

**THE MINUTES OF THE 495<sup>TH</sup> STATED MEETING OF THE  
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION  
14 November 2003**

**City Council Caucus Room, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, City Hall  
Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair**

Present

---

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair  
James Brown IV  
Duane Bumb, Deputy Director, Department of Commerce  
Warren Huff, City Planning Commission  
Joseph James, Department of Public Property  
Kathleen Murray, Council President Verna's Office  
David Perri, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections  
Vincent Rivera, AIA  
Denise Smyler, Esq.  
Norman Tissian  
Scott Wilds, Assistant Director, Office of Housing and Community Development

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

Lawrence Copeland, Esq., Senior Attorney, Law Department  
Eileen Quigley, Esq., Deputy City Solicitor, Law Department

Also

Robert Thomas, Campbell Thomas & Company  
Richard Waldron, American Swedish Historical Museum  
Andrew Fish, Riverview Condominium Association  
Larry Moore, Block Captain, 4600 Block Hazel Avenue  
Matthew Heckler, Loie  
Jerry Roller, J.K. Roller Architects  
Idell R. Rasner, 249 Market Street  
William G. Schwartz, Esquire, 327 Race/923 South 2<sup>nd</sup> Streets  
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance  
Maria Rivera, Pennsylvania Social Services Union  
Kenneth L. Baritz, Esquire, 224 Market Street  
Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association  
Ronald Patterson, Esq., 241 Chestnut Street  
Stephanie Haney, 4643 Hazel Avenue  
Marvin Haney, 4643 Hazel Avenue  
Daniel Banks, Engineer  
Lotte D. Gottslich, 4600 block Hazel Avenue  
Patricia J. Lavelle, 4645 Hazel Avenue  
Brem Moldovsky, Esq., 4643 Hazel Avenue  
William Pryor, 4645 Hazel Avenue  
Emily Cohen  
Aaron Kornfield

Sam Hugeman, 923 South 2<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Cathy Harris, Mural Arts Program  
David Amburn, Amburn/Jarosinski Architects  
Susan Osborn, Bloomfield Associates  
Peter Bloomfield, Bloomfield Associates  
Robert Boyd, 627 Pine Street  
John Scorsone, 341 North Front Street  
A. Blanda, Sandvold/Blanda Architects  
David Stello  
Dean Carlson, 919 Clinton Street  
Rhonda Carlson, 919 Clinton Street  
Mac Glisten  
Robert Hicks, Chemical Heritage Foundation  
Dennis McCarthy, Wiechert McCarthy Realty  
Norman Swindells, 137 Elfreth's Alley  
Agnes Kan, Civitas Architects  
William Alesker, 923 South 2<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Ron Kushner, The Dodd Group, Quarry Street  
Errol Ismail  
Miriam, Schaefer, Chemical Heritage Foundation  
M. Alex Haddad, 126 W. Penn Street  
Laura MacGregor, 126 W. Penn Street  
Katie Masi, Elfreth's Alley  
David White, 111 Pensdale Street  
Robert Hotes, DPK&A Architects  
Marc Morfei, Center City District  
Julie Panassow, The Lighting Practice  
Jeff Glassberg, Old City Civic Association  
James Quilligan, River's Edge Civic Association  
Chip Dunohugh, River's Edge Civic Association/Old City Civic Association  
Tod Barritz, Esq.

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 495<sup>th</sup> Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:20 a.m.

#### **Minutes of the 494<sup>th</sup> Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission**

Upon a motion made by Mr. Wilds and seconded by Mr. Tissian, the Commission voted to approve, as amended in writing by Mr. Sklaroff, the minutes of the 494<sup>th</sup> Stated Meeting, 10 October 2003, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

#### **Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission**

Upon a motion made by Mr. Wilds and seconded by Mr. Tissian, the Commission voted to approve the minutes of the Special Meeting, 22 October 2003, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

## **Report of the Committee on Historic Designation**

At the suggestion of Mr. Sklaroff, the Commission agreed to hear public testimony related to the proposed Old City Historic District.

James Quilligan, the president of the River's Edge Civic Association, advocated for the inclusion in the district of the neighborhood around the 300-blocks of Front and Water Streets. He pointed to the significance of the Hertz Lot, an important archaeological site, as well as the significance of the topography. The area includes the last unaltered stretch of Delaware Riverbank in the historic city.

After soliciting for further public comment on the proposed district, Mr. Sklaroff reminded the audience that public testimony would be taken and the district considered at the Commission's December 2003 meeting.

## **Report of the Architectural Committee, 28 October 2003, Vincent Rivera, Chair**

### **City Hall, 1300 Market Street, 1319-25 Market Street, 21 North Juniper Street**

City Hall- City of Philadelphia, Owner

1300 Market Street- Philadelphia Center Realty, Owner

1319-25 Market Street- G. Holdings Corporation, Owner

21 North Juniper Street- CNL Hospitality, Owner

Robert Hotes, Architect/Applicant

Date: City Hall- 1871-1901, John McArthur, Jr., architect

1300 Market Street- 1901-07, Daniel Burnham, architect

1319-25 Market Street- 1930, Ritter & Shay, architects

21 North Juniper Street- 1927, Philip Johnson, architect

Proposal: Lighting for City Hall

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval subject to review of a mock-up for a determination of glare and the effect of the fixtures on the appearance of the buildings, and subject to the elimination of the pole lighting, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guidelines, with staff to review details.

Mr. Baron presented the application, which proposes lighting of City Hall with fixtures mounted on a number of buildings surrounding Penn Square including three historically designated buildings on the eastern edge of the square and possibly a pole-mounted group of lights at Market Street and Penn Square.

The Committee and Commission approved in concept the lighting of City Hall in 2000 and again last month. The 2000 review included a mock up to show the effect of lighting the tower and William Penn statue from the Municipal Services Building. Much of City Hall was to receive new lights attached to its façade. That plan no longer has funding.

The current plan calls for lighting City Hall from surrounding buildings with a scheme that uses the brightest lighting on the center and corner pavilions, less bright lighting on the wings and the lowest lighting on the curtain walls between the center and the corners. The lighting will involve broad beams for overall lighting as well as spotlights for sculptures and highlights. On three sides of the building there will be lighting from non-historically designated buildings, from two locations per side. On the eastern side however, the application provides for lighting from five locations, all on historically designated buildings. An alternate plan uses a pole-mounted bank of lights on Market Street in place of the lights on the One East Penn Square building.

Mr. Sklaroff inquired into the meaning of “mock-up,” a term used by Mr. Baron, and noted his preference for the term “test.” Marc Morfei of the Center City District provided an overview of the project; Julie Panassow, a consultant from The Lighting Practice, provided details. Mr. Sklaroff asked for several clarifications including definitions of “glare” and “external snoot,” which Ms. Panassow provided. Mr. Tissian inquired about the impact of the lighting on pedestrians and drivers. Ms. Panassow stated that the lighting would have no negative impact on pedestrians and drivers. Mr. Wilds asked if pedestrians would feel like actors under theater lights; Ms. Panassow replied that they would not. Mr. Sklaroff inquired about the prevention of glare. Ms. Panassow explained that she had studied the problem and used computer calculations to verify that the lights would not produce excessive glare. Mr. Sklaroff then asked Mr. Rivera if the Architectural Committee would accept an amendment to its recommendation stating that the lighting consultant would certify in writing to the Philadelphia Historical Commission that neither pedestrians nor drivers would experience glare from the new City Hall lighting. Mr. Rivera replied that it would accept that stipulation. Mr. James informed his colleagues that Commissioner Perez of the Department of Public Property had reviewed the proposal and supports its approval.

*Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Architectural Committee provided that the lighting consultant certify in writing to the Philadelphia Historical Commission that neither pedestrians nor drivers will experience glare from the new City Hall lighting. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which carried with a vote of 10 to 0; Mr. James abstained.*

### **126 West Penn Street**

Michael Alex Haddad and Laura MacGregor, Owners/Applicants

Date: 1869, Patrick Connelly, architect

Proposal: Replace slate mansard with asphalt shingle

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

Mr. Baron presented the application, which proposes the removal of decorative slate along the mansard of this twin and its replacement with asphalt/fiberglass shingles. The roof has an irregular shape with several protrusions and eight dormers. The light grey slate has a hexagonal shape and would remain on the other half of the twin. The proposed asphalt shingle has a different shape and perhaps different dimensions. None of the photographs have a scale to determine measurements. Also, the mansard along the front has no break between the houses; the application does not detail the treatment of the break of materials at this location. The curved roofs of the dormers will have membrane roofing and all flashing and edging will be in copper. Mr. Baron explained that the applicants had accepted a compromise at the Committee meeting that would have had several slopes of the mansard re-roofed in slate. Upon further investigation of costs they decided to go ahead with their original submission based on hardship.

Michael Alex Haddad and Laura MacGregor, the owners, approached the Commission to make a statement, but then decided to wait to make their statement to the Committee on Financial Hardship.

*Mr. Wilds made a motion to refer the application to the Committee on Financial Hardship. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.*

**919 Clinton Street**

Dean and Rhonda Carlson, Owner

Jennifer Bonaccorsi, Architect/Applicant

Date: 1835

Proposal: Roof deck and stair tower on main section

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and Roof Guideline.

Mr. Baron presented the application, which proposes a roof deck and stair house on the main block of this brick row house. The Commission has regularly denied roof decks on the main blocks where suitable rear ells exist. A suitable rear ell exists in this circumstance.

Jerry Roller, the architect, contended that the deck would not be visible. Dean Carlson, the owner, explained he preferred a deck on the roof of the main block, not the rear ell, because access would be easier, it would be more private, and it would not be visible. Mr. Sklaroff and Mr. Wilds asked about the building and proposed deck and noted that there is more than one possible location for the deck. The deck could also be erected on the rear ell, they asserted. Mr. Bumb contended that the question was one of visibility; Mr. Sklaroff observed that it was also a question of history. Mr. Tissian added that the Commission should not set a precedent it would later regret. The owner stated that a deck stands on the main block of the building directly across Clinton Street from his property. The staff responded that they would investigate to determine its legality. Mr. Sklaroff asked if the proposed deck would be visible from Cypress Street. Mr. Roller noted that it would be visible from Cypress.

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

**1900 Pattison Street, American Swedish Historical Museum**

American Swedish Historical Museum, Owner

Robert Thomas, Architect/Applicant

Date: 1929, John Nyden, architect

Proposal: Revised elevator tower

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of revised design, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron presented the application, which involves a modification to the formerly approved elevator addition on the north façade of the museum. Excavation for a foundation for the elevator revealed that piling caps and foundations for the museum preclude placing the elevator in the previously proposed corner. The new plan reverses the placement of the elevator and the lobby, bringing the two-story elevator closer to the north pavilion façade.

*Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.*

**923 South 2<sup>nd</sup> Street**

Helen Grandella, Owner

William Schwartz, Esq., Applicant

Date: c. 1840; new storefront and 2/2 windows, c. 1870; storefront removed and residential façade restored with 6/6 windows and 4-panel door, 1974

Proposal: Replace front steps, remove side door and steps

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the wood ramp or steps over original steps; removal of side steps and retention of side masonry opening as a reveal with a window, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Baron presented the application, which involves a house that had a late nineteenth-century storefront until the 1970s. In 1974, the Historical Commission approved removing the storefront and restoring the building to its residential configuration; however, since then, many changes have been made to this house without permits or Historical Commission approval. The front marble steps remain from the time of the storefront installation. The owner has difficulty climbing stairs and needs steps that have a shorter rise and a larger landing. The application calls for removing the marble steps and installing new cast-stone steps with metal pipe railings. The proposed steps will project approximately four feet into the sidewalk. The property to the rear of this house is being developed and the developer seeks to widen Salter Street, the side street, to accommodate vehicular traffic. As a result, the owner, with the assistance of the developer, wishes to remove the side door and stairs and install a window in the former door opening. The window would match the others on the façade, all of which were installed without permits. The door is an historic door opening, but the present steps are of non-historic materials. Salter Street is a legally open, public street, but it does not appear on the City Plan.

Mr. Tissian asked if the proposed cast stone steps would be able to be removed at a later date. Mr. Baron replied that they would be removable. Attorney William Schwartz and architect William Alesker represented the application. They explained that their client prefers cast stone steps, not wood steps.

*Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the retention of the marble front step and its covering with cast stone steps with a metal railing as well as the removal of the side steps and replacement of the side doorway with a reveal, stuccoed to match the façade, and a window within the reveal to match the others on the façade, with staff to review details. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.*

#### **4643 Hazel Avenue**

Stephanie Haney, Owner

Alex Abdalla, Contractor/Applicant

Date: 1910

Proposal: Remove pitched roof and cornice and install flat roof

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the flat roof, subject to drawings which depict the restoration of the side walls and cornice as well as framing that allows for the later installation of a fourth floor, with staff to review details.

Mr. Baron presented the application, which proposes the removal of a fourth-floor hipped attic that collapsed and the installation of a flat roof and parapet in its place. This house has had a troubled history with long periods when the building sat without care to its roof and other elements. Ms. Haney recently purchased the property and is attempting to renovate it. This house is part of a row of houses. This building is unlike its immediate neighbor; this building and the other at the opposite end of the row make up architectural “bookends.” It had a cornice that sat lower than its attached neighbor and the house rose an extra story. The drawing by the engineer for the applicant shows only a flat roof and parapet without a fourth floor.

Mr. Baron noted that the applicant had supplied new drawings. He also noted the receipt of two new letters opposing the application and advocating for the restoration of the building.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Baron to clarify whether work had been done without building permits. Mr. Baron answered in the affirmative, stating that illegal work had been done. Mr. Sklaroff asked him to clarify. Mr. Baron explained that he had recently learned that a roof had been installed without Commission approval; the applicant had not mentioned the new roof at the most recent Architectural Committee meeting, he added. Stephanie Haney, the property owner, engineer Daniel Banks and attorney Brem Moldovsky represented the application. Mr. Banks claimed that the collapse had occurred because of high winds and contended that it was necessary to the repair quickly. The owner could not wait for permit approvals. He added that a restoration would take place in the future. Mr. Sklaroff asked if the owner had provided any assurances of the future restoration. Mr. Banks replied that she had not.

Mr. Moldovsky claimed that the cost to replace the 4<sup>th</sup> story would be \$225,000. Commission members countered that the figure did not sound accurate; they believed Mr. Moldovsky's number to be much too high. Mr. Rivera reminded the Commission of his Committee's recommendation. Mr. Sklaroff and Mr. Wilds asserted that they were not bound to the recommendation. Mr. Moldovsky confessed that he had been mistaken about the cost to replace the 4<sup>th</sup> story. It would cost about \$126,000 to replace.

Mr. Tissian asked if the 4<sup>th</sup> story had collapsed because of neglect by the current owner or her contractors. Mr. Sklaroff suggested that the Commission postpone that discussion until all the facts had been collected. Mr. Wilds asked for further background including the name and relation of the second owner of the property. Stephanie Haney, the owner, explained that the second owner is Marvin Haney, her father, and pointed him out in the audience. Mr. Wilds asked if the property had been inspected prior to the purchase. Mr. Moldovsky answered that it had not. Mr. Sklaroff asked if there had been any interior demolition prior to the collapse. Mr. Moldovsky answered that there had been interior demolition prior to the collapse. Mr. Sklaroff asked if the owners carried any insurance on the property. Mr. Moldovsky and Ms. Haney answered that they did not have any insurance. Mr. Banks, the engineer, claimed that the 4<sup>th</sup> story was not very visible from the street. Mr. Sklaroff and Mr. Wilds countered that the engineer's visibility argument was not a strong one.

Ms. Smyler questioned why the matter had not been referred to the Committee on Financial Hardship. Mr. Moldovsky asserted that the Commission should accept the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Sklaroff contended that the recommendation was predicated on an assumption of hardship. He added that the house is part of an ensemble and would impact the remainder of the row if not restored. Mr. James echoed Mr. Sklaroff's statement and declared that the Commission should not legalize the flat roof, which would be out of place in the row. Ms. Murray asked if the mirror-image house at the opposite end of the row had its original roof design. Mr. Baron answered that it did.

Mr. Sklaroff solicited comment from the audience. William Pryor of 4645 Hazel Avenue, the house to the west of the subject property, stepped forward to speak. He explained that he moved to 4645 Hazel Avenue in 1990. Since that time, he has contacted the Department of Licenses & Inspections numerous times to alert the agency of the deteriorating condition of 4643 Hazel Avenue. He stated that the department had determined that the building was structurally sound not long before the current owner purchased the property. He claimed that the current owner did substantial demolition work without building permits, causing the collapse of the houses at both 4643 and 4645 Hazel Avenue. He asserted that he was homeless now and his house was significantly damaged because of the reckless, illegal actions of Ms. Haney and her contractor.

He stated that he would restore his house and he demanded that Ms. Haney completely restore her house as well.

Patricia Lavelle, also of 4645 Hazel Avenue, stepped forward to speak. She stated that the illegal interior demolition at 4643 Hazel Avenue, which was done without a building permit, caused the collapse of both houses. She stated that she and her husband had already spent \$100,000 since the collapse and that that number did not include any rebuilding. She thought that Ms. Haney should have had an engineer or architect's plan for the reconstruction of the roof before her contractor began working on the roof structure. She considered working without an approved plan to be "demolition by neglect."

Mr. Sklaroff stated that he considered Ms. Haney's financial hardship to be self-inflicted; Ms. Haney's and her contractor's actions produced the hardship. He further suggested that not all parties had been forthcoming and truthful with the Commission. He proposed that the witnesses testify again at a later date under oath with record taken by a court stenographer. Mr. Wilds suggested that the Commission deny the application and refer it to the Committee on Financial Hardship. Mr. James dissented, stating that the owner caused the hardship and must be held responsible for it.

The Commission turned again to the question of whether the owner and her contractor had been working legally with a building permit when the collapse occurred. Mr. Moldovsky produced a building permit that ostensibly covered the interior demolition at the time of the collapse. Mr. Perri, the Deputy Commissioner of the Department of Licenses & Inspections, examined the permit and noted that it covered minor porch and roof repairs. He also noted that the total estimated cost of the work was \$800, a very small amount. He therefore concluded that this building permit did not cover the interior demolition underway at the time of the collapse.

Larry Moore, the block president and the owner of 4651 Hazel Avenue, stepped forward to speak. He remarked that he has been working for years to correct the problems associated with 4643 Hazel Avenue. He stated that the block's position is that the house should be completely restored. He also stated that he witnessed the major demolition work underway at the time of the collapse and contradicted the engineer, who had claimed that a strong wind had induced the collapse. He asserted that there was no wind that day. He added that the owner's contractor was working without a building permit at the time of the collapse.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Perri if an inspection is required for interior demolition. Mr. Perri explained that interior demolition permits are very restricted. They are for the removal of non-load bearing partitions only and do not require inspections. He added that permits for major demolition such as removal of load bearing members require plans sealed by an engineer or architect.

Mr. Moore addressed the Commission again. He claimed that the owner had told him many times that money for work to her building was readily available. He insisted therefore that the building be restored, especially in light of the fact that the demolition work that resulted in the collapse had been done without a valid building permit.

Mr. Wilds pointed to the monthly building permit log for October 2003 and noted that the two interior demolition permits for 4643 Hazel Avenue approved by the Historical Commission dated to mid October 2003, several weeks after the collapse. He stated that the record showed that the owner did not have a building permit at the time of the collapse. Mr. Banks interrupted, claiming that his investigation after the collapse determined that it could not have been predicted. He stated

that the joists were rotten, but that the rot was hidden. Mr. James asked Mr. Banks to clearly state for the record whether or not the demolition had caused the collapse. He answered that he thought nothing structural had been removed before the collapse.

Ms. Murray asked that the owner submit evidence that she had been unable to insure the building. Mr. Moldovsky pointed out that the contractor at the time of the collapse had insurance. Ms. Murray insisted that the historical character of the row and neighborhood must be maintained.

Mr. Sklaroff reminded his colleagues of the complexity of the application and asked them consider it fully.

*Mr. James made a motion to deny the legalization of the new roof and require that the cornice and 4<sup>th</sup> story be restored to their historical appearance. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which carried by a vote of 8 to 3; Mr. Sklaroff, Mr. Bumb, and Ms. Smyler dissented.*

Ms. Smyler left the meeting.

### **111 Pensdale Street**

David White, Owner/Applicant

Date: c. 1830

Proposal: Rear rooftop addition and deck

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval, subject to a setback of the new dormer at the side elevation of 18 to 24 inches, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal.

*Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the proposal, with the dormer set back as the Committee recommended. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.*

### **627 Pine Street**

John Infante, Owner

Robert Boyd, Applicant

Date: 1807, John Warner, carpenter

Proposal: New door, skylights, roof deck

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval, subject to the rear deck being lowered as close to the top of the roof as possible, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. He noted that the new deck will sit lower than the previous one so it will not be as visible.

*Ms. Murray made a motion to approve the proposal. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.*

### **101-15 Lombard Street**

Riverview Condominium Association, Owner

Andrew Fish, Applicant

Date: 1978

Proposal: Replace steps with alternate material

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of replacement of the pavers with masonry of a similar color, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal. Andrew Fish, a condominium owner and representative of the association, stated that the association would prefer using the flagstone. He claimed that it is easier to obtain and would look nicer than a material that is the color of terra cotta. Mr. Wilds countered that terra cotta is a material that is typical of the period from when these buildings were designed and to change the color would be too drastic a change in their appearance.

*Mr. Huff made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed with nine votes. Mr. Bumb dissented.*

Ms. Murray left the meeting

### **600 South Washington Square, Lea and Febiger Building**

Gene and Sueyuh Locks, Owners

David Amburn, Architect/Applicant

Date: 1923, Earle Nelson Edwards, architect

Proposal: Extend rooftop addition, stucco side

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial of enlargement of rooftop addition, pursuant to Standard 9 and Roof Guideline; Approval of a metal panel system recessed several inches on vertical and horizontal infill areas at roof and light well section of west façade.

The Commission previously approved penthouse additions for a stair and elevator for the rooftop sculpture garden as well as glazing the former lightwell area on the west side of the building. David Amburn, the architect for the project, explained the revisions. The owner has decided to expand the storage space in the building and on the roof. Therefore the application returns to expand the rooftop addition for more storage space on the roof. The former lightwell on the western side will only be partially glazed. The lower floors will now be used as storage, so the owner wants the wall stuccoed instead of glazed. A two-inch reveal can be achieved, as the Committee requested.

*Mr. Tissian made a motion to approve the revised submission. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.*

### **326 Lawrence Court**

Peter Bloomfield, Owner

Susan Osborn, Architect/Applicant

Date: 1970, Fradley Architects

Proposal: Cut new windows, doors, rebuild roof decks, new pergola at rear

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval, subject to revised drawings showing the existing single-light door, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal and noted that the revised drawings were in the Commission's packets. Peter Bloomfield stated that other end units in the development had windows in the side wall. His house did not because the owner at the time chose to not have windows to get a credit

from the builder. The blank wall was not necessarily a design element of the house. The changes to the rear windows were not visible except from the parking lot.

*Mr. Bumb made a motion to approve the revised drawings. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.*

**558 Judson Street**

John Dogum, Owner

J. Douglas Grainge, Architect/Applicant

Date: c. 1861, Colonial-Revival façade alterations, c. 1920

Proposal: Legalize door alterations

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.

The applicant had withdrawn the proposal.

**250 Delancey Street**

Thomas King, Owner

Raymond Rola, Architect/Applicant

Date: c. 1785

Proposal: Move skylight, remove false chimney, install HVAC

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the relocation of low-profile skylight; removal of false chimney; installation of HVAC equipment on 2-foot by 2-foot platform on east slope of roof near south party wall; and installation of a low-profile hatch where false chimney once stood to access the HVAC equipment, with staff to review details.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal, which proposes the relocation of a large, low-profile skylight on the east slope of the gable roof, the removal of a false chimney covering a light well on the same east slope, and the installation of HVAC equipment adjacent to the chimney on the west slope of the gable roof. At some point after 1957, the large historic chimney on the west slope was removed. At some point before 1999, a slender brick chimney was constructed where the historic chimney once stood. Both slopes of the roof are highly visible owing to the property's corner location. The building occupies 100% of the site; therefore, the roof is the only possible location for the HVAC equipment.

Mr. Wilds noted that the original chimney is much smaller now than in historical photographs. He asked if it could be restored to its original size. Mr. Farnham responded that the Committee discussed the same idea, but the Committee's engineer noted that the roof would not be able to support the necessary structure.

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

**1627 Wallace Street**

Ralph Pungitore, Owner

Eugene J. Yanelli, Applicant

Date: c. 1859

Proposal: Legalize stucco on rear ell, legalize windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 6.

The staff granted a 30-day continuance.

**1924 Spring Garden Street**

Pennsylvania Social Services Union, Owner  
Cathy Harris, Mural Arts Program, Applicant

Date: 1960-62

Proposal: Mural on side facade

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial on basis of incomplete application.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal, which proposes the painting of a mural on the east façade of the Pennsylvania Social Services Union building in the Spring Garden Historic District. Erected between 1960 and 1962, the building is listed as non-contributing in the district. The east façade faces a parking lot. It is constructed of CMU with a brick return at the front. Mr. Farnham noted that the applicant submitted additional information including examples of other murals painted by the artist.

Maria Rivera, office coordinator of the Social Services Union, Cathy Harris of the Mural Arts Program, and Cesar Viveros, the artist for the mural, attended the meeting. Mr. Farnham stated that the Spring Garden Civic Association wrote an opposition letter claiming that the Mural Arts program promised not to add any murals to the Spring Garden neighborhood. Ms. Harris said that she did not know of any such agreement with the civic association. The Commission members had an animated discussion about murals in historic districts. Mr. Tissian noted his objection to all murals in historic districts regardless of their theme or location. Mr. Sklaroff noted that the Commission does not regulate the content of any murals and that the application in question is for a non-contributing building. Mr. Perri objected to murals as a form of signage. He said that the Department of Licenses & Inspections and the Planning Commission have asked the Mural Arts Program to work together to establish guidelines for murals under the zoning code.

Ms. Harris argued that the proposed mural would not affect the architecture of the building. The wall is painted CMU and attracts graffiti.

*Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the mural. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 5 to 4. Mr. James, Mr. Perri, Mr. Rivera, and Mr. Tissian dissented.*

**128 South 19<sup>th</sup> Street**

Avram Hornick, Owner/Applicant

Date: 1921, Herman Wetherell, architect

Proposal: Ductwork and exhaust fan

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval the second ventilation scheme option, which routes ductwork out the rear of a one-story section, up the façade near the metal balconies in the middle section of the building, up to and across the roof, provided that the ductwork is painted to match the brick.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. This building stands at the northwest corner of 19<sup>th</sup> and Moravian Streets. Currently, the mushroom vent for the restaurant's kitchen protrudes from a first-floor opening. In response to neighbors' complaints and a violation notice from the Health Department, the owner of the restaurant wishes to move the vent to the roof of the building. Because he does not own the upper floors, the restaurant owner proposes installing ductwork on

the outside of the building to the roof. The plans show two options: the first routes the ductwork flat against the exterior wall of the main section of the building adjacent to the current opening up to and across the roof. The second routes the ductwork out the rear of a one-story section, around the metal balconies in the middle section of the building, and up to and across the roof.

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

### **1908-14 Delancey Street**

Albert and Rosa Esquenazi, Owners

Richard Wesley, Architect/Applicant

Date: c. 1880

Proposal: Side additions, front façade restoration

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the application, which proposes the construction of additions to the carriage house at 1912-1914 Delancey Street. Richard Wesley is the local architect. Isaac Broid, an internationally renowned Mexican architect, originally formulated the plans. The Commission approved the proposal in concept at its September 2003 meeting. This application for final approval complies with the conceptual approval.

The additions would extend out from the east façade into the side yard. The east façade is a stuccoed former party wall; a carriage house once stood to the east. An existing brick wall topped by a fence runs along the side yard at Delancey Street, obscuring the view of much of this facade. The additions to the carriage house would include a 2-story stair tower clad in slate nearest Delancey Street, a shallow 2-story glass and aluminum projection in the center of the façade, and a large 1-story glass and aluminum projection with rooftop terrace at the rear of the façade. The historic front façade would be restored.

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

### **2020 Chancellor Street**

Cary Borish, Owner

Neil Sandvold, Architect/Applicant

Date: 1880

Proposal: New windows – final approval

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Window Guideline.

Mr. Farnham presented the application. He explained that the Commission approved in concept the two-light casement windows for this 1880s carriage house at its September 2003 meeting. As the Committee requested, the architect has supplied additional information on the windows and is seeking their final approval.

*Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.*

### **100 Block of Quarry Street**

Ron Kushner, Applicant

Proposal: Regrade street, replace fence, add street lights

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval, provided a granite gutter matching the existing gutter is installed in the easternmost 50 feet of the block, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. The 100-block of Quarry Street runs from Front to Second Streets. It is paved with granite block and includes a central granite block gutter running from approximately the midpoint west to Second Street. The eastern end of the street is bordered by a parking lot with a chain-link fence to the north and vacant lots to the south. The developer of the properties began constructing five townhouses on the vacant lot to the south prior to the consideration of the Old City Historic District. In order to facilitate access to the five new garages on the south side, the developer proposes raising the street at this location to the same level as the sidewalk. The granite block will be removed, the street re-graded, and the block replaced. New concrete sidewalks and streetlights will be installed. On the north side, the developer proposes replacing the chain-link fence with a new eight-foot, metal picket fence.

Commission members thought it inappropriate to install a new central granite gutter in the eastern end of the street.

Richard Thom spoke in support of the proposal.

*Scott Wilds made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted. Joe James seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, with the exception of Norman Tissian, who abstained.*

Mr. Bumb left the meeting.

### **137 Elfreth's Alley**

Ronald Miller, Owner/Applicant

Date: 1789

Proposal: Legalize new roof and dormer alterations

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval the legalization of the asphalt shingle roof, subject to the complete restoration of the dormer, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 2.

Mr. Farnham presented the application, which proposes the legalization of roof work undertaken without a building permit. Initially, it also proposed work to, but not a restoration of, the dormer. After attending the Architectural Committee meeting, listening to the Committee's advice, and seeing a 1931 Historic American Buildings Survey drawing of his house, the owner has decided that he would like to undertake a complete restoration of his dormer. He would like to return it to its eighteenth-century appearance, rather than proceed with the rather crude work initially proposed. Since the Architectural Committee meeting, the owner developed a plan to fully restore the dormer, which the staff approved. Therefore, all that remains of this application is the legalization of the asphalt shingle roofing, which is not quite the correct color and is minimally visible.

*Vincent Riviera made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Warren Huff seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.*

### **327 Race Street**

Aris Kartoutsidis, Owner

Charles Datner, Architect/Applicant

Date: c. 1830

Proposal: Legalize basement entrance

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Restoration Standard 7 and Storefronts Guideline.

The staff granted a 30-day continuance.

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

Chemical Heritage Foundation, Owner

Miriam Schaefer, Applicant

Date: c. 1855

Proposal: Mural on side façade

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval in concept.

Mr. Farnham presented the application, which proposes a mural for the Chemical Heritage Foundation on a building on North 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. The mural would be added to a former party wall that has a painted stucco finish and faces a parking lot. If approved by the Commission, the Foundation will apply to the Mural Arts Program for the painting of a mural depicting the history of chemistry. The mural will educate the public about the history of chemistry in Philadelphia. It will not obscure any architectural details of the building.

David Perri explained, as he had during the discussion of the proposed mural on Spring Garden Street that the Department of Licenses & Inspections considers murals to be signage and has asked the Mural Arts Program to work with Planning and L&I to develop rules for murals. He said it would be considered non-commercial signage.

Norman Tissian thought that this was a much more highly visible location than the example on Spring Garden Street.

John Gallery thought that a policy should be established not to approve murals in historic districts. He expressed concerns about a mural near Independence National Historical Park.

Joe James asserted that the Commission needs to develop criteria for reviewing murals. He suggested that the applicant reapply with a more detailed application.

*Norman Tissian made a motion to deny the application, seconded by Warren Huff. Four voted in favor of the motion and four including the chairman voted against. The motion failed.*

*Scott Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee recommendation, which was seconded by James Brown. The motion again failed in a four to four vote.*

*Joe James made a motion to table the decision for a period not to exceed six months, which was seconded by Scott Wilds. The motion passed unanimously.*

### **241-43 Chestnut Street**

William Caton, Owner

Doug Seiler, Architect/Applicant

Date: 241: c. 1857, Stephen Button, architect; 243: c. 1897, Wilson Eyre, architect

Proposal: Rooftop addition, façade alterations

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Accessibility Guideline.

Mr. Farnham presented the application, which proposes additional pieces of the ongoing rehabilitation at 241-243 Chestnut Street. The Commission has reviewed and approved several aspects of this renovation during the past several months. This application includes three segments, labeled Areas A to C on Sheet C-1 of the plans.

The work labeled Area A consists of the construction of an addition on the terrace atop the 2-story addition that has been approved but not yet built at the rear of 243 Chestnut Street, along S. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. The U-shaped addition would include mechanical and storage rooms as well as roofs over the entrances to the terrace. The addition would connect to historic and new fabric and would be visible from S. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street.

The work labeled Area B consists of the installation of double-leaf doors, a transom, a bullet glass panel, and a sidewalk grate at the entrance to the apartment complex at 241 Chestnut. At its August 2003 meeting, the Commission approved the restoration of the westernmost bay of the storefront at 241 Chestnut Street to its original appearance. Since that meeting, the Board of Building Standards rejected the approved plan because of the existing concrete step at the entrance. This new proposal, which meets ADA requirements, stipulates the removal of the step and the addition of double-leaf door and second transom.

The work labeled Area C consists of the addition of a pool in the basement. The Commission's jurisdiction does not extend to the interior, but it may extend to the pool because a faulty design might lead to the accumulation of excessive moisture and the decay of the exterior.

The applicants assured the Commission that this would be the final application for this development project.

*James Brown made a motion to approve the Committee recommendation and the proposal. Norman Tissian seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.*

### **224 Market Street**

Scott Stein, Owner/Applicant

Date: c. 1920

Proposal: Storefront alterations

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval, provided that the wood and pressed metal portions of the storefront are painted, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Storefronts Guideline.

Mr. Farnham presented the application, which proposes the renovation of the two outer bays of the four-bay storefront at 224 Market Street. The pre-designation aluminum windows in the two inner bays will be replaced in the future.

At its February 2003 meeting, the Architectural Committee reviewed and recommended denial of a proposal for this storefront. The application was withdrawn before the Commission meeting. In July and August 2003, the Committee and Commission reviewed and denied a second proposal for this storefront. After that denial, the applicant illegally installed aluminum doors in the outer bays, removed and discarded a historic marble step in the east bay, and added emergency lights. In response to the illegal work, the Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a Stop Work/Cease Operations Order. The current proposal results from a series of negotiations with the staff following the cessation of all work at the site.

The proposal stipulates the replacement of the illegal aluminum doors with single-leaf wood doors that mimic the historic double-leaf doors. It also stipulates the restoration of the original transoms above the doors and the fluted pilasters flanking the doors. A marble step like that removed from the east doorway will be installed in the west doorway. The storefront cornice, which is now covered with plywood, will be uncovered and repaired or replaced.

Tod Barritz, the legal counsel for the applicant, noted that he agreed with the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

Warren Huff said that the application needed to be review by the Planning and Art Commissions.

A clarification was made that the new doors would look like the double doors but would operate as a single leaf door.

*Joe James made a motion to approve the Committee recommendation, which was seconded by Warren Huff and passed unanimously.*

## **Old Business**

### **149 South Hancock Street**

Redevelopment Authority, Owner

Joseph Pacitti, Applicant

Date: c. 1840

Proposal: Complete demolition, construction of 11-story building

The applicant has withdrawn the proposal.

### **6901 Germantown Avenue**

Dennis McCarthy, Owner/Applicant

Date: c. 1798; front porch added, c. 1860

Proposal: Legalize side porch enclosure and rear shed

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial of the porch enclosure, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9; Approval of the rear shed, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Dennis McCarthy, the applicant, accepted responsibility for working without a permit. He said that the work began as a repair, but that the realty office decided to enclose the porch because they needed more space.

Mr. Wilds thought that the infill was inappropriate.

*Scott Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee recommendation, which was seconded by Mr. Brown and passed unanimously.*

### **Report of the Committee on Historic Designation**

Mr. Sklaroff presented an overview of the deliberations on proposed Old City Historic District. He then asked if anyone from the public wished to speak on the proposed district.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance registered his objection to the failure of the Commission to abide by its published agendas. He noted that the discussion of the proposed district has twice been moved, at this meeting and the previous Commission meeting. He stated that he would save his comments on the proposed district itself until the December 2003 Commission meeting.

Richard Thom of the Old City Civic Association stated that his organization approves of the building classifications in the current draft of the inventory of the Old City Historic District nomination. He asked the Commission to address conceptual questions related to classification, but not to reopen the classifications of individual buildings. He contended that the Committee on Historic Designation had already diligently addressed questions related to individual buildings. In response to Mr. Thom, Mr. Sklaroff suggested that the Commission tour the proposed district before carefully evaluating the inventory. Mr. Gallery pointed out that the Committee had already toured the district and addressed questions related to individual buildings. Mr. Brown asserted that the Commission needs to examine the boundaries as well as the classifications.

Mr. Sklaroff directed the staff to arrange a tour of the proposed district for Commission members. Mr. Rivera asked if lunch would be provided.

### **Report of the Historical Commission Staff, October 2003, Richard Tyler**

Commission members did not have any questions for Mr. Tyler regarding the report of the activities of the Historical Commission staff.

### **Harry A. Batten Memorial Fund**

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to approve the expenditure of \$27.79 for the Architectural Committee lunches.

*Mr. Tissian made a motion to approve the Batten Fund expenditure of \$27.79. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.*

The meeting adjourned at 12:30pm to an executive session.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist  
Jonathan Farnham, Historic Preservation Planner  
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner

As corrected 12/18/03