

**THE MINUTES OF THE 483rd STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
8 November 2002 at 9:00 a.m.**

**City Council Caucus Room, 4th Floor, City Hall
Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair**

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
Melissa Heller-Batzer, Director of Economic Development, Office of City Council President
James Brown
Duane Bumb, Deputy Director, Commerce Department
Gary Hack, Chair, Philadelphia Planning Commission
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
David Perri, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Vincent Rivera, AIA
Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.
Norman Tissian
Scott Wilds, Deputy Director, Office of Housing and Community Development

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

Lawrence K. Copeland, Esq., Senior Attorney, Law Department

Also

Ann Gitter, 2040 Rittenhouse Square
Robert N. Poston, Local Union #98, 540-550 North 17th Street
Ted Watson, 114 Elfreth's Alley
Shawn Evans, 130 Elfreth's Alley
Christine M. Sanchez, 4818 Cedar Avenue
Selma Zellis Baratz, 637 Spruce Street
James Nelson Kise, Kise Straw Klodner Architects
Aaron, Beyer, 632 Spruce Street
Liz Zimmers, 1903-05 Green Street
Adam Glassman, 4115 Pine Street
Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association
Richard Tucker, 221 Vine Street
Aileen Bannon, 16 South Letitia Street
Jennifer Barr, 3317 Ryan Avenue
Howard B. Haas, 1420 Locust Street
Tatjana Stevens, 4318 Larchwood Avenue
James Wiesenhuber, Unkefer Brothers Construction Company
Alan Metcalfe, Metcalfe Architecture & Design
Stuart Harting, Silver/Harting
David Cohen, Spector Roseman & Kodroff
Ted Newbold, 112 Cuthbert Street
Arthur Meckler, 112 North 3rd Street

Gerald Broker, CSB Associates, LLC
Anthony Tarcelli, Philadelphia Club
Shannon Fitzpatrick, 615 Lombard Street
John Harkins, 7 Appletree Court
Martin A. Fischer, 408 Vine Street
Lorna Katz Lawson, John Lawson Architects
Charles Loomis, Loomis McAfee Architects
Lisa Newcomer, Wesley Architects
Richard Wesley, Wesley Architects
Jane Purcell, 120 Elfreth's Alley
Suzanna Barucco, 805 Clifford Avenue, Ardmore PA
Steve Fox, 277 South 3rd Street
Yishai Kedar, 277 South 3rd Street
William G. Schwartz, Esq., 300-18 North 63rd Street
Joshua Grimes, 228-30 Arch Street, 1822 Spruce Street
Carl S. Primavera, Esq., North 2nd Street, LP
Adam E. Laver, Esq., North 2nd Street, LP
Bob Berman, 136 North 2nd Street
Alan Krigman, 211 South 45th Street, KRF Corporation
Jeff Glassberg, 202 Race Street, Old City Civic Association
Craig Boon, 649 North 16th Street
Cory Kegevis, 1817 Bainbridge Street
Jamie Graham, 3321 Spring Garden Street
Beth Richards, 126 Elfreth's Alley, Elfreth's Alley Association
Carolyn Schlecker, 211 Vine Street
Ariella Cohen, 306 Market Street
Daniel Brook, City Paper, 123 Chestnut Street
Charles Rue, Esq.
Mark Liddy
Elizabeth Baumann
Bill Greenlee, 15th Ward Democratic Leader
Rocco DiBattista
Todd Kilbaugh, 214 New Street
Stuart Sidlow, 11 South Letitia Street
Robert Powers, Powers and Company
Jovida Hill for Mykola Kulish, owner of 1907 Green Street
Jay Farrell
Edward T. Halligan
Albert Malmfelt, 113 Elfreth's Alley
Michael Hauptman, Brawer and Hauptman Architects
Paul Coughlin, Brawer and Hauptman Architects
Brian Slohu, 4321 Larchwood Avenue
John Loonstyn, 1903-05 Green Street
Allan Rubin, 1903-05 Green Street, 649 North 16th Street, 1911 Brandywine Street
Janice Woodcock, 7303 Woodland Avenue, 2100 West River Drive
Christian Busch, The Sullivan Company, 925 Chestnut Street
Heather H. Harris, 8 Appletree Court, National Products Building
Steven Corley, 416 South 50th Street
Michael Sparano, 1822 Spruce Street
Robert and Rachel Cheetham, owners, 1911 Brandywine Street
Theresa Stuhlman, Fairmount Park Commission

Mr. Sklaroff, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:11 a.m.

Minutes of the 482nd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission. Upon a motion made by Mr. Hack, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the 482nd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held 11 October 2002, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

Mr. Sklaroff noted that the discussion of City Council Bill 020462, which would amend the Historic Preservation Ordinance regarding designation of districts, was tabled. He commended the public for its interest and input on the issue. In addition, he thanked the many community organizations that supported the work of the Commission in designating districts, as well as the efforts of the many preservation groups.

THE REPORT of the Committee on Historic Designation. 24 October 2002
Harris Steinberg, Acting Chair

109-131 North 2nd Street aka 117-21 Arch Street aka 128 Elfreth's Alley
National Products Company

National Products, Company, Linda Levin

DATE: façade, 1957-58

Mr. Laverty made a motion to recommend designation subject to adding the geographic boundaries of 128 Elfreth's Alley to section 5. Ms. Klein seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Ms. Spina gave an illustrated presentation. The National Products Company building, which incorporates 109-31 North 2nd Street, 128 Elfreth's Alley and 117-21 Arch Street, meets criteria a, c, d, e, f, h, and j of Section 14-2007 (5) of the Philadelphia Code. It is a unique example of modern commercial architecture in Center City Philadelphia. It reflects the environment of the 1950s as characterized by a distinctive architectural style and embodies distinguishing characteristics of modern architecture. Owing to its location on North 2nd Street, the National Products building represents an established and familiar visual feature of the Old City neighborhood. Lastly, it exemplifies the cultural, economic, and historical heritage of the community.

Sweeping rooflines, glass or tiled walls, metal accents, and details that defied gravity and traditionalism became signature elements in modern architecture. As the 1950s progressed, these elements of modern architecture were embraced not only by companies that built chains along the highway, but also the individual storeowner on Main Street. In a sense, the building itself became a form of advertising. The National Products Company building epitomizes modern commercial architecture. Its sleek, orange terra cotta tiles, smooth granite niches, undulating canopy and stainless steel letters are elements used again and again in modern commercial design of the period. The building succeeds in its purpose of catching the eye of a passer-by and advertising the products within.

Started by Harry Caplen in 1929, the National Products Company had an expansive inventory of restaurant supplies ranging from stoves to tables to dishes. In 1957-58 he installed a new façade and opened the showroom, a first in the industry. The design of the façade is attributed to Israel Demchick. Demchick received his baccalaureate degree in architecture from the University of Pennsylvania in 1915. During his career, Demchick designed apartment houses, stores, and restaurants, such as the Linton's Lunch Company.

Ms. Spina noted that the Commission received letters in support of the designation from the Preservation Alliance, The Elfreth's Alley Association and Councilman Frank DiCicco, as well as a petition from area residents.

Mr. Hack questioned the inclusion of 131 North 2nd Street as well as 117-21 Arch Street in the designation. Mr. Tyler noted that the designation would include the building and its site and its appurtenances; therefore, the parcel would include all the addresses. Ms. Spina explained that a property can have more than one address and the three addresses refer to the same building. The Committee discussed the issue of including the vacant lot at 131 North 2nd Street and was persuaded because the north facade of the building also has the terra cotta tiles and the granite niches wrapping around from 2nd Street. Ms. Spina said that she believes that, although a later addition, 117-121 Arch Street is an integral part of the function of the building. However, since the Commission reviews the history of a building when considering permit applications, if the owner wishes to change or demolish these later additions, the Commission may approve their alteration. Mr. Sugrue still had reservations about its inclusion as well as 128 Elfreth's Alley, which has been slightly altered. Mr. Tissian noted that 128 Elfreth's Alley has its own significance in history as a stove factory. Mr. Wilds concurred with Mr. Sugrue about 117-121 Arch, and thought that it should be removed, but 128 Elfreth's Alley should remain part of the designation, upon reflection, Mr. Sugrue then concurred with Mr. Wilds concerning 128 Elfreth's Alley. Mr. Tyler reiterated that all of the buildings are now part of a single parcel.

Carl Primavera, Esquire, represented North 2nd Street, LP, the equitable owner, which has a binding agreement of sale. He said that the owner and equitable owner do not consent to the designation. He believed that the designation would impact development in Old City. In addition, he opined that the community thought only the facade would be designated. Therefore, he recommended tabling the decision and remanding the nomination back to the Designation Committee.

Richard Thom of the Old City Civic Association asked that the property in its entirety be designated. He noted that the community, as well as the Civic Association, knew what the designation encompasses. He said that it is imperative that some type of action is taken to halt any further destruction to the property. In response to Mr. Sugrue's query about the relationship of the structures on the property, Mr. Thom said that the interior of 117-121 Arch Street is connected to the main building. He presented a copy of a permit obtained by Boca Properties for removal of tiles and repair as needed. Mr. Perri said that the Department of Licenses and Inspections was unaware that the notice letters for the designation hearings had been sent and that the permit was to remove and repair 1200 square feet of tiles. However, after learning of the nomination, the permit was revoked.

Mr. Primavera noted that the owner has a zoning permit for a mid-rise building on the site.

Shawn Evans, representative of Elfreth's Alley, said that 128 Elfreth's Alley was constructed as a stove factory and has great importance in the industrial history of Old City. He urged the Commission to include this property in the designation.

John Gallery, of the Preservation Alliance, strongly supported the nomination. Having lived on Elfreth's Alley and on the 100 block of Arch Street, he had a close personal relationship with Mr. Caplen, the original owner. He said that Mr. Caplen took great pains to insure that the modern storefront design fit within the streetscape. He noted that the building is an important example of modern architecture of the 1950s and that it meets six of the ten criteria for designation.

Susanna Barucco, Elfreth's Alley Association, expressed her support of the designation and said that 128 Elfreth's Alley represents a larger story of the evolution of industry in Old City. She noted that the Old City Civic Association has been working on the nomination for the Old City Historic District for the last two years.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and to designate 109-31 North 2nd Street aka 128 Elfreth's Alley aka 117-21 Arch Street to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which carried with 10 votes. Mr. Perri dissented.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 29 October 2002

637 Spruce Street, NE corner of 7th Street

Selma Zellis Baratz, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1970, Stonorov & Haws, architects

PROPOSAL: New design for rear doors

The Committee voted to recommend denial pursuant to 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 the window guideline [Not recommended: Removing a character-defining window and replacing it with a new window that does not convey the same visual appearance.]

This application calls for replacing the large, two-leaf sliding aluminum doors and transoms on the first and second floors with three-leaf, aluminum-clad wood doors and transoms. Some of these doors on other houses of similar design were altered prior to designation, but all of the houses on this particular row remain intact.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal. Selma Baratz, the owner, attended the meeting and explained that she wishes a three-leaf door instead of the two-leaf door, which currently exists. She said that a three-leaf door would be easier and lighter to operate. Ms. Baratz also said that the current condition allows the cold to filter through as well as the noise level. She proposes a dull metal instead of a shiny aluminum and that a shiny aluminum on the interior would be ugly. Ms. Baratz noted that the cost of the proposed doors started at \$8,500, while the recommended doors will cost about \$16,000.

Commission members discussed the possibility of painting the aluminum or having an anodized aluminum frame.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. James and Mr. Perri opposed the motion.

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Vice-chair, Thomas Sugrue.

400-14 Walnut Street, SW corner of 4th Street

John Turchi, Owner

Robert Powers, Applicant

DATE: 400-02: 1906, Watson & Huckel, architects; 404-14: 1923, Frank Watson, architect

PROPOSAL: Cut windows into doors, legalize replacement doors

The Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]

The owner wishes to divide the expansive first floor into several commercial units, necessitating individual entrances. The proposal calls for removing the stone steps at one of the bays and cutting the storefront windows into a double-leaf, frame-less glazed door. The bay that has a

single-leaf door would be redesigned with a new double-leaf frame-less, glazed door. Lastly, the owner wishes to legalize the replacement frame-less glazed door in the original entrance at 414.

Robert Powers attended the meeting and informed the Commission that his search for historic photographs was fruitless and that he proposes a simple modern design.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion which carried with 10 votes. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

615 Lombard Street

Shannon Fitzpatrick, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1820; alterations, c. 1966, Montgomery, Bishop & Arnold, architects

PROPOSAL: Revision to rear addition design

The Committee voted to recommend 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.] and the Masonry Guideline [Recommended: Repairing masonry walls and other masonry features by repointing masonry joints where there is evidence of deterioration such as disintegrating mortar, cracks in mortar joints, loose bricks, damp walls, or damaged plasterwork; Removing deteriorated mortar by carefully hand-raking the joints to avoid damaging the masonry; Duplicating old mortar in strength, composition, color, and texture; Duplicating old mortar joints in width and in joint profile.], with staff to review a pointing sample.

At its September 2002 meeting, the Historical Commission voted to approve an application for the construction of a two-story rear addition as well as the repointing of the front façade. Since the meeting, the applicant has decided to amend the design of the addition. The design now proposed is identical to the approved design with the exception that the plan of the second-story segment has been reversed. The second-story door and deck, which previously appeared to the west, have been moved to the east. The added second-story room, which appeared to the east in the approved design, has been moved to the west. Like the old application, the new application proposes the repointing of the front façade.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal and the Commission concurred with the Architectural Committee.

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

632 Spruce Street

Aaron and Francine Beyer, Owners

Lorna Katz, architect/applicant

DATE: 1805-06 by Caleb Lowens, house carpenter; Alterations: c. 1850; new façade, 1883; renovations, 1961, Robert Trump, architect; interior renovations, 1977, A. Hinkey

PROPOSAL: Rear two-story addition and deck

The Committee recommended approval of the proposal, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the

old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and the Roofing Guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as decks and terraces so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.], with the following conditions:

The windows in the bay should have a 2/1 configuration;

The door leading to the deck should have an eight- or ten-light configuration; and

The soldier-coursing above the bay at the second floor should be eliminated.

This application proposes an addition and deck at the rear of this brick rowhouse. It stipulates removing the existing deck atop the 1-story section of the rear ell; constructing a 2nd-story brick addition with copper-clad bay window atop 1-story section of the rear ell and new brick piers; constructing a 3rd-story deck with wood board parapet wall on rear ell; enlarging a 3rd-story rear window opening and installing a fully glazed wood door for deck access; and installing exterior lighting at the addition and deck.

Mr. Farnham explained the application. Lorna Katz, the architect, attended the meeting and said that she and the owner are in accord with the Committee's recommendation.

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

308 Cypress Street

R. Barlow, Owner

Henry W. Heist, Applicant

DATE: c. 1809; alterations, c. 1964, Joseph Praissman architect

PROPOSAL: Rear greenhouse addition

The Committee voted three to two to recommend 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.] Mr. Rivera and Mr. Levy voted nay owing to the project's impact on the historic open space at the rear of the house.

This application proposes erecting a 1½-story copper, wood, and glass greenhouse addition at the rear of the brick rowhouse at 308 Cypress Street. The addition would be built in a garden area at the rear of the house. Excepting the removal of a storm door and storm window, the historic rear façade would not be altered, making the modification reversible. The clerestory windows on the greenhouse's west façade, which would appear above an existing garden wall, would be minimally visible from Cypress Street down a narrow, gated alley that runs along the house from Cypress to Delancey Street.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Mr. Rivera questioned the impact the addition would have on the neighboring house. Mr. Tyler noted that the addition is in the rear yard and minimally visible.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Tissian seconded motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Rivera dissented.

309-11 South Street

Axelrod Giannascoli Realty Group, Owner
Adam E. Laver, Esq., Applicant
DATE: c. 1895
PROPOSAL: Legalize windows

The applicant requested a one month continuance.

277 South 3rd Street aka 241 Spruce Street

Stephen Fox, Owner
Yishai Kedar, Applicant
DATE: c. 1963, Wright, Andrade, Ament & Gane, architects
PROPOSAL: Legalize windows and doors

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the application pursuant to Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.]; Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]; and to Standard 9 [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.].

This application proposes legalizing the seven 6/6 windows and three multi-light, sliding doors installed without a permit at 277 S. 3rd Street. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the illegal windows and doors on 18 September 2002. The illegal windows and doors should be replaced with the historically appropriate 1/1 windows and fully-glazed doors.

Yishai Kedar, the contractor, attended the meeting. He presented photographs and noted that he did not know that the property was historic and replicated the windows of neighboring houses.

The Commission discussed the work being done without a permit and that the installed windows are quite different from those of the redevelopment era. It also noted that the installed windows are not true-divided-light and have sandwiched muntins. Mr. Hack believed the installed windows inappropriate for this architecture. Mr. Tissian noted that this property is part of a cluster, the majority of which has one-over-one windows.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Bumb opposed the motion and Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

228-30 Arch Street

K/K Enterprises, Owner
Joshua Grimes, Esq., Applicant
DATE: 228: c. 1890; 230: c. 1840, mansard added c. 1880
PROPOSAL: Complete demolition

The Architectural Committee concurred with the staff recommendation and voted unanimously to recommend denial of the demolition, 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.]. The Committee also recommended that the Commission insist that the owner continue with the stabilization as defined by the stabilization plans formulated by the Court and the City of Philadelphia.

This application proposes the complete demolition of the buildings at 228 and 230 Arch Street. The properties have been declared imminently dangerous by Licenses and Inspections on three occasions, 6 April 2000, 9 March 2001, and 1 May 2002. After the owner failed to rectify the violations, the Court of Common Pleas issued an injunction on 26 June 2002 ordering the owner to correct all violations and maintain the properties. The owner began the work mandated by the court order, but, after removing the roof, abruptly terminated the repairs, leaving the buildings further exposed to the elements and hastening their deterioration. Currently, the buildings are rapidly disintegrating. The actions of the owner are furthering demolition by neglect.

The Historical Commission's ordinance and Rules and Regulations allow for demolition of buildings on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places under two conditions: public interest and financial hardship. Although this application does not explicitly request consideration on the grounds of financial hardship, it does make a case for demolition on those grounds. The Commission's ordinance and Rules and Regulations definitively delineate the requirements for a demolition application predicated on financial hardship. This application does not meet those requirements. First, Section 14-2007 (7) (f) prescribes that the facts demonstrating financial hardship will be submitted "by affidavit." It was not. The application provides no assessed value as required by Section 14-2007 (7) (f) (.2). The application states that the assessed value is unknown; however, the Board of Revision of Taxes records for 2002 indicate an assessed value of \$4,752 and \$9,648 for the land and building at 228 Arch and indicate an assessed value of \$5,808 and \$11,792 for the land and building at 230 Arch. The application provides only vague information, without dates, regarding a marketing of the property by Plumer Levitt. Section 14-2007 (7) (f) (.5) requires that the applicant submit "all listings of property for sale or rent, price asked, offers received, if any." Most importantly, the application merely asserts that there "are no profitable adaptive uses for the properties." Section 7.5.a of the Rules and Regulations asserts that the owner "has an affirmative obligation in good faith to attempt the sale of the property, to seek tenants for it, and to explore potential reuses for it." The owner and applicant have not met this crucial requirement.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Mr. Grimes, counsel for the owner, stated that the comments of the Architectural Committee were appropriate; however, he would not be opposed to the Commission's referral of the application to the Committee on Financial Hardship. Mr. Sklaroff said that, based on the application submitted, the Architectural Committee had no recourse but to recommend denial of the demolition.

Mr. Grimes said that the city is pursuing action against the owner to repair or demolish the property. In addition, any consideration of reuse or long term stabilization of the property would present a financial burden on the owner.

Mr. Sklaroff noted that the property had been vacant for approximately twenty years and inquired if marketing the property presented a hardship. Mr. Wilds asked if the owner had listed the property. Mr. Grimes stated that it was to no avail. Mr. Wilds said he believes the application should be referred to the Committee on Financial Hardship if a complete application is submitted. Mr. Sklaroff inquired if the property was listed separately, without the inclusion of the parking lot next door.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Perri seconded the motion.

Mr. Rivera asked that the motion include the continuation of the stabilization of the property. Mr. Sklaroff said that the motion is to deny the demolition only.

Richard Tucker, owner of 232-36 Arch Street, said that the property in question has not been

maintained and has only been offered for sale in conjunction with the adjacent parking lot. He noted that his property is identical to the one in question, and he believes that the property can be easily adapted for reuse. In addition, he stated that he was present when the structural engineer proposed stabilization plans for the property. Mr. Tucker emphasized that this represents a classic case of demolition by neglect.

Richard Thom of the Old City Civic Association said that the building has deteriorated tremendously over the last few years and he believes that the removal of the roof was a deliberate act to ensure further deterioration of the building. He reiterated the process that the Department of Licenses and Inspections has followed to have the owner perform the work required to stabilize the buildings, including the many hearings in court.

Mr. Sklaroff said that in light of the testimony presented, he believed that referral to the Financial Hardship Committee should not be an option. Mr. Tyler informed the Commission that the court instructed the owner to stabilize the building; however, the owner proceeded to remove the roof and the mansard, which made the conditions worse. Mr. Baron stated that he is scheduled to testify in court on 12 November 2002 although the owner is requesting a continuance of the court hearing until January. Mr. Sklaroff believed that a resolution could be offered. He stated that the Commission takes very seriously the conclusion of the Architectural Committee, and that the testimony presented today demonstrates flagrant and malicious demolition by neglect.

On the motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, the Commission voted unanimously in favor.

Mr. Tissian offered a resolution stating that the Commission recognizes the actions of the owner as flagrant and malicious demolition by neglect and that the Commission would like the court to be aware that not only is this issue important to the Commission, but to the neighborhood and community as well as the entire City of Philadelphia. Mr. Wilds seconded the resolution, which carried unanimously.

100-04 Market Street, SW corner of Front Street

Michael Yaron, Owner

Richard Wesley, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 100-02: 1882, 104: c. 1790

PROPOSAL: New storefront, windows, doors, cornice and columns, new elevator penthouse on 102

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the repointing pursuant to Masonry Rehabilitation Guideline [Recommended: Cleaning masonry surfaces with the gentlest possible method, such as low pressure water and detergent; Repairing masonry walls and other masonry features by repointing masonry joints where there is evidence of deterioration such as disintegrating mortar, cracks in mortar joints, loose bricks, damp walls, or damaged plasterwork; Removing deteriorated mortar by carefully hand-raking the joints to avoid damaging the masonry; Duplicating old mortar in strength, composition, color, and texture; Duplicating old mortar joints in width and in joint profile] Approval of the storefront alterations, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]. Approval of the elevator penthouse, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline: [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as ... elevator housing ... when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining

features.].

This application proposes several alterations to a Queen Anne commercial building and a Federal building at the southwest corner of Front and Market Streets. Most of the alterations impact the three storefronts. The storefronts at 100 and 102 Market date to early-twentieth century; the storefront at 104 Market was recently erected. The design stipulates that the new storefront proposed for 102 Market harmonize with the historical storefront at 100 Market. It also stipulates that the new storefront at 104 Market be differentiated from the other two. The application specifies the addition of a new wood storefront cornice at 102 Market to match the existing storefront cornice at 100 Market; a new wood storefront with cornice at 104 Market; new wood storefront doors, windows (some of which are café windows), and panels at all three addresses; and new wood pilasters (noted as columns on plans) at 102-104 Market. Details of the doors were not submitted with this application, but should be reviewed. In addition to the storefront alterations, the plans specify a new elevator penthouse on 102 Market, which will be 1'-0" tall and will be set back 1'-10" from cornice. Finally, the application proposes the cleaning and repointing of all masonry and the repainting of trim.

Mr. Wilds inquired about the door which was referenced but the details are absent from the plans, and it was noted that details of the door are forthcoming.

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

313-15 North 3rd Street, SE corner of 3rd and Wood Streets

Wade Properties, Owner

Charles Loomis, Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Two roof decks

The Committee unanimously recommended approval of the two decks pursuant to Standard 9 [New editions, 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.] provided that the deck nearer the front façade of the building be set back an additional three feet from the location specified in the original proposal.

This application proposes the construction of two roof decks on the nineteenth-century commercial building at 313 N. 3rd Street, which, together with 315 N. 3rd Street, has recently been redeveloped as residences. The 16' x 17' decks would be accessed via an existing stairway with rooftop bulkhead. The decks would be enclosed by Sterope steel fencing. Any view of the rear deck would be obscured by an existing elevator tower. The front deck would be visible from N. 3rd Street as well as Wood Street west of 3rd Street.

Mr. Farnham presented the application. Mr. Sklaroff reiterated that the Commission's approvals of decks are generally on the rear ell. Mr. Farnham stated that the proposed locations of the decks are on a large commercial-turned-residential property. Mr. Hack noted that the decks would be visible at a distance, but questioned the advantage of a four-foot setback. Mr. Tyler said that the decks are well concealed on the main building. Mr. Sugrue noted that the bulkhead and elevator would hide the decks. Mr. Wilds said that the building is five-stories high and that one deck on the rear is reasonable. Mr. James opined that the Commission should be flexible in considering a building's massing and history.

Mr. Hack made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Sklaroff and Mr. Wilds opposed the motion.

1822 Spruce Street

Michael Sparano, Owner

Joshua Grimes, Esq., Applicant

DATE: 1895, T. Roney Williamson, architect

PROPOSAL: Cover brick façade with stucco at rear

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the stucco to the extent that the façade had received wire mesh; however, the areas that had received mesh but no stucco should receive a smooth coat of stucco rather than rusticated. The approval would be subject to the stucco colored red, presentation of scale drawings showing the extent of work, and the restoration of the rear first floor window with detail drawings to be approved by the staff.

The rear of this house has a brick façade with ornate metal bays. The owner started to stucco the entire façade, but was stopped by Licenses and Inspections and told to seek a permit. The stucco would be a brick-red color and have scoring to mimic stone, with jack-arches over the windows.

Michael Sparano, the owner, said that the lower part of the building's rear had been painted multiple times, and only 30% is covered with stucco. The rest of the brick would be repointed and repaired. Mr. Tyler reiterated that a permit is required for stucco regardless of historical status to ascertain structural stability. Mr. James asked that the motion be amended to include with staff to review details.

Mr. Rivera made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, with staff to review details. Ms. Heller-Batzer seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

2040 Rittenhouse Square

Ann and Stephen Gitter, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1890

PROPOSAL: New carriage house doors

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended approval 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 a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and the entrance guideline [Recommended: Designing and constructing a new entrance when the historic entrance is completely missing. It may be a restoration based on historical, pictorial, and physical documentation or a new design that is compatible with the historic character of the building.].

The original carriage door openings currently have non-historic infill pedestrian doors and glazing. The proposal calls for new wood carriage doors with a cross-buck and bead-board design. One bay would have a double-leaf door with fixed side panels. The other would have an overhead garage door. Commission members concurred with the Committee's recommendation.

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

1903-05 Green Street

John Loonstyn and Fred Duling, Owners

Liz Zimmers, Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Partial demolition of 1903, demolition of 1905, new construction, roof decks, parking

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend final approval of the demolition and approval in concept of the project with the parking.

This application returns to the Committee and Commission with a new design. The proposal calls for the demolition of the entire rear of 1903 Green Street and for the complete demolition of 1905. Two new rear-ells would be constructed on the rear of 1903 and a new four-story main building with two rear-ells at 1905. The proposal now has a single vehicular entrance with a metal picket gate in the center of the entire development.

Ms. Spina noted that 1905 is listed as an addition to 1903 in the Spring Garden Historic District inventory and is a non-historic addition. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the new construction would restore the streetscape of the block. Mr. Wilds said that the 1905 new construction should align with the height of 1903. He questioned the visibility of the roof decks. Mr. Sklaroff asked for clarification of the conceptual approval, if it would include the massing of the building and the concept of the roof decks and off-street parking. Ms. Spina said that the staff had concerns about the design of the roof decks because of the proposed housing for the stairs and that they are proposed for the main building of 1903. Commission members emphasized that this application gives final approval to the demolition of 1905 and the rear of 1903. It approves in concept the new construction at 1905, the cornice of which should align with the cornice of 1903 and incorporate the entrance to the parking of 1905. However, the roof decks and stair towers would be excluded. Mr. Hack stated that owing to the building's height of 45 feet, neither the stairs nor the roof decks may not be visible.

Allen Rubin, speaking on behalf of the Spring Garden Civic Association, said that it supports the application.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the demolition of 1905 and the rear of 1903 and conceptual approval of the new construction, including the parking but not the roof decks. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

540-50 North 17th Street

Local Union #98 IBEW, Owner

Robert N. Poston, Applicant

DATE: c. 1922

PROPOSAL: New garage, expanded parking, parking lot fence, rear addition to office building
The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval, 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 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.] with the following conditions:

- 1. The pediment must be removed from the addition;*
- 2. The garage cupola design must be amended to make the cupola look less like the cupola on the union hall and more like a functional ventilator; and*
- 3. The brick color and bond must be reviewed and approved by the Committee.*

This project includes several parts. The last remaining rowhouse in this block was demolished

last year. The union would like to build a two-story garage that would mimic the existing building, with entrances from 17th Street and Brandywine Street. The union proposes to build a second-story, glazed addition on the rear of the union building, set on Doric columns. Lastly, the newly expanded parking lot would have a brick and wrought-iron fence.

Ms. Spina explained the project. Robert Poston, the applicant attended the meeting and stated that he would like to match the brick of the existing structure. He also asked if the details could be reviewed by the staff rather than returning to the Committee.

Mr. Wilds suggested that the brick should match the adjacent and recommended that the staff review the brick. In addition, Mr. Sklaroff thought that the staff could review the new design of the cupola.

Mr. Rivera made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, but have the staff review details instead of the Committee. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

649 North 16th Street

Angelo Tartaglino, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1875

PROPOSAL: Reconstruction of rear ell

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the design with the addition of the articulation at the junction of the brick and stucco, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment] 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 calls for removing the severely damaged addition to the rear ell and rebuilding it. The three-story addition includes brick-colored stucco and vinyl one-over-one windows.

Commission members agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

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

2024 Brandywine Street

Mark Liddy and Susan Green, Owners

Miranda Hitzemann, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: 2nd and 3rd-floor additions, deck on rear ell, and roof deck on main building

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the third-story deck and denial of the roof deck. Ms. Pentz, Mr. McCoubrey, Mr. D'Alessandro, and Mr. Levy voted to recommend approval of both additions. Mr. Rivera voted to recommend denial of the additions because he believed that the third-floor addition might possibly violate zoning regulations.

This proposal consists of additions at the second and third floor rear as well as rear deck and roof decks at this 19th-century rowhouse. The roof deck is set well back from Brandywine Street.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal and said that additional information on the site line study shows that from Spring Garden Street and Brandywine Street there is minimal visibility.

Mr. Metcalfe, the architect attended the meeting. He said that the proposed deck and addition meets the zoning 70% and 30% guidelines of outdoor space. He noted that the Commission previously approved a similar deck at 2005 Brandywine Street, which is referenced in the application. He stated that the proposed deck could not be seen from Brandywine Street.

Mr. Rivera expressed concern about the deck and the addition extending over the sidewall, which may eliminate air and light. Commission members discussed the visibility of the decks. Mr. Sklaroff inquired about the overhang of the deck and addition, and if the Commission had ever approved a roof deck which did not sit within the confines of the main building. He asked Commission members if they had any issue with the overhang. Most of the members thought visibility a more important issue. However, Mr. Sklaroff stated that treatment of historical spaces is an issue and questioned the precedent of the overhang. Mr. Brown concurred with Mr. Sklaroff. Mr. Wilds thought it important to acquire additional space and that this proposal is an improvement over the spiral staircase at 2005 Brandywine. Some Commission members thought that the amount of overhang should be limited.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion which passed with 6 votes. Mr. Sklaroff, Mr. Brown, Mr. Rivera and Mr. Tissian dissented.

3299 Girard Avenue, NE corner of 33rd Street, Hatfield House

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Janice Woodcock, Applicant

DATE: c. 1760, altered c. 1835

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation, remove shutters

The Committee agreed that the proposed restoration work could be reviewed at the staff level.

The Commission took no action.

7303 Woodland Avenue, Blue Bell Tavern

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Janice Woodcock, Applicant

DATE: 1766, modified c. 1860 and c. 1970

PROPOSAL: Reconstruct porch, vents, HVAC units

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the re-roofing of the rear ell with wood shingles, the reconstruction of the porch with posts based on the photo-documentation and a free-standing enclosure for the condenser in the rear yard with staff to review details. The Committee voted to recommend approval of the vents in the new porch roof and on the rear slopes of the roofs, with staff to review details.

This historic tavern will receive a reconstruction of its mid-19th century porch as well as a new main roof vent on the rear slope of the roof and a condensing unit mounted at the rear wall.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal and said that since the Architectural Committee meeting, the Fairmount Park Commission has reviewed the proposal.

Janice Woodcock, the architect, attended the meeting. She expressed that the applicant did not concur with the Architectural Committee's recommendation about the porch columns. She believes that the restoration is consistent with the aesthetics of the building and that the

Fairmount Park Commission wants slender octagonal pickets with capitals on all sides of the porch.

Mr. Wilds noted that if the Park Commission proposes a porch, then it should be true reconstruction. At the time the porch existed, the property consisted of a mixed vocabulary of features. Commission members believed that the columns of the porch should be differentiated as depicted in the photographs.

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance, stated that he believed the reconstruction of the porch is inappropriate and damages the integrity of the 18th-century character of the building. Mr. Tyler concurred.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion which carried with 7 votes. Mr. Sugrue and Mr. Bumb opposed the motion. Mr. Sklaroff and Mr. James abstained from the vote.

Mr. Baron asked the Commission to consider two additional elements to the plans. The additional features are up-lighting from the grass and a drainage system along the porch, which will include hanging gutters. Commission members thought the additional elements appropriate.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the additional elements of the proposal. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion which carried with 10 votes. Mr. James abstained.

2100 West River Drive, Boelson Cottage

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Janice Woodcock, Applicant

DATE: c. 1678 and 1684

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation, replace wood elements

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the project as proposed, with staff to review details.

The proposal involves rehabilitation work to the interior and exterior. The applicant proposes to modify the entry porch.

Commission members agreed that in a restoration, the historic materials should be used. Janice Woodcock, the architect, argued that there is a lack of detailing of the original features.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, with the bulkhead doors replaced with wood doors. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion which carried with 10 votes. Mr. James abstained.

2411 South 21st Street

Toni Vellucci-DiBattista, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1913, John and James Windrim, architects

PROPOSAL: Legalize vinyl 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.]

This proposal calls for legalizing vinyl windows installed on the front and sides of the building

without a permit.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Rocco DiBattisti, the owner, stated that he replaced the windows because the glass was broken. The windows had aluminum frames, not the original wood windows.

Mr. James made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Brown seconded the motion. Mr. Wilds amended the motion to approve the vinyl sash on the side, subject to the correct replacement of sash on the front façade. Mr. Rivera seconded the revised motion which failed with a 4 to 7 vote. Mr. Brown, Mr. Rivera, Mr. Perri, Mr. James, Mr. Tissian, Mr. Sugrue and Mr. Hack opposed the motion.

Mr. Wilds inquired if the side windows were replaced with vinyl sash and thought that as a compromise, the applicant could retain the side vinyl windows subject to the replacement of the correct sash on the front façade. Mr. Brown believed that the difference between aluminum and vinyl is marginal.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to legalize the vinyl replacement windows. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Rivera and Mr. Wilds opposed the motion. Ms. Heller-Batzer abstained.

Mr. James emphasized that it is not the Commission's intention to legalize work done without a permit. He offered to put information regarding the Historical Commission on the cable channel to help educate residents of the Commission's requirements about exterior work to historic property.

818-20 Chestnut Street

Historic Property Holdings, Owner

David Amburn, Architect/Applicant

DATE:

PROPOSAL: New door opening, door, and rebuild and glaze 2nd and 3rd floor niche
The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept of the proposal, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

This proposal in concept involves cutting a door into the right side of the Art Deco storefront of the former Horn and Hardart restaurant on Chestnut Street. The vacant building would be converted into apartments above and a store below. The doorway to the upper floors would be placed at the right side of the façade to preserve the use of the storefront for the first floor tenant. The new doorway would be wider than the spacing of the existing vertical mullion in order to meet code, but would otherwise mimic the existing window design with bronze and marble. On the second and third floors, the niche composed of painted enameled panels would be reconstructed to contain glazing of an opaque nature to mimic the former panels.

Mr. Hack made a motion to approve the proposal in concept. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. James opposed the motion.

925 Chestnut Street, NE corner of 10th Street, Federal Reserve Bank

Jefferson Hospital, Owner
Christian Busch, Architect/Applicant
DATE: 1921, 1931-35, Paul Cret, architect
PROPOSAL: Signage, new gate on 10th Street

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the following, 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 historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.]:

- 1. The revised plaques on either side of the entrance;*
- 2. The revised design of the gate;*
- 3. The large sign on 10th Street to direct drivers attached on a pole within the property line, and*
- 4. The splay railing for Chestnut Street.*

With the staff to review the revised changes.

The proposal involves modifications to an approved gate design, signage and a railing. The Commission approved modifications to the gate at Kelly Street to separate pedestrian and vehicular traffic into the medical center in a previous submission. That design proved very expensive and the applicant now seeks to modify the northernmost section of the gate for the pedestrian entrance. It will not shorten the existing gate leaves, but will weld them into place in a fixed, open position.

Christian Busch, the architect, and Jeffrey Fisher, the building manager, attended the meeting. Mr. Baron presented the proposal and noted that the plans have been revised to reflect the Committee's recommendation. He pointed out an additional sign, which was not seen previously. The free-standing kiosk at the corner of 10th and Chestnut Streets will match the existing temporary sign in that location.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to approve the revised proposal. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

With the departure of some members, the Commission now consisted of 8 members.

THE REPORT of the Committee on Financial Hardship, 4 November 2002
Michael Sklaroff, Chair

300-318 North 63rd Street, NW corner of Vine Street, Patterson Memorial Presbyterian Church

Owner: Church of Christ
Applicant: William G. Schwartz, Esq.
Architect: T.P. Chandler
Date: 1884, parish house and bell tower; 1897, sanctuary
Proposal: Complete demolition based on financial hardship

The Financial Hardship Committee recommended denial of the demolition based on financial hardship, on the grounds that the applicants did not fulfill the necessary requirements of a hardship application by failing to demonstrate the exploration of viable reuses for the property and denying the Historical Commission access to the property to conduct its own investigation.

Mr. Sklaroff presented the proposal and gave an overview of the application's history and the Committee on Financial Hardship meeting. He said that the applicants have failed to allow the

Commission to perform its own investigation by refusing to give access to the property to the Commission's structural engineer. Mr. Copeland, counsel for the Commission, asked that the minutes reflect that on 17 October 2002, the City delivered a right-of-entry agreement to the applicants.

William Schwartz, Esq, applicant for the church, said that he believes that the Commission's opinion won't change. He said that, owing to the current condition of the building, a reuse of the premises is not a feasible option. Mr. Schwartz stated that the congregation has ceased using the premises as a result of the imminently dangerous citation issued by the Department of Licenses and Inspections. He also objected to the Commission's response to the application, claiming it was not in a timely manner.

Mr. Tissian asked why Ms. Pentz was denied access to the property, since the parishioners would not have to incur the expense. Mr. Schwartz said that the Commission violated the agreement by entering the property without the benefit of the waiver. He then refused to sign the right-of-entry agreement because the Board of License and Inspection Review sustained his appeal of the Commission's decision in September to table the application for a period not to exceed six months. Mr. Wilds noted that the congregation worshipped at this location for several months despite the ID status, and it is difficult for him to make a judgment absent the engineer's report.

Ms. Spina clarified some issues. She noted that in 2001 the Commission created an Ad-hoc Committee to investigate reuses for the property. Although they received notice of the meeting, both Mr. Schwartz and his client refused to attend. Without the owner's cooperation, the Committee was limited in its effort to find possible reuses. Second, the Committee on Financial Hardship did not review the application until August 2002 because Mr. Schwartz asked for a continuance. The Committee was ready to discuss the application back in March 2002.

John Gallery, of the Preservation Alliance, stated that he had attended all the various Committee meetings and examined all the documentation submitted. He believes that the recommendation of the Committee is appropriate and the Preservation Alliance supports it. He reiterated that it is important to find a viable reuse for the structure.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation for denial of the demolition based on financial hardship, on the grounds that the applicants did not fulfill the necessary requirements of a hardship application by failing to demonstrate the exploration of viable reuses for the property and denying the Historical Commission access to the property to conduct its own investigation. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

1911 Brandywine Street

Robert and Rachel Cheetham, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Legalize roof deck

The Architectural Committee recommended approval subject to a mock-up for a determination of visibility.

This application proposes to legalize a roof deck and access stairway on the rowhouse at 1911 Brandywine Street. The roof deck sits on the main body of the rowhouse; the stairway rises from the roof of the 2-story rear ell to roof-level of the 3-story main body of the rowhouse. Without a building permit, the owner removed an earlier deck, repaired the roof, and constructed the new deck. L&I issued a violation on 2 August 2002. The new deck is set back 4 feet from the front or

Brandywine façade. In an attempt to reduce the visibility of the deck, the owner recently dismantled the front railing, but not the deck itself. This work was also done without a permit.

Mr. Tyler made a site visit to determine visibility. He said that the mock-up erected by the applicants showed visibility only from the service alley and not from 19th Street. Mr. Wilds said that he believed that this is an extenuating circumstance because in order for the applicants to repair their roof, it required the removal of the deck and the deck was put back without a permit. Mr. Perri stated that removal of a deck does not require a permit. Mr. Hack stressed that a written policy on roof decks should be implemented. Mr. Sklaroff pointed out that in this situation, the Commission never had the chance to exercise its review. Mr. Wilds stated that the deck would be pulled back with minimal visibility and that this situation differs from the illegal erection of a deck.

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

1301-03 Walnut Street, NW corner of 13th Street, Philadelphia Club

Philadelphia Club, Owner

James Wiesenhutter, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: 1837, attributed to William Strickland, architect, 1888, addition, Frank Furness, architect, 1904-5, bay on rear, Horace Trambauer, architect

PROPOSAL: Legalize windows

Ms. Pentz recommended denial of the legalization of the windows, 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].

This application calls for legalizing the replacement of sash in three windows on the second floor, north facade. The new Pella sash have their own sub-frames, resulting in windows that have lost approximately 3 inches of glazing.

James Kise, an architect, expressed his embarrassment of the situation and presented photographs of the location of the windows. He said that the location is a service façade and, until a few years ago, was not visible. He believes that the windows are reasonably similar to the windows they replaced. In response to the inquiry about the amount of glazing lost, Mr. Kise said that the loss would be about one inch on each side. He argued that the Walnut and 13th Street facades have been treated respectfully. James Wiesenhutter, the contractor, said that the undertaking of the rehabilitation was not taken lightly, the overall cost for the project was approximately \$100,000. Most of the work included rehabilitating the windows and painting the windows and shutters on all facades. These three windows were the only ones replaced.

Commission members asked Mr. Wiesenhutter if any permits were obtained for any portion of this extensive renovation. He did not acquire any permits. Mr. Sklaroff said that it is important that the Commission strives for consistency and it takes issue with the work proceeding without a permit.

Mr. Hack made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Hack seconded the motion which carried with 7 votes. Mr. Wilds abstained.

2110 Chancellor Street

Ara Chalian, Owner

Michael Hauptman, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1867

PROPOSAL: Rooftop addition with deck in concept

Mr. Rivera recommended approval of the proposal, while Ms. Pentz recommended denial.

This application for approval in concept proposes the restoration of the historical facades including masonry cleaning and painting of trim and doors and the construction of a 1-story addition atop a 2-story carriage house at 2110 Chancellor Street.

Michael Hauptman, the architect, stated that there is no way to accomplish limited visibility of the addition, owing to its location. His intent was to design an elongated glass and steel addition, which reads as separate from the historic building.

Mr. Tissian inquired if the addition could be one story. Mr. Hauptman said that the revised design has already eliminated the catwalk. Mr. Sklaroff stated that it is his belief that the addition to this 1880s carriage house will change the roofline as well as the scale of the building. Mr. Baron noted that the Committee had not seen the revised design.

Mr. James made a motion to table the proposal for a period not to exceed six (6) months and referred the proposal back to the Architectural Committee. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

NATIONAL REGISTER COMMENT

3175 John F. Kennedy Boulevard, Pennsylvania Railroad Office Building

Mr. Tyler said that the property meets Criteria A and C. The Pennsylvania Railroad was very significant in the history of Philadelphia. The Office Building itself gives tangible expression to the City's and the Railroad's Philadelphia Improvement Project, an extraordinary city planning, urban renewal and transportation program that did not reach full fruition until after World War II. For the Office Building, the Railroad chose the nationally renowned Chicago architectural firm of Graham, Anderson, Probst & White who also designed the contemporaneous 30th Street and Suburban Stations.

Mr. James made a motion to recommend that the property be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

505-515 Vine Street, Boekel Building

Mr. Tyler stated that the property possesses local significance under Criteria A and C. The Boekel Building establishes its place in history in the production of scientific instruments, chemical laboratory equipment and plumbing in Philadelphia. These industries, along with the related chemical and pharmaceutical companies, have long traditions in the city. The Boekel Building is the work of Clarence Wunder, who specialized in the design of industrial buildings and the use of mushroom column and slab floors for them in the early twentieth century.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to recommend that the property be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. Hack seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

3025 Walnut Street, Hajoca Corporation Headquarters and Showroom

Mr. Tyler presented the nomination. He said that this building clearly meets criterion C. He described history of the Hajoca Corporation and its predecessors and noted their importance in the history of the manufacture and distribution of plumbing fixtures and fittings, particularly of bathroom fixtures. As commonplace as these items may seem, their development and improvement, as illustrated by Hajoca, had a profound effect on residential design and notions of personal hygiene. Like Boekel, Hajoca retained Clarence Wunder, a Philadelphia architect locally known in the 1920s for his commercial and industrial buildings.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to recommend that the property be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

THE REPORT on the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, October 2002
Mr. Tyler then asked if members of the Commission had any questions about the report. There were none.

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to approve the expenditure of \$37.35 for Architectural Committee lunches.

Mr. James made a motion to approve the expenditure. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Mr. Sklaroff thanked the Commission for its indulgence of an extremely lengthy meeting, but emphasized, as a courtesy to the public, that members should strive to be on time. He noted that Commission members must have continuing education of at least 8 hours a year to fulfill the requirements of a Certified Local Government. He thought of possibly having someone address the Commission members a half-hour prior to the start of its regular meeting. Mr. Hack offered his assistance in recruiting speakers from the Preservation Program at the University of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to adjourn. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 1:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary

As corrected 12/13/02