

**THE MINUTES OF THE 534TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**9 FEBRUARY 2007
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18029
MICHAEL SKLAROFF, ESQ., CHAIR**

PRESENT

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
James Brown IV
Rosalie Leonard
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
David Perri, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Vincent Rivera, AIA
David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Joan Schlotterbeck, Department of Public Property
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing & Community Development

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Jonathan Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Assistant City Solicitor, Law Department

ALSO PRESENT

Harvey Spear, Centra Associates
Robert Spear, Centra Associates
Richard DiMarco, Klehr Harrison Harvey, Branzburg & Ellers, LLP
Dan Reisman, Eckert Seamans, LLP
Richard Thom, R.W. Thom, AIA
Leo Addimando, 806 Capital, LLC
Michael Bufalino, Stuart Rosenberg Architects
Lydia Evans, Stuart Rosenberg Architects
Sabia Smith, University of Pennsylvania
Garrett Miller, Curtis Center
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Tuong Huynh, Partridge Architects
Joe Schiavo, Old City Civic Association
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

CALL TO ORDER

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 534th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:13 a.m. Commissioners Sklaroff, Brown, Leonard, Merriman, Perri, Rivera, Schaaf, Schlotterbeck, and Wilds were in attendance.

MINUTES OF THE 533RD STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Upon a motion proffered by Ms. Merriman and seconded by Mr. Rivera, the Commission unanimously approved the corrected minutes of the 533rd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 8 December 2006.

CONTINUANCE REQUESTS

48 AND 50 S. FRONT STREET, 103 CHESTNUT STREET

Owners: Centra Associates, Cheswal LP, Robert and Harvey Spear

Applicant: Richard DeMarco, Esq.

History: 48 & 50 S. Front Street, 103 Chestnut Street, built separately c.1835

All individually designated and contributing to Old City Historic District

Project: Complete demolition

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the demolition of the buildings at 48 and 50 S. Front Street and 103 and 107 Chestnut Street, pursuant to 14-2007 (7)(j) and Standards 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10; and denial of the demolition of 111 Chestnut Street, pursuant to 14-2007(7)(k)(.4). The Committee suggested that the applicant stabilize the buildings immediately.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL HARDSHIP RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Financial Hardship recommended that the Commission table the matter for 60 days to allow the applicant to amend his incomplete application and submit a complete application for review by the Committee and Commission.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the complete demolition of the buildings at 48 and 50 S. Front Street and 103 Chestnut Street owing to financial hardship. The demolition applications for the buildings at 107 and 111 Chestnut Street have been withdrawn.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the continuance request to the Commission. Attorneys Richard DeMarco and Daniel Riesman and owners Robert and Harvey Spear represented the application. Mr. Baron explained that the applicants sought the 30-day continuance to complete the revisions to their financial hardship application.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Perri to explain the implications of the Department of Licenses & Inspections declarations that the buildings are Imminently Dangerous. Mr. Perri responded that the Imminently Dangerous declarations for these buildings do not authorize the owners to demolish the buildings. They must seek the Commission's approval before undertaking any alteration or demolition. The declaration of Imminently Dangerous does not give a "carte blanche" approval for demolition. Mr. Perri informed the owners and their attorneys that they must immediately stabilize the buildings and take all precautions to protect the public from the dangerous buildings.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. DeMarco if his clients would immediately stabilize the buildings and protect the public. Mr. DeMarco replied that his clients would comply with the requirements of the Department of License & Inspections.

ACTION: The Commission voted unanimously to grant the applicants' request and continue the application for 30 days to allow them to revise their financial hardship application.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 JANUARY 2007

Vincent Rivera, Chair

601 WALNUT STREET, CURTIS BUILDING

Owner: Joe Grasso

Applicant: Tuong Huynh

History: 1910-14, Edgar Seeler, architect

designated 3/7/1974 and significant in Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Cut down window, install doors and steps at sidewalk level (In Concept)

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application in concept proposes to add an entranceway with steps to the 7th Street elevation of the Curtis Building. The location of the proposed entrance is three bays north of the main entrance along the west facade. The applicant proposes to remove the existing double-hung windows and to cut the marble sill down to the granite base of the building to create the door opening. Bronze doors following the pane pattern of the windows would be installed in the opening. A flight of stairs matching the granite base of the building would be added leading up to the new doorway.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. He noted that the alteration would significantly detract from the symmetry of this grand façade. He also noted that the proposed entrance would not be ADA compliant. Architect Tuong Huynh and building manager Garrett Miller represented the application.

Mr. Huynh stated that they were seeking to increase the foot traffic into the commercial space. Mr. Miller stated that an independent entrance to the restaurant was needed to draw attention to the business, which would be a high-end establishment. He further explained that the main entrance is currently closed outside of regular business hours. A restaurant at this location will not survive without its own entrance, which will give it an identity.

Mr. Wilds referred to the plans and noted that the main entrance to the building on 7th Street is directly adjacent to this restaurant space. He suggested that this extant, primary entrance should be used for access to the restaurant space. He noted that an entrance for the restaurant could be created within the vestibule of the building's entrance. Mr. Miller agreed that access through the main entrance was possible, but contended that the restaurant needs its own entrance to promote its identity and attract a clientele.

Ms. Merriman pointed to the INA Building, now the Phoenix, which houses a restaurant, café, and bank, as an example of a large office building where businesses and restaurants are accessed using the main entrance. She noted that even though she promotes commerce for a living, but could not support this proposal. Mr. Wilds remarked that high-end restaurants like the one Mr. Miller described are not supported by a walk-in clientele, but instead operate as destinations. They do not need a flashy street presence; their reputations are built through reviews and word-of-mouth. Mr. Schaaf agreed and added that lighting and signage could be effectively utilized to create an identity on the street. He noted the very large windows, which could be used to announce the restaurant's presence to people passing by.

Mr. Miller stated that the extant retail in the building is poorly conceived. He is seeking to create a vibrancy and retail environment in the Jewelers' Row area. He needs a prominent entrance.

Mr. Wilds emphasized the importance of the Curtis Building. It is a landmark that must be preserved. Mr. Sklaroff agreed and noted that it is a grand building that has played an important role in the city's history.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and deny the proposal, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

209 CUTHBERT STREET, A.K.A. 56-60 N. 2ND STREET

Owner: 806 Capital Group, Leo Addimando, principal

Applicant: Richard Thom, AIA

History: 56-60 N. 2nd Street, 1836

new façade and addition for Tuttleman Brothers & Faggen, 1900-01, Thomas Stephen, architect

individually designated; contributing in Old City Historic District

Project: Repair masonry, alter basement windows and fire-escape, pave rear area, and install roof deck

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval, provided the flashing is brown, not white; all historic paving is retained and reused; brick from the wall remnant is salvaged and reused during repairs; and a mock-up verifies that the deck will not be visible from the public right-of-way; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate the many facades of this building. All masonry facades would be repaired with spot pointing and selective brick replacement; also the fascia and drip edge around the entire building would be repaired or replaced. Several changes are proposed to the façade labeled "E" along 2nd Street. The applicant proposes to modify the fire escape openings to create balconies. The opening size would not be modified; but an existing pipe railing would be removed and a new picket railing would be installed behind the existing historic sill. The wells at the basement windows would be modified. They currently sit at grade level and the applicant proposes to install a 6" concrete curb face. This installation would require cutting down the metal grates in front of the basement windows to accommodate the new curb face. The main entrance along this elevation would be replaced in kind and the transom above it re-glazed. At the rear of the property, facing Little Boys Way, the applicant proposes to replace a non-historic storefront system in kind. This area would also be completely repaved to create four parking spaces. The parking area work would involve enlarging a retaining wall and demolishing the remnant of a brick wall along the north property line. The plan shows an existing concrete apron encroaching onto Little Boy's Way. The applicant proposes to remove cobblestones from the existing parking area and repave the area in concrete. Finally, a roof deck is proposed for the main roof of the building. The roof deck would be accessed from an existing penthouse stair house and it would be set back from all major elevations. However, it may have some visibility.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect Richard Thom and developer Leo Addimando represented the application.

Mr. Baron directed the Commission members to additional information that Mr. Thom had submitted since the Committee meeting. It documented details of the proposed door and doorway as well as a proposal to remove bars on the first-floor windows, which was not brought to the attention of the Architectural Committee.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Thom if he concurred with the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Thom stated that he agreed with most, but not all, of the recommendation.

MOTION: Mr. Rivera moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee to approve the proposal, provided the flashing is brown, not white; all historic paving is retained and reused; brick from the wall remnant is salvaged and reused during repairs; and a mock-up verifies that the deck will not be visible from the public right-of-way; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Mr. Brown seconded the motion.

Mr. Thom stated that his client is investing a large amount of money to rehabilitate the building; it was rehabilitated very poorly in the 1980s. His client is undoing the substandard work undertaken at that time. He explained that his client is seeking to better utilize the rear, creating four parking spaces where there are now three. He asserted that the cobblestone in the parking area is not historic, but dates to the rehabilitation in the 1980s. He offered to work with the staff on the details of the parking area and restoration of Little Boys Way.

Mr. Sklaroff asked about the recommended reuse of the salvaged brick. Mr. Thom stated the wall is in very poor condition and that the brick, which is not historic, is unusable. When Mr. Rivera questioned if this is a party wall, Mr. Addimando responded that it is entirely on his property.

Mr. Schaaf voiced his concern about Little Boys Way. He asserted that it should be restored. For example, the cement slopped over it should be removed, revealing the historic paving beneath. Mr. Baron opined that Little Boys Way is the last street with its original cobblestone in the entire city. He also asserted that cobblestones salvaged from Little Boys Way were reused to pave at the rear of the building in question. He stated that the cobblestones should be retained and restored to Little Boys Way. Mr. Thom disagreed, stating that the cobblestones on his client's property date to the 1980s, when the building was rehabilitated. Mr. Baron noted that the cement referred to by Mr. Schaaf allows for a dumpster to be rolled across Little Boys Way to an adjacent parcel, where a refuse truck empties it. Mr. Thom stated that his client seeks to maintain the dumpster in its current location; he therefore needs to leave the cement on the historic street paving in place. Relocating the dumpster to his side of Little Boys Way would prevent his client from adding the additional parking space. Mr. Sklaroff asked about the number of parking spaces and units. Mr. Thom replied that there are currently three parking spaces and 29 units. Mr. Wilds asked the applicant if he is seeking to retain the existing condition with the cement on the historic street. Mr. Addimando stated that he is. Mr. Thom suggested using bluestone to pave the area of question where the dumpster is rolled; his client did not agree with this suggestion. Mr. Sklaroff noted that owners may maintain existing conditions if they are not proposing work. Mr. Addimando offered to retain the cobblestones from the paving and walkway areas for their potential reuse on Little Boys Way. Mr. Schaaf asserted that he should restore Little Boys Way now. Several Commission members contended that the documentation for the proposed work to Little Boys Way was not detailed or specific to merit an approval. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the graphics defining the work to the historic street were inadequate. He suggested that the applicants refine their proposal for the street and submit it for a subsequent review by the Commission. Mr. Addimando stated that the cobblestones would be damaged during their

removal and would not be reusable. He requested that the Commission not delay his project, but act on it today. Mr. Sklaroff replied that the Commission appears willing to approve most, but not all, of the application. It needs clarity on the proposal for Little Boys Way, which is very important historically.

Lydia Evans of Stuart Rosenberg Architects addressed the Commission. She stated that her firm was rehabilitating the building to the west, across Little Boys Way. She opposed any project that included locating the dumpster on the west side of Little Boys Way, adjacent to her client's building. Commission members asked about the ownership of the property on which his dumpster is currently located. No one was able to answer the ownership question conclusively.

ACTION: Messrs. Rivera and Brown amended their earlier motion. They moved to deny the proposed alterations to Little Boys Way; and to approve the remainder of the proposal, provided the flashing is brown, not white; all paving materials are retained and preserved on site for potential reuse; and a mock-up verifies that the deck will not be visible from the public right-of-way; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. The Commission voted unanimously to approve the amended motion.

Mr. Sklaroff advised the audience that, to amend the Rules & Regulations, at least 10 members of the Commission must vote in favor of the amendment. Only nine Commissioners were in attendance. Therefore, the Commission will not hold the discussion of the proposed amendments to the Rules & Regulations that is noted on the agenda.

313 ARCH STREET

Owner: Normandy/806 Capital, LLC, Leo Addimando

Applicant: Richard W. Thom

History: c. 1895, designated 4/12/1979 and significant in the Old City Historic District

Project: Remove double-hung windows, install doors, alter balcony, relocate mechanical equipment

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposal with single-light double-leaf doors and six-light transoms, provided the mechanical equipment is suspended from the balcony, not attached to the wall, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove five existing windows on the second floor of the rear of the building, and install casements and transoms with simulated-divided lights. This application also proposes to alter the fire escape landing to create a balcony. This application also proposes to relocate the existing condensers below the fire escape landing supported by a steel support frame and steel plate deck. No information was provided on the attachment to the wall.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect Richard Thom and developer Leo Addimando represented the application.

Mr. Thom stated that his client is seeking to create some outdoor space for the condominiums he is developing in the building. He noted that the area is at the rear of the building and is minimally visible from Cherry Street.

Mr. Sklaroff asked the staff why it and the Committee had deemed the proposed doors inappropriate. Ms. Cote explained that the staff contended that the new doors should replicate the appearance of the historic windows. Mr. Wilds stated that it was difficult to make a double-leaf door look like a tripartite window. Mr. Thom opined that a plain door that was clearly non-historic would be more appropriate than a door that falsely appears like a window. He stated that the alteration should render clear what is historic and what is not, to facilitate a later restoration.

ACTION: Mr. Rivera moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal with single-light double-leaf doors and six-light transoms, provided the mechanical equipment is suspended from the balcony, not attached to the wall, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1646 WAVERLY PLACE, A.K.A. 417 S. 17TH STREET

Owner: Stuart G. Rosenberg

Applicant: Andrew Eisenstein

History: c. 1840, remodeled c. 1970, contributing in the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District

Project: Install a garage door, roof replacement, and bollard removal. Legalize open parking bay and curb cut.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: In November 2004, a previous applicant submitted a similar proposal to legalize an open parking bay and curb cut and to install garage doors at this location. At the Architectural Committee Meeting, the applicant was unable to provide all of the necessary information regarding the size, structure, and plan of the garage. The Committee unanimously recommended denial owing to incompleteness. The applicant withdrew the application.

A violation was issued for the illegal garage in December 2004. The violation has not been resolved.

The property is now under new ownership and the current applicant proposes to legalize the garage and curb cut, install a wood garage door, and replace the garage roof.

A photograph documents that this location was used as an open parking bay in the middle of the twentieth century. The opening was infilled prior to designation in 1995. The house at 417 S. 17th Street was built in the mid nineteenth century, but was dramatically remodeled in the 1970s with stuccoing and several major changes to window and door openings.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Wilds and recused. Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Commission. Architects Michael Bufalino and Lydia Evans represented the applicant.

Mr. Bufalino stated that he has implemented the suggestions offered by the Architectural Committee. He noted that this project is the first he is overseeing as an architect. The Commission commended him on the milestone.

ACTION: Mr. Brown moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE HISTORICAL COMMISSION STAFF FOR JANUARY 2007

Jonathan E. Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director

Mr. Farnham presented the report to the Commission. When asked if they had questions about the report, the Commissioners replied that they had none.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 10:12 a.m., Ms. Merriman moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 1: A property will be used as it was historically or given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

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.

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

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.

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.

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

§14-2007(7)(j): No permit shall be issued for the demolition of an historic building, structure, site or object, or of a building, structure, site or object within an historic district which contributes, in the Commission's opinion, unless the Commission finds that issuance of the permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Commission finds that the building ... cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.

§14-2007(7)(k)(.4): In making its determination as to the appropriateness of the proposed alterations, demolition or construction, the Commission shall consider ... the compatibility of the proposed work with the historic district or with the character of its site, including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings and the streetscape.