

**THE MINUTES OF THE 474th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
8 February 2002 9:30 a.m.**

**Commission Conference Room 18th Floor, 1515 Arch Street
James Cuorato, Acting Chair**

Present

James Cuorato, Director & City Representative, Commerce Department, Acting Chair
Warren Huff, Urban Design Director, City Planning Commission
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
Vincent Rivera, AIA
Michael Sklaroff, Esquire
Denise J. Smyler, Esquire
Harris Steinberg, AIA
Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.
Norman Tissian
Scott Wilds, Deputy Director, Office of Housing and Community Development

Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner

Lawrence K. Copeland, Senior Attorney, Law Department

Also

Harry J. Sher, Esquire, Attorney for Michael Sher
John M. Blickensderfer, neighbor, 410 South 15th Street
Jean Barr, Owner, 608 South Front Street
Agnes Kan/Orhan Tuncay, owners, 250 Delancey Street
Mary Hunt, 201 South 18th Street for Kaiserman Company
Eileen Eckstein, 1319 Pine Street
Gary Cohen, 1319 Pine Street
Vito Chimenti, Peirce College, 1420 Pine Street
Dee Rasado, Artist
Judith Eden, 335 South 16th Street
Lenore Millhollen, 2047 Waverly Street
Richard W. Thom, 16 South Letitia Street
Mark Brodsky, 1216 Arch Street
Marc D. Brookman, Esquire, Duane Morris Associates
Kevin Cornell, Midwood Management
Michael Schade, Atkin Olshin Lawson-Bell Architects
Randy Cotton, Preservation Alliance
Mark Dominus
Sandra Lazovitz, S & S Properties
Lynn Henson, Waverly Street mural
Mike Carosella, 423 South 16th Street
Paul Christner, 251 South 12th Street
Tom Schnepf, 251 South 12th Street
Nicholas Aloï, 124 Queen Street and 342 South 5th Street
Frank Glodek, owner, 2102 Mt. Vernon Street

Elise Vider, Center City District
William G. Schwartz, Esquire, 235 North 2nd Street
Deena Parham, City Planning Commission
Scott Craven, 313 North 3rd Street
Mihuko Samejima, 228 Monroe Street
Elizabeth Campion, For Waverly Street mural
Christian A. Busch, The Sullivan Company
Michael Johns, Philadelphia Housing Authority
Anne Fadullon, Dale Corporation
Charles Loomis, Loomis McAfee Architects
William Kramer, Kramer Marks Architects
Charles Robin, Robin Real Estate
Saul Levy, 228 Monroe Street
Peter Shaw

Mr. Baron made an administrative announcement in regards to Mr. Tyler's health.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to designate James Cuorato the acting-chair for the meeting. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

James Cuorato, Acting Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m.

Minutes of the 473rd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission. Upon a motion made by Mr. Tissian and duly seconded, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the 473rd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held on 11 January 2002, James Cuorato, Acting Chair.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 29 January 2002, Vincent Rivera, Chair.

245 South 17th Street

University City Housing Company, Ithaca Partnership, Owner

Lauren Weinstock, Applicant

DATE: 1888, Frank Miles Day, Architect

PROPOSAL: Install garage door

The Architectural asked the applicant to return with mechanical and the masonry surround details.

The Commission approved the cutting of a garage door in the face of this building in 1997. The applicant is returning for approval of the actual garage door design. Committee, at a previous meeting, asked for shop drawings to prove that the approved design can be built. This application has scaled drawings, but they differ from the approved 1997 design and fail to show how the door functions.

The approved garage door design had three multi-light transoms, each with 22 panes. This detail mimicked the transoms in the upper sash of the 3rd floor windows as shown in the enclosed drawing. The proposed door now has only 12 panes in each transom. Also, the drawings now show a paneled reveal of 1foot-8inches. The drawings fail to show how the door functions, and do not have hardware information.

Finally, the application does not address details of the garage opening. The approved design had stone quoins along the sides of the opening and a stone lintel above. The drawings do not show any of these details.

No one appeared to represent the application.

Mr. Steinberg questioned the transom overhanging the door itself and the four-light transom in place of the original three-light transom. Mr. Wilds responded that the current opening is wider than the previous opening. Commission members thought that the design should follow the approved design. It also recommended that the applicant meet with staff and Committee for guidance.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to deny the proposal owing to the inconsistency with the originally approved design. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

2102 Mt. Vernon Street

Frank Glodek, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855, Oliver Parry & Nathaniel Randolph, builders; alterations: new façade, 1966;
new cornice, c. 1985

PROPOSAL: Security door

The Architectural Committee recommended approval as submitted.

This proposal calls for a security door on the front entrance of this non-historic facade.

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

1719-21 Walnut Street

Midwood Management Corporation, Owner

Michael Schade, Architect

DATE: 1719: c. 1850; storefront, c. 1940
1721: c. 1900

PROPOSAL: Façade alterations, substantial demolition

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the application as submitted with the staff to review details. Ms. Pentz and Mr. Atkin recused themselves from the vote.

This application involves demolishing two separate buildings and creating a single commercial space. The Commission previously approved the demolition of the neighboring, non-contributing building at 1715-17 Walnut Street and this is part of a related development. The basis of the district's significance is the residential development of the area, and both of these buildings are listed as "contributing" in the district's inventory.

1719 and 1721 Walnut Street were constructed as separate residences in the mid to late-19th century, and stretch back to Moravian Street. As commercial development moved along Walnut Street, they became commercial spaces, with storefronts added to the first floors. However, their massing remains fairly intact with the basic footprint of front building, piazza and rear-ell. 1721's rear has been modified with a three-story ell and the installation of industrial windows, but 1719 retains the c. 1850s footprint. The proposal includes demolishing both buildings, except for the front façade of 1721 and perhaps salvaging a portion of the front façade of 1719 as well as roof structures and dormer, and replacing them with a single building that occupies the entire lot. The parapet wall between the two buildings and their chimneys will be removed completely.

On the front façade of 1719, the proposal calls for replacing the curved-glass storefront on the first floor with a limestone façade that has a double-leaf glazed door and fixed aluminum

storefront windows; the installation of a limestone cornice above the first floor; new stucco on the upper floors and three bays of new fixed, aluminum windows on the second and third floors in place of the existing two bays in the original masonry openings; a new wood cornice, wood dormer with coupled, single-sash windows and a standing-seam copper roof. The drawings say that the entire front brick wall maybe replaced with CMU and that the stucco may be replaced with limestone.

On the front façade of 1721, the proposal includes removing the door and replacing it with a fixed sash; removing paint, cleaning and repointing the limestone; rebuilding the metal cornice and dormer; and installing dormer windows.

Marc Brookman, Esquire, counsel for the project, and Michael Schade, the architect attended the meeting to explain the project. Mr. Brookman stated that at one time 1719 and 1721 were combined into one property for zoning reasons with a breached wall on the interior. The property's owner has a letter of intent from the Talbot Company. Mr. Schade when questioned about the missing parapet wall, responded that is an error in the drawings and that the two roofs form a single slope. He stated that the proposal would fully restore 1721 with the limestone cleaned and re-pointed. In addition, 1719 will have the original roof and dormer restored, the cornice restored to the original configuration and also enlargement of the windows of the middle two floors as well as an adding an additional window. In response to Mr. Wilds inquiry about the original size of the windows, Mr. Schade said that the current reduced windows will be lengthened to their original size. Mr. Baron raised the question of retaining the brick, Mr. Schade said that the determination of what remains underneath would dictate their retention.

Mr. Sklaroff thought that the design picks up the rhythm of the restoration; however, he believes that because 1719 is a modern building and the roofline of 1721 should be differentiated. Mr. Tissian questioned whether at any time would 1719 be an empty lot. Mr. Brookman responded that they would be willing to accept a proviso, which prevents demolition without financing. Commission members said that the preferred material is limestone. Mr. James inquired about the retention of the door at 1721, and the applicant stated that he plans to replicate it exactly. Mr. Cuorato stated that he believes this is a balance that supports continuous growth and does not hamper preservation.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to accept the Architectural Committee's recommendation with the following changes:

1. *The preferred material for 1719 is limestone;*
2. *Demolition subject to the start of construction, and*
3. *Staff to review details, particularly in regards to the door for 1721.*

1904-08 Spring Garden Street

Janet Tegler, Owner

1904-06-08 Spring Garden Street, LLC, Agreement of Sale

Monroe Buckner, Architect

DATE: 1968

PROPOSAL: New entrance, signage, fence and gate

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with the staff to review the new lamp's details.

The application for this non-contributing building has multiple parts. The owner wishes to install a four-foot-high fence at the sidewalk with some landscaping, ten-foot gates into the parking lots flanking the building, new lights at the sidewalk to illuminate the parking lot, one sign next to an

existing ATM machine, and two new entrances and a canopy on the east façade. One entrance calls for a flush metal door and the one with the canopy will have a fully-glazed aluminum door.

The staff received a revised lamp drawing and approved its design.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal with the revised lamp detail. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1921 Walnut Street

Te Chow Lei, Owner

Vern Lei, Architect

DATE: 1897, Cope and Stewardson, Architect

PROPOSAL: New storefront

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the revised proposal with an interior sign, and the staff to review details.

This storefront application returns to Committee with several changes, which reflect the Committee's recommendations. The application now calls for retaining the historic wood transom and installing new wood storefront windows flanking a wood and glazed single-leaf door. Simple metal pipe railings flank new concrete steps leading to the new doorway. The proposal also calls for an illuminated cabinet sign to hang in the central transom pane.

Mr. Wilds questioned handicapped accessibility and it was noted that the applicant plans to petition for an exemption of ADA. Mr. Steinberg questioned the visibility of the interior side stairs on the front façade and whether part of the floor could be removed to create a vestibule. He also asked if the barrel vaults in the interior could be removed to accommodate the interior stairs.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation amended with the staff to review details, in particular the view of the side of the interior stairs through the front window. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Tissian abstained.

306 South 19th Street, aka 1901-05 Delancey Place

Henry McNeil, Owner

Wesley Wei, Architect

DATE: 1900, Cope & Stewardson, architects

PROPOSAL: New rear door

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

This proposal calls for cutting a window opening down to accommodate a new door and cutting a gate into a brick garden wall. The house has a small areaway on its own property that has steps leading down to a basement entrance. A brick wall separates this areaway from a formal alley running behind the house. A stuccoed CMU wall separates the formal alley from the parking lot next door. The owner wishes to cut a gate in the brick wall and install a metal staircase leading from the formal alley to a new rear door of the house, bridging the areaway leading to the basement.

The wood, one-over-one window will be changed to a wood fully-glazed door with a single-light transom above.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

410 South 15th Street, SW corner of Waverly Street

Michael Sher, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850, altered c. 1885

PROPOSAL: Legalize mural on stuccoed base of side wall

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended denial per Standard 9.

This application seeks to legalize a mural painted on the Waverly Street wall of this corner rowhouse. After receiving complaints, Licenses and Inspections issued a violation. The owner claims that the portion of the wall with the mural was previously stuccoed and painted brick red. In a similar circumstance at 23rd and Walnut Streets, the Commission denied a mural application on a corner property.

Harry Sher, Esquire, counsel for the applicant attended the meeting and stated this area of the city is beset with graffiti. He said that the artist never touched the corbelling or the brick but only painted on the stucco. He stated that the mural took a little over a year to complete and in that time he was not aware of any complaints. He believes that the mural is an improvement and showed photographs of some of the neighborhood's graffiti. In addition, he stated that his client made an oversight in not obtaining a permit. The applicant is here to correct the process. Mr. Sher also noted that Hugh Zimmers, a neighbor, sent a letter in support of the mural.

Mr. Baron emphasized that the Commission has not approved a mural on an historically exposed wall with architectural details. All murals that have been approved were on former party walls. He read from the *Standards* and guidelines on masonry where it says that it is not recommended to "radically change the type of paint or its color."

Commission members inquired about the condition of the wall at the time of the mural and if the building was designated before the district. Ms. Smyler believes that the mural detracts from the historic features and that it is setting a precedent. Members also questioned whether the mural would have been approved if the correct procedures were followed. Mr. Scott expressed concern that others may paint on brick walls.

Lynn Henson, a resident, said that this is a unique block with great diversity and expressed her support of the mural.

Judith Eden, Center City Residents' Association, spoke as a neighbor saying that the mural should be judged as if the applicant came before the fact, otherwise it is poor policy that encourages people to proceed and ask for forgiveness later. She also said that to approve the mural would be rewarding an owner who is negligent in keeping his property free of graffiti. There are other ways to remove and control graffiti.

John Blickensderfer, a resident, said that although the mural did violate the process, he supports the mural as it is a deterrent to graffiti.

Vito Chimenti, Peirce College, said that the entrance to the school is directly across the street, however, his issue with the mural is the disregard for procedure.

Liz Champion said that she never noticed the corbelling but that the mural adds significance to the bricks and it has a lovely balance.

Dee Chin, the artist, said that creating the mural has led to many positive experiences in her life.

Mr. James raised the issue of jurisdiction, in the case of defacing of the mural and whether the applicant would have to come back to the Commission for approval of its restoration. Mr. Sklaroff raised the issue of the approval if it was a wall wrap. Mr. Wilds said comparing this case to the gates of Girard Estate that he thought the mural addresses problems with graffiti and owing to the artwork currently existing he believes that it should remain. Mr. Tissian said that he was aware of the mural for a longtime and believes that the Commission should take future similar issues on an individual basis and not consider it a precedent. In addition, he said that he would not want to see the artwork destroyed. Commission members concurred that this is a unique situation. Mr. Cuorato asserted that the Commission is bound by *Standards* and guidelines; but believes that in unique situations the Commission's role is to make certain judgement by applying a restrained amount of subjectivity and he believes that this proposal falls within that category. He also noted for the record that he supports the mural's retention.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to reject the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the legalization of the mural. Mr. Huff seconded the motion which failed with a 5 to 5 vote. Mr. Sugrue, Mr. James, Ms. Smyler, Mr. Sklaroff and Mr. Rivera opposed the motion.

2000-14, 2016-26, 2001-13 West Diamond Street

Philadelphia Housing Authority, Owner

William Kramer, Architect

DATE: 19th century rowhouses demolished after district designation

PROPOSAL: New construction of 19 houses

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the revised submission with the following changes:

- 1. Adding a side window on the second and third floors of the end units;*
- 2. Four-over-one windows, even if they contain sandwiched muntins, and*
- 3. Finials at the party wall divisions.*

With staff to review details.

This application, seen by the Architectural Committee in November was withdrawn and substantially revised based on the Committee's and staff's comments. The houses will now sit much closer to the front property line, take the basic form of individual rowhouses, and have modern detailing inspired by the late 19th century examples on the surrounding blocks. Parking has been moved off the front yards to the rear and units have been shifted to build a more solid streetscape.

William Kramer, the architect, and Michael Johns, Philadelphia Housing Authority, attended the meeting. The applicant submitted revised drawings that reflect the Committee's recommendations.

The placement of the air conditioning units was raised, and Mr. Kramer responded that the units would be placed in the rear of the houses. Mr. Steinberg raised the question of an angled stairwell; however, the applicant reiterated that cost is a major issue in the design.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the revised proposal. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Ms. Smyler abstained.

251 South 12th Street

Paul Christner, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Three new rear decks

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with the fourth floor deck reduced to a small balcony, with the staff to review details.

This proposal involves removing existing rear decks/fire escapes and installing new decks. The rear of the property faces houses on Sartain Street.

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

2301 Madison Square, NW corner of 23rd Street

Dennis Milstein, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c.1865

PROPOSAL: Legalize new stucco at building base

The Architectural Committee recommended legalization of the repair of the existing stucco.

This proposal involves the legalization of stucco to the base of the building. The applicant claims that he repaired stucco that already existed.

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

250 Delancey Street, SE corner of 3rd Street

Agnes Kan, Owner

Raymond Rola, Architect

DATE: c. 1826

PROPOSAL: New roof, dormers, rear deck, areaway along Delancey Street

The Architectural Committee recommended denial per Standards 2 and 9.

This proposal involves extensive alterations to the historic fabric of the building. The plans call for cutting the roof extensively to make a dormer on the front façade and a recessed roof deck on the rear. At the base of the building, the applicant seeks to cut away the historic cellar bulkhead to create an areaway, lightwell and entrance to the basement. Windows on the front façade would be cut down.

Mr. Baron stated that there exists other situations in the area comparable to this proposal; however, these predate the *Standards* adopted with the 1985 Ordinance.

Agnes Kan and Orhan Tuncay, the owners, attended the meeting and stated that the property was previously altered. They propose using the adjacent buildings as examples for the alterations. Ms. Kan further stated that the roof is in very poor condition, the basement is incurring leakage and she believes that the alterations are an improvement. She presented photographs of end houses that have dormers and basement areaway changes in neighborhood. She said that the areaway would provide more natural light to the basement and by creating the dormer it would transform the third floor into living space.

Mr. Baron noted that the end houses, typically did not have dormers because they had windows in the side of the building. Mr. Sklaroff questioned the current living space area and cited a similar case in which the Commission denied a dormer. Members believed that the creating of an

areaway would entail the cutting away of the marble bulkhead, a feature that is characteristically found throughout the district.

Penelope Batchelor, a resident, stated her opposition to the proposal and that it is important to keep as many original buildings as possible.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Steinberg abstained.

700-28 Walnut Street, between 7th & 8th Streets

St. James Walnut Association, Owner

Mark Brodsky, Applicant

DATE: 700-10 Walnut Street, 1868-69, Addison Hutton, architect; altered 1885-86, Frank
Furness, architect
712-16 Walnut Street, c. 1807
718 Walnut Street, c. 1950

PROPOSAL: Façade rehabilitation, new tower

The Architectural Committee recommended final approval of the entire proposal but with glazing at the second floor level of the corner building, with the staff to review all details.

This application received approval in concept in August 1999. The proposal is returning for final approval. Three main changes from the previous application: the treatment of the façade at the parking garage level, the treatment at the roof, and glazing in the corner building.

The Committee and Commission originally approved glazing of the tower at the garage level, the tower's first nine stories. The applicant now wishes to have metal vents instead. At the roofline, the proposal now calls for metal sheathing.

The application also includes rehabilitation of the remaining historic façades, including masonry cleaning, repair and painting of wood windows and doors.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal and stated that the applicant sent a letter stating that the glazing at the second floor level will be retained.

Peter Shaw and Mark Brodsky attended the meeting. Mr. Shaw stated that the project is an improvement for the neighborhood. In response to the question about the garage's usage, he responded that the garage is for the residents. He said that the tower would be comparable to the PSFS building in an architectural concrete of a limestone color with the glass of a blue or blue/green color.

Mr. Steinberg questioned the columns and lighting in the garage and recommended an angled blade rather than the proposed horizontal configuration; however, it was determined that this would produce more light to the street from the garage.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the proposal, with the glazing at the second floor of the corner pavilion, with staff to review all details. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Sklaroff abstained and Mr. Steinberg opposed the motion.

400 Pine Street, aka 400-16 South 4th Street, Old Pine Presbyterian Church

Old Pine Presbyterian Church, Owner

James Crowell, Applicant

DATE: c. 1768; alterations: windows and stucco, c. 1837; front portico, columns and pediment,
c. 1857, John Fraser, architect, A. Catanach, builder

PROPOSAL: Exterior lighting

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the recessed lighting behind the columns and the strip lighting in each sign box as submitted.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the incandescent light fixtures above each sign box. It recommended investigating other options of attaching lights to the sign boxes.

The Architectural Committee recommended tabling the recessed lighting above the door pending review of a cross section of the lintel area.

This application calls for new exterior lighting in four areas on the front of the church.

1. Recessed lighting behind the columns to illuminate the portico area. This includes six fixtures, which will highlight the front door and the windows that flank it.
2. Strip lighting inside each of the sign boxes mounted in the niches of the church's base.
3. New incandescent light fixtures above each sign box to illuminate the entire niche. These linear lights will have a metal valance, painted to match the surrounding stone.
4. New recessed fixtures installed above the double-leaf door located in the central niche of the base. The existing wood panel in the reveal will be replaced with a new wood piece that has two panels.

James Crowell attended the meeting and presented drawings which illustrates his proposal for the lighting above the doors. In addition the applicant submitted the cross section, as requested by the Committee.

Mr. Scott questioned the originality of the fabric being removed and it was noted that this may be modern material. Mr. Steinberg inquired about its removal, and what would be in its place. The Commission thought valance lighting inappropriate; however, it gave the staff the authority to approve some type of lighting in the niches. Members recommended that the applicant work with the staff to explore other lighting options.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to approve the proposed lighting for the portico, sign boxes and over the door and to deny the proposal for the valance lighting in the niches but to allow staff to approve a new lighting scheme for the niches. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

220 West Washington Square, aka 701 Locust Street, W.B. Saunders Building

220 West Washington Associates, Owner

Christian Busch, Architect

DATE: 1911

PROPOSAL: HVAC and legalize bird netting

The Architectural Committee recommended the approval of the HVAC proposal as submitted, and the approval of the 4th floor units without trunk ducts. It also recommended approval of the legalization of the bird netting.

This building has been converted to condominiums, with a different unit on each floor. The owners of the 4th and 5th floors installed HVAC units in the open balconies of the fire stair and they prove highly visible. The Committee reviewed the application to legalize the units and asked for more information concerning placement on the building, manufacturer's requirements and the possibility of blacking out the units. At the same time, the condominium association also

installed bird netting in the open balconies. Although black, the netting is visible in certain light. The staff and Committee asked the application to seek other options.

The proposals now return to the Committee. The application for the HVAC calls for the units to remain in the balconies of the fire stair, but to be setback approximately 36 inches from the front façade. Air-handling requirements set by the manufacturer require at least eight inches between the unit at the facing wall; the proposal has the units set at 12 inches. All the units will be painted black. The photographs in the proposal show the units on the 4th floor blacked out, but the trunk ducts are still visible. Mr. Busch stated that they will remove the trunk ducts at the 4th floor and completely relocate the units on the 5th floor. This new location and design with the units blacked out will be the prototype for all the other floors.

The application for the bird netting does not show any alternatives, but simply asks for the legalization of the present condition.

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

319-21 South 3rd Street

Lisa Colton, Owner

John Douthwade, Applicant

DATE: c. 1974, Louis Goldberg, architect

PROPOSAL: Two-story addition, new front façade – in concept

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the project, as submitted, per Standard #3 and encouraged the applicant to work with Staff.

In January 2001, the Commission approved, in concept, a two-story addition and new brick facade on this contemporary building dating to the redevelopment period of Society Hill. However, the original proposal called for copying the 19th-century building next door. At the time, both the Committee and Commission said that the new design should be more contemporary in nature, rather than mimic an earlier building.

The applicant is returning with a new design, which has a brick front, cast stone detailing, and a galvanized metal roof.

No one attended the meeting to represent the proposal.

Penelope Batchelor, a resident, said that the area east of 3rd Street consists predominately of original buildings and that the proposal shows a lack of design and that the new design should remain the same volume to continue the rhythm.

Commission members thought that the applicant, the owner and a registered architect should meet to discuss a proposed design.

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

234 Pine Street

Harvey Snyder, Owner

David Amburn, Architect

DATE: c.1835

PROPOSAL: Side and rear additions, new rear 2nd floor windows
The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the project, as submitted, per Standard #2, #9 & #10.

The applicant requested a thirty (30) day continuance.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to grant the continuance. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

342 South 5th Street, NW corner of Pine Street

Raymond and Margaret Ullman, Owners

Nicholas Aloï, Applicant

DATE: c. 1972

PROPOSAL: Façade alterations

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the project, as submitted, per Standard #2 & #9. They voted to recommend approval of removing, cutting and re-installing the original metal spandrel, stuccoing the new addition in a buff or champagne color and stuccoing the rear spandrel areas in a dark "bronze" color to simulate the missing original metal.

In August 2001, the Committee and Commission approved an addition on the 3rd floor of this house. However, both said that the metal spandrel between the front entrance and the roof of the building should be extended.

Mr. Aloï, the contractor, has searched for metal sheathing to extend that spandrel on the addition and cannot find an exact match. The owner now proposes to remove all of the metal in the spandrel and replace it with a pinkish-cream smooth stucco or Dryvit. The removed metal sheathing would be used on the rear of the property above the second floor windows.

Nicholas Aloï, the applicant, attended the meeting and stated that he did research and fiberglass is not an option, new aluminum presents a problem with the color. He said that the existing metal could not be taken off piece by piece because they interlock. The metal covers the new window and the pieces cannot be cut in place. He thought that removal of the metal and re-doing of the 5th Street façade with matching stucco appropriate. Although the metal is the only ornamentation on the building, Commission members recognized the difficulty of matching the material.

Mr. Sugrue made motion to approve a smooth stucco on the façade to match the color of the removed metal and with the option of reusing the metal on the rear facade. Mr. Sklaroff seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

124 Queen Street

Nicholas Aloï, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1825

PROPOSAL: Legalize façade details

The Architectural Committee recommended legalization of the façade details subject to the replacement of the bulkhead door to its correct size and with the proper hardware.

This proposal seeks to legalize work that varied from the approved permit. Staff approved a permit for façade restoration, much of which has come to a successful completion. The outstanding items include shutters that have incorrect panels, windows with incorrect frames, a cellar bulkhead that has small doors cut into what should have been full size doors, and steps rebuilt with brick sides rather than marble.

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

608 South Front Street

Jean and Russ Barr, Owners

Frank Reis, Contractor

DATE: c. 1765

PROPOSAL: Two-story rear addition

The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

This proposal calls for constructing an addition on the rear of this unusual and early house. The addition, however, while it faces Howard Street, attaches to an existing rear addition from the late 20th century.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

228 Monroe Street

Janet Levy, Owner

Christopher Beardsley, Architect

DATE:

PROPOSAL: Rear one-story addition

The Architectural Committee recommended approval

The proposal involves constructing an addition in the rear yard of this house. The house contains a passageway in the front wall that serves as an entryway for a number of rear court houses. The addition will have a visual impact upon the communal space and would be visible from Monroe Street.

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

314 Catharine Street, Unit 402

Don P. Foster, Owner/Applicant

DATE: Central Talmud Torah, built 1911 Magaziner & Potter, Architects

PROPOSAL: New windows

The Architectural Committee thought that three inches less glass width significantly changes the profile, and recommended denial per Standard 6.

This application calls for the installation of new wood windows in place of the existing replacement windows. The new windows, while true divided light, do not match the dimensions of the existing. For example the glass width is nearly three inches less per sash because of differences in frame dimensions. This becomes especially significant because most of the windows on each façade will not change, making for easy comparison.

No one attended the meeting to represent the proposal.

Mr. Baron's site visit determined that the windows even on the rear are highly visible from a street. He noted that the window installer spoken to Mr. Baron about the possibility of reducing

the difference in the window glass width to one inch, but has not submitted revised drawings.. Mr. Wilds thought that more information is needed in respect to the windows' location.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

314 Catharine Street, Unit 303

Craig M. Martin, Owner/Applicant

DATE: Central Talmud Torah, built 1911 Magaziner & Potter, Architects

PROPOSAL: New window sash

The Architectural Committee thought that three inches less glass width significantly changes the profile, and recommended denial per Standard 6.

This application calls for the installation of new wood windows in place of the existing replacement windows. The new windows, while true divided light, do not match the dimensions of the existing. For example the glass width is nearly three inches less per sash because of differences in frame dimensions. This becomes especially significant because most of the windows on each façade will not change, making for easy comparison.

No one was present to represent the proposal. The comments from the previous application apply to this proposal as well.

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

57 Summit Street, corner of Prospect Street

Malcolm Sheppard, Owner

Chariss McAfee, Architect

DATE: c. 1870

PROPOSAL: Cut new side and rear windows and doors

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the design as submitted per Standard 9, except for the approval of the single double-hung window in the extension of the rear-ell. The Committee made design recommendations to the applicant for a revised proposal for other aspects of the design.

This application calls for installing new windows and doors on the side and rear of this building, which prove highly visible from Prospect Street. The main house has a stuccoed rear ell, a stuccoed rear extension and then a wood-framed rear wing with clapboarding. In the rear ell of the building, the owner wishes to remove an existing window and cut a large opening to install large sliding-glass doors out to an existing terrace and install a new metal canopy over the doors. Also, the proposal calls for cutting a new double-hung one-over-one window in the stuccoed extension of the rear ell. In the wood-framed rear wing, the owners wish to stucco the brick base and install a new, large cross-gable bay window on the side, which breaks the historic cornice line. On the rear, the proposal calls for cutting a bank of new windows in the rear wing.

Charles Loomis, representing the architect, attended the meeting and stated his belief that the double door to the dining room and the kitchen window had been approved.

The Commission thought that the proposal should be tabled to be reviewed in its entirety.

Mr. Rivera made a motion to table the entire proposal for a period not to exceed six (6) months in order to allow the proposal to be reviewed as a whole. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

313 North 3rd Street

Paul Wade, Wade Properties, Owner

Christopher Beardsley, Architect

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Replace entrances, new windows, firestair

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with all wood doors and windows including a double-leaf wood door with a four-light transom on the 3rd Street façade, with the staff to review details.

This multi-faceted proposal includes installing a new elevator and fire-stair tower, new windows and new entrances to rehabilitate this former light-industrial building into housing units. The proposal calls for cleaning and restoring the 3rd Street façade and replacing the non-historic entrance with a two-light transom and fully-glazed double-leaf doors. On the Wood Street façade, the proposal includes restoring a former entrance opening and installing a new single-leaf fully-glazed door with a sidelight and handicap-access ramp, and cutting new window openings in the easternmost bay on the top three stories and installing six-over-six double-hung windows to match the others on the façade. Finally, the proposal calls for a new elevator and fire-stair tower. These will be slightly visible from down 3rd Street, but sit in the middle of the building.

Scott Craven attended the meeting to represent the project.

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

236 Quarry Street

S & S Properties, Owner

Sandra Lazovitz, Applicant

DATE: c. 1820

PROPOSAL: 3rd floor addition, façade alterations

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of either the two or three floor design with the staff to review details.

This proposal involves building a floor and roof deck onto a much altered former house that once had rear court houses. The building has Flemish bond brickwork at the second floor, but the first floor and roof have been replaced/rebuilt. The Hexamer & Locher atlas of 1860 indicates a former wood shake roof. Staff worked with the applicant to develop a reasonable approximation of the former appearance of the property from which the applicant has deviated in the area of the doorway/former passageway.

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

235 North 2nd Street

R. Levitt and R. Rigolizzo, Owners

Hugh Zimmers, Architect

DATE: c 1810

PROPOSAL: Demolition of two rear houses for new construction
The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the demolition.

William Schwartz, Esquire, was retained as counsel for the proposal and stated that he recommends that the proposal be sent to the Committee on Financial Hardship because the two rear buildings present a hardship to the demolition of the two front structures which have been declared Imminently Dangerous. Commission members noted that the owner must make a formal application for financial hardship.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to table the proposal for a period not to exceed six months but amended the motion to grant a continuance. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Cuorato opposed the motion.

OLD BUSINESS

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 30 October 2001, Vincent Rivera, Chair.

2026 Locust Street

Robin Apartments, Owner

Carl Zucker, Esq., Applicant

Date: 1890, Hazelhurst & Huckel, architects

Proposal: Legalize stucco at rear; modify stucco and paint

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of grinding down the stucco to a smooth finish on the lintels, sills and window frames and painting it; removing the stucco from the cornice; adding a wooden surround to the dormer window; and installing asphalt shingles to the mansard roof, with staff to review details.

Mr. Baron explained that the owners applied for and received a building permit from the Department of Licenses and Inspection for stucco on the mansard, cornice, lintels and window frames on the rear of this property. Harvey Robin claimed that the former owner had already stuccoed some of these areas. The Historical Commission did not review the work for the permit and the Department issued the fast-form permit in error. The owner then applied to the Historical Commission to legalize the work, which the Commission denied, and the owner appealed to the Board of License and Inspection Review. The Board remanded the issue back to the Commission in an effort to reach a compromise. Mr. Zucker emphasized that his client acted in good faith and relied upon the validity of the building permit issued by the Department. He also said that the rear of the building faces the rear of another building on a dead-end street.

The application now calls for grinding down the stucco on the lintels, windows and mansard and painting it. The Committee noted that although the work is on the rear of the property, the stucco covers details that contribute to the historic character of the building. Also, the fronts of houses do face the street, just to the west of this property.

Charles Robin, the owner, sent a letter of his intentions to the staff, which included all the Committee's recommendations with the exception of the grinding down of the stucco. He proposes an alternate option of chipping away the stucco and then re-applying a new coat of stucco.

Mr. Baron questioned the application of stucco if the historic fabric is revealed. Mr. Rivera thought that stucco on the mansard inappropriate for a roofing material; however, it was noted that the stucco will be covered with asphalt shingles. Mr. Wilds stated that the applicant has responded to the Committee's recommendations, and that the alternate option for the stucco is appropriate.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation with the alternate option of smoothing out the stucco. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 18 December 2001, Vincent Rivera, Chair.

1319 Pine Street

Eileen Eckstein, applicant/owner

DATE: 1836, Anthony Frazier, builder

PROPOSAL: Legalize, repair roofing, aluminum cladding, masonry and windows

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the legalization of the masonry and front façade windows subject to the restoration of the cornice, dormer, and dormer window to original condition with staff to review details.

This proposal involves the legalization of work completed without a permit. A violation has issued. The work includes the re-roofing of a house with gray shingles, rebuilding the dormer and cornice, and covering them with aluminum siding. In addition, the house received wide pointing in Portland cement and a waterproof coating. Many years ago, but after designation, the applicant also removed deteriorated wood windows without a permit and replaced them with one-over-one wood windows with aluminum panning.

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

423 South 16th Street

Michael and Mario Carosella, Owners

Thomas Citro, Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Front windows with applied muntins, legalize new rear of building

Since the previous meeting, the applicant has submitted drawings, which reflect the rear alterations.

Mr. Huff made a motion to approve the legalization of the rear alterations and staff to review the details of the windows of the front façade on site. Mr. Sklaroff seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

213 St. Marks Square

Sylvia Palms, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1877-80, George W. & William D. Hewitt, Architects

PROPOSAL: Install square-head storm windows in arched openings

There was no vote taken; however, Ms. Smyler reiterated for the record that the lack of decision does not constitute a precedent.

THE REPORT on the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, November 2001

Mr. Baron asked if members of the Commission had any questions about the report. There were none.

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Baron asked the Commission to approve the expenditure of \$ 33.73 for the Architectural Committee's breakfast and lunch.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to approve the expenditure. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

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

The meeting adjourned at 1:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary