

**THE MINUTES OF THE 501<sup>st</sup> MEETING OF THE  
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**14 May 2004**

**City Council Caucus Room, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, City Hall**

**Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair**

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair

Warren Huff, City Planning Commission

Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property

Thomas Kilkenny

Kathleen Murray, Special Assistant to the President of City Council

David Perri, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections

Harris Steinberg, AIA

Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.

Norman Tissian

Scott Wilds, Deputy Director for Policy and Planning, Office of Housing Community Development

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist

Jeffrey Barr, Historic Preservation Planner

Jonathan Farnham, Historic Preservation Planner

Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary

Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner

Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Lawrence Copeland, Esq., Senior Attorney, Law Department

Eileen Quigley, Esq., Assistant City Solicitor, Law Department

Also

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance

Michael Silver, Owner, 413 South 3<sup>rd</sup> Street

Clarence Mitchell, 2701 Bainbridge Street

Gersil Kay, Building Conservation International

Carolyn Gould, St. Mark's Church

Alan Barzilay, Toll Brothers Incorporated

Carl Primavera, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers, LP

L. Klehr, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers, LP

Tully Speaker, Logan Square Neighborhood Association

Sara Kealey, Schuylkill NBH

Maureen Kane, Schuylkill NBH

Barb Failer, Naval Home

William J. Brennan, 624 South 26<sup>th</sup> Street

Ann Hoskins-Brown, 905 South 25<sup>th</sup> Street

Charles McGloughlin, Metcalfe Architects

John DiNicola Jr., 2504 South Cleveland Street

Catherine Califano, Deputy Secretary of Housing and Neighborhood Preservation

Kevin Hanna, Secretary of Housing and Neighborhood Preservation

Paul Commito, Toll Naval Square  
Adam Barzilay, Toll Naval Square  
Mitch Kotler, Toll Naval Square  
Kevin Smith, Toll Naval Square  
John Pagenkopf, Eastern States Engineering  
James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Company  
Jerry Simon, Toll Naval Square  
Amy Johnston, Mural Arts Program  
Anthony Perri, Richard M. Cole & Associates  
Larry Landes, St. Mark's Church  
James Lee Deddens, 2304 Wallace Street  
John Gerbner, Ewing Cole Architects  
Kevin Towey, Cecil Baker & Associates  
Paul Horning, Berkshire Construction Management Incorporated  
Davis D'Ambly, St. Mark's Church  
Joanne Phillips, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll  
Matthew McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll  
James W. Rowe, Agoos/Lovera Architects  
Leonard Smiley, Mural Arts Program  
Cathy Harris, Mural Arts Program  
Libby Espey, St. Mark's Church  
Mark Hollowell, Berkshire Construction Management  
Stephen J. Maffei, 239-41 Market Street  
Van Strother, New Covenant Church  
Sean Mullen, St. Mark's Church  
Rosita Jaipaul, 1610 Locust Street  
Scott Craven, 427 Spruce Street  
Ross Warne, 451 Lenni Road  
Jon Wagner, 250 North Lawrence Street  
Heather Knott, Graboyes Commercial Windows  
Peter Kahn, 1622 Locust Street  
Joseph Caruso, Esq., St. Mark's Church

## **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

### **501<sup>st</sup> Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission**

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 501<sup>st</sup> Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:30 a.m.

### **Minutes of the 500<sup>th</sup> Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission**

Upon a motion made by Mr. Wilds and seconded by Mr. Sugrue, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the 500<sup>th</sup> Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 8 April 2004, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

**THE REPORT** of the Architectural Committee, 27 April 2004

Vincent Rivera, Chair

Mr. Sklaroff recused himself from the Naval Home applications and surrendered the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

**2420 Gray's Ferry Avenue, Naval Home**

Owner: Toll Naval Associates

Applicant: Adam Barzilay, Toll Brothers Associates

History: 1827-1833, 1844, William Strickland, architect

Proposal: Final Site Plan and Landscaping Plan

*The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend the following, with staff to review details:*

- 1. Approval of the site plan for building placement pursuant to Standards 9 and 10*
- 2. Approval of the alterations to the Bainbridge Street perimeter wall where the brick masonry is missing or collapsed only. Where the existing brick wall is intact, it should be retained and repaired, with staff to review details*
- 3. Approval of the historic gate alterations at the entrance and exit on Gray's Ferry Avenue*
- 4. Approval of the restoration of the existing gatehouses, provided the details are submitted for staff review*
- 5. Approval of the new guardhouse, provided the proposed windows have a real muntin profile on the exterior of the glass, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10*
- 6. Denial of the new interior fencing proposed inside the north entrance and south exit pursuant to Standard 9*
- 7. Approval of the general landscaping*
- 8. Approval of the HVAC condenser locations, provided a color sample and specification of the proposed units are submitted for staff review*
- 9. Approval of the tree removal and tree protection as proposed*
- 10. Approval of the replacement light fixtures pursuant to Standard 6*
- 11. Denial of the demolition of the pavilion and gazebo pursuant to Standards 2, 5 and 6; the structures should be restored and relocated on the site*

At the start of the Commission's review, Mr. Sugrue acknowledged that the agenda was long and asked that all comments be pointed and brief. Mr. Wilds requested that the Commission establish a framework for the review of the complex Naval Home proposals. He suggested that the applicant be offered an opportunity to address the Commission early in the proceedings. He stated that the applicant had some "specifics" to present to the Commission. Carl Primavera, counsel for the applicant, confirmed Mr. Wilds' assertion, stating that his client would like an opportunity to present some amendments to the proposals. Mr. Barr of the staff asked for clarification on the type of presentation the Commission deemed appropriate. Mr. Wilds again interjected that the applicant might have new information to provide to the Commission and therefore ought to be heard. Mr. Barr then proceeded with his introduction to the site plan and landscaping proposal.

Mr. Barr explained that the Commission reviewed and approved a site plan subject to the review of treatments of the historic perimeter walls, fencing, gazebo, and pavilion at the 8 August 2003 meeting. In response to comments at that meeting and the preceding Architectural Committee meeting, the applicant has adjusted and refined the site plan. Half of Building 12 has been shifted away from the Governor's Residence, which necessitated minor modifications to the sidewalk and driveway layout. The site plan otherwise remains the same as it relates to the building placement, new driveways, and parking areas. The project has been split into a two phases. Although included on the final site plan for building placement,

the design of Buildings 18, 19 and 20 are not part of this submission.

The applicant proposes to replace two portions of the Bainbridge Street perimeter wall. The balance of the brick perimeter wall along Bainbridge Street, Schuylkill Avenue and Gray's Ferry Avenue will be retained and repaired. The stone and wrought iron fencing at front will be cleaned, repaired and repainted. At the August meeting, the Commission approved the widening of the original front gates in concept. The applicant proposes to relocate an original stone pier, remove a short section of wall and fencing and widen the north entrance by 5 feet, to more than 19 feet. The existing gates will be repaired, re-installed and fixed in an open position. The south entrance will be similarly altered and widened from nine feet to more than 23 feet. The existing original gatehouses will be repaired and mothballed and a new guardhouse will be constructed inside the north entrance. This small stuccoed guardhouse includes metal roofing, vinyl windows, and sliding glass doors. The entrance/exit alterations also include new paving, bollards, fencing, and landscaping.

Many of the existing large mature trees in front of the historic buildings will be protected and retained. The applicant proposes to remove all of the other trees that stand outside of the front, or parade ground, zone. The applicant proposes to screen the new front parking lot with a landscaped berm with low shrubbery. Low shrubs will also screen the 16 small HVAC condensers proposed for the front of Biddle Hall. New landscaping is proposed around the base of both dependencies which will screen new condensers to be situated at grade between the main block and rear ell of the historic residences.

All of the existing deteriorated light fixtures will be removed and new light fixtures will be installed at driveways and parking areas throughout the site. At its August 2003 meeting, the Commission asked to review the proposed treatment of the gazebo and the pavilion. The applicant has submitted a report from their structural engineer and now proposes to demolish them.

After Mr. Barr's introduction, Mr. Sugrue suggested that the Commission focus its discussion on the Bainbridge Street wall; the gazebo and pavilion; and the entrance and exit fencing on the parade ground.

Mr. Kottler addressed the Commission and distributed some background material. He also introduced the team members: James Campbell of Campbell Thomas Architects, Matthew Koenig of J.K. Roller Architects, Kevin Smith of Toll Brothers, Jerry Simon of the Lessard Architectural Group, landscape architect Tim Gibbon of Eastern States Engineering. Carl Primavera of Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers and Adam Barzilay and Paul Committo of Toll Brothers also represented the project. Mr. Kottler emphasized the final approvals granted by the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission and the Federal Advisory Council for Historic Preservation. He also emphasized that Toll Brothers has developed very detailed plans. He then asked Mr. Campbell to present the most recent design revisions to the Commission. Mr. Primavera added that the revisions are improvements requested by the Architectural Committee and the community.

Mr. Campbell stated that, after meeting with the neighbors, the applicant has agreed to replace the missing sections of wall along Bainbridge Street with "a full height masonry wall to match the existing wall." He also stated that the applicant had agreed to eliminate the proposed high plantings along the new security fences running east-west at the Gray's Ferry Avenue entrance and exit as well as the plantings along the parking lot in front of Biddle Hall. Although not related to the landscape plan, Mr. Campbell noted that the applicant had agreed to replicate the historic wood fascia on the front and rear verandahs. The applicant also agreed to reduce the height of the privacy screens on the dependencies, to eliminate the feet on those privacy screens, and to install the screens without connecting them to the historic railings.

Mr. Kottler requested that the Commission view the application “comprehensively” and not impose additional design changes on the applicant. He asked that the Commission’s approval mirror those from the other agencies. Mr. Kottler added that he opposed the “staff to review details” clauses in the recommendations. Mr. Sugrue asked for clarification. Mr. Kottler asserted that the details are included in the submitted drawings and should be approved as is. He asked for a comprehensive approval. Mr. Wilds agreed with Mr. Kottler. He contended that all of the details necessary for the Department of Licenses & Inspections to issue building permits had been included in the drawings; therefore, the staff does not need to review the design any further. He stated that there was no need to “continually re-revise and re-revise” the plans and “drift away from the proposal.” Mr. Steinberg countered, stating that staff review is warranted. Mr. Wilds pointed out the fact that the staff had recommended denial of several segments of the proposal and staff review of several others. He said that it was time for the continual reviews to end, allowing the developers to move ahead with the project. Mr. Steinberg rejoined that the progress to this point was attributable to the staff’s intimate involvement with the details. He asserted that the Commission should not give a blanket approval without any staff review. Mr. Kottler interjected that the Commission be very specific if it gives the staff the authority to review details. He again asserted that the level of detail in the current plans is very high.

Ms. Murray asked about the impetus for the design revisions submitted at the meeting. Mr. Primavera responded that they resulted from the Architectural Committee’s review and from community concerns. Mr. Sugrue asked if the applicant had disclosed every revision in his overview. Mr. Campbell replied that he had.

Mr. James inquired about the fate of the gazebo and pavilion. Mr. Campbell stated that applicant’s engineer determined that the structures are in very poor condition; Toll Brothers requests the approval of their demolition. Mr. Tissian asks if the applicant would allow another party to remove and preserve the structures. He also asked if the applicant had approached the Fairmount Park Commission. Mr. Campbell replied yes to the first, but did not have an answer for the second query. Mr. Sugrue contended that the two structures had been “demolished by neglect.” Mr. Wilds countered that the applicant was “admirable” for allowing the structures to be removed from the site. He added that there is no location on the site for the gazebo and pavilion. Mr. Steinberg disagreed, stating that they could be relocated to the back of the site. Mr. James asked about the Architectural Committee’s position on the two structures. Mr. Barr recounted that the Committee believed that the gazebo and pavilion could be retained and restored; it also believed that sites could be found for them at the Naval Home.

Mr. Wilds requested that the Commission hear all four Toll Brothers applications before voting. Mr. Sugrue recommended that the Commission conclude the site plan discussion before hearing the other three. The Commission agreed with Mr. Sugrue.

Commission members discussed the proposals for the entrance and exit on Gray’s Ferry Avenue including the security fencing and plantings. The applicants agreed to low plantings along the fences. Commission members inquired into the design for the new guard house. Mr. Koenig stated that the windows in the guard house would match those proposed for the historic buildings.

Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee with the following exceptions: that “staff to review details” be deleted in the opening line; that Item 2, the Bainbridge Street perimeter wall, be approved with the reconstruction of the missing wall sections with a new full-height masonry wall to match the historic wall; that Item 6, the interior fencing at the Gray’s Ferry Avenue

entrance and exit, be approved with low plantings; that Item 11, the demolition of the pavilion and gazebo, be approved if no entity removes them within 30 days. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion.

Mr. Steinberg asked if the current landscape plan was based on the historic landscape. Mr. Campbell replied that the current plan is based on remnants of the historic landscape. Mr. Steinberg asked about plantings at Biddle Hall, the dependencies, and the parking lots. Mr. Campbell stated that there is no historic precedent for those plantings. Mr. Wilds asserted that landscaping is “temporary” and stated that this site would not be returned to its historic condition. Mr. Steinberg disagreed and upheld that “some semblance” of the original landscape should be maintained. He added that the proposed plantings diminish the historic buildings. Mr. Kottler noted that the state and federal agencies had inquired about historic plantings, but had agreed that historic plantings were not viable for reasons of practicality and marketing. Mr. Wilds asked rhetorically if the current planting scheme accords with the scheme approved in concept. Mr. Kottler replied that it does.

Ms. Murray, like Mr. Wilds and the applicant, emphasized that the Commission needed to review the project in a comprehensive manner, as a whole, not piecemeal. She also asserted that the Commission should agree with the state and federal regulatory agencies. The project should move forward for the common good.

Mr. James stated that he would like to see Toll Brothers make a good faith effort to save the gazebo and pavilion. He asked for some evidence that the applicant was endeavoring to save the structures. He asked if the applicant had called the Fairmount Park Commission or other parties that might be interested in saving them. Mr. Primavera remarked that his client would like to preserve them. He stated that “We will pledge our good faith to try to find a home for them.”

Ms. Murray asked members of the community to speak. Barbara Failer requested that the project move forward. Mr. Tissian asked her if the Bainbridge Street wall proposal to rebuild the missing pieces to match the historic wall was acceptable. She replied that it was. Ms. Murray asked the 10 or 12 community members in the audience favoring the project to stand.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that his organization supports the Naval Home applications. He contended that no adequate locations for the pavilion and gazebo existed at the site. He added that he had contacted staff members at the Fairmount Park Historic Preservation Trust, who thought that chances of saving them were remote. Mr. Steinberg asked if Mr. Gallery would support disassembling the structures and storing them at the site. Mr. Gallery replied that their conditions would not warrant such preservation.

Gersil Kay declared that the designs for the new construction had been improved, but remained inadequate. Mr. Sugrue asked if her comments were related to the site plan under consideration. She stated that they were not and left the table.

Mr. Huff requested that Mr. Wilds propose a 60-day, not 30-day, period to find new homes for the gazebo and pavilion. After verifying with the applicant that this suggestion was acceptable, Mr. Wilds and Mr. Bumb, agreed to the 60-day period.

*Mr. Wilds moved to approve the following:*

- 1. The site plan for building placement.*

2. *Reconstruction of the missing sections of the Bainbridge Street perimeter wall with a new full-height masonry wall to match the historic wall.*
3. *The historic gate alterations at the entrance and exit on Gray's Ferry Avenue.*
4. *The restoration of the existing gatehouses.*
5. *The new guardhouse.*
6. *The new interior fencing proposed inside the north entrance and south exit with low plantings.*
7. *The general landscaping.*
8. *The HVAC condenser locations.*
9. *The tree removal and tree protection.*
10. *The replacement light fixtures.*
11. *The demolition of the pavilion and gazebo, if no entity removes them within 60 days.*

*Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.*

### **2420 Gray's Ferry Avenue, Naval Home**

Owner: Toll Naval Associates

Applicant: Adam Barzilay, Toll Brothers Associates

History: 1827-33, 1844, William Strickland, architect

Proposal: Rehabilitation of Biddle Hall, Surgeon General's Residence and Governor's Residence

### **Biddle Hall**

*The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended the following, with staff to review details:*

1. *Approval of the solid two-panel door with three-light transom and frame to match the original window for the main unit doors at the rear of Biddle Hall*
2. *Denial of the solid two-panel door with six-light transoms for the main unit doors at the first-floor rear. The new first-floor doorways should include taller doors and the same three-light transoms used on other floors.*
3. *Denial of the multi-light patio doors for the verandah unit doors at the front of Biddle Hall. The introduction of the smaller lights detracts from the character of the primary elevation and does not simulate the original windows. Although not original to these locations, if glazing is desired, the applicant should install a door with a panel and glazing pattern based on the one surviving original verandah door.*
4. *Approval of the three-light transoms and doorframe to match the original window frame at the verandah unit doors at the front of Biddle Hall.*
5. *Denial of the six-light transoms for the verandah unit doors at first-floor front of Biddle Hall. Again, the new first-floor doorways should include taller doors and the same three-light transoms used on other floors.*
6. *Denial of the simulated-divided-light windows. The new windows should be wood, true-divided-light with a ¾" muntin to match the original.*
7. *Denial of the one-over-one tripartite window configuration as shown. The tripartite windows should have two, two-over-two units flanking a six-over-six unit as the architect noted during the Committee meeting.*
8. *Denial of the single-leaf front door. The original front door will no longer function as the primary entrance and will not be handicapped-accessible. As a significant character defining feature of Biddle Hall, the new door should replicate the historic, wood, double-leaf door with a flat-panel pattern, glazing, and sidelights. A single-leaf door that simulates a double-leaf door is acceptable.*

9. *Denial of the alteration of the wing wall door openings. The installation of a six-over-six windows above a panel creates a false historic appearance. The original doors at these locations had glazing and this door type should be replicated and fixed in place.*
10. *Approval of the removal of the metal fire stairs at rear and metal awning structure at the front.*
11. *Approval of the alterations at the rear to accommodate the new annex connections.*
12. *Denial of any additional fiberglass replica columns. The applicant should reinstall all original cast iron columns at their original locations.*
13. *Approval of the new wood decking.*
14. *Denial of the first and second-story verandah floor fascia. The original floor fascia at the rear and on the second floor front was wood with a half-round nosing. The fascia should be reconstructed in wood to replicate the profile and dimensions.*
15. *Approval of the privacy screens on the verandahs.*

At the Commission meeting, Mr. Barr presented the application to the Commission. He noted that the Commission reviewed and approved the new roof, dormers, monitors, and skylights on Biddle Hall at its 8 August 2003 meeting. The applicant now seeks final approval for the proposed rehabilitation of Biddle Hall and the two dependencies. Biddle Hall will be completely renovated to contain 66 one and two-bedroom residential units. In the north and south wings, the units are configured across the wings running from the east or front façade to the west or rear façade. New openings and doors are proposed for the front and rear elevations. The concept of cutting down existing window openings for new exterior doors was discussed at the October 1999 and February 2000 Committee meetings. Throughout design development, all parties have acknowledged the practical necessity of converting some windows into doors. The main entrances to the units will be located at the rear of Biddle Hall. The rear doors in the units will open onto the verandahs at the front of Biddle Hall. The verandahs will be divided into individual, private balconies. Two-panel metal or fiberglass doors are proposed for the rear elevation with three-light transoms on the ground and second floors. Multi-light metal patio doors are proposed for the front elevation with three-light transoms on the ground and second floor. As the floor to ceiling height is greater on the first floor, the applicant proposes taller six-light transoms above the new doors at the front and rear elevations.

The existing multi-light double hung windows are deteriorated or missing, and the applicant proposes new, simulated-divided-light, double hung, wood windows to match many of the original muntin patterns. Proposed details show a flat exterior muntin that measures 1" in width. The original muntin was deeper and measured ¾" in width. At the August meeting, the Commission approved simulated-divided-light windows for the monitor and dormers, but only after deciding that the simulated-divided-lights would not be detectable at that height above the ground. The original tripartite windows to either side of the front portico and at north and south end walls had a six-over-six, double hung flanked by two-over-two double hung units. At the tripartite window locations, the applicant proposed one-over-one units, but may wish to revise that design decision. All frames and exterior window trim will be wood to match the existing original dimensions and profiles.

Original door openings onto the verandahs exist in the wing walls of Biddle Hall. One original single-leaf door with glazing has survived as well. The applicant proposes to convert these wing wall door openings into windows, each with a new six-over-six double hung window above a recessed wood panel.

There are wide half-round arch top openings at the side of the C section, or center section at rear. There is an inconsistency between the plans and elevations regarding the treatment of these openings.

The original front door is missing. Historic images indicate that, at one time, there was a double door with a tall glass pane over a small solid recessed panel in each leaf. The applicant proposes a wide fiberglass or metal, single-leaf door with two tall glass panes over two small solid panels. The drawings lack information regarding the treatment of the sidelight openings.

The Commission approved in concept the removal of the stucco as well as the CMU stairtower additions at the rear at the August meeting. The new connection for the addition will require the modification of one section of original railing on each floor. The plans for the new annex propose the reinstallation of one section of original railing on the new construction. The proposed areas of connection for the new annex will require the infill of several original window and door openings at the rear. Many of these openings are currently infilled with CMU or brick. The applicant proposes to remove the metal fire stairs that had been inserted at the verandahs at the rear as well as the metal awning frames flanking the entrance at front.

The entire verandah at the north and west of the center section at the rear was destroyed in the fire. Some columns were salvaged intact; the Commission approved ten fiberglass replica columns for five locations at load bearing points as part of the completed roof framing and sheathing work. No other columns will bear any roof load. The drawings lack information regarding the re-installation of the original cast iron columns at the reconstructed verandah. The applicant proposes new 2"x4" wood decking and new wood fascia trim at veranda floors throughout. The original masonry floor fascia at the first floor front will be retained.

As discussed in concept at previous meetings, the applicant proposes five-foot privacy screens on the front verandah to create private balcony space at the rear of each unit. The screens will span the depth of the verandah, perpendicular to the original railing. The new screens will align with and attach to each cast iron column and the marble façade.

Among many issues, Mr. Barr noted that Matt Koenig, architect for the historic buildings, had updated the tripartite window design to correspond to the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Barr to clarify which point in the Committee's recommendation related to the tripartite windows. Mr. Barr replied that the applicant had agreed to comply with Point 7 in the recommendation. Mr. Sugrue asked if the applicant remained committed to simulated-divided-light windows. Mr. Barr replied that the application continues to propose simulated-divided-light windows despite the Committee's recommendation, Point 6 on the list. He also noted that the Commission approved simulated-divided-light windows for the dormers and monitors at Biddle Hall only after determining that the non-historic muntins would not be discernable at that great height above the ground. Mr. Barr reported that the plans call for 6-over-6 windows above wood panels in the wing wall openings; historically, doors stood in these openings; the Committee recommended replicating the doors. This item is addressed in Point 9 of the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Barr stated that the applicant is proposing a fiberglass or metal door for the main front door to Biddle Hall. The Committee recommended denial of the proposed front door, Point 8 in its recommendation. Mr. Wilds asked if the Committee rejected the "single-leafedness," the material, or the design. Mr. Barr responded that the Committee accepted the simulation of a double-leaf door with a single-leaf door, but rejected the material and design. When asked about the verandah columns, Mr. Barr stated that the applicant had submitted a revised plan that complies with Point 12 in the Committee's recommendation. The applicant will install all of the original cast iron columns. Mr. Barr also noted that the applicant has agreed to replicate the historic verandah fascia in wood, complying with Point 14 of the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Campbell verified that the fascia would be reconstructed in wood.

Mr. Barr recounted that the Committee's discussion focused on the simulated-divided-light windows, awkward doors and transoms, fascia details, and verandah columns. He stated that the Committee members unanimously agreed that the windows should be true-divided-light wood windows with a  $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch muntin to match the original windows. He also relayed the Committee's assertion that the 3-light transoms should be used throughout the Biddle Hall unit doorways and that the patio doors at the front verandahs should be redesigned with larger lights. Mr. Steinberg, Mr. Wilds, and Mr. Sugrue asked for clarifications of the Committee's door and transom recommendations. Mr. Barr stated that the Committee preferred a taller door at the first floor; the applicant preferred a standard door even though the ceiling height is much greater at this floor. Mr. Steinberg asked why the applicant proposed a standard patio door for the front of Biddle Hall when an historic verandah door exists on site. Mr. Wilds stated that the verandah doors never stood in the front façade openings. Mr. Barr noted that the front façade openings did not exist historically; the applicant will cut window openings into door openings. He acknowledged that the historic verandah door never stood in the new openings, but that it was more sympathetic to the historic building than the patio doors proposed. Adam Barzilay of Toll Brothers placed a rendering of the front of Biddle Hall on an easel to clarify the door and transom design. Mr. Steinberg exclaimed that the rendering depicted the 3-light transoms at the first floor as recommended by the Committee, not the 6-light transoms proposed by the applicant. Mr. Barzilay explained that the rendering was "just a representation." Mr. Barr also remarked that the Committee had recommended denial of the infilling of the wing wall opening with a window and panel and suggested instead that the historic door, which has virtually the same configuration as the window and panel, be fixed in place. Mr. Wilds inquired about the distance from the openings on the verandahs to the public right-of-way at Gray's Ferry Avenue. He asked rhetorically if it was 15 feet. Mr. Barr replied that it was greater than 15 feet. Mr. Wilds then asked rhetorically if it was 50 feet. Before Mr. Barr could reply, Mr. Sugrue stated that it was a great distance across the parade ground from the avenue to Biddle Hall. Resuming his line of questioning, Mr. Wilds asserted that he was "trying to elicit a number" from Mr. Barr. Mr. Tyler contended that the distance was approximately 150 feet. Mr. Wilds concluded his questioning by stating that he was trying to establish some sense of scale. Mr. Huff asked if the Committee really preferred a wide transom bar over a 6-light transom. Mr. Barr replied that the Committee stressed the importance of maintaining a consistent, historic pane dimension, especially at the top of the opening. Mr. Barr summarized the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Sugrue noted that the application was "bewilderingly complex." He proclaimed the importance of the historic buildings at the site. He suggested as a general principles that Commission question any alterations to the historic fabric. He also suggested maintaining the symmetry of Biddle Hall.

Mr. Steinberg moved to accept the recommendation of the Committee with the modifications outlined in the handout presented by the applicant for Points 7, 12, and 14. Mr. Wilds interrupted, contending that the Commission should hear testimony from the applicant before making a motion. Mr. Sugrue replied that it was Mr. Steinberg's right to introduce a motion at any time. Mr. Steinberg completed his motion, which Mr. Tissian seconded.

Mr. Kottler of Toll Brothers remarked that the 450 square-foot, semi-one-bedroom units in Biddle Hall had been a challenge to design. He noted that other agencies had already reviewed and approved the project. He added that the Commission should approve the proposal in light of the concessions already made.

Mr. Sugrue suggested working down the Architectural Committee's recommendation to resolve

disagreements. He suggested beginning with the 6-light transoms. Mr. Campbell stated that the designers wanted to allow as much light as possible into the small units; the 6-light transoms were the best solution. Mr. Wilds asked about the depth of the verandah. Mr. Campbell stated that it was nine feet deep. Mr. Wilds concluded that the verandahs would cast large shadows on the windows, making them less visible from Gray's Ferry Avenue. He asked Mr. Campbell to comment on this fact. Mr. Campbell stated that the shadow was not the concern; he explained that the applicant wanted the larger transoms to allow light into the units. Mr. Wilds asserted that the units were "quite small." Mr. Campbell said that they were "deep and narrow."

Mr. Sugrue interrupted the line of questioning to report that Mr. Steinberg, who made the motion, needed to leave the meeting. Mr. Steinberg withdrew his motion. Mr. Tissian, who seconded, agreed with the withdrawal.

Mr. Tyler contended that the argument for the 6-light transoms was "spurious." Mr. Campbell responded that the 6-light transoms would correspond to the surrounding 6-over-6 windows. Ms. Murray asked if the question of a 3 or 6-light transom was a purely subjective one. Mr. Kottler offered to consider the 3-light transom as long as it was not a requirement. Mr. Sugrue asked if the door would be a stock door. Mr. Campbell replied that a taller door would be a custom door.

Mr. Tissian inquired about the simulated-divided-light windows. Mr. Campbell explained that it would have a 7/8-inch muntin. He added that the simulated-divided-light window would be more energy efficient. Mr. Sugrue asked if the muntin would be flat or would have a raised profile. Mr. Campbell answered that it would be slightly raised. Mr. Koenig provided details about the proposed windows, which he claimed were almost identical to the original windows. Mr. Sugrue reminded his fellow Commissioners that the Commission always requires individual homeowners to install true-divided-light windows; he worried that an approval of this window would set a negative precedent. Mr. Wilds asserted that the distance from the street obviated the need to require historically appropriate windows. He added that the staff already approves Weathershield true-divided-light windows that are not appropriate. He noted that he sees the inappropriate windows throughout Society Hill. He concluded that the Commission would most certainly approve the window currently under review if proposed by a home owner. Mr. Sugrue countered that it would not approve the window owing to the inappropriate muntin profile. Mr. Wilds replied that the Commission has certainly approved simulated-divided-light windows. Mr. Sugrue again asserted the importance of appropriate profiles. Mr. Bumb opined that the distinction between this building and the typical row house is the distance from the street; he contended that the difference in the muntins would not be discernable from the street. Mr. Sugrue asked rhetorically why the applicant had consented to the historically appropriate fascia profile, which would be even less visible from the street. He added that one would need night-vision goggles like those used in Iraq to detect the difference in the two proposed fascia types. Mr. Koenig submitted that the historic brickmold would be replicated exactly. He also listed several advantages of the windows.

Mr. Primavera argued that, owing to the "enormity" of the project, the details are not as significant as they might be with smaller projects. He asked the Commission to look at the project as a whole and not consider individual details. He asked Commissioners to "step away from the window" and consider "the big picture."

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that he is favor of the motion. He added that the 3 or 6-light transom question is subjective. He also has reservations about the treatment of the wing wall door openings. He noted that historic fabric exists in this case.

Mr. Huff provided his opinion on the 3 or 6-light transom question. He recommended the taller door with a 3-light transom or the proposed shorter door and 6-light transom, but rejected the wide transom bar option.

*Mr. Wilds moved to approve the following:*

- 1. The solid two-panel door with three-light transom for the main unit doors at the ground and second-floor rear of Biddle Hall*
- 2. The solid two-panel door with six-light transom for the main unit doors at the first-floor rear of Biddle Hall.*
- 3. The multi-light patio doors for the verandah unit doors at the front of Biddle Hall.*
- 4. The three-light transoms for the verandah unit doors at the ground and second-floor front of Biddle Hall.*
- 5. The six-light transoms for the verandah unit doors at first-floor front of Biddle Hall.*
- 6. The wood simulated-divided-light windows with 7/8" muntins.*
- 7. The tripartite windows consisting of two-over-two double-hung simulated-divided-light windows flanking a six-over-six simulated-divided-light window.*
- 8. The single-leaf front door in wood or fiberglass that simulates a double-leaf door with an astragal, with staff to review details.*
- 9. The alteration of the wing wall door openings with a six-over-six simulated-divided-light window above a panel. The surviving original door verandah door will be retained and stored on site.*
- 10. The removal of the metal fire stairs at the rear and metal awning structure at the front.*
- 11. The alterations at the rear to accommodate the new annex connections.*
- 12. The reinstallation of all original cast iron columns at their original locations.*
- 13. The new wood decking.*
- 14. The first and second-story verandah floor fascia in wood to replicate the historic profiles and dimensions.*
- 15. The privacy screens on the verandahs.*

*Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 1. Mr. Sugrue opposed.*

### **Surgeon General's and Governor's Residences**

*The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended the following, with staff to review details:*

- 1. Approval of the window repair.*
- 2. Denial of the new simulated-divided-light windows. New windows should be true-divided-light with a ¾" muntin to match the original.*
- 3. Denial of the small one-over-one windows on the side facades. Historic photos indicate that the windows were three-over-three.*
- 4. Approval of the removal of one set of steps and the addition of the handicapped ramp on each residence, with the provision that the applicants investigate the possibility of not making the buildings accessible.*
- 5. Denial of the first-floor front openings as drawn. All exterior doors at the first floor had sidelights. The new doors and sidelights should replicate the original details and dimensions.*
- 6. Denial of the second-floor front openings as drawn. Historic photos suggest that there was a single-leaf door at the center flanked by six-over-six windows. The proposed treatment should fit into the existing openings.*
- 7. Approval of the privacy screens at the first-floor porch.*

8. *Denial of the privacy screen on second floor. The 5' height and location at the center of the railing and window appears awkward. The screen, or screens, should align with the existing columns.*
9. *Approval of the spandrel glass for the second-floor center window opening.*
10. *Approval of the infill sections of metal railings provided the "feet" are removed and the bottom and top rail align with the existing original railing. The missing railing motifs such as the anchor should be replicated if feasible.*

Mr. Barr presented the application to the Commission. He stated that the dependencies will be renovated for 12 residential units. The applicant proposes to retain and repair the existing original windows, porch posts, railings, and stucco on the dependencies. The drawings show one-over-one double hung windows in the small openings on the side elevations. One new window opening is proposed at first-floor rear on each residence on the façade opposite Biddle Hall. The applicant proposes to install a new, six-over-six double hung simulated-divided-light window unit with a 1-inch muntin to match the height and fill the width of an existing door opening.

Handicapped accessible ramps are proposed on both residences on the façade opposite Biddle Hall. The installation of the ramps will entail the removal of a set of stone steps. The original front doors are missing. The drawings lack information on the all of the proposed exterior door and doorway details. The drawings are unclear regarding the treatment of the openings on the front façade.

Similar to Biddle Hall, the applicant proposes privacy screens for the front porches on both floors. The screens will span between and attach to the columns and masonry façade. On the second floor, the privacy screen divides the porch equally and appears to attach to center section of original railing and center door opening. Spandrel glass is proposed for this center opening. Again the drawings are unclear regarding this treatment. New sections of railing are proposed to fill the existing spaces between the paired porch columns. Lastly, the proposed site engineering drawings show a fire department connection on the Governor's Residence on the façade opposite Biddle Hall.

Mr. Sugrue asked the applicant to explain the most recent set of revisions to the Commission. Mr. Koenig offered clarifications. He noted that the revised design includes the 3-over-3 windows recommended by the Committee in Point 3. He stated that the drawings have been revised to comply with the Committee's recommendations on Points 5 and 6. He also noted that the railing design has been modified to comply with the Committee's Point 8. He clarified that the screens have been replaced with railings.

Mr. Barr asserted that the drawings have been clarified to reflect the existing conditions of the front façade windows, but the proposed doors are new and have not been reviewed by the staff or Committee. Mr. Koenig replied that they are the same patio doors as proposed for Biddle Hall.

Mr. Gallery declared that he supported the revised proposal. He also stated that the staff, especially Mr. Barr, should be commended for the careful review of the Naval Home project. He also asked that the Toll Brothers team, especially Adam Barzilay, be commended for its willingness to compromise and its selfless efforts to preserve this highly significant historic building. Mr. Sugrue echoed the praise of the staff.

*Mr. Wilds moved to approve the following:*

1. *The window repair or replacement with wood simulated-divided-light windows with 7/8" muntins.*

2. *The wood simulated-divided-light windows with 7/8" muntins.*
3. *The small three-over-three windows on the side facades.*
4. *The removal of one set of steps and the addition of the handicapped ramp on each residence.*
5. *The revised first-floor front openings with sidelights.*
6. *The revised second-floor front openings.*
7. *The privacy railings at the first-floor porch.*
8. *The revised privacy railings on second floor.*
9. *The spandrel glass for the second-floor center window opening.*
10. *The infill sections of metal railings provided the "feet" are removed and the bottom and top rail align with the existing original railing.*

*Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed with unanimously.*

### **2420 Gray's Ferry Avenue, Naval Home**

Owner: Toll Naval Associates

Applicant: Adam Barzilay, Toll Brothers Associates

History: 1827-1833, 1844, William Strickland, architect

Proposal: Biddle Hall Annex

*The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.*

Mr. Barr presented the application to the Commission. He explained that the Commission reviewed and approved the design of the addition to Biddle Hall in concept at its 8 August 2003 meeting. The plans and elevation have now been refined and return for final approval. In response to comments by the staff and Committee, the revised design has less vertical divisions in elevation, the proposed materials are more uniform, and the general character is more contemporary. Although red brick remains as the predominant material on the exterior, the variation of brick colors has been eliminated and the roof has been simplified. On the courtyard elevations the upper floors are clad in a stucco finish that appears compatible with the rear of Biddle Hall. The light colored split face block remains on the ground floor on all the elevations. The proposed connection at the rear of the prow ends is now fully glazed and provides a rooftop location for all of the HVAC condensers for the upper story units in Biddle Hall. The applicant has designed a "well" in the new roof on the courtyard side of the annex to accommodate the condensers for the units in the new building. In the courtyard, the annex connects to the rear center section of Biddle Hall with a simple flat roofed hyphen clad in split face block and stucco. At the landings on the upper floors of the connections, the applicant proposes to incorporate a section of original railing from Biddle Hall on the four courtyard elevations. The railing returns onto the new construction and visually unifies the new with the old. Several original window and door openings, many of which are currently infilled with masonry, will get covered by the new connections and will get infilled as necessary. At the prow ends, there is a discrepancy in the setback of the connection between the J.K. Roller and Lessard drawings which deserves study. All three connections now have an open "pass-thru" at grade level against the rear wall of Biddle Hall.

*Ms. Murray moved to approve the application as submitted without staff to review details. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which passed with 8 votes. Mr. Sugrue abstained.*

### **2420 Gray's Ferry Avenue, Naval Home**

Owner: Toll Naval Associates

Applicant: Adam Barzilay, Toll Brothers Associates  
History: 1827-1833, 1844, William Strickland, architect  
Proposal: New Construction

At the Commission meeting, Mr. Barr presented the application. He explained that the Commission approved in concept the front elevations of the new construction with simplification of the brick colors at its 8 August 2003 meeting. The elevations have been refined and return for final approval. In response to comments at previous meetings, the brick colors have been simplified. However, the character and features of the new construction still have a pseudo-historic look which neither relates to the character of the Naval Home nor the historic vernacular Philadelphia rowhouse architecture in the surrounding neighborhood. The recessed terrace at the fourth floor of the townhouse design has been eliminated and replaced by a traditional pitched roof with dormers. The front and side elevations are faced in brick while the rears are brick and stucco. Other than the brick color, the façade details return essentially unchanged. The applicant, however, has modified the design in response to the condition of the conceptual approval at the August 2003 Commission meeting.

*Ms. Murray moved to approve the application as submitted without staff to review details. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.*

**915 Clinton Street**

Coles House, LLC, Owner  
Albert Tantala, Engineer/Applicant  
DATE: 1835-1843  
PROPOSAL: Legalize roof deck

The applicant requested a thirty-day continuance.

**1800-18 Park Mall aka Liacouras Walk**

Temple University, Owner  
Hyman Myers, Architect/Applicant  
DATE: 1872, David A. Woelpper, builder  
PROPOSAL: Reconstruct mansards in steel, replace slate with substitute material, infill basement windows – in concept

The applicant withdrew the application.

**1228 Pine Street**

David Callan, Owner  
Charles McGloughlin, Architect/Applicant  
DATE: c. 1832  
PROPOSAL: Alter 1<sup>st</sup> floor window to new bay window, add 3-story rear addition  
*The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended approval of the revised proposal, with the staff to review details.*

Mr. Farnham presented the application, which proposes the replacement of a Colonial Revival storefront

window with a bay window at the first story front façade and the construction of a large addition at the rear. The design of the proposed bay window derives from a bay window across the street at the northeast corner of Camac and Pine Streets. It is not based on the current or previous window at 1228 Pine Street. The rear of the property is visible from Waverly Street. The applicant submitted a revised proposal at the Committee meeting with corrections to the rear window designs.

*Mr. James moved to accept the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.*

### **222 North 20<sup>th</sup> Street, Franklin Institute**

Franklin Institute, Owner

Debbie Terrell, Applicant

DATE: 1929-1931, John Windrim, architect; addition, 1988, Geddes Brecher Qualls Cunningham

PROPOSAL: Cooling tower on roof

*The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the cooling tower and replacement windows, provided the replacement windows replicate the historic windows in configuration, profile, and dimension, 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.]; 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.]; and the Roofs Guideline [Recommended: Installing mechanical and service equipment on the roof such as air conditioning ... when required for the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].*

Mr. Farnham presented the application, which proposes the addition of a large cooling tower to the roof. The tower would be added to the Mandell Center, a recent addition at the southwest corner of the complex, not the older neo-classical building. The center's large scale and simple Post-Modern lines can accommodate the addition of the bulky cooling tower. Committee members agreed that the tower would not be visible from the Parkway and Logan Circle and would have little or no negative impact on the addition at the rear. The applicant also proposed window replacement, but, following the Committee's negative assessment of the window proposal, he withdrew that segment of the application.

Tully Speaker of the Board of the Logan Square Neighbors Association inquired about the visibility as well as the noisiness of the cooling tower. John Gerbner of Ewing Cole replied that cooling towers do not make noise. He also displayed sightline studies, which show that only one-third of the cooling tower will be visible. He also noted that it will be placed with existing equipment on the roof. Mr. Speaker stated that he had no opposition to the tower.

*Mr. Tissian moved to accept the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.*

### **2504 South Cleveland Street**

Sara DiNicola, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1909, John Windrim, architect

PROPOSAL: Replace security door

*The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal as submitted, 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 explained this application, which proposes the replacement of a non-historic aluminum screen door with a metal security door.

John DiNicola, the son of the owner, said that she was requesting a full glass security door with a mail slot because her mail has been stolen numerous times.

Mr. Sugrue remarked that the Commission has approved the simplest of security doors in the past and inquired if the applicant had pursued other options. Mr. Wilds said that, in the light of the extenuating circumstances, the proposed door should be approved.

*Ms. Murray made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.*

### **1939 West Diamond Street**

Margaret Carney, Owner

Cathy Harris, Applicant

DATE: 1889, Willis Hale, architect

PROPOSAL: Mural

*The Architectural Committee recommended approval, 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 the application, which proposes a mural with a landscape theme by artist Anna Uribe on a stucco party wall at 1935 Diamond Street.

Anna Uribe, the muralist, displayed renderings of the proposed mural.

*Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried with 6 votes. Mr. Tissian abstained and Mr. James dissented.*

### **329 South 17<sup>th</sup> Street**

MFT Holdings, LLC, Owner

Cathy Harris, Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Mural

*The Architectural Committee recommended approval 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 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 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 property and its environment would be unimpaired.].*

Mr. Baron explained this proposal, which calls for painting a mural on a stuccoed party wall facing a parking lot on Pine Street. The mural is a rendering of different buildings to the north of this structure including Liberty Place. The mural does not cover any exposed brick surfaces.

Cathy Harris, Mural Arts Program, said that architecture and the environment are considered when developing a mural. She believes that the architecture of the building will not be impacted. Ms. Harris informed the Commission that she has been working with the 1600 block of Waverly Street neighbors as well as the community.

Mr. Wilds asked about the owner of the parking lot and the party wall. Ms. Harris responded that the lot is owned by Five Star Parking. Mr. Sugrue contended that the applicant should present a letter of authorization for the usage of the wall from the owner of the parking lot. Mr. James stressed the importance of maintaining the same standards throughout the city. He questioned why his fellow Commissioners approved the mural in the Diamond Street Historic District in North Philadelphia without much discussion, but then balked at a similar mural in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District in Center City. Some members opined that perhaps the previous mural application should be reconsidered.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance expressed concern about the proliferation of murals in historic districts. He maintained that a set of standards for the Commission's review of mural should be established. He further stated that he believes that murals should be forbidden in historic districts.

Amy Johnston, Mural Arts Program, said that the owners could not be present at the Commission meeting, but that the community approved of the mural.

Mr. Tissian opined that murals indicate decaying neighborhoods. He objected to murals in historic districts. Mr. Sugrue commented that there are different types of murals and that he voted against the mural at 15<sup>th</sup> and Waverly Street because it was on a historically exterior wall, not a party wall. He suggested that a subcommittee be created to establish a policy on murals. Mr. James suggested that the Commission reconsider and deny the mural approved in the previous application, but Mr. Wilds noted that a previous motion cannot be revoked. Mr. Huff contended that murals express the vitality of neighborhoods. Mr. Wilds asserted that there are differences between the two proposed murals. The Diamond Street relates historically to its setting; the 17<sup>th</sup> Street mural design does not. Mr. Tyler asserted that the Commission has maintained a consistent mural policy; it approved those on former party walls and denied all others. He added that the Commission did not address content. Ms. Murray pointed out that the community may appeal any Commission decision.

*Mr. James made a motion to approve the proposal. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which carried with 5 votes. Mr. Perri, Mr. Wilds, and Mr. Tissian dissented.*

*Mr. Tissian offered a motion to create a subcommittee to be appointed by the Chair to formulate a policy on murals. Mr. James seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.*

**25 S. Van Pelt Street**

Archdiocese of Philadelphia, Owner

Cathy Harris, Applicant

DATE: 1894, addition 1939 by Louis Magaziner for Big Brothers Association

PROPOSAL: Mural

The applicant withdrew the application.

**342 South 15<sup>th</sup> Street**

Frankie Francis, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1845

PROPOSAL: Reinstall windows, stucco façade

*The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the installation of the original windows and patching of the stucco, with staff to review a sample and color of the stucco 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.]*

Mr. Baron explained this proposal, which involves work to a Greek Revival rowhouse. The applicant removed the historic windows, closed down the openings on the second floor and installed vinyl windows. The applicant now seeks to reinstall the wood sash that were removed. Mr. Baron noted that the applicant originally proposed a new coat of stucco over the existing stucco, but now wishes simply to patch the existing stucco.

*Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Kilkenny seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.*

**1612-18 Locust Street**

TC & KY Association, Incorporated, Owner

Joanne Phillips, Esq., Applicant

DATE: 1612-1616, built 1960, architects Supowitz & Demchick, Non-contributing

1618, built 1850, attributed to John Notman; altered ground floor 1890, Wilson Eyre Jr.,  
Significant

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation of 1618, demolition of 1612-16, construction of 8-story multi-unit residential building with parking – in concept

*The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept, 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 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 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 property and its environment would be unimpaired.].*

The Architectural Committee reviewed an application to redevelop the properties at 1612-1618 Locust Street at its February 2004 meeting. After the Committee and community registered its disapproval of the plan by Bower Lewis Thrower, the applicant withdrew the proposal, dismissed the architect, and retained the architectural firm of Agoos Lovera. Agoos Lovera has prepared a design that stipulates the demolition of the Non-contributing structure at 1612-1616 as well as a 1960 addition that wraps around the rear of 1618 Locust Street. The Significant brownstone house at 1618 Locust will be retained and restored on the exterior. The plans call for an 8-story residential building to be constructed on the site of the Locust Club. The new building will have multiple set backs from Locust Street as well as from the west side above the 6<sup>th</sup> Floor to respect the scale of Locust Street and minimize shadows on St. Mark's Church. The building will be clad in yellow and pink Casota stone like that on the Art Museum and will include balconies as well as an entrance on the west end of the facade. On Latimer Street, the building will include a courtyard and a vehicular entrance to basement parking with a brick wall running along the sidewalk line. At its May 2004 meeting, the Commission approved in concept the Agoos Lovera plan.

Joanne Phillips, counsel for the project, said the Ceebraid Corporation is the equitable owner of the properties. The proposed development will consist of 17 units with underground parking. Ms. Phillips emphasized that the revised plans will retain 1618 Locust Street. She met with the community to address issues of concern such as shadows impacting St. Mark's Church. Ms. Phillips said that the revised design respects the streetscape and that there would be no shadow impact for nine months of the year.

James Rowe, the architect, believes that the proposed new construction will combine the old and the new in a respectful manner. He noted that there would be a setback from Locust to minimize the massing profile and from Latimer Street for a garden. The lower four stories will be constructed of Casota stone to relate to the neighboring buildings. Mr. Rowe disclosed that a sun study was performed that detailed that shadows would be cast onto the church in October and March and only in the middle of the day, approximately between 10:45 and 1:15.

Mr. Wilds inquired if a zoning height restriction exists on Locust Street. Mr. Phillips responded that height is controlled by FAR, not a numerical limit.

Carl Primavera, counsel for St. Mark's Church, said that the revised proposal is a great improvement; however, the shadow impact is still a major concern for the church.

Sean Mullen, St. Mark's Church, acknowledged the efforts of the applicant with regards to the revised design, which addressed the scale issue; however, he believes that the height remains a significant open issue. He believes that the proposed design will encroach upon the church's light and sense of open space.

Jerry Hund, owner of 1610 Locust Street, said that he has not met with the developers and expressed concern about the height and safety of the neighboring building. He also noted that his side windows would be in shadow if the proposed building is constructed.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance urged the Commission to give conceptual approval. He believes that the revised proposal preserves the integrity of the Significant historic building. Additionally, the

applicant has stepped the building back at several points, maintaining the historic cornice line. Mr. Gallery remarked that this project is a good example of the positive impact that the Commission's review of new construction can have.

*Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the proposal in concept. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.*

### **33 South 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, and 18-22 Letitia Street**

EFL Partners V, LP, Owners

Paul Stewart, Applicant

DATE: c. 1905, 18-22 S. Letitia, built c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Roof decks, HVAC

*The Architectural Committee recommended approval, subject to the height of the privacy fence, not to exceed six feet, and with the staff to review details pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.*

This proposal, seen in the past, involves items that became apparent with the arrival of the full set of drawings. These items include roof top HVAC and deck structures, and cutting several windows on the north wall facing Black Horse Alley. Staff has now worked with the applicant to minimize some of the issues.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal and gave the Commission a clarification of the term dunnage as requested by some members.

*Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the Committee recommendation. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.*

### **2304 Wallace Street**

William Cromar, Owner

James Lee Deddens, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Replace stucco on façade, new front door

*The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the stucco with a neutral color sand finish, and denial of the door as submitted, but approval of a four panel door with glazing subject to staff review 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.].*

This proposal calls for removing a stuccoed brick face façade and installing new smooth stucco on the façade. The applicant claims that the brick is in poor condition. He also wishes to change the front door and frame with a design that is not based on the historic doors of this period.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal and noted that the door and door frame portion of the application has been withdrawn.

*Mr. James made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Murray seconded the motion,*

which carried unanimously.

### **250 Lawrence Street**

Arden Theatre Company, Owner

Noele Parris, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1820, significant in district

PROPOSAL: Partial demolition of rear, construction of 3-story rear addition

*The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, 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 a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportions, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and 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.].*

This proposal includes the removal of two, small rear additions and the construction of a three-story addition. The original rear ell with the staircase will remain and connect the main section of the house with the addition. The new construction consists of a large section at the same height as the rear ell with a projecting, asymmetrical bay at the rear. The south wall of the addition will be brick and will extend past the plane of the addition's rear wall. The rear wall will be stuccoed and the projecting bay will be clad in metal with a standing-seam metal roof. All windows will be wood and a mix of casements and fixed sash. Although the addition will be highly visible from 5<sup>th</sup> Street, it will have minimal impact on the building's historic fabric.

The Commission concurred with the Architectural Committee.

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

### **317 and 319-29 Vine Street**

Berkshire Vine Street, LP, Owner

Paul Horning, Applicant

DATE: 317- vacant lot; 319- c. 1960, non-contributing, demolition permit approved at staff level

PROPOSAL: Construction of 6-story multi-unit residential building with parking

*The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal, 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 a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportions, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and 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.].*

This application is for a new 6-story, 60-unit residential building with parking. The U-shaped complex faces Vine Street with the open courtyard as the pedestrian entrance. At six stories, the building responds to its neighbors, the Charles E. Brown Factory next door, the Leas & McVitty building down the block and the expansive Thomas Scientific Building across the street. The building will have brick walls, large banks of black-finish, one-over-one windows, and stone coping. The courtyard will be a break in the building that offers a relief to the monolithic nature of the building, like Orianna Street does further down the block.

On the 4<sup>th</sup> Street façade, the building breaks down to minimize its scale in response to the smaller buildings along York Avenue. Zinc-clad, projecting bays are introduced and the parapet is broken to reduce the sense of the overall height of the building. The brick and windows remain the same. This treatment continues along the Wood Street façade, which houses the vehicular entrance. All parking will be underground.

All mechanical equipment will be on the roof and will be hidden by the zinc-clad or brick parapet. According to the zoning agreement, nothing will be above 75 feet. The brick façade will be a typical red brick, but some details, such as the watertable and some piers, will be done in a darker red brick for contrast. However, at the north end of the 4<sup>th</sup> Street façade and along Wood Street, the watertable is at 4 feet above the sidewalk. This makes the pedestrian experience rather bland. Perhaps windows or reveals in the brick could be inserted to break the monotony of the brick façade at this level.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Mr. Wilds stated that the review of details by the staff is not necessary because the project is limited to new construction and the architects and builders involved in the project are highly regarded. Ms. Spina explained that although the drawings seen by the Commission are fully developed, they are not construction drawings. When developing full working drawings, details such as the placement of mechanical equipment or window configurations may change. If the “staff to review details” clause was included in the Commission’s approval, the staff could review and approve late changes to the working drawings without an additional Commission review. If the staff is barred from further discretionary review, changes to the current plans might require the Commission’s review, potentially delaying the project. She concluded that the “staff to review details” clause allows the staff to expedite the processing of working drawings; it is not a license to impede applications.

*Mr. James made a motion to accept the Committee’s recommendation. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.*

### **241-45 Market Street**

The 241-245 LLC, Owner

Stephen Maffei, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 241- c. 1840; demolished 1987; 243- c. 1840; demolished 1988; 245- c. 1925; demolished 1987

PROPOSAL: New construction on vacant lot

*The Architectural Committee recommended approval, with the staff to review details of the building and Committee to review details of the Church Street garden wall and trellis.*

This proposal calls for a six-story, multi-unit residential building along Market Street, with commercial on the ground floor. Although the lot goes to Church Street, the building sits at Market Street only. The

rear of the development is reserved for parking with only a garden wall and gate at the Church Street street-line.

The building follows the design which became popular in the 1940s with services in a single core, called out in a different material and the actual used space in wings coming off of that core. The service tower will be sheathed in either terra cotta panels or brick veneer. The floors will be articulated with limestone veneer panels. Casement windows with transoms will add a verticality to the building. Each floor will have recessed balconies with a Trespa Meteon (man-made, wood-resin) panel system for the railings. At the penthouse, the balcony will extend the width of the building. The entrance to the upper floors will have a stone canopy and halo-lit stainless-steel numbers over a double-leaf, fully glazed door with transom. The storefront at the first floor will have a symmetrical design of a double-leaf, fully glazed door with transom, flanked by tripartite windows. There is a large entablature at the first floor for signage when there is a tenant.

The rear façade matches the Market Street in design. At the street-line, the plans call for a series of stone columns and concrete canopies with brick bases. This wall will extend to the rear of 239 Market Street, which is owned by the same developer. Metal gates stand at the vehicular and pedestrian entries.

The west elevation, which is visible since the neighboring building is only two stories tall, calls for smooth stucco with scored expansion joints with piers of terra cotta or brick veneer at both ends. The east façade also has a stucco finish, but since the owner also owns 239 Market Street the design can incorporate windows on this façade. At the middle there is a light well with casement windows topped with transoms. At the ends, the floors also have banks of casement windows with transoms.

Ms. Spina presented the application and informed the Commission that the issue of the trellis was given consideration at the Committee meeting; however, there has not been a submission for its design.

Stephen Maffei, the architect, said that it is his intent to retain the visual openness of the Church Street facade and believes that a trellis over the parking area will accommodate this issue; however, the owner would have to consent to its installation. He noted that the Planning Commission is deferring to the recommendation of the Historical Commission in its approval of the façade on Market Street. Mr. James thought that the trellis should be a requirement on Church Street. Mr. Sugrue concurred, saying that Church Street is an important street in the Old City Historic District.

*Mr. Huff made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Kilkenny seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.*

### **239 Market Street**

Loumac, LP, Owner

Stephen Maffei, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1847; storefront and industrial windows installed, c. 1925

PROPOSAL: Cut new windows in rear, roof deck

*The Architectural Committee recommended approval of restoring the front façade, the aluminum replacement windows, cutting the windows and door in the rear ell, re-building the rear wall (if substantiated by a structural engineer) and cutting the windows to single-leaf doors, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 4 [Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.], Standard 6 [Deteriorated 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.] and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]. Denial of the sliding glass door, 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 proportions, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].*

Ms. Spina presented this proposal, which calls for restoring the front façade to its 1920s appearance. However, the proposed aluminum windows have larger dimensions at the operational sash. For now, these are the best alternative on the market for insulated, aluminum sash for these industrial type of windows.

On the rear, the owner wishes to install two new windows on the rear ell with identical industrial sash and a new door that will be the primary entrance for one of the units. Although this will include the removal of historic fabric, the rear ell has been stuccoed in the past and has seen some deterioration. On the roof of the rear ell, the owner wants to install a roof deck with a horizontal rail; this meets the Secretary's Standards, but may not meet code. To have access to the roof deck, the application calls for removing the original windows on the third floor of the main portion of the building and installing a large, sliding glass door. The plans call for rebuilding the entire rear wall of the main building, citing deterioration as the factor, but the application does not include a structural engineer's report documenting the need for reconstruction.

Mr. Wilds asked for clarification of the sliding glass door and its visibility from Church Street. Stephen Maffei, the architect, said that the owner wishes to have large sliding door leading out to the roof deck, but is willing to change a window to a door.

Mr. Wilds thought that the sliding glass door would be situated on the third floor and set back from the Church Street façade; therefore he believes that it is approvable. Ms. Murray concurred and noted that it would have minimal visibility behind the fence.

*Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.*

### **7500 Germantown Avenue, Wingohocking Hall**

New Covenant Church, Owner

Van Strother, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1890-1900, Wilson Brothers, Cope and Stewardson, architects

PROPOSAL: HVAC units, fencing, gazebo, landscaping

*The Architectural Committee recommended approval of HVAC with landscaping as a buffer on all sides, 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 a property.], 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.] and Mechanical Systems Guideline [Recommended: Installing air conditioning units if required by the new use in such a manner that historic features are not damaged or obscured.]. Approval of the landscaping, hardscaping, and fencing, but without the curve at the private*

*garden, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.*

Ms. Spina explained this proposal, which involves two parts. First, the rehabilitated building will have 56 housing units and each unit plus all of the common areas have their own HVAC condensers. The condensers are small (23-inches by 35-inches), but they are grouped together in places around the building. The rear of the building is actually the most visible from a public right-of-way, Gowan Street. At the front of the building, the plan calls for hiding them with shrubbery.

Second, the applicant wants to create landscaped gardens in the areas between the wings with fencing. The western courtyard will become the entry garden and the eastern courtyard will become the private garden. The proposed fencing is a simple, aluminum picket fencing. The applicant also proposes to have a straight fence at the entry garden with simple, picket columns at the entry path. Along the building façade, by the door, another fence will delineate the garden to create a visual porch. For the eastern, private garden the applicant proposes a curved fence. For both gardens, hardscaping and landscaping are proposed.

Mr. Wilds inquired about the curved fence. Van Strother, the applicant responded that the fence denotes the private garden and is for security. Commission members agreed that the curve of the fence should be eliminated.

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

#### **1420-22 Chestnut Street**

Property Management, Owner

Dominic Aspite, Applicant

DATE: 1896-97, Frank Miles Day, architect; 1<sup>st</sup> floor altered, c. 1960; 1<sup>st</sup> floor refaced in granite, 1981.

PROPOSAL: Signage

*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.] and Signage Guideline [Not Recommended: Using inappropriately scaled signs and logos or other types of signs that obscure, damage, or destroy remaining character defining features of the historic building.]. It suggested a halo-lit sign in the band above the transom.*

This proposal calls for signage at the first floor for a new commercial tenant. The signage would be placed at the top of the arches and includes brass letters, with a high shine finish, with bands that would span the length of the building. Florescent lights will illuminate the sign.

Ms. Spina presented the application and explained that the revised proposal, with the signage located below the transom bar, is a result of requirements by the Preservation Alliance, which owns a façade easement.

*Mr. Kilkenny made a motion to approve the revised proposal. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.*

### **427 Spruce Street**

Antonio and Georgine Atacan, Owners

Steven Owens, Contractor

DATE: 1791

first French Consulate General in the United States, 1791-1793

Spanish Legation, 1795-1805

restored, Carl Massara, architect, 1969-1972

PROPOSAL: Roof deck, change dormer window to door

*The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal as submitted.*

This application proposes the addition of a roof deck to the rear ell. The plans originally submitted to document the proposal were incomplete. On 26 April 2004, 13 days after the application deadline and one day before the Committee meeting, a newly-retained architect submitted revised plans for the deck. To access the deck, an original rear dormer window would be cut into a door and a bridge would be built from the new door across the roof and narrow piazza to the deck on the rear ell. The deck would stand very high owing to the steep pitch of the roof. It would be visible from Manning Street and, perhaps, S. 5<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Mr. Wilds disagreed with Mr. Atkin of the Architectural Committee, who stated at the Committee meeting that he has “absolutely no problem” with the deck and cited the views from it as a reason for approving it. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance noted that the Alliance holds an easement on the property.

After Commission members expressed a propensity to deny the application, Mr. Huff remarked that the tabling of the proposal would be more generous to allow the applicant time to revise his design. He pointed out that tabling would also allow the applicant an opportunity to meet with the civic association. Mr. James countered that even if the Commission denies the application, the applicant can resubmit a revised proposal. Mr. Bumb asserted the importance of a consistent roof deck policy. Mr. Wilds stated his strong opposition to the destruction of historic fabric with the expansion of the dormer into a doorway. He added that the applicant should consider other options. Mr. Tyler cited a similar proposal the enlargement of the dormer at N. Lawrence and Vine Streets, which the Commission denied.

*Mr. Wilds made a motion to reject the Committee recommendation and deny the proposal. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried with 5 votes. Mr. Bumb, Ms. Murray, and Mr. Kilkenney dissented.*

### **123 League Street**

Rostislav Kopylkov, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1793

PROPOSAL: Legalize metal door

*The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the legalization 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.]*

This application to cure a violation involves the front door of the house. The applicant replaced his

historically accurate wood front door with a metal door with shallow panels on an emergency basis without a permit. The wood front door had been reviewed by the Commission and the house was awarded a plaque for an accurate restoration.

No one attended the meeting to represent the proposal. Commission members discussed the proposal and concurred with the Architectural Committee.

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

### **237 South 18<sup>th</sup> Street, Barclay Hotel**

Barclay Condominium Association, Owners

David Matus, Applicant

DATE: 1928, J.E.R. Carpenter, architect

PROPOSAL: Replace 20 windows

*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. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]*

Mr. Baron explained this application, which involves installing twenty wood Marvin windows in a second floor condominium unit. The installation would include the windows only on the right half of the front façade. The windows differ from the existing in some dimensions as well as with a visible jamb liner. A similar application for a higher floor was denied by the Commission in the past.

David Matus, the applicant, noted that Marvin Windows can manufacture a window with details that differ slightly, with a pulley system. Commission members thought it important not to set a precedent.

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

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **126 West Penn Street**

M. Alex Haddad and Laura MacGregor, Owners/Applicants

DATE: 1869, Patrick Connelly, architect

PROPOSAL: Replace slate mansard with asphalt shingle

Proposal: Replace slate mansard with asphalt shingle

*Architectural Committee Recommendation: Front and return of mansard to be roofed in slate and remainder roofed in asphalt shingle, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9, with staff to review details.*

Mr. Baron presented the application, which proposes the removal of decorative slate along the mansard of this twin and its replacement with slate on the four front slopes and asphalt/fiberglass shingles on the rear slopes. The applicant accepted the Committee's recommendation and asks that the Commission approve the same.

Mr. Baron disclosed to the Commission that the applicant would now like approval according to the recommendation of the Architectural Committee.

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

### **413 South 3<sup>rd</sup> Street**

Michael Silver, Owner

Richard Cole, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Cut new windows in south façade

*The Architectural Committee voted two to one to recommend denial of the proposal, 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 3 [Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.].*

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission, which proposes cutting four new window openings and installing 6-over-6, wood, true-divided-light windows in the south façade of this rowhouse at the northeast corner of 3<sup>rd</sup> and Stamper Streets. The south façade faces Stamper Street. The south, brick façade is unfenestrated (except the half-round attic window) and entirely original.

This building was constructed in the early nineteenth century as part of a row of speculative houses. Speculative builders did not typically fenestrate the exposed, side facades of the buildings at the ends of rows. Two factors prompted the builders' decisions to leave the end walls unfenestrated. First, the double chimneys precluded fenestration in large portions of the walls; closets were typically installed on the chimney walls. Second, when erecting a row, the builder worked from a standard plan that defined each building in a row, regardless of its position; obviously, mid-block buildings did not include side windows.

Michael Silver, the owner, presented a revised submission. He stated that the proposed windows would bring in light and deter petty vandalism. He noted that other homes in Society Hill have windows in similar walls. He disclosed that the proposed alterations have received the approval of the Society Hill Civic Association. Mr. Wilds asserted his opposition to the proposed windows in this 1830s wall. He believes that the petty crime is a temporary behavioral problem that does not require this permanent solution. Ms. Murray did not agree. She asserted that historic homes must be updated for current conditions. She added that the proposed windows are sensitive to the historic fabric. Mr. Huff concluded all three windows are not necessary to improve security on the side street. Mr. James pointed out that the

Architectural Committee has not reviewed the revised submission.

*Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. James seconded the motion, which failed with a tie vote. Mr. Kilkenny, Mr. Huff, Mr. Bumb, and Ms. Murray opposed the motion.*

*Mr. Wilds made a motion to table the proposal for a period not to exceed one (1) month. Mr. James seconded the motion, which failed with a tie vote. Mr. Kilkenny, Mr. Huff, Mr. Bumb, and Ms. Murray opposed the motion.*

*Ms. Murray made a motion to approve the revised submission. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which failed with a tie vote. Mr. Perri, Mr. James, Mr. Wilds, and Mr. Sugrue dissented.*

*After verifying that the 60-day limit would not expire by the next Commission meeting, Mr. Sugrue made a motion to rehear the proposal first on the on 11 June 2004 agenda. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.*

#### **NATIONAL REGISTER COMMENT**

##### **2446-2468 Coral Street, Beatty's Mills Factory Building**

This building erected in 1886 as a textile mill, Beatty's Mills appears to meet criteria A and C. The textile industry has a well-known and obvious place in the history of Philadelphia and Kensington. The building exemplifies specialized, diversified or fragmented system of textile production in Philadelphia as distinguished from New England's integrated system. The building itself also illustrates the late 19<sup>th</sup> century use of heavy timber construction has a connection to fire insurance and fire protection. It is an important industrial building design and construction in an industrial city.

Mr. Wilds inquired if the owner was in agreement with the National register nomination.

*Mr. Huff made a motion to recommend that the nomination be added to the National register. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.*

##### **640 North Broad Street, Mulford Building or Metropolitan Building**

The building built in 1912-13, meets criteria A and C. The Mulford Building began as a tenant manufacturers loft utilized by firms in the garment trade as a significant element in the city's economic history. In 1918 it became the home of H. K. Mulford Company, a pharmaceutical firm, which over time became a part of Merck. Since the 18<sup>th</sup> century, pharmaceuticals have held an important place in Philadelphia's economic and technological history. The building itself meets criterion A and the work of Charles Balderson meets criterion C.

*Mr. James made a motion to recommend that the nomination be added to the National register. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.*

#### **THE REPORT on the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, April 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 \$29.80 for the Architectural Committee lunches.

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

*Mr. Kilkenny made a motion to adjourn. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.*

The meeting adjourned 2:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary