequately match the historic brick to fill in the patches currently paved with asphalt. Mr. Thomas noted that plans to repair utilities under this street instigated the Department of Streets request to pave over this street. There is concern that this brick will not withstand the relocating and resetting necessary with the digging up of this street. The Committee did not agree, and wanted the remaining bricks consolidated into one

stretch of the street, perhaps the middle section, with the possibility of laying new brick at the ends.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the Committee 's recommendation, with staff to review and approve details. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1-21 North Juniper Street, aka 1325 Market Street

Granite Penn Square LLC, Owner

Nabutaka Ashihara, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1930

PROPOSAL: Renovate building for hotel; HVAC; marquee

Architectural Committee Recommendation: to approve:

- 1. restoring the mezzanine level window areas, and replacing the windows on the upper floors to match the sight lines of the existing;*
- 2. installing new, simple glass storefronts in place of the existing non-original storefronts;*
- 3. placing large HVAC units on the upper roof that will provide for the removal of the air conditioning units from the windows of the rest of the building;*
- 4. a steel and glass marquee at the front entrance;*
- 5. the proposed signage, but with the red medallion signs bearing the initial "M" for Marriott placed on the proposed new sign board over the entrance;*
- 6. flagpoles in two existing locations and two near the proposed marquee;*
- 7. up lighting the building; and*
- 8. the new paving scheme.*

With staff to review and approve all details.

The proposal involves conversion of the former Market Street National Bank into a Marriott Hotel. The proposal includes:

1. restoring the mezzanine level window areas, and replacing the windows on the upper floors to match the sight lines of the existing;
2. installing new, simple butt-joint glazed storefronts in place of the existing non-original storefronts;
3. placing large HVAC units on the upper roof that will provide for the removal of the air conditioning units from the windows of the rest of the building;
4. a steel and glass marquee at the front entrance;
5. signage;
6. flagpoles in two existing and two new locations;
7. up lighting the building; and
8. a new paving scheme.

Mr. Thomas explained that the Architect plans to remove the many window air conditioning units, and to install large HVAC units at the top of building, and that the Committee agreed that the rooftop HVAC units would be minimally visible from the street, and a major improvement over the existing condition.

The proposal involves the replacement of the existing casement windows with new windows that will match the site lines and profiles of the existing, and the insertion of windows on the rear of the building. The plans also include installing new, simple butt-joint glazed storefronts in place of the existing non-original storefronts, and with open-ended, shed-type

awnings as seen in early photographs. The original storefronts had a three-part design with stainless steel joints. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee did not object to the windows replacement or the new storefronts. Plans also call for the installation of a new steel and glass marquee, of a relatively delicate design at the front entrance that will extend about twelve feet.

Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee did not object to the other signage aspects, which include two red medallions at the top of the eastern facade, and the new sign board over the main entrance. Mr. Thomas also noted that the Committee suggested placing signage on the blank wall of the adjoining building at the east side of the main building, facing the parking lot. He also stated that the Committee did not object to the proposed paving scheme, the flagpoles in two existing locations and two at the new marquee, or up lighting the building.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, including the new windows at the rear. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

153 North 4th Street, se corner at Race Street, Old First Reformed Church

Old First Reformed Church, Owner
Michael Hauptman, Architect/Applicant
DATE: 1836
PROPOSAL: Replace window with a door

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for converting a window into a door. The door will include a transom. He stated that the Committee members agreed that the proposed location is on a secondary facade, and significantly obscured from the public right-of-way by a wall.

Mr. Ward made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Wolf seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

401 North Broad Street

401 North Broad Street Associates, Owner
Robert McCauley, Architect/Applicant
DATE: 1929
PROPOSAL: Master plan for louvers

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of allowing staff to review for approval new louvers located in three registers on the sides of the headhouse and in the transom portion of already altered windows in the warehouse section of the building below the fifth floor. The Committee thought that alterations to historic windows in the warehouse section should return to the Committee and Commission.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal creates a master plan for the installation of louvers at 401 North Broad Street. The plan shows new louvers in three bays of the side facades of the headhouse and the upper portion of all windows on the warehouse portion of the building below the fifth floor. The fifth floor and above have access to a central light well.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

2100 Spruce Street, sw corner at 21st Street

Joseph Friedberg and Jo Buyske, Owners

Barry Ginder, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1880

PROPOSAL: Install louvers in former window openings

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal seeks to install louvers in two currently boarded up windows in the carriage house to accommodate the new HVAC units. The sash, jamb and sill will match those of the historic house. He stated that the Committee did not object to the proposal.

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

2033 Spruce Street

Israel Kimberg, Owner

Richard Pandolfi, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1875

PROPOSAL: Shave loose brownstone details and patch without details

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial.

Mr. Thomas explained that the applicant has already shaved the loose brownstone from the building facade including the details on the window and door lintels. He now seeks to patch the stone using a brown colored mix, restoring the detail only on the lintels of the first floor openings. The applicant explained that he removed the material to remedy a safety issue. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee discussed the possibility of reconstructing the details using existing lintels within the same row, or actually making casts from them. As several houses in this row have damaged or missing details, the Committee suggested the applicant ask other neighbors if they may be interested in having a cast made to repair or replace damaged details.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Wolf seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

251 South 18th Street, Philadelphia Art Alliance

Philadelphia Art Alliance, Owner

Bryan Marton, Applicant

DATE: 1906

PROPOSAL: Ramp on Rittenhouse Square

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal seeks to build a ramp for handicapped accessibility to the garden dining area at the rear of the Art Alliance. He stated that the Committee did not object to the proposal.

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

2406-08 Delancey Street

Dieter and Sara Forster, Owners
Reed Axelrod, Architect/Applicant
DATE: c. 1860
PROPOSAL: New design for addition

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas stated that this proposal involves a modification to the proposal approved last month. The applicant now seeks a larger, rectangular, two-story addition. He explained that the Committee did not object to the modified proposal.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the Committee 's recommendation. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1516 Spruce Street

Harvey Levitan, Owner/Applicant
DATE: 1865
PROPOSAL: Legalize sign

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that the owner has received a violation for his signage that he claims has existed for over eighteen years. The relatively small flat wall sign consists of a metal backing with applied plastic strips containing the names of numerous tenants. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee did not think the Commission should exercise its jurisdiction to deny legalization of this signage. He also explained that the Committee thought the Commission should continue to look at legalization applications such as this on a one-by-one basis.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee 's recommendation. Ms. Wolf seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1924-1928 Delancey Street

Rosa Marino, Owner
Michael Onyiah, Architect/Applicant
DATE: c. 1920
PROPOSAL: Cut garage door, windows and door in front facade

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial.

Mr. Spilove recused himself and passed the Chair to Ms. Wolf.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for extensive alterations to the front facade of this contributing building in the Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District . The changes include cutting a garage door opening, a new french door type window and a double door main entry. The applicant seeks to close existing openings on the first and second floors. The plans also show the enlargement of the balconies on the second floor.

Mr. Thomas noted that the applicant informed the Committee that a number of former carriage houses exist on this block with garages. Mr. Brownlee explained that in the early 20th century many Spanish style Arts and Crafts houses and apartments were created on this block. Some of these may have been new construction, while others converted from existing buildings.

Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee and staff strongly objected to this proposal, as it violates *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. Mr. Tyler cited the guidelines of *The Standards* relating to windows and doors, which do not provide for alterations such as these on a primary facade, even in cases of change of use (see p. 81, 85 of *The Standards*). Mr. Thomas explained that the applicant offered to eliminate the changes to the second floor, and that the Committee members told the applicant that they still could not recommend approval of any of the alterations. He noted that the Committee did concede that the front door may need to be expanded slightly to meet current code requirements. After discussing several aspects of the application, the Commission agreed with the Committee's recommendation to deny the proposal as submitted.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Mr. Spilove resumed the Chair.

312 South American Street

Edward Plachter, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1846

PROPOSAL: Rear addition

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that the applicant proposes a two-story rear addition that has visibility across a parking lot. He noted that Committee members urged that the applicant to retain the wooden doorframe at the rear of the house, and did not object to the proposal.

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

Mr. Wilds made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Scott Jacob
Executive Secretary

