

**THE MINUTES OF THE 506th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
8 October 2004
City Council Caucus Room, Room 401, City Hall
Michael Sklaroff, Esquire, Chair**

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
Kathleen Murray, Assistant to President of City Council
Duane Bumb, Department of Commerce
Vincent Rivera, AIA
Denise Smyler, Esq.
Harris Steinberg, AIA
Norman Tissian
Scott Wilds, Deputy Director, Department of Housing and Neighborhood Preservation

Lawrence Copeland, Esq., Law Department
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department

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

Also

Mary Montague, New Century Guild
Ray Diebel, Please Touch Museum
Jim Foster, Pomona Cherokee Civic Council
Neil Sklaroff, Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll
David Plante, West Central Germantown Neighbors
Marc Stein, West Mt. Airy Neighbors
Sabrina Soong, Soong Associates Incorporated
David Knapton, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Sherman Toppin, Impacting Your World Christian Center
Virgil Procaccino, Christian Street
Craig Deutsch, Harman Deutsch Architects
Elizabeth Armour, Society Hill resident
Dan Vicencio
William G. Schwartz, Esq., Obermayer Rebmann Maxwell & Hippel
State Representative Rosita Youngblood
George Baker, 102 North 2nd Street
Betty Jane Heppenstall, 400 Spruce Street
Douglas Brunk
Lloyd Bauman
Philip E. Scott, Kise Straw and Kolodner Architects, Please Touch Museum
Marita Osborne, The Wanamaker Building
Nancy Kolb, Please Touch Museum
Joseph Rollo
Michael Rigolizzo, Second Street Parkominium

Robert Levitt, Second Street Parkominium
 Ron Hancock, Greenwood Cemetery
 Carol Hancock, Greenwood Cemetery
 Glen Swantak, Hillier
 Kit Matthew, Please Touch Museum
 Jonathan Lipner
 William J. Maffucci, Schnader Harrison Realty Associates
 Ken Handrich
 Ken Handrich, 23 West Walnut Lane
 Hugh Zimmers, Zimmers Architects
 John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
 Jim Garvey, Edon Fiberglass, Horsham PA
 Catharine K. Franklin, 52 West Penn Street
 Bernice Hamel, 302 South 2nd Street
 Lorna Katz Lawson, 200 Locust Street
 Steven Weixler, 604 South Washington Square
 Joan Hooke, 264 South Van Pelt Street
 DeOliver, Davis, West Mt. Airy Neighbors
 Richard Thom, 1314 Rodman Street
 George Anni, 1216 Spruce Street
 Kark Krumholz, 1225 Spring Street
 Archibald Clinton Hewes, 256 South Van Pelt Street
 Karen Escovutz, 6369 McCallam Street
 Joseph Serratore, 840 South 2nd Street
 Alex Taurisano, 1909 Spruce Street
 John Moore, 258 South Van Pelt Street
 John Varicka, 2118 Pine Street

506th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 506th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:15 a.m.

Minutes of the 504th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Upon a motion made by Mr. Wilds and seconded by Ms. Smyler, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the 505th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, as corrected, held 10 September 2004, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

The Report of the Committee on Historic Designation

1309 Noble Street, Lasher Printing Company Building

3607 Broadway Realty Associates, Owner
 Date: 1928, Philip Scott Tyre, architect

Standing among a group of imposing Art Deco factories, the Lasher Printing Company Building is an intact industrial building wrapped in Art Deco detailing. Constructed in 1928 by George F. Lasher for his expanding business, the building reflects the modern, streamlined, and technologically advanced ideas embraced at the time. The Lasher Printing Company Building represents a rare example of industrial architecture that should be protected as it meets four criteria of Section 14-2007 of the Philadelphia

Code. It has significant character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City (Criterion A). It embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style, namely the Art Deco (Criterion D). It is the work of Philip Scott Tyre, an architect whose work has significantly influenced the architectural and cultural development of Philadelphia (Criterion E). Lastly, it is part of a distinctive area, which should be preserved according to an historic and architectural motif (Criterion G). The Committee on the Historic Designation voted unanimously to recommend the designation of 1309 Noble Street, the Lasher Printing Company Building, as historic and the listing of it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Ms. Spina gave an illustrated presentation.

William Maffucci had previously expressed concerns about the potential impact of designation on the development of the property. He conceded that the Committee on Historic Designation mollified some of his concerns about the ramifications of designation during their discussion.

Mr. Bumb moved to designate 1309 Noble Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

4865 Market Street, a.k.a. 111 North 49th Street, Pennsylvania Hospital for the Insane, Kirkbride Center

Kirkbride Realty Corporation, Owner

Date: 1854-59, Samuel Sloan, architect with Dr. Thomas Story Kirkbride; addition, 1929; service buildings, c. 1920; hospital building, 1959

The movement to improve the treatment of the mentally ill is an important chapter in the social reform movements that swept the United States during the 19th century. Dr. Thomas Story Kirkbride and the City of Philadelphia played prominent roles in that narrative, as Kirkbride along with Samuel Sloan designed a hospital for the mentally ill that influenced the construction of similar institutions in thirty-one states. The Kirkbride Center meets four of the criteria for designation as set forth in Section 14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code. It has significant character, interest, and value as part of the development, heritage and cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth, and Nation and is associated with the life of Thomas Kirkbride, a person significant in the past (Criterion A). It is the work of Samuel Sloan, a designer and architect whose work was significantly influenced the historical and social development of the City, Commonwealth, and Nation (Criterion E) and contains elements of design, which represent a significant innovation (Criterion F). Finally, the property exemplifies the cultural, social, and historic heritage of the community (Criterion J). The Committee on the Historic Designation voted unanimously to recommend the designation of 4865 Market Street, a.k.a. 111 North 49th Street, to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with a sub-committee of the Committee on Historic Designation with the Commission's staff, the nominator, and the property owner to determine the extent of the Commission's jurisdiction over the buildings, site, and appurtenances.

Ms. Spina gave an illustrated presentation. Mr. Wilds asked for clarification of the designation with regards to the site and its appurtenances. Mr. Harris opined that the historic building and a portion of the site is eligible for designation; however, the

Commission's jurisdiction should not extend to the later additions. He believes that a sub-committee should undertake a site visit to determine the extent of the Commission's jurisdiction at the site.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance noted that the Alliance's nomination was not intended to nominate any buildings other than the 1859 building. He pointed out that the staff expanded the description of the nomination.

Mr. Sklaroff thought that since the nomination included that fence and stone wall, it encompasses the entire site within these walls. Ms. Spina disclosed to the Commission that she had included additional photographs with the nomination to apprise members of the complete conditions at site.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to table the designation for a period not to exceed six (6) months to allow a sub-committee of the Committee on Historic Designation to visit the site with representatives of the staff, owner, and nominator and to recommend bounds and other conditions of the Commission's jurisdiction over the buildings, site, and appurtenances at 4865 Market Street. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

1307 Locust Street, New Century Guild

The New Century Trust, Owner

Date: c. 1870s; 1906

The New Century Guild building at 1307 Locust Street has served as the organization's headquarters continuously from 1906 to the present. Founded in 1882, the New Century Guild (NCG) was one of the earliest, largest, and most successful of the many organizations created across the country in the 19th century to deal with the serious problems that arose as more and more women entered the labor force. Although these clubs had several characteristics in common with the middle-class women's clubs of the day, they were unique because they directly addressed employment-related problems. The Guild explicitly stated from the outset that its goal was to address the specific needs of "self-supporting women," a bold step at a time when many Americans believed that no self-respecting woman would work for pay outside the home. Not only was the Guild among the first of such organizations formed anywhere in the United States, but it was also among the most flourishing and long-lived. The NCG meets three criteria as outlined in Section 14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code. It has significant character, interest and value as a part of the development heritage and cultural characteristics of not only the City but of the Commonwealth and the Nation and is associated with the life of persons significant in the past (Criterion A). As a part of the women's movement and the reformation of labor, it is associated with events of importance to the history of the City, Commonwealth and Nation (Criterion B). Finally, the Guild exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social and historical heritage of the community (Criterion J). The Committee on the Historic Designation voted unanimously to recommend the designation of 1307 Locust Street, the New Century Guild, as historic and the listing of it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Ms. Spina gave an illustrated presentation of the designation. Mr. James inquired if the mural attached to the property is part of the site under consideration for designation. Mr. Steinberg responded that the mural is on the party wall and therefore is not a part of the

site.

Mary Montague of the New Century Trust expressed her displeasure with the nomination process. She claimed that the owner had not been consulted and requested that the nomination be tabled. Mr. Sklaroff responded to Ms. Montague, explaining that the owner is apprised of all public meetings held during the designation process. Ms. Spina said that notice letters had been sent to the property owner in accordance with Section 14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code. She added that she had had a telephone conversation with Cynthia Little, the president of the New Century Trust.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance, the nominator, informed the Commission that an Alliance representative had spoken with representatives of the Guild. He asserted that the nomination proceedings had complied with the Commission's ordinance; however, he concluded that he would be receptive to a continuance.

The Commission determined that the Trust is the title holder and responsible for the maintenance of the property.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to table the nomination for one month to the Commission's 12 November 2004 meeting. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Sklaroff recused himself and passed the gavel to Mr. Wilds.

221 West Johnson Street, Nugent Home for Baptists

UR Choyce, Inc., Owner

Date: 1896, J. Franklin Stuckert, architect

The Committee on Historic Designation voted to unanimously recommend the designation of the George Nugent Home for Baptists at 221 W. Johnson Street as historic and the listing of it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. It recognized that the Home on the border of Mt. Airy and Germantown is an important architectural and historical landmark in Philadelphia. The Nugent Home fulfills Designation Criteria A, C, D, E, H, and J, which are delineated in the City's "Historic Buildings" ordinance. The Nugent Home (A) has significant value as part of the development of the City, and is associated with the life of a person significant in the past; (C) reflects the environment in an era characterized by its distinctive architectural style; (D) embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style; (E) is the work of an architect who has significantly influenced the development of the City; (H) represents an established and familiar visual feature of the community; and (J) exemplifies the heritage of the community.

With its steeply pitched hipped roof, complex roofline, elegant masonry, proliferation of dormers, and fusion of Gothic and Renaissance detailing, the Nugent Home exemplifies the Chateausque style. Designed by prominent architect J. Franklin Stuckert, it is a rare and important example of a style that eloquently evokes the Gilded Age.

The Nugent Home also marks an important point on the trajectory of American socio-economic history. It was an integral part of the historic movement that redefined old age and produced a series of institutions to administer it. It exemplifies the economic, social, and historical heritage of the community. A model of Christian charity, George Nugent willed his material possessions to improve the spiritual lives of others. The Home is a

monument to that altruism and faith. Moreover, it is a monument to significant points in our shared architectural and socio-economic histories and is eligible for listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Commission.

Neil Sklaroff, counsel for the owner, noted that the property is under an agreement of sale to Impacting Your World Christian Center and Blair Christian Academy. He said that the designation would create obstacles for the owner. He remarked that the owner will continue to work with the community. Mr. Sklaroff did not dispute the claim that the site is eligible for designation; however, he urged the Commission to withhold its decision to allow the equitable owner time to reconsider the matter.

Sherman Toppins, counsel for Impacting Your World Christian Center, conceded that the church is still weighing its options. He offered his opposition to the designation, but conceded that the site satisfies the designation criteria. He concluded that the church intended to preserve the Nugent home, but demolish the Presser building. Mr. Toppins suggested that the sale could be hampered by the designation.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stressed that this building has unique character, meets many criteria, and marks an important social innovation. He alluded to the tax credit benefits of restoration.

Bernard Wilson, the vice president of West Central Germantown Neighbors, asserted that this building is an important jewel in the community. He offered his organization's support of the designation.

Mark Stier, the president of West Mt. Airy Neighbor's, said that his organization does not oppose the church, but that it does support the designation. Mr. Stier noted that two organizations have expressed interest in acquiring the building; one for a bed and breakfast and the other for a senior home.

Lloyd Bowman, a twelve year resident, said that he opposes the demolition, the mis-use of the building, its neglect and deterioration. He gave an overview of the history and establishment of the Nugent Home. Mr. Bowman said that the building is a defining site within the neighborhood. He strongly believes that the building should be designated.

Ms. Smyler asserted that the designation should not be postponed.

Mr. Tissian moved to designate 221 West Johnson Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Wilds returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

3700-3800 Hamilton Walk, Richards Medical Building and Goddard Biology Building at the University of Pennsylvania

University of Pennsylvania, Owner

Date: 1957-65, Louis I. Kahn, architect

The Committee on Historic Designation voted unanimously to recommend the

designation of the complex consisting of the Alfred Newton Richards Medical Research Building and the David Goddard Biological Laboratories on the campus of the University of Pennsylvania as historic and its listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The Committee recognized that it is one of the most significant landmarks of Modern architecture in Philadelphia and the world. Designed by world-famous architect Louis I. Kahn in the late 1950s and erected in two stages between 1958 and 1965, it fulfills Designation Criteria D, E, and F. The complex of laboratories:

- (D) embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style and an engineering specimen;
- (E) was designed by an architect whose work has significantly influenced the architectural development of the City and Nation;
- (F) and contains elements of design, detail, materials, and craftsmanship that represent significant innovations.

The laboratories mark the beginning of Kahn's stunning late career and, more significantly, a key point in the development of world architecture. With the opening of the Richards Medical Building in 1960, architecture forever changed; with his revolutionary design, Kahn forced every architect, whether in Philadelphia, Paris, or Sydney, to rethink fundamentally the nature of design and to question deeply the basic tenets of Modern architecture, which had hardened into a rigid dogma during the 1950s. The Alfred Newton Richards Medical Research Building and the David Goddard Biological Laboratories are eligible for listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Farnham presented the nomination. He explained that Kahn's design was an alternative to the rigid modernism of the day. The Museum of Modern Art in New York featured the building in an exhibit soon after it was completed, testifying to its great significance.

Mr. Steinberg emphasized the significance of this building. Mr. Sklaroff remarked that it is a very powerful building.

John Gallery stated that this building is often seen as a companion to Guild House and that Robert Venturi and Louis Kahn are two of the most prominent architects of the twentieth century.

Mr. Rivera made a motion to designate the Alfred Newton Richards Medical Research Building and the David Goddard Biological Laboratories at 3700-3800 Hamilton Walk as historic and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Sklaroff recused himself and again passed the gavel to Mr. Wilds.

Rescission of 930 Adams Avenue, a.k.a. 800 Adams Avenue, Greenwood Knights of Pythias Cemetery

Greenwood Cemetery Company, Owner

Mr. Tyler presented the rescission application to the Historical Commission. He stated that the nomination that led to the designation of the cemetery in August 2000 was rife

with errors. The majority of the argument for designation presented in the nomination rested on the claim that Benjamin Rush, a noted eighteenth-century doctor and a signer of the Declaration of Independence, had lived at the site. Mr. Tyler contended that Rush had never lived at the site, but had owned the property for a short time as an investment. Mr. Tyler noted that Rush had numerous other investment properties throughout the commonwealth. He concluded that the insignificant Rush connection did not warrant designation. Designating this property because of its link to Rush would be tantamount to designating any site in Pennsylvania because it had once belonged to William Penn.

Moving to the cemetery, which was designed by Thomas Levy about 1870, Mr. Tyler remarked that the nomination had argued that it was an example of the Rural Cemetery type, an important type in the history of cemetery development. He explained that Mt. Auburn Cemetery outside Boston and Laurel Hill and the Woodlands in Philadelphia, all of which date to the 1830s and 1840s, are excellent examples of the Rural Cemetery type. The type was prevalent from the 1830s to the 1850s and was based on the Romantic, rambling, picturesque English garden. Greenwood Cemetery was established on cleared, graded farmland that did not resemble the rolling, natural landscape of the typical English garden. The area around Greenwood Cemetery may have been rural in 1870, but Greenwood was not a Rural Cemetery, as the nomination argued.

Finally, the nomination argued that the farmhouse on the site is a significant example of eighteenth-century vernacular architecture. Mr. Tyler reported that he and Mr. Farnham had analyzed the house from the basement to the attic and had undertaken extensive research to substantiate the competing claims made about it. He stated that map research shows that a structure of the appropriate size and location existed on the site as early as 1839. He also stated that information garnered from the numerous deeds is inconclusive. Two lengthy site visits have produced no evidence to support an eighteenth-century date for any portion of the structure. Mr. Tyler asserted that the house meets the criteria for designation, but that the justification for designation is not presented in the original nomination. He concluded, reporting that the Committee on Historic Designation unanimously recommended that the Commission table the rescission application for a period not to exceed six months pending the review of an amended nomination to be compiled by the staff, with all new information to be submitted by interested parties to the staff on or before 5 January 2005.

Ronald Hancock submitted the application for rescission. He said that he has done years of research that disputes the information in the original nomination. He asserted that Greenwood Cemetery is neither Rural nor a Garden cemetery. Mr. Hancock read a written statement, which was submitted for the record.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance offered his organization's support of the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Steinberg reminded all interested parties that all materials for the new nomination must be submitted to the staff by 5 January 2005.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to table the rescission application for a period not to exceed six (6) months pending the review of an amended nomination to be compiled by the staff, with all new information to be submitted by interested parties to the staff on or before 5 January 2005. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried unanimously. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Re-classification of 1706 Rittenhouse Square

Parkway Corporation, Owner

Mr. Tyler summarized the application for the re-classification of 1706 Rittenhouse Street from contributing to non-contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. He explained that the row along the south side of Rittenhouse Square was not built together, but was an organic development of houses converted to carriage houses that were then returned to residential use. The diverse composition of well-to-do residents mixed with the service class proved necessary for the survival of both classes. This mix forms a major part of the significance of the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District.

The changing of the façade of the building is also typical of changes found throughout the district. Many buildings in the neighborhood have had the front facades changed by famous and not-so-famous architects over time, using tile, stucco, and brick materials. These changes also formed a major part of the significance of the historic district.

Mr. Tyler emphasized that the local historic district did not have an end date for its period of significance and that the classifications were based on the building's historic use, massing, scale, and rhythm. He noted that the building had been altered at the first floor in the 1950s, but unlike the National Register, the local register does not have a 50-year rule.

Lastly, Mr. Tyler expressed concern that to re-classify this building would set a dangerous precedent for this district. It would put at risk any building that had undergone changes in the last 50 years.

He concluded, reporting that the Committee on Historic Designation recommended that the Commission reclassify 1706 Rittenhouse Square from contributing to non-contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District.

Ms. Smyler concurred with Mr. Tyler's concerns that such a reclassification would set a precedent, and asserted that the demolition should be predicated on a finding of financial hardship and not a re-classification. Mr. Tissian reiterated that each building is reviewed on its own merits. Mr. Reuter commented that although the building would be re-classified, it would remain under the jurisdiction of the Commission, owing to its location in a district.

Thomas Witt, counsel for the Parkway Corporation, argued that the building was misclassified when the local district was created and that it does not meet the necessary criteria for classification as contributing. He said that this is a 1920s building that has undergone many façade changes and should not be treated as contributing. Since the nomination, the façade has been painted and the storefront altered. Mr. Witt suggested that the Commission not only reclassify the building, but also approve its demolition.

Mr. Steinberg remarked that the Committee considered this application very seriously and concluded that the building does not contribute to the district. Mr. Tissian asserted that it would not be appropriate to consider the reclassification and demolition of this building in a single vote. He suggested two votes, one on reclassification and one on demolition. Ms. Smyler recommended tabling the reclassification application and proceeding to the financial hardship question. Mr. James argued that the reclassification

would set a negative precedent.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance declared that the Alliance supports the reclassification owing to the building's substantial alterations. He believes that the reclassification is consistent with the Commission's policies. Mr. Gallery cited 2019 Green Street and 328 Delancey Street as examples. He also opined that it is appropriate to approve the demolition.

Mr. Reuter pointed out that the Commission is not reviewing a Committee report on demolition.

John Gallery noted that the developer would submit plans for the new construction to the Architectural Committee.

Mr. Tissian moved to approve the re-classification of 1706 Rittenhouse Square from contributing to non-contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. Ms. Murrar seconded the motion, which carried unanimously. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Tissian moved to approve the demolition of the building at 1706 Rittenhouse Square. Ms. Murrar seconded the motion, which carried unanimously. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Ms. Smyler moved to table the financial hardship Committee's recommendation for 1706 Rittenhouse Square. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which carried unanimously. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Wilds returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

The Report of the Architectural Committee

Memorial Hall

City of Philadelphia/Fairmount Park Commission/ Please Touch Museum, Owner
Philip Scott, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1876, Centennial Exhibition, Hermann Schwartzmann, architect

PROPOSAL: Façade restoration, new windows, addition, signage and lighting – final approval

The Architectural Committee voted to approve the proposal, provided the west niche banners are reduced in size, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.], Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.] and Standard 10 [New additions and 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.].

Mr. Farnham presented the application for final approval of the proposal to adapt Memorial Hall for the Please Touch Museum. The alterations include façade rehabilitation, an addition, signage, lighting, and other improvements.

On 10 October 2003, the Historical Commission approved in concept the following: the main-façade doors and windows stipulated in Revised Scheme C, i.e. the replicated 1876 bronze and iron doors as well as new windows based on the 1921 configuration,

but without the infill; the restoration of the corner pavilion windows to their 1876 appearance; the location, size, connection, and overall appearance but not the exterior details of the carousel addition; the removal of non-historic stairs, doors, and ramps and the restoration of associated areas; the addition of two emergency exits on the west façade; the redesigned drop-off lots flanking the main entrance, provided the paving matches the central walkway; the school bus drop-off road and main parking lot; and the restoration of the plaza between the branches of the Concourse. The Commission requested further study and review of alternative plans for the regrading for sidewalks up to the main entrance and the closing of the north branch of the Concourse.

Mr. Farnham noted that with the exception of the front windows and the carousel addition, which has been modified in size, connection, and overall appearance, the plans submitted for final approval appear to comply with the Commission's in-concept approval.

The carousel addition will stand on a pre-cast panel base (color to match the base of Memorial Hall); will be constructed of glass and aluminum; and will be topped with a standing-seam roof. The design of the carousel addition has been revised since it was last reviewed. The link between Memorial Hall and the addition has been shortened and its bulk stands closer to the historic building. A shed addition for restrooms now projects out to the east. A front stair and entranceway has been added. At the roof, the clerestory has been replaced by a series of gables. Overall, the elevations of the addition are more complicated; the clarity and simplicity of the in-concept design have been abandoned for more intricacy and detail.

Site and tree plans are included. The plans no longer stipulate the closing of North Concourse Drive in front of the museum; the closing had troubled some Commission members. Paving plans for the walks and drop-off zones comply with the Commission's in-concept approval. The proposed garden walls on either side of the main entrance, one of which will hide an ADA ramp, are not fully defined. No materials or colors are specified.

Plans for a vast array of sign types are included. Most of the signage will not visibly or physically impact Memorial Hall itself. Sixteen banner signs will mount directly to the building. Attachment details have not been provided.

Plans for lighting are also included. No details for lighting attached to the building itself have been provided.

Philip Scott, the architect, attended the meeting.

Mr. Steinberg asked if the design of the lighting and signage was compatible with the plans for the Centennial district. He urged the Commission to consider a more demure and recessive design for the addition. He declared that the carousel addition is not appropriate for the historic building. Mr. Sklaroff commented that at the previous meeting, this project received conceptual approval, which authorized the applicant to proceed to the next step in the design. He cited the Centennial kiosk in Rittenhouse Square. Mr. Tissian suggested that the glass addition not abut the historic building. Mr. Wilds thought that the roofline should be redesigned. Mr. Steinberg stressed the significance of the historic building and asserted that the addition should be an expression of its time.

Mr. James pointed out that the conceptual design and the revised design are totally different. He contended that the new addition would be situated too close to the historic building and that it would compete with Memorial Hall. Other Commission members disagreed and deemed the location appropriate.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance said that he chaired the advisory Committee, which counseled the architect and its client. The design, which must meet the Secretary of Standards, was approved by the National Park Service. Mr. Gallery said that he believes that the design is consistent with that which was approved conceptually. He said that the fixed line established by the pool position made it impossible to relocate the bathrooms for Kelly Pool. He offered his support of the project as submitted.

Mr. Steinberg disagreed. Mr. Sklaroff noted that the view of the front façade will change with the addition; therefore, it is important. Mr. Tissian inquired if the roofline could be simplified. Mr. Scott responded that the building and its connection were designed to be as small as possible and that they still encroach on the pool property.

Mr. Rivera moved to grant final approval for the proposal, provided the west niche banners are reduced in size, with staff to review details. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which carried with 7 votes. Mr. James and Mr. Steinberg dissented.

1825 Porter Street

Joseph Rollo, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1907, James & John Windrim

PROPOSAL: Legalize roll-down gate at rear

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of legalizing the roll-down gate, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.].

Ms. Spina presented the application. She noted that the owner was out of the country last month and did not receive the notices of the meetings; he wishes to return this month to plead his case. Without a permit or Commission approval, the owner installed a metal roll-down gate at the rear of the property, which faces Roseberry Street. Although they are out of the historic district, houses on Roseberry face this work. Ms. Spina noted that a resident on Roseberry Street sent a letter opposing the gate and Ronald Donatucci submitted a letter supporting the applicant.

Mr. Wilds remarked that this property is at the edge of the district and that its former openness has been lost. He believes that if the application had come before the Commission, it would have received approval. Mr. Steinberg declared that edges of districts are important. Mr. James thought that the applicant should pursue the appeal's process. He noted other similar situations and stated that any action by the Commission could set a precedent. Mr. Sklaroff expressed concern about the illegal alteration and said that the gate introduces an intrusive mechanical feature.

Joseph Rollo, the owner, claimed that he did not receive the notification of the previous meeting in a timely manner. He stressed that illegally parked cars and trespassing children prompted the installation of the gate. Mr. Rollo asserted that his contractor was

told that a permit was not required. He said that he appeared before the Zoning Board with a petition in support of the gate and that no one opposed the gate.

Mr. James made a motion to reconsider the motion from the previous meeting. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. James contended that the roll-down gate is inappropriate. Mr. Wilds cited a similar situation on 4th and Pine Streets.

Mr. James made a motion to legalize the gate. Ms. Murrery seconded the motion, which carried with 6 votes. Ms. Smyler, Mr. Rivera, and Mr. Sklaroff dissented.

231-35 North 2nd Street

2nd Street Investors, Owner

Hugh Zimmers, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Change cast-stone to fiberglass

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the material change.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal. The Commission approved the construction of the six-story parking condominium in September 2002. The facing of the proposed structure included cast-stone columns, pipe metal grilles with screening and wood storefront details. The proposal calls for changing the cast-stone pilasters to fiberglass.

Ms. Spina passed around a sample of the fiberglass.

Mr. Wilds referenced the compromise struck by the Commission at the time the project had been approved. It specified that the salvaged cast iron be incorporated into a mural; the applicant has not yet supplied the details of that mural to the Commission. Mr. Sklaroff asked for clarification of the facts surrounding the demolition to clear the site. Commissioners agreed that it had included one illegal and one approved demolition.

William G. Schwartz, counsel for the owner, and James Garvey attended the meeting. Mr. Schwartz said that cost as well as the fact that superstructure was unable to support the cast-stone load dictated the change in materials. Mr. Schwartz disputed the statement that some of the demolition had been illegal. He pointed out that the horizontal add-ons, which are fiberglass, have already been approved; the substitution of materials would make the façade more coherent. Mr. Schwartz added that safety was also a driving force for the change in materials; the fiberglass is not as heavy.

Mr. Wilds noted that the cast iron elements being retained were not a part of the previous application; therefore, he believes that the material change would be acceptable.

Ms. Spina stated that the Committee contended that the texture and depth of cast stone would not be replicated in fiberglass. She also noted that the Commission has already made numerous compromises on the new construction. Ms. Murray recalled that the Commission had approved the replication of cornices in fiberglass on the St. James project. Mr. Steinberg inquired about the durability of fiberglass at the base of the structure. Mr. Garvey cited the Widener and Bookbinder's buildings, which used fiberglass. He noted that the fiberglass would have a sandblasted finish which would be easier to clean and have more longevity. He also noted that if a car strikes the

fiberglass, then it is easily replaceable, while the cast stone would pose a structural problem. Mr. Wilds asked for an update on the plan for the salvaged materials. Mr. Schwartz said that the mural is not the focus of the project at this time owing to considerations about the method of attachment. Mr. Wilds thought that by 15 November 2004, the Commission should receive information about the mural and by the end of the year the staff should be furnished with details of the attachment for the cast-iron pieces.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the substitute material. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

400-02 Spruce Street

R. Bruce Heppenstall, Owner

William J. O'Brien II, Esq., Applicant

DATE: 1969, Hassinger and Schwam, architects for Penn Tower Development Corporation; garage and side addition, c. 1995 for Redevelopment Authority

The Committee voted to approve the proposal as submitted, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and 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.].

Ms. Spina described the history of the property and the proposal. On the Spruce Street façade, the application calls for enlarging the first-floor windows in the original section of the house. This will be accomplished through the removal of the metal spandrel above the existing windows. At the entrance in the later addition, the plans stipulate the replacement of the glass block with a single-paned sidelight and the concrete stringer stairs with cascading stairs.

On the 4th Street façade, the twenty-light fixed window would be replaced with a double-leaf, single-paned casement window and an identical window would be cut just next to it. Lastly, a second-story addition would be built on the garage. The addition would have brick facing, an aluminum, standing-seam metal roof and HVAC equipment at the very western end of the roof. The aluminum garage door will have a brick arch opening and wood in-filled transom. This detail, though a bit awkward, echoes the arches over the windows on the addition.

Karl Krumholz, the architect, attended the meeting. He noted that the second floor would be used for storage.

Bernice Hamel expressed concern about the appearance of the garage and asked that she be included in the presentation of the details. Mr. Krumholz agreed. Commission members commented that Ms. Hamel's inclusion is not part of the Commission's processes.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, with staff to review details. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which carried with 7 votes. Ms. Murray abstained and Mr. Rivera recused himself.

214 Delancey Street

Bryan Miller, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1756 by John Goodwin, carpenter; front façade restored, c. 1957

PROPOSAL: 3rd-floor addition on rear ell, rear decks, new windows – in concept

The Committee recommended denial pursuant to Standards 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.]; 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and 10 [New additions and 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.].

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. The owner provided an incorrect mailing address with the application and therefore did not receive the notice letters of the meetings. He returns this month to plead his case. The concept proposal calls for adding a third story to the rear ell of this intact 1756 house. The main section has a gambrel roof with a shed roof dormer, and the rear ell has the original half-gable roofline. To accommodate the addition, the roofline would be extended from the ridgeline, demolishing the roof at the rear. The rear wall of the house and rear ell are currently stuccoed. The plans call for the addition to be stuccoed as well. Two wood decks would extend off the rear ell at the second and third floors with double-leaf doors. The application form also states that the owner would like to replace the windows, but the application does not include any details.

No one was present to represent the application.

Commission members agreed not to take any action and to allow the previous motion to stand.

14 North Front Street

Luca Sena, Owner

Sabrina Soong, Architect/Applicant

DATE: bet. 1828 and 1836; rehabilitated 1989

PROPOSAL: Alter windows to sliding doors with balconettes

The Committee recommended approval as submitted pursuant to Standards 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work 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 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.].

Ms. Spina introduced this submission. This project entails changing non-historic coupled, one-over-one windows on the south side of the building. The new configuration includes single-leaf doors and casement windows with A/C units below. Each opening

will then have balconettes that project approximately 1'3". The area of work encompasses a former party wall that historically did not have openings and several rear additions.

Sabrina Soong represented the project.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and approve the submission. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

400-02 Wood Street aka 314 York Avenue

Luigi Basile, Owner

Danilo Vicencio, Applicant

DATE: c. 1820; gable roof removed and façade stuccoed, mid-20th century

PROPOSAL: 4th – floor addition with gable roof, face building in brick, cut window openings on 1st floor

The Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.] and Standard 7 [Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken in the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.].

Ms. Spina described this application. According to the Smith Atlas of 1909, this building originally had another half story, probably with a cedar-shingled, gable roof and six-over-six double-hung windows along the Wood Street façade. Like the house behind this one on Lawrence Street, the gable only sat on the front portion of the building and the rear ell was a three story section with a half-gable roof. The owner wishes to add one and a half stories to the property and has submitted two different versions of the proposal. Both versions include a gabled roof extending over the entire property and refacing the entire building with thin bricks; however, no other details of materials appear on the plans.

The first proposal includes two large six-over-six windows with pedimented parapets that break the roofline on the front façade. On the Wood Street façade, two six-over-six windows with fanlights and shutters flank a large bank of windows. The bank of windows stretches to the peak of the roofline and surrounds a double-leaf door leading to a balconette.

The second proposal, which is more modest in scale, eliminates the parapets on the front façade and has an unbroken cornice line. The fourth-floor windows match the existing third-floor windows. On the Wood Street façade, again, the proposed six-over-six windows match those found on the third floor, except for the middle bay. This bay has a double-leaf, multi-light door with a fanlight and balconette.

The owner also wants to expand the storefront on the first floor by cutting another bay of windows. These would be single-pane casement windows with an awning to match the existing awning. A sign would be installed on the corner above the second floor, but the plans do not include any details other than the size.

No one was present to represent the project.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation of denial. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried with 6 votes. Mr. Bumb abstained and Ms. Murray dissented.

23 West Walnut Lane

Ken and Lois Ann Handrich, Owners

Robert Thomas, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1849

PROPOSAL: Demolish existing one-story rear addition; construct one-story addition, cut fence for gate for parking

The Committee recommended approval of the proposal subject to the redesign of the addition's cornice, especially where it overlaps onto the historic building, the annotation of materials on the plans, and the submission of a plan for the gate conversion, with staff to review details, 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.].

Mr. Farnham presented this submission. This application proposes the demolition of a non-historic, one-story, rear addition; construction of a large, one-story, rear addition; the conversion of an historic fence into a gate; and the addition of a curb cut and driveway. Although at the rear, the new addition would be visible from Walnut Lane. The plans provide no information about materials or the gate to be created from the historic fence.

Robert Thomas, the architect, and Ken Handrich, the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Thomas informed the Commission that the owner agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

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

1216 Spruce Street

George Anni, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1825

PROPOSAL: Switch door and window on Camac Street façade

The Committee recommended approval of the conversion of a window into a door with a door and transom to match the historic door to the north and a step in marble or cast stone; the installation of the bathroom fan; and the installation of an interior kitchen fan with a flush louver in the alley painted to match the surrounding brick, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; and Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.].

Mr. Farnham introduced this submission. This application originally proposed swapping a first-floor door and window on the Camac Street façade of this rowhouse, which is being converted into a restaurant. The applicant recently revised the submission to

include kitchen and bathroom fans as well.

The Department of Licenses & Inspections has requested that an exterior door be added at the top of a basement stairway for egress. A window currently occupies the spot. An unused door into the dining room stands to the north of the window. The locations of the door and window would be swapped.

The fans would be added to a one-story addition at the south. They would be visible from Camac Street.

George Anni, the owner, informed the Commission that he is in agreement with the Architectural Committee's recommendation. He noted that the Department of Licenses and Inspections requires an additional door for egress. Mr. Anni now proposes to allow the existing door to remain and to change a window into a door.

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

1300 Market Street aka 100 Penn Square East, Wanamaker Building

Wanamaker Office Lease, LP, Owner

Marita Sommar Osborne, Applicant

DATE: 1902-1910, Daniel H. Burnham & Company

PROPOSAL: Carve signage over west entrance

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended approval of the proposal, with staff to review details.

Mr. Farnham presented the application. This application proposes carving "THE WANAMAKER BUILDING" into the granite frieze band of the entablature over the west entrance to this department store and office building. The hand-carved letters would be 18" tall.

Mr. Wilds expressed concern about carving a sign in unaltered historic fabric. He also wondered if the carving could be done safely.

Marita Osbourne and Glen Hilltack attended the meeting. Ms. Osbourne explained that the carved sign would identify and affirm the historic name of the building. She stressed that the carving can be done safely owing to the 13-inch thick stone.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which carried with 7 votes. Mr. Wilds and Mr. James dissented.

261-63 South 22nd Street aka 262 South Van Pelt Street

Arthur Elwood, Owner

Craig Deutsch, Applicant

DATE: 261 S. 22nd Street, aka 262 S. Van Pelt Street, c. 1875

new façade at 261 S. 22nd Street, 1937

263 S. 22nd Street, addition to 261 S. 22nd Street, 1957

PROPOSAL: Substantial demolition of three contributing buildings and construction of three three-story buildings with garages – in concept

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]; and 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.].

This application proposes in concept the partial demolition of three buildings and the construction of three residential buildings with garages and decks in their places. All three buildings are listed as Contributing to the Rittenhouse-Filter Historic District.

The buildings, which have been consolidated as one property since the mid 1950s, have complex histories. The building at 261 S. 22nd Street was constructed as either a rowhouse or carriage house about 1875. The only nineteenth-century features surviving on the S. 22nd façade are the third-story window frames and the uncommon pierced Neo-Grec cornice. The brick of the Van Pelt Street façade, which is covered with several layers of paint, may be original. By 1895, the building was used as a livery; it occupied the entire lot from S. 22nd through to Van Pelt and probably had stable or garage doors at both facades. In 1937, part of the S. 22nd façade was demolished and reconstructed. It is likely that the awkward corbelled brick brackets at the cornice were added at this time. A four-story rowhouse with a three-story rear ell once stood at 263 S. 22nd. It was standing in 1939, but had been demolished by 1957. The two-story brick building that now stands at 263 S. 22nd was erected in 1957 as an addition to 261 S. 22nd. The façade at 261 S. 22nd was further altered when the addition was built. The facades of both 261 and 263 S. 22nd stand several inches out onto the sidewalk from the traditional building line, evidencing the fact that they are not original, but are later additions. The Colonial Revival doorway and glass block windows on Van Pelt Street probably date to the 1957 renovation and addition. The glass and aluminum storefront at 263 S. 22nd is a fairly recent addition, but predates the district designation.

The proposal stipulates the demolition of the facades at 263 S. 22nd and 262 S. Van Pelt. New brick and limestone veneer facades would be constructed. Garages would be included in all three new townhouses. The proposal also stipulates the demolition of the center section of the 261 S. 22nd/262 Van Pelt building and the rear section of the 263 S. 22nd building to create rear yards for the three new townhouses. The yards are needed to meet the open-space and rear-yard requirements specified in the zoning code. One-story additions would be constructed on the two-story pieces at 263 S. 22nd and 262 S. Van Pelt. Penthouses and roof decks would be constructed atop all three buildings.

Virgil Procaccino, one of the developers, and architect Craig Deutsch attended the meeting.

Mr. Wilds inquired about the height of the existing buildings in relation to the height of the proposed construction. He asserted that the façade at 263 S. 22nd should not be altered. Mr. Deutsch responded that the height would remain the same. He also said

that the cornice would be removed, the façade re-built, and the decorative cornice reinstalled. Mr. Wilds questioned the need for a 4th floor on Van Pelt Street. Mr. Deutsch replied that the 4th story would allow access to the deck. He added that the penthouses would be set back from the façades.

Mr. Sklaroff clarified the issues in question. He noted the need for retention of historic fabric; the overwhelming massing of the proposed buildings; and the lack of elevation and detailed drawings.

Mr. Bumb made a motion to approve the proposal with the retention of the historic features and the additions of 3rd and 4th stories. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which failed with a vote of 2 to 7. Mr. Wilds, Mr. James, Ms. Smyler, Mr. Steinberg, Mr. Tissian, Mr. Rivera and Mr. Sklaroff.

Mr. Steinberg opposed approving the proposal owing to the lack of detailed drawings as well as the overwhelming massing of the proposed construction. Mr. Wilds thought that the proposed sizes of the penthouses width are excessive.

Joan Hooke, the owner of 264 South Van Pelt Street, expressed concern about the massing and its overall impact on the streetscape. She believes that the Commission should view the demolition as a complete or substantial demolition, which should be justified by public interest or financial hardship.

John Moore, the owner of 254 South Van Pelt Street, stated his opposition to the loss of historic fabric and to the proposed massing, which would block his sunlight. Mr. Procaccino said that a light study had been untaken and that it proved that there will be limited impact on Mr. Moore's property. However, Mr. Moore questioned the study.

Mr. Sklaroff recommended that the applicant rethink the proposal after conferring with the neighbors, consider carefully the streetscape's effect, retain historic fabric, and submit detailed drawings to the Commission.

Ms. Murray referred to a letter from Council President Anna Verna, which supports the project. She remarked that she had no knowledge of letters of opposition to the proposal, but thought that the applicant should use the feedback from this meeting for guidance in the redesigning of the new construction. Mr. Rivera remarked that enough land exist to allow for a setback.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation of denial. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried with 6 votes. Mr. Bumb and Ms. Murray opposed the motion and Ms. Smyler abstained.

2118 Pine Street

John Vavricka, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1865

PROPOSAL: Legalize roof deck

The Committee unanimously recommended that because of the extenuating circumstance of the City's issuance of a permit in error, they would recommend approval of a lowered deck on the rear ell and a full width deck on the mansard roof subject to the

entire structure being pulled back five feet from the Pine Street façade with an open metal picket rail.

Mr. Baron explained this proposal, which calls for approval of a roof deck already under construction on top of the mansard roof of this corner house. The work received a building permit in error without review by the Historical Commission. Staff has visited the site to look at a mock up and the deck will have visibility from several directions on Pine and Van Pelt Streets. The Historical Commission also generally does not approve decks on the main roofs of buildings particularly where the public has visibility.

John Vavricka, the owner, and Vincent Melchiorre, Esq., counsel for the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Melchiorre explained that special beams are needed to support the structure. He noted that the floor and railing would be setback to minimize visibility; however, he requested that the framework be allowed to remain owing to cost issues. Mr. Melchiorre presented photographs of neighboring properties with decks. He informed the Commission that lowering of the rear deck would prove very costly.

Mr. Wilds thought that a metal railing would be less intrusive. Mr. Sklaroff remarked that he is not a fan of roof decks, but that he was persuaded by the extenuating circumstances.

Mr. Bumb made a motion to approve the legalization with the retention of the framework, provided that the deck and railing is setback five feet from the Pine Street façade with an open metal picket rail. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which carried with 7 votes. Ms. Murray abstained and Mr. James dissented.

1900 Wallace Street

David Krahn, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Legalize window alteration

The Architectural Committee recommended denial pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work 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.].

Mr. Baron explained that this property had been reviewed last month for the legalization of a deck and door. This proposal calls for legalization of the bricking up of the bottom of a window and the installation of a small vinyl window on the visible side wall of this corner house. The owner said that he installed the smaller window to accommodate a kitchen counter.

David Krahn, the owner, sent a letter in his absence, explaining the circumstances of the window alterations. Mr. Wilds inquired if the brickwork matched; however, the information was not available.

Mr. James made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and deny the legalization. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Steinberg abstained.

2028-30 Fairmount Avenue

Savaas Navrosidis, Owner

Gerry Gutierrez, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Remove concrete ramp and infill at storefronts, construct new wood and glass storefronts

The Architectural Committee recommended final approval of the storefront subject to the submission of detailed drawings to be reviewed by the staff and Committee at its next meeting.

Mr. Baron described this proposal, which calls for the installation of two modern wood storefronts at the base of these structures. The Commission has previously approved more historic looking storefronts at this location.

No one came to represent the application.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to table the proposal for a period not to exceed six months. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

2434 Poplar Street

Sean and Allene Pulsifer, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1885

PROPOSAL: Replace slate roof with imitation slate shingles

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, material].

Mr. Baron presented this proposal, which calls for re-roofing the slate covered mansard of this house with dark grey rubber faux slate shingles.

Commission members concurred with the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

1312-14 Rodman Street

Robert Volpe, Owner

Edward Bell, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: Legalize cornice, window changes, stucco on watertable and starbolts
Restore door openings.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the Mr. Bell's originally submitted proposal to legalize the cornice, removal of chimneys and shutter hardware subject to the restoration of the doorway with the inclusion of the larger basement window; the larger lintel at the 1st floor window; the electrical outlet and the dryer vent.

Mr. Baron presented the application. This application involves the legalization of work that does not comply with approved plans. After receiving an initial stop work order, the applicant had his architect apply for a permit for exterior work. On the plans for 1314 Rodman, the applicant proposed to remove the stucco from the base of the building, restore the cornice and doorway and install new windows preserving the shutter hardware. His plans called for preserving the existing roof. The actual work resulted in the removal of the chimney and shutter hardware, and the increase in the amount of stucco at the base of the building by eight inches. The applicant rebuilt the doorway with an asymmetrical and non-historic frame and transom without reopening the full historic masonry opening. He also revised the star-bolts and rebuilt the doorway on 1312 Rodman Street without a three light transom.

Mr. Volpe has now submitted revised plans to legalize the removal of the chimney and shutter hardware, restucco the building base and modify the star bolts. He also seeks to legalize the removal of the corbelled brick cornice which he says a former owner altered. He offers, however, to restore the doorways by reopening the masonry opening, constructing new three light transoms and installing the historic door frame on 1314 Rodman Street.

Richard Thom, the consultant for the project, noted that the revised plans show a raised panel door. This door has already been approved. He said that the transom of 1314 would be replaced.

Commission members concurred that owing to the ownership issue for 1312 Rodman Street, the motion would be restricted to 1314 Rodman Street only.

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

935 East Moyamensing Avenue

Massimo Taurisano, Owner

Joe Seratore, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c 1810

PROPOSAL: Legalize brick window heads over new lintels, re-painting façade

The Architectural Committee agreed with the staff recommendation to deny the proposal pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work 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.]

Mr. Baron presented the application, which seeks to legalize work that differs from plans approved at staff level. The approved plans call for the applicant to strip paint from the

façade and to repair brick work with staff to review a masonry sample in the field. When staff reviewed the brickwork in the field, the bricks and mortar seemed a poor match. The applicant painted the formerly brick red wall and brown stone colored base a green color. When neighbors complained, he changed it to a second green color. The staff contends that he should either follow the original plans or repaint the wall and base to match the underlying colors of the red and brown.

Staff recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Wilds inquired if the paint is removable. Massimo Taurisano, the owner, and Joe Seratore, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Seratore said that the paint is removable. He told the Commission that he removed the previous paint and decided to repaint instead of pointing. Mr. Taurisano asserted that after his meeting with Mr. Baron, he thought that he had two options; either to paint or repoint. Mr. Baron noted that the installed bricks are not a good match and that a more appropriate brick should be substituted. Mr. Wilds recommended that the bricks be repainted red.

Mr. Rivera made a motion to approve the legalization. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which failed with a vote of 3 to 5.

Mr. James made a motion to deny the legalization and require the bricks to be painted red. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which carried with 6 votes. Mr. Steinberg and Mr. Rivera dissented.

THE REPORT of the Committee on Financial Hardship

1917 Panama Street

Michele Williams, Owner

Date: c. 1840/1910

The Financial Hardship Committee recommended the tabling of the application for a period not to exceed 90 days for its return to the Financial Hardship Committee and a period not to exceed 120 days for its return to the Commission.

Michele Williams, the owner, asked the Commission to accept her withdrawal of the application for financial hardship, owing to her father's name remaining on the title. In response to the applicant's request, the Commission took no action.

4643 Hazel Avenue

Stephanie Haney, Owner

Date: 1911

The Financial Hardship Committee recommended the tabling of the application for a period not to exceed 60 days and requested insurance and claims documentation for the property.

No one representing the application was present.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to table the proposal for a period not to exceed six months. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Old Business

102 N. Front Street

Alan Karpo, Owner

George Baker, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: Install lottery window, remove bulkhead

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials]; Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and 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.].

Ms. Spina presented the application. The owner proposes to install a sliding glass window within the large plate-glass storefront window. The proposal also includes removing the historic central basement bulkhead and infilling the area with concrete. The owner wants the change to be able to sell lottery tickets to disabled patrons.

In April 2002, the Historical Commission approved a handicap-access ramp for the property. This would be a simpler and more architecturally appropriate solution to the owners needs.

George Baker, the architect, informed the Commission that the owner has reconsidered the removal of the bulkhead and only proposes the change to the window. Ms. Spina noted that the Lottery Commission will not issue a lottery machine if the property is not handicapped accessible.

Commission members concluded that ADA accessibility could be accomplished with the installation of the previously approved ramp.

Richard Thom, of the Old City Civic Association, urged the Commission to vote against the alterations to the window. He argued that the Civic Association has opposed sidewalk service windows for the last twenty years.

Mr. James made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and deny the application. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

APPOINTMENT TO THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE

Commission members discussed the appointment of Daniela Holt Voith to a vacant position on the Architectural Committee.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the appointment. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

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

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

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to approve the expenditure of \$31.98 for the Architectural Committee lunches.

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

Mr. Sklaroff announced an all-day training session for Commission members and staff given by the Pennsylvania Bar Institute on 16 November 2004 on the 10th floor of the Wanamaker building.

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

The meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary

As corrected 11/30/04