

**THE MINUTES OF THE 513th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
13 May 2005**

**1515 Arch Street, Room 18025
Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair**

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
Warren Huff, Director of Urban Design, City Planning Commission
Sara Merriman, Special Assistant to the Director, Department of Commerce
Kathleen Murray, Special Assistant to the President of City Council
David Perri, P.E., Chief Code Official, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Denise Smyler, Esq.
Norman Tissian
Scott Wilds, Deputy Director, Office of Housing and Community Development

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

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

Also

Mrs. M.J. Divine, Father Divine's Peace Mission Movement
May S. Belle, Father Divine's Peace Mission Movement
Kevin McDonnell, I.M. Christian Associates, Inc.
Anthony Buccinni, I.M. Christian Associates, Inc.
Lisa Neely, 2040 Rittenhouse Square
Vittorio Ginzburg, 2040 Rittenhouse Square
Ann Gitter, 2040 Rittenhouse Square
Lanny Leibowitz, 265 S. 19th Street
Eric Milby, Esq., 3620 Hamilton Street
Sharon Suleta, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Greg Hill, Brown Hill Development
Peter Rothberg, 28 S. Front Street Associates
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Archangelo Guida, DPK&A Architects
Scott Ritchie, ODG/Otto Design Group
Nik Vedejs, 114 Quarry Street
Morgan Model, 114 Quarry Street
S.D. Fineman, Esq., 305 S. 17th Street
Bonnie Schorske, Martin & Co., LLC
Joel Spivak
Tom Durnell, 54 E. Haines Street
Mike Guadagno, M&G Development
Gerry Gutierrez, Group G
Charles Loomis, Loomis/McAfee Architects

Helma Weeks, Powelton Village Civic Association
Alvin Holm, architect
Ed Flicker
Josh Mosley
Sarah Zwerling
John E. Thrower, BLTA
John Tucker, BLTA
Jane Wilson
Ralph Fey, architect
Nick Ventura
Marion Malakoff, 220 Locust Street
Lois Ginsberg, 220 Locust Street
Carl Primavera, Esq., 101 Walnut Street
Janice Woodcock, Capital Programs Office
Gagan Lakhmna, CREI
Bly Gau, CREI
Jon Seibert, 220 Locust Street
Mayan Shah, J.K. Roller Architects
Craig Deutsch, Harman Deutsch Architects
Kevin Kriig
Michael Greenzang, 920 Clinton Street
Jonathan Wilson, 2124 Wallace Street
Richard Thom, AIA
Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association
Don Ventresca, 1730 Pine Street
Kalberg N. Kutz, Powelton Village Civic Association

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 513th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:10 a.m.

Minutes of the 512th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Upon a motion made by Mr. Wilds and seconded by Mr. Tissian, the Commission voted to approve the minutes of the 512th Stated Meeting, 8 April 2005, as corrected, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

THE REPORT of Committee on Historic Designation, 25 April 2005 Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D., Chair

699 North Broad Street, Lorraine Apartments

Owner: 699 North Broad Street Associates

Date: 1892-93; Willis Hale, architect

Mr. Farnham gave a short presentation on the significance of the Lorraine Apartment building, now commonly known as the Divine Lorraine. The Lorraine Apartment building was designed by noted architect Willis Hale and constructed in 1892 and 1893. The exuberant, luxurious hotel epitomized the late nineteenth-century *nouveau riche* culture of North Broad Street. When the *nouveau riche* moved to the suburbs, the Lorraine was converted into a hotel that catered to a largely Jewish clientele. In 1948, followers of Father Divine, an African American religious and civil rights leader, acquired the building and transformed it into the Divine Lorraine, Philadelphia's first racially integrated grand

hotel. The Father Divine's Peace Mission sold the site in 1999 and the building is currently vacant. The nomination asserts that the Lorraine Apartments satisfies designation criteria a, b, d, e, h, and j as defined in the City's preservation ordinance, making it worthy of inclusion on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Mother Divine said that she was very pleased to offer her support for the building's listing on the Philadelphia Register. The followers of the Peace Mission strive to be supportive of the community and the Mission has proven to be an important part of the history of the City. She noted the Lorraine's prominent location in North Philadelphia and that the building should be preserved for future generations.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance said that Historic Preservation Committee of the American Institute of Architects awarded the Lorraine Apartments its annual Landmark Building Award this year. He offered his appreciation to Mother Divine and the Peace Mission for their years of preservation of the building, including the interiors as well as the exterior. He lamented that the Historic Preservation Ordinance does not offer the Historical Commission the opportunity to preserve interior lobby spaces.

Mr. Sklaroff opined that the building not only represented a magnificent architectural specimen as a work of Willis Hale, but the spirit embodied by the good works promoted by the Peace Mission.

Mr. Huff made a motion to list 699 N. Broad Street on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

3620 Hamilton Street

Owner: Joy Donnelly

Built: c. 1860

Mr. Farnham presented the application for rescission of this building, which is a twin house in the Powelton Village neighborhood. He noted that after a lengthy discussion, the Committee on Historic Designation concluded that the applicant did not provide a justification for rescission under Section 5.5.c.1 of the Rules & Regulations.

Mr. Sklaroff directed the Commission members to compare the photograph of the building at the time of the designation with one taken recently, showing little change in the property. He noted that when reviewing designation and rescission applications, the Commission is exercising its legislative, not regulatory, powers.

Joy Donnelly, the owner of the property, claimed that when she purchased the property she was unaware that it was on the Philadelphia Register. She lived in Powelton Village all her life and owns other properties in the neighborhood. She listed the elements of the building that she believed were not original to the construction of the house, including the door and porch.

Mr. Wilds noted that her argument related to repairs she made to the property and the proper forum for those arguments was the Architectural Committee. He believed rescission to be an excessive step to take since the building was designated over 40 years ago.

Eric Milby, Esq., represented Ms. Donnelly. He submitted a brief to the Designation Committee arguing for the rescission of the property. He introduced Alvin Holme, a restoration architect. Mr. Holme called the building a mongrel of a building with bits and pieces of various styles from a variety of dates and argued that the building does not typify a particular style or the neighborhood. He also argued that the building was built as the starter portion of a much larger development that was never finished, much like the development of the Edgar Allen Poe house at 7th and Spring Garden Streets, since he surmised that the porch and shutters were added at a later date.

Mr. Sklaroff then went through the ten criteria for designation, noting that a resource only has to meet one of the ten. Mr. Tyler emphasized that the criteria date to the ordinance passed by City Council in 1984 and the designation of this building occurred under the previous ordinance. Other Commission members questioned if every building designated under the old ordinance would be put under the same scrutiny. Mr. Sklaroff responded in the negative, and emphasized that the 1984 Ordinance explicitly adopted the Philadelphia Register as it was created under the older ordinance. However, since Ms. Donnelly as the owner and Mr. Milby's brief specifically question this particular designation, the Commission should evaluate this designation. The Commission then went through the ten criteria and came to focus on Criterion e: that the property is the work of a particular designer. Mr. Farnham at the Designation Committee meeting noted that the developer of the property was Wesley Sloan, brother to the famed architect, Samuel Sloan, and the building was probably designed by Samuel Sloan. Mr. Holme rebutted the argument about Sloan.

Ms. Murray asked if the property appears on any other Register. Mr. Farnham responded that the house is listed as contributing to the Powelton Village National Register Historic District.

Discussion then turned to why only one of the two twins was designated. Ms. Smyler emphasized that the designation of the property was instituted by the owner of the property at the time, referring to a letter in the file, so she was not overly concerned that only one twin was designated. Mr. Huff noted that the Designation Committee discussed the issue at length. Mr. Milby said that a member of the Historical Commission at the time spoke to the community and sparked a flurry of designation requests.

Helma Weeks, Chair of the Historic Preservation Committee of the Powelton Village Civic Association, asked the Commission to deny the rescission. She said that the house's uniqueness contributes to the suburban quality in the neighborhood. The area suffers from great development pressures, especially from Drexel University, and rescission of this building would set a strong precedent.

John Gallery noted that the owner's question is more financial hardship than anything else and the forum is the Financial Hardship Committee. The ties to Sloan prove too strong to ignore, not only with the developer being his brother Wesley, but also that the house is the typical housing type that he advocated at the time. The building's uniqueness does not put it at a disadvantage for designation, but adds to its importance. If Mr. Holme should be right that it represents a particular building technique that is unfinished, then its preservation should be advocated all the more.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to deny the rescission of 3620 Hamilton Street. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

24-28 South Front Street

Owner: 28 Front Street Associates

Mr. Farnham presented the application for rescission. The owner of the vacant lot has requested that the individual designations of the properties be rescinded. The properties would remain designated as part of the Old City Historic District and would continue to be classified as “non-contributing” to the district.

Daniel Reisman, Esq., representing the buyer of the properties said that the properties have been vacant for approximately 15 years.

Mr. Wilds confirmed that the effect of this vote would be that any new construction on the properties would only receive 45-day review-and-comment rather than plenary review by the Commission.

John Gallery argued against the rescission until after the Commission has exercised its plenary review of the new construction. He noted that Front Street is an important streetscape with major design issues and the Commission should not relinquish its power over new construction in this area. Mr. Tyler countered that the Commission is not an “Urban Design Commission.”

Mr. Sklaroff noted that the Commission should undertake a larger discussion on its review of new construction but it must do so at a different time.

Ms. Murray made a motion to rescind the individual designations of 24-28 South Front Street. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7 to 1. Mr. Tissian dissented.

The following are staff-initiated applications for Register-maintenance rescissions of designations.

920-22, 926, 930 Chestnut Street

Mr. Farnham presented the application. The Committee found that the buildings were demolished with the Commission’s approval and that no historic resources remain at the site.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to rescind 920-22, 926 and 930 Chestnut Street from the Philadelphia Register. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1114 and 1116 Locust Street

Mr. Farnham noted that the Committee found that the buildings were demolished with the Commission's approval and that no historic resources remain at the site.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to rescind 1114 and 1116 Locust Street from the Philadelphia Register. Ms. Smyler made a motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

1113-1125 Pine Street

Mr. Farnham presented that the Committee found that the building was demolished with the Commission's approval and that no historic resources remain at the site.

Ms. Smyler made a motion to rescind 1113-1125 Pine Street from the Philadelphia Register. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

800-802 Walnut Street

Mr. Farnham noted that the Committee reviewed the rescission application for 800-802 Walnut Street, found that the buildings were demolished prior to the adoption of the current ordinance in 1985 and that no historic resources remain at the site.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to rescind 800-802 Walnut Street from the Philadelphia Register. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

251 South 9th Street

Mr. Farnham presented the application for rescission. He noted that the Committee found that the building was demolished with the Commission's approval and that no historic resources remain at the site.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to rescind 251 South 9th Street from the Philadelphia Register. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 26 April 2005

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair

4250 Belmont Drive

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Janice Woodcock, Architect

History: 1742-50 by William Peters; stair tower added, c. 1765; 3rd floor added, c. 1850; repairs from fire, 1905

Project: Rehabilitate building; reconstruct deck and porch; rehabilitate windows and stucco – in concept

Architectural Committee recommendation: Approval in concept, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 6, and 9.

This application proposes in concept a rehabilitation project at Belmont Mansion that includes the retention of the third floor and restoration of details that can be found in photographs that date to 1871 and the turn of the twentieth century. The most visible elements to be reconstructed include a widow's walk platform at the peak of the house

with a picket railing and a flag pole and a first-floor porch that wraps around three sides of the house. The porch will have a terne-coated stainless-steel roof, wood posts with scroll brackets, and a herringbone-patterned brick floor.

The remainder of the rehabilitation project consists of the restoration of the windows, reconstruction of shutters on all of the floors, and restoration of the façade, including the quoins and scored stucco on the rear wing.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Commission. Janice Woodcock of the City's Capital Programs Office represented the application. Mr. Wilds noted the Commission's past reviews of proposals for this property and asked the staff to recount briefly the site's history with the Commission. Ms. Spina and Mr. Tyler reminded the Commission of the discussions relating to the third story, especially the decision to retain the third story even though it was added after the Peters family, the prominent abolitionists, had sold the property. Mr. Wilds inquired about the date of the third story; Mr. Tyler answered that it was constructed about 1855 or 1860.

Mr. Wilds asked Ms. Woodcock if the decorative plaster would be safeguarded during construction. She stated that it would. She added that she would provide many more details when she returned to the Commission for final approval.

Mr. Huff moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and to approve the application in concept. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1530 Spruce Street

Owner: Spruce 1530, LLC

Applicant: Al Shapiro

History: 1898, Thomas Bennett, architect

Project: Replace wood balcony doors with steel

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 6.

This application proposes the replacement of fourteen doors that lead to balconies on the side façade of this corner building, which is listed as significant in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District. The historic doors are half-glazed, paneled wood doors with single-light transoms and detailed transom bars. The owner proposes to replace them with half-glazed steel doors with single-light transoms and plain transom bars. These doors are visible from South 16th and Spruce Streets.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Historical Commission. Al Shapiro, the owner of the building, and his architect, Archangelo Guida, represented the project. Mr. Shapiro stated that he is restoring the entire building with the advice of Randal Baron of the Commission's staff. He presented photographs of the building and noted that the side doors on the balconies, not the prominent arched doors, are the subject of this application. Mr. Wilds asked why the arched doors are included on the plans submitted to the Commission if no work is proposed for them. Mr. Shapiro replied that they would be addressed during another phase of the project. Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Shapiro if he had endeavored to find an appropriate door. He replied that he had searched and that the proposed door was the best match available.

Mr. Shapiro remarked that Robert Thomas of the Architectural Committee had claimed

at the Committee's meeting that the doors were highly visible. He countered that they were not. He asserted that they were only minimally visible. Ms. Spina contradicted Mr. Shapiro, contending that the side balcony doors are very visible from the street. Mr. Tissian explained that he resides very near the subject property and that the doors in question are not visible from the street. Mr. Sklaroff held up a photograph in which the doors are visible. Mr. Shapiro asserted that the railings on the balconies block the views of the lower portions of the doors. Mr. Sklaroff suggested that perhaps the walkways, not the railings, partially obscure the views of the doors. Mr. Shapiro conceded that the doors are partially visible from Spruce Street. Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Guida if the doors are visible from the street. He stated that the doors on lower floors are visible, but those on upper floors are not. Mr. Wilds recommended that the Commission accept that the views of the doors are partially obscured and then discuss whether the change is acceptable under that condition.

Mr. Sklaroff reminded his fellow Commissioners that they look very carefully at mullions, reveals, and shadow lines when reviewing proposals to replace windows. He added that this is a very important Victorian building.

Several Commission members asked the owner and his architect why they had chosen this type of door. Mr. Guida replied that they were chosen for energy efficiency, maintenance, and security reasons. Mr. Sklaroff expressed skepticism about the security risks posed by wood doors. He asked about the cost differential between the appropriate wood and the proposed metal doors. Mr. Shapiro reported that the cost differential between 14 metal and wood doors would be \$12,000 to \$14,000.

Ms. Smyler moved moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and to deny the application. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 6 to 2. Ms. Merriman and Mr. Tissian dissented.

1813 Spruce Street

Owner: Peter Mangiola

Applicant: Joel Spivak

History: c. 1850; bay added at 1st floor front, c. 1890

Project: Build roof deck and penthouse, side addition, rehabilitate rear ell

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the proposal subject to a mock-up for determination of visibility of the deck and the retention of the panels on the bays, with staff to review details.

This application proposes the conversion of a single-family house, which is currently divided into apartments, into condominiums. The proposal includes several segments. First, the entire rear ell will be rehabilitated with new windows and brick pointing. Second, the aluminum siding on the bays will be removed and new wood siding installed; however, investigation shows that the bays originally were covered in metal with panels below the windows. Third, a rooftop penthouse and deck, with the deck over the main section of the building, will be added. It will have a setback of approximately twenty feet from the front façade. Fourth, in order to make the first floor unit handicap accessible and connected between the front section and rear ell, a twenty-two foot long addition will be constructed in the side yard of the building at the first floor. This addition is in the deep shadow of the building and would not be visible from a public right-of-way. The original rear door for the property will be reused in the addition. Last, a tongue-and-

groove wood fence will be installed at the rear of the property to make the rear yard into a garden.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Commission. Joel Spivak represented the application. Mr. Wilds asserted that the Committee's recommendation is ambiguous because it does not specify who would review the mock-up for approval or what level of visibility would be acceptable. Ms. Spina offered that the staff could assess the mock-up. Mr. Wilds restated that the recommendation is not acceptable because it does not explicitly define what is acceptable. Mr. Sklaroff commented that visibility is very subjective. Mr. Wilds suggested that the applicant stage the mock-up and return to the Commission with the results. Mr. Spivak stated that the mock-up has already been undertaken and the deck is not visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Sklaroff suggested that the staff verify the results of the mock-up.

Mr. Huff moved to approve the proposal, provided a mock-up verifies that the deck is not visible from the public right-of-way and provided the panels on the bays are retained, with staff to review details. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

529 Delancey Street

Owner: Nick Ventura

Applicant: Jane Wilson, Architect

History: 1804; front façade re-faced in tapestry brick, 1920s; façade stuccoed and cornice altered, mid-1960s

Project: cut new and alter windows on side elevation, install shed dormer and bay on rear

Architectural Committee recommendation: Approval of alterations on 1st, 2nd & 3rd floor rear and approval of single dormer on rear; denial of shed dormer on rear and any alterations on side facade

The application proposes alterations to the side and rear of the building; the owner plans to submit an application for the front façade to the Commission in the future. The application calls for cutting several windows in the visible side façade and altering several extant windows. Although stuccoed, this façade dates to 1804.

On the rear, the proposal includes creating a one-room addition at the first floor, cutting a two-story bay that projects from the second and third floors, and cutting a large shed dormer at the roof. This would entail the removal of a large amount of historic fabric that dates to 1804. Owing to the side yard, the shed dormer would be visible from Delancey Street. The rear of the property abuts the yards of other houses.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Historical Commission. Owner Nick Ventura and architect Ralph Fey represented the application.

Mr. Tissian moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion.

Mr. Fey noted that he deemed this the ugliest building in the city and would therefore like to renovate it. He stated that he had embraced the comments of the Architectural Committee and staff and had updated the plans. The originally proposed dormer, for

example, had been replaced by a modest French door. Mr. Sklaroff suggested that the application be reviewed again by the Committee because the design has been revised significantly since the Committee meeting.

Mr. Tissian, with the concurrence of Mr. Wilds, withdrew his motion and moved to continue the application for a period not to exceed six months. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

54 E. Haines Street

Owner/Applicant: Thomas Durnell

History: c. 1750

Project: Replace roof with standing-seam copper roof

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of a standing-seam metal roof in either copper or lead-coated copper, with staff to review details.

Mr. Farnham presented the project, which proposes the installation of a copper standing-seam roof on an eighteenth-century house in Germantown. He noted that some Architectural Committee members suggested that lead-coated copper might be a more appropriate material.

Thomas Durnell, the owner, stated that the original roof on the house was cedar shingle. He hesitates using that material because of the fire-hazard and he finds the fake shingles aesthetically unappealing. He prefers the lower maintenance offered by the copper rather than standing-seam tin because tin would require painting.

Mr. Wilds noted that the cost difference between the tin and copper would outweigh the costs of the tin's maintenance and reiterated that copper was not used as a roofing material in this manner.

Mr. Huff made a motion to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve a standing-seam metal roof in either copper or lead-coated copper, with staff to review details. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six to two. Messrs. Wilds and Sklaroff dissented.

223 S. Jessup Street

Owner: Martin & Co., LLC

Applicant: Bonnie J. Schorske, Martin & Co., LLC

History: c. 1825

Project: Legalize pointing, masonry cleaning and sealing, and stucco

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Legalizing the brick and stucco work because undoing the illegal work would further damage the fragile facade

Mr. Farnham briefly described the masonry work performed on the building without a permit or Historical Commission approval. The Architectural Committee discussed the application at length with the owner. It recommended legalizing the brick and stucco work because undoing the illegal work would further damage the fragile facade.

Ms. Murray expressed her displeasure that the Historical Commission was faced with an application to legalize work performed by a contractor who knew beforehand that the

Commission needed to approve the work. Other Commission members concurred. Mr. Wilds emphasized to Ms. Schorske that any work to the exterior, including painting, requires the Historical Commission's review.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and legalize the brick and stucco work because undoing the illegal work would further damage the fragile façade. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

920 Clinton Street

Owner: 920 Street Condominiums, NWJ Companies

Applicant: Jonathan Broh, Architect

History: 1839; additions, c. 1910

Project: Demolish bay, construct side and rear additions, replace windows, rehabilitate façade, reconstruct rear wall with gates

Architectural Committee Recommendation: All pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 6, 9 and 10.

1. Approval in concept of wood true-divided-light windows at the Clinton and Pine Street façades and wood simulated-divided-light windows at the side façade, provided all leaded glass windows are retained and restored.
2. Approval in concept of the reconstruction of the second-story, Clinton Street, side porch based on the Commission's historic photographs, with a standing-seam metal roof, but denial of the proposed fenestration.
3. Approval in concept of the demolition of the first-story side bay and construction of a one-story side addition with a roof deck, provided it is faced with an appropriate material. Denial of all proposed Meteor plastic panels.
4. Denial of the enlargement of the dormer on the Pine Street slope of the main roof. Approval in concept of the roof deck on the piazza, provided the dormer is not further altered (the window was converted to a fire escape door many years ago).
5. Approval in concept of the reconstruction of a two-story addition atop the one-story side addition at the piazza, provided it is faced with an appropriate material.
6. Denial of the construction of a large three-story addition along the rear ell in the side yard.
7. Approval in concept of the construction of a one-story infill addition beneath the second-story Pine Street bay, provided it is faced with an appropriate material.
8. Denial of the reconstruction of a second-story deck at the Pine Street façade.
9. Denial of the construction of a third-story deck at the Pine Street façade, the cutting of a window into a door, and the new casement window.
10. Denial of the reconstruction of a brick and marble rear wall, but approval in concept of wood gates in existing openings.

Mr. Farnham briefly described the proposal. The large rowhouse is uniquely situated; the front façade faces Clinton Street; the rear façade faces Pine Street, with virtually all exterior facades visible from the public right-of-way. The rowhouse was constructed in 1838. About 1910, the building was renovated in the Colonial Revival style. Several side and rear bays, a side addition, leaded glass windows, and other features were added at that time. Since the applicant included few details, the Committee recommended only conceptual approval for several of the proposed elements and denial for the rest.

Jerry Roller, the architect for the project, said that the owner accepted the notion of an

approval in concept, but objected to the denial of some of the elements of the proposal. The building now has eight apartments and will be converted to six condominium units. The side addition will add 300 square feet to each floor to make the units more livable. The conceptual approval for the side addition will only apply to the height and massing of the addition; the materials and fenestration will return for additional review.

Sharon Suleta, Esq., legal counsel for the owner, noted that the Historical Commission designated the property in 1958 with other buildings along Clinton Street. She reported that the property is not in a local historic district and the rear of the property was not photographed at the time of designation.

Discussion then turned to the proposed decks. Mr. Roller acknowledged that the Historical Commission may not have approved the existing deck at the second story, but the Commission typically approves decks on rear ells. Mr. Wilds countered that Pine Street is a highly visible and important right-of-way, not an alley. This is not a typical rear ell, he claimed.

Mr. Roller objected to the Committee's recommendation of denial of rebuilding the rear wall. It has already been rebuilt recently and it already has a gate for parking. Mr. Roller contended that the curb-cut exists and that the owner would like two gates for the cars. When Commissioners pressed him on the curb-cut, he conceded that the existing curb-cut would need to be enlarged significantly. He maintained that the enlarged curb-cut would not result in a loss of public parking on Pine Street.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which failed with a vote of zero to seven.

Mr. Wilds moved to:

- 1. Approve in concept wood true-divided-light windows at the Clinton and Pine Street façades and wood simulated-divided-light windows at the side façade, provided all leaded glass windows are retained and restored.*
- 2. Approve in concept the reconstruction of the second-story, Clinton Street, side porch based on the Commission's historic photographs, with a standing-seam metal roof, but denial of the proposed fenestration.*
- 3. Approve in concept the demolition of the first-story side bay and construction of a one-story side addition with a roof deck, provided it is faced with an appropriate material. Deny all proposed Meteor plastic panels.*
- 4. Deny the enlargement of the dormer on the Pine Street slope of the main roof. Approve in concept of the roof deck on the piazza, provided the dormer is not further altered (the window was converted to a fire escape door many years ago).*
- 5. Approve in concept the reconstruction of a two-story addition atop the one-story side addition at the piazza, provided it is faced with an appropriate material.*
- 6. Approve in concept the construction of a large three-story addition along the rear ell in the side yard.*
- 7. Approve in concept the construction of a one-story infill addition beneath the second-story Pine Street bay, provided it is faced with an appropriate material.*
- 8. Approve in concept the reconstruction of a second-story deck at the Pine Street façade.*
- 9. Deny the construction of a third-story deck at the Pine Street façade, the cutting of a window into a door, and the new casement window.*

10. Approve in concept the reconstruction of a brick and marble rear wall with wood gates in existing openings.

Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

101-13 Walnut Street

Owner: 101 Walnut Street, LLC

Applicant: John F. Tucker, architect

History: vacant lot, 103-05 Walnut Street - built c. 1845, demolished 1996

107-09 Walnut Street – built c. 1872, demolished 1996

Proposal: Construct 12-story residential building

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and Section 14-2007(6)(k)(.4)

Mr. Farnham described the proposal for construction of a 12-story residential building with parking at the ground level. The lot, which is located at the northwest corner of Front and Walnut Streets, is currently vacant. The buildings that once stood on the site were individually designated in 1970. In 1995, the Commission approved the demolition of the buildings, provided a “fence wall” was constructed. The buildings were demolished, but the required wall was never built. In 2003, the Commission created the Old City Historic District; the lot was included in the district and classified as “non-contributing.” The Commission, however, has not rescinded the earlier individual listing. At its meeting, the Architectural Committee reviewed the proposed building and deemed it incompatible with its surroundings and the Old City Historic District.

Carl Primavera, Esq., legal counsel for the developer, argued that the Commission's jurisdiction should only be 45-days review-and-comment because the historic buildings that had previously occupied the site were demolished owing to financial hardship. The development has as-of-right zoning approvals. Mr. Primavera noted that he misread the Commission's stamp on the zoning application as meaning that the Commission only had review-and-comment jurisdiction.

Mr. Copeland opined that, owing to the individual designations of the properties, the Commission has plenary review of the development.

Jack Thrower, architect for the project, briefly described the building. The proposal calls for a twelve-story, residential building sits at the corner of Front and Walnut Streets with the entrance for ground-floor parking on Walnut Street. The plan seen by the Architectural Committee had the building sheathed in cast-concrete panels with an exercise room at the very corner on the first floor. Mr. Thrower showed the Commission a revised design that altered the facing materials and first-floor configuration, but not the overall massing and design. The revised design called for slate as the facing material and the garage door set back to create an arcade with a mural. Instead of the exercise room at the corner, the lobby space had been expanded and the entire corner glazed.

Mr. Wilds inquired about designing a six-story building that would be more in keeping with the scale of the overall streetscape of Walnut and Front Streets. Mr. Thrower responded that a six-story building would require a zoning variance and not all of the units would get a river view. The view is very marketable. Mr. Wilds objected that it was the Historical Commission that had to compromise and noted that other housing developments have proven successful without river views.

Richard Thom of the Old City Civic Association noted that the developer never presented the project to the civic association. Paul Boni of the Society Hill Civic Association said that the developer had not come to his group either.

Marsha Bacall, who lives in Society Hill Towers, objected to the building's height as inconsistent with other historic buildings in the area, such as the Merchant's Exchange and others in the Independence National Historic Park. She called upon the Commission to preserve the flavor of the historic neighborhood. She compared the many new high-rise buildings along Front Street to a "Chinese wall." Mr. Sklaroff asked her about the heights of the Society Hill Towers buildings, where she resides. She stated that they are more than 30 stories tall.

John Gallery noted that the site proved to be difficult to develop owing to its small size. He acknowledged the cooperation of the applicant and architect, who agreed to redesign the project. He spoke in favor of its approval. He acknowledged that he had labeled the design the worst he had ever seen at the Architectural Committee meeting.

Ms. Murray strongly objected that this developer had not conferred with the community groups. Mr. Tissian agreed. Mr. Perri suggested that the design should return to the Architectural Committee.

Mr. Gallery noted that the developer would accept approval in concept for the height and massing of the building and would be willing to return to the Architectural Committee for a review of the details. He again favored its approval.

Ms. Smyler made a motion to approve the proposal in concept. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which failed with a tied vote. Commissioners Huff, Wilds, Smyler, and Merriman voted for the motion.

Mr. Huff moved to remand the revised proposal to the Architectural Committee for its review and recommendation to the Commission. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of five to two. Commissioners Smyler and Merriman dissented. Mr. Wilds abstained.

263 North 3rd Street

Owner: M&G Development

Applicant: Gerry Gutierrez, Architect

History: c. 1840 as a four-story building; all but first story demolished after 1921

Proposal: Add four stories, renovate existing first story

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval, provided a gambrel or hipped mansard is substituted for the proposed mansard; the stucco is color-integrated, not painted; the window-railling combinations are refined; and the rear elevation facing Bodine Street and the Painted Bride is improved, with the Architectural Committee and staff to review the revised proposal and details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application, which proposes the construction of four stories atop a one-story Non-contributing building in the Old City Historic District. The building was constructed as a four-story building about 1840. At some point after 1921, the top three stories were removed, leaving the extant one-story building. He noted that the architect revised the plans to reflect the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

Michael Guadagno, the owner of the property, expressed his pleasure with the design.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the revised design. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

307 S. 17th Street aka 1636 Spruce Street

History: built c1860 designated individually 1970, contributing to Rittenhouse Fittler Residential historic district 1995.

Owner: George Bochetto

Applicant: Kevin McDonnell, I.M. Christian Associates

Committee Recommendation: The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the new conjectural woodwork with a curved molding added to the roof brackets to match the photograph and subject to the re-pointing of the wall with the appropriate mortar, restoring the bead board on top of the dormer windows, removing the glass block from the stoop, and installing a new wood window as mandated by the Commission in 2001, with staff to review details.

Mr. Baron presented the project, which proposes to legalize work that exceeded a permit to repair a gutter. The contractor removed the original crown molding on the north and west facades of the building and replaced it with a similar molding. Several brackets and the bottom portion of the pilasters surrounding the dormers also were replaced without a permit or Historical Commission review. In addition mortar joints in the bottom half of the building have been cut out and no plans to re-point are underway. Mr. Baron explained that at the Committee meeting, the applicant revised the proposal to now include the re-pointing of the façade.

The applicant agreed with the recommendations of the architectural committee.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the committee's recommendation. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

265 S. 19th Street

History: built c. 1855, alterations c.1960

Owner: Joseph DiSantis, Premier Fiduciary Properties IFLP

Applicant: Lanny Liebowitz, Architect

Architectural Committee Recommendation: The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the upper-floor windows, deck, masonry work, and one-story addition at the 3rd-floor level. They also recommended approval of the two-story side bay, subject to a revised design in painted wood or metal with horizontal cornices and belt-courses, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Denial of the new first-floor windows pending receipt of an application with further information, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron presented the project, which proposes alterations to all facades of this corner building. On the front, side, and rear façades the architect proposes the installation of new wood, two-over-two windows, no details have been provided yet. On the side façade, the applicant proposes to remove non-historic balconies and replace them with stucco-finished bays. In addition, the applicant proposes to close openings made for air-conditioners with matching brick and legalize a rear roof deck which appears in the designation photograph.

Mr. Wilds mentioned that it seemed very likely that a bay existed at the same location on the façade where the new bay would be located. Mr. Baron pointed out that indeed it was very likely.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the committee's recommendations. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

2124-26 Wallace Street

History: built c. 1855

Owner: Jonathan and Lorraine Wilson

Applicant: Charles Loomis, Loomis-McAfee Architects

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Three members of the Architectural Committee recommended approval of Option 2 to rebuild the wall with a thin mortar joint, with staff to review details. Mr. D'Alessandro did not agree and recommended that the façade should be repaired, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6

Mr. Baron presented the application, which proposes to modify the front façade of this double carriage house. The Historical Commission reviewed a similar proposal at its December 10th 2004 meeting. At that time the Commission approved the restoration of several openings, but denied the proposal to raise the cornice and the heads of the second floor windows. Since that time the applicant has appealed the Commission's decision to the Board of License and Inspection Review. In doing interior work for which a permit exists, the applicant inspected the inside of the front wall and found voids between the inner and outer wythes of brick. An engineer has examined the wall and proposes two alternate courses of action. Option One involves repair of the existing façade including rebuilding some portions of the wall and pinning the wall with closely spaced Heli-fix anchors and nine star bolts. The applicant says that this would require greater maintenance and would be less uniform in appearance. Option Two involves demolishing the façade and rebuilding it with the higher cornice and raised second floor windows similar to, though not identical, to what the Commission denied in December.

Mr. Wilds requested some clarification of the reasons to demolish a historic wall and

replace it with a historic looking new wall. The project's architect, Mr. Loomis, mentioned that rebuilding a new wall with higher windows would be consistent with the interior space, which had been altered in the past and no longer matched the outside openings. He also explained that owing to the walls structural integrity it would be much more cost and maintenance efficient for his client to rebuild rather than repair. Mr. Loomis also pointed out that the historic lintels would be saved to be incorporated in the new wall.

Mr. Reuter, speaking on behalf of the City, mentioned that it would be prudent for the applicant to withdraw his appeal to the Board of License and Inspection Review if the Commission decided to approve option two. The applicant was in agreement with this suggestion.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to approve option two. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

1730 Pine Street

History: built c.1840

Owner: 1730 Properties Inc.

Applicant: Donald Ventresca

Committee's Recommendation: The Committee unanimously recommended approval of the deck, provided the front is pulled back about nine feet to sit only on the rear ell, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofing Guidelines.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. This application involves legalization of a roof deck mostly on the rear ell of this row-house. The applicant was in agreement with the committee's recommendations.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the committee's recommendation. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

319 Market Street.

History: Built 1831, designated on September 1970 and December 2003, classified Significant

Applicant: Markanni Enterprises

Project: Removal of canopy and alley door and construction of pergola.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with staff to review details, pursuant, pursuant to Standards 9, 10 and Roofs Guidelines.

Mr. Danta presented the application, which proposes changes to an existing side deck. The deck appears to have been in place prior to the year 2000, when this property had much work legalized. The existing stucco wall along Market Street will remain unchanged.

Ms. Murray made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation to approve the proposal. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

114 Quarry Street.

History: Built 1908, designated on December 1984 and December 2003, classified

contributing.

Applicant: Nik Vedejs

Project: Alteration of window into door to access a new proposed balcony

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with staff to review details, only if the applicant could provide the staff with a letter stating the adoption of a balcony master plan for the entire building.

Mr. Danta presented the project, which proposes to reconfigure a window into a door that would open onto a new balcony. 114 Quarry Street, the address given in the application, underwent a merger with 141-43 N. 2nd Street, both buildings are now internally connected. The proposed work would in fact take place at 141-43 N. 2nd Street.

The condominium association accepted the committee's recommendation to implement the new balcony design as a balcony master plan to be followed by all unit owners if they wish to add balconies to their units.

The application was represented by Nik Vedejs, the owner and Scott Richie and Giovanni Caputo of the Otto Design Group.

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

1519-21 Wallace Street.

Applicant: Spring Properties Development

Project: New construction on vacant lots

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the new construction with staff to review details.

Mr. Danta presented the project. The proposed new construction would be a three-story, three-bay brick townhouse. This application is for review and comment of the proposed new construction pursuant to the Philadelphia Historical Commission Rules and Regulations, Article 8.1, and Section 14-2007(7)(d) of the Philadelphia Code

At Mr. Sklaroff's request, Mr. Copeland clarified that the Commission has review and comment jurisdiction over this application.

Craig Deutsch represented the application. He explained that they had complied with the Committee's recommendations to lower the head of the garage and put a transom over the door.

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Wilds.

Mr. Tissian asked if it is possible to put the garages in the back of the houses. Mr. Deutsch responded that there is no street access to the rear. He explained that they went to the Zoning Board of Adjustment which asked them to re-subdivide the property.

Ms. Smyler made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Murray seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

1527 North Street.

Applicant: Spring Properties Development.

Project: New construction on vacant lots

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with staff to review details.

Mr. Danta presented the project. This application proposes a new three-story, three-bay townhouse on a lot vacant at the time of designation of the Spring Garden Historic District. The house would be located at the corner of North and Sydenham Streets. This application is for review and comment of the proposed new construction pursuant to the Philadelphia Historical Commission Rules and Regulations, Article 8.1, and Section 14-2007(7)(d) of the Philadelphia Code.

Mr. Sklaroff resumed the Chair.

Mr. Deutsch, the applicant, explained that the Spring Garden Civic Association asked them to create a parking space at the rear, but that the space will require a variance because it does not meet the required length.

Mr. Huff made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

2040 Rittenhouse Street.

History: Built c. 1890, designated February 2003

Applicant: Lisa Neely

Project: Replacement of existing skylight and addition of roof deck with stair access

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended approval with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9, 10 and Roofs Guidelines.

Mr. Danta presented the application. The applicant proposes the construction of a zinc-clad stair access to the roof, which would open onto a new roof deck. There was a clear mention of visibility at the Architectural Committee meeting, at which time the applicant specified that the roof deck would not be visible owing to the distance of the drop off.

Mr. Wilds asked the applicant to confirm that the skylight would not be visible.

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

OLD BUSINESS

3620 Hamilton Street

Owner: Joy Donnelly

Date: c. 1860

Proposal: Legalize deck and conversion of a window into a door

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial

In 2004, the owner of 3620 Hamilton Street installed a deck on the roof of a side porch without a permit or Historical Commission approval. For deck access, a window opening was enlarged and a door installed.

Ms. Spina explained that the Commission had granted the application a six month postponement to allow for the consideration of the de-listing of the property. That six months elapsed at this meeting. The Commission had earlier decided not to rescind the designation and the application was not made on the basis of financial hardship.

Ms. Donnelly showed a letter from Licenses and Inspections saying that, from a code compliance standpoint, the deck could be approved, if the work was approved by the Historical Commission. She explained that she cut down a window and installed a salvaged Victorian door in the opening and an ornate railing. She said that the house dated from several periods.

Mr. Perri confirmed that, if not approved, the applicant would need to remove the deck and return the building to its previous condition.

Mr. Wilds and Mr. Huff spoke of the possibility of an alternate design for a deck with a simplified metal picket railing.

Helma Weeks spoke on behalf of the Powelton Village Civic Association. She said that the deck was highly visible and out of character with the building. She said that the applicant knew of the designation before she did the work and its approval would send a message to the community that the Commission does not enforce its own rules.

Ms. Smyler told Ms. Donnelly that she sympathizes with her but that she knew that she needed to get approval before she undertook the deck.

Mr. Tissian said that Ms. Donnelly has complained of the costs associated with designation and yet she chose to build a deck before completing the many urgent needs that are found in the building. He said that this is one of three properties that Ms. Donnelly owns in the neighborhood and it is important that she comply with the rules in managing her properties.

Joshua Mosley, the next door neighbor to the property, explained that the house is poorly kept with debris piled next to their yard. He said that the chimney has collapsed and that the house has sat empty. He said that he would like to see the house renovated and occupied. He and his wife oppose a deck that looks into their master bedroom.

Ms. Donnelly explained that she has been rewiring the house and installing new joists.

Kathleen Kirts, a neighbor from across the street and a history teacher, explained that she appreciates the historic nature of the area and has real concern about allowing any resident to skirt the rules by wearing the Commission down. She said that the neighbors are very concerned with this precedent.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation to deny the legalization application. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion which passed 7 to 1. Ms. Murray voted against the motion.

CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMENT on National Register Nominations

5125 Woodbine Avenue, Wynnestay

Wynnestay, in the Wynnefield section of Philadelphia, was erected in 1690 and added to and renovated in 1700 and 1905. The house was originally the residence of Jonathan Wynne, the son of Thomas Wynne, a friend of William Penn and the first speaker of the Pennsylvania Assembly. It is a medieval, Welsh-style house and is one of the oldest structures in the city. It was designated by the Philadelphia Historical Commission on June 26, 1956 at its 4th Stated Meeting.

Ms. Spina made a presentation on the significance of the building and explained that it meets Designation Criterion C

Ms. Murray made a motion to recommend Wynnestay at 5125 Woodbine Avenue for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

315 N. 12th Street, Smaltz Building

The Smaltz Building, home of the Smaltz-Goodwin Shoe Company, stands at 315 N. 12th Street. Ballinger & Perrot, prominent Philadelphia designers of industrial buildings, erected the 10-story, reinforced-concrete factory building in 1911 for dress trimming manufacturer Isaac Goldman. It is an early example of reinforced concrete in the city. The Smaltz-Goodwin Shoe Company, a mid-sized manufacturer of fine welted and turned shoes for women, purchased the building during its construction and occupied it until going out of business in 1933.

Ms. Spina made a presentation of the significance of the building and explained that the building meets Designation Criteria A & C.

Mr. Huff made a motion to recommend the Smaltz Building at 315 N. 12th Street for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Kathleen Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT of the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, April 2005

Mr. Tyler noted that the 10 February 2005 Historical Commission meeting minutes should reflect that the vote for the Boathouse Row re-lighting scheme was for final approval, not conceptual approval.

HARRY A. MEMORIAL FUND

Ms. Smyler made a motion to approve the \$31.11 expenditure for lunches for the Architectural Committee. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Ms. Smyler made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron
Jorge Danta
Jonathan E. Farnham
Laura M. Spina