

**THE MINUTES OF THE 472nd STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
14 December 2001, 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
Thomas Kilkenny
David Perri, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections
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
Mark Zecca, Senior Attorney, Law Department

Also

Christian A. Busch, The Sullivan Company
Chariss McAfee, Loomis McAfee Architects
Marty Jacobson, Forman Signs
Brett Webber, Brett Webber Architects PC
Miriam and Diane Pastor, 313 South Lawrence Court
Daniel Neducsin, Neducsin Properties
Reese Browne, Representing Charles and Lillian Messick
Ray Hewitt, Radisson Plaza-Warwick Hotel
Rand Baldwin, Radisson Plaza-Warwick Hotel
Michael Hauptman, Brawer and Hauptman Architects
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association
David Amburn, Amburn/Jarosinski Architects
Gregory Wright, 1717 Spring Garden Street
Frank Kakos, Frank Kakos Architects
Ronald Patterson, Esquire, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers
Valerie Rogers, Grid Signs
Sylvia Palms
Vern Lei, T.C. Lei & Associates
Andreas Bacher

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 471st 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 471st Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held on 9 November 2001, James Cuorato, Acting Chair.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 27 November 2001, Herbert Levy, FAIA, Vice-Chair.

237 South 18th Street, Unit 21B, The Barclay

Steven Wolfson, Owner

Christian Busch, Architect

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

PROPOSAL: New French doors and balcony in light court

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

The proposal calls for installing a balcony on the west façade within the lightcourt. The plans show removing the metal casement windows and cutting the brick down to install new French doors. The staff recommended denial per Standards 2 & 9. An earlier balcony application produced a compromise precedent of allowing a balcony situated behind the fire balcony.

Mr. Sklaroff questioned the removal of historic fabric and the changing the contour of the building. However, the plans show that only the masonry below the sill will be removed.

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

330 South 24th Street

Ken Kalfus and Inga Saffron, Owners

Chariss McAfee, Architect

DATE: c. 1845, altered c. 1870

PROPOSAL: Alter roof and first floor windows

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the roof and window frames working with the staff for their design, but denial of the first floor window alterations.

The proposal involves alterations to the first floor windows, installing a flower box and shorter sash to hide the raised countertop in the kitchen. The applicant seeks to replace other window sash and frame moldings. However, the molding shown does not replicate an historic molding appropriate to the windows. On the fourth floor the application calls for recovering the roof in metal and altering the windows to a two-over-two pattern. The staff recommended approval of the metal roof and dormer windows as we do not have historic information on the mansard. The existing elements appear modern and the proposed elements appear compatible. However, the staff recommended denial of the first floor window alterations per Standard 2.

Chariss McAfee, the architect, attended the meeting. She stated that the façade was previously altered. The size of the existing sash has been changed and the lintels removed.

Mr. Wilds suggested leaving the existing opening and attach the flower box at a height which would conceal the kitchen elements. Mr. Rivera noted that the proportions of the window would change and thought an interior solution more appropriate.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion which carried with 6 votes. 3 members opposed the motion while two members abstained.

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 Committee recommended tabling the proposal owing to insufficient information about the proposed door.

The proposal returns to the Committee and Commission for the review of the garage door materials and details. The cutting of the opening for the garage received Historical Commission approval in 1997. The owner cut the opening in the last few months.

The applicant withdrew the proposal.

1920 Waverly Street, Ringgold Place

John and Barbara Ramb, Owners
Frank Kakos, Architect
DATE: 1862, Walter Allison, builder
PROPOSAL: HVAC at the third floor exterior, flower boxes

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the following:

- 1. Tying back the shutters;*
- 2. The window boxes, and*
- 3. HVAC in a location which minimizes visibility from the front and rear*
With the staff to review all details.
- 4. Denial of the raising of the roof.*

The proposal involves the installation of flower boxes and a rooftop air-conditioning unit. Most of the staff recommended approval; however, one staff member thought the unit could be hidden if tucked into the corner of the rear ell.

The applicant stated that the reason for raising the roof and sealing the vents is for insulation and keeping the rafters from rotting out.

Commission members believed that raising the roof would change the profile of the rowhouse.

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

1701 Locust Street, NW corner 17th Street, Warwick Hotel (Radisson)

AP/RAD Venture L.P., Owner

Barry Jacobson, Applicant

DATE: 1925-1928, Frank Hahn, Architect

PROPOSAL: Plaques, awnings and signage

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the signage, but the signs on the corners of the building should have equal vertical dimensions of gold colored metal and the parking sign should be moved off the quoin.

The proposal calls for installing new wall plaque signs at the corners of the building and on the marquee. These signs will feature gold and black backgrounds with push-through plastic letters. The applicants will replace a large back-lit parking sign on the northeast corner of the building with a much smaller back-lit sign. The staff recommended approval of the parking and marquee signs, but a redesign of the corner signage with a more traditional approach that does not include plastic or the shiny gold background per Standard 9.

Rand Baldwin, of Radisson Plaza Warwick Hotel, attended the meeting and noted that the parking signs would be moved off of the quoins of the building.

Mr. Sklaroff expressed his belief that the Commission and staff should not regulate sign design. Mr. Tissian questioned the Warwick name remaining on the signage.

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

2215 Rittenhouse Square Street

Peter Zambelli, Owner

Michael Hauptman, Architect

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Legalize aluminum windows, new door

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the fanlight transom and four-over-four windows per Standard 6 but approval of the door and marble sills of King of Prussia Marble with the staff to review details.

The proposal calls for legalizing four-over-four aluminum-clad sash. The owner installed them without a permit, against the specific advice of the Historical Commission staff and received a violation which includes the removal of the shutters. The owner has purchased a door with horizontal panels which he seeks to use as a front door. He also wishes to install an ornate Federal Style fanlight transom. All the original examples in the same row have a simple three-light transom. The staff recommended denial of the windows and transom per Standard 6, but approval of the door per Standard 6.

Michael Hauptman, the architect, and Peter Zambelli, the owner, attended the meeting. The applicant revised the drawings to reflect the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Zambelli noted that the only original features are the reveal moldings, sills and marble watertable. He proposes a gray marble without veining for the sills. In addition, the owner said that he had

not been given guidance on the window configuration and the proposed aluminum-clad material. He also expressed his dismay with the 6/6 windows.

Commission members questioned the approval of marble sills and raised the issue of the shutter removal. Mr. Baron stated the shutters are an integral part of the design of this building and that the first and third floor shutters show in the designation photographs as wood operating shutters. The second floor were vinyl non-operational shutters. Mr. James noted that the shutters were a feature of the designation and therefore should be a consideration of this proposal. Mr. Rivera said that the 4/4 windows and the fanlight transom change the character of the building. Members thought that since this proposal consists of various issues, each should be voted on individually. Commission members noted that staff should review all details.

1. The restoration of the shutters:
Mr. Tissian made a motion to require the restoration of the shutters. Mr. Huff seconded the motion which carried with 7 votes. 5 members opposed the motion.
2. The door replacement as proposed:
Mr. Sugrue made a motion to approve the proposed door. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.
3. The fanlight transom:
Mr. Tissian made a motion to approve the fanlight transom. Mr. Kilkenny seconded the motion which carried with 7 votes. 5 members opposed the motion.
4. The windows:
Mr. Wilds made a motion to deny the proposed 4/4 windows and require the restoration of the 6/6 wood windows. Mr. Sklaroff seconded the motion which carried unanimously.
5. The marble sills:
Mr. Tissian made a motion to approve the marble sills. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion which carried with 11 votes. 1 member opposed the motion.

1921 Walnut Street

Vern Lei, Owner/Architect

DATE: 1897, Cope and Stewardson, Architect

PROPOSAL: Cut new door and alter storefront

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal per Standards 4 and 9.

The proposal involves alterations to a former residence that received a storefront circa 1920. Plans call for removing the storefront window and three-part transom and installing a bronze aluminum storefront system. The new storefront will have a single-light transom, a new central doorway with stairs and flanking operable windows. The plans also show neon signage. The staff recommended denial per Standards 4 and 9. It recommends that the transom should be preserved.

Vern Lei, the owner, attended the meeting and presented revised drawings with the transom restored and wood operational windows and door. He said that future tenants would benefit from the additional entrance.

Commission members believed that floor plans of the interior configuration should be seen to better explain the need for an additional entrance. However, Mr. Sklaroff said that the

revitalization of the streetscape is important, but he thought an additional entrance may not be approved. Members thought the new proposal should be referred back to the Committee.

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

1929-39 Sansom Street, corner of 20th Street, Lucy Eaton Smith Residence

Project H.O.M.E., Owner

William Kramer, Architect

DATE: 1925, Arthur L. Harmon, Architect

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation, new doors and HVAC on roof

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the following:

- 1. Placement of the HVAC eastward on the roof;*
- 2. Flush metal doors in the alley;*
- 3. Handicapped accessible door on 20th Street, and*
- 4. Approval of the main entrance door as submitted unless historic documentation reveals the original configuration. At that time the staff can approve a replication of the historic door. With the staff to review details.*

This proposal includes new storefront doors on 20th Street, a new door on Sansom Street and HVAC units on the roof of the building. The staff recommended approval of the proposed door on the Sansom Street façade, approval of storefront doors on 20th Street with sidelights and mullions with a thinner profile. The staff asked for more details concerning the HVAC units on the roof.

The main entrance approval was subject to documentation of the infill's date. An architectural plan dated reveals that the entrance infill was a later alteration; therefore the entrance can be approved as submitted.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation which includes the main entrance as submitted. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

City Hall, Broad and Market Streets

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Sheth Jones, Capital Program, Applicant

DATE: 1871-1901, John McArthur Jr., Architect

PROPOSAL: Install ballards around perimeter

The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

This proposal calls for increasing security at City Hall by installing bollards around the perimeter of the building apron. The design will match existing bollards on the property. The staff recommended approval per Standard 9.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion which carried with 11 votes. Mr. James abstained from the motion.

1717 Spring Garden Street

Gregory Wright, Owner/Applicant
DATE: 1878, Charles W. Budd, builder
PROPOSAL: Rear ramp

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the project as submitted.

The owner proposes to install a handicap-access ramp on the visible rear of this property to serve the commercial space on the first floor. The weather-treated wood ramp will extend 35 feet into the rear yard. The staff recommended approval.

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

The Architectural Committee recommended denial per Standard 9.

These ornate houses have segmental-arch windows on the second floor and gothic-arched windows on the third floor. The owner wishes to install triple-track aluminum storm windows that have square heads. The remaining space within the window opening will have aluminum panning. A neighboring house has similar windows; however, the Commission did not approve them. The staff recommended denial per Standard 9.

Sylvia Palms, the owner, attended the meeting and argued in support of the proposed storm windows by citing conditions of neighboring houses and submitted new information including a petition from neighbors supporting the proposed windows. She stated that the cost for rebuilding the top sash would be prohibitive. In addition, she said that interior storm windows present a problem for the second floor windows, which have security bars; however, exterior storms would allow the removal of the bars. She also believes that the triple track does not reduce the size of the sash.

Staff emphasized that the Commission consistently required exterior storm windows to match the historic window in shape and color and location of the meeting rail.

Mr. Sklaroff noted that the cost factor is significant and might put an undue burden on the homeowner. Mr. Tissian questioned if the proposed storms are aesthetically appropriate.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion which failed with a 6 to 6 tie vote.

Mr. Zecca explained that a tie vote does not constitute an action on an application. He said that the Ordinance says that the Commission should determine whether it has an objection within 60 days of a complete application to the Commission. Where the Commission has no objection, Licenses and Inspections shall grant the permit subject to the requirements of the code. Some Commission members believed that an action should be taken on the matter. Mr. Sklaroff noted that if no action is taken within the 60 day period, the applicant could proceed with her proposal;

therefore, he asked that Commission members vote on this motion as they had on the previous motion.

Mr. James made a motion to table the proposal. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which failed with a 6 to 6 tie vote.

See attached letter to the applicant.

1735 Porter Street

Bernadette Mestichelli, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1906, James & John Windrim, Architects

PROPOSAL: Security doors

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the “Ornatube” design for the front and rear doors. The recommendation passed with three votes, one Committee member dissented.

The proposal calls for new ornate security doors on both the front and the visible rear door. The owner proposes a different bar pattern for each.

The staff recommended approval of new security doors because of the fact that the front door sits within a new addition, but not as proposed. The rear door should have simplified bars, such as #560-Ornatube, and the front door should be fully glazed without bars, such as #572-Ultra View.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to accept the Committee’s recommendation. Mr. Huff seconded the motion which carried with 11 votes. Mr. Sklaroff abstained from the vote.

4129-4135 Main Street

Daniel Neducsin, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1845

PROPOSAL: Demolish facades, new construction

The Architectural Committee approved the following:

- 1. The complete replacement of the facades in stone and stucco to match the original;*
- 2. Maintaining the doors and steps;*
- 3. Wood true divided light windows in the upper floors to match the original;*
- 4. First floor window widened and lowered slightly, and*
- 5. Roof rebuilt maintaining the existing historic terraced facade heights.*

With the staff to review all details.

The proposal involves the complete demolition of the two historic facades at 4129 and 4135 Main Street. The plans propose constructing new facades that do not match the historic facades. They do not have doorways and they show large first floor store windows specifically denied by the Historical Commission. The Commission had previously approved a plan to allow a structure to be constructed behind the historic facades. This proposal abandons that earlier concept and approval. The staff recommended denial per Standards 2 and 9.

Ronald Patterson, Esq., attorney for the project, David Amburn, the architect, and Daniel Neducsin, the owner, attended the meeting. The applicant presented revised drawings which reflected the Architectural Committee’s recommendation. Mr. Amburn stated that upon the removal of the stucco on the outside and the plaster on the interior a rubble material was found. He said that based on the findings, a steel structure is not a viable way to proceed. He also noted that the scale of Main Street is preserved as well as the original openings and that the parapet is

higher than the cornice, the center section different with the use of the same materials for the return walls.

Mr. Wilds questioned the rebuilding in stone rather than CMU, since the material would stuccoed. Mr. Rivera stated that schist would give the stucco a rough texture, but the CMU wall would be very smooth.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to approve the steel and masonry building. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

When it was determined that the motion as presented would require schist construction, Mr. Sklaroff asked that the motion be rescinded.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to rescind the previous motion and approve the revised proposal as submitted. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion which carried with 11 votes. Mr. Rivera opposed the motion.

313 South Lawrence Court

Ira and Diane Pastor, Owners

Brett Webber, Architect

DATE: 1970, Bower & Fradley, Architects

PROPOSAL: Fourth floor additions

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of a modified proposal with the side window heightened and widened into a single glazed unit and the front glazing and cornice drawn to visually float free of the end walls. With the staff to review details.

This is one of a series of houses encircling Lawrence Court. The original design for this gateway building included setbacks on both the eastern and western facades, at the fourth floor. The owners propose to extend the fourth floor to the full footprint of the building, as on the lower floors, eliminating the designed voids. The western end includes a designed opening in the parapet wall to emphasize the fourth floor deck.

Brett Webber, the architect, attended the meeting and stated that he proposes single panels for full height with reveals between them on the east and the west and a continuous zinc roof for a higher degree of refinement.

Mr. Sklaroff said in the case of a living architect, he thought it appropriate to receive a commentary from the architect about the proposed changes. Mr. Huff believed the changes are in keeping with the period in which it was built.

Mr. Huff made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion which carried with 11 votes. Mr. Sklaroff opposed the motion.

Mr. Cuaroto delegated Mr. Sklaroff acting chair.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to approve Mr. Sklaroff's delegation to acting chair. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

312 Cypress Street

Kimberly and Andreas Bacher, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1797, Finnix Stretcher, house carpenter
PROPOSAL: Rear deck

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

This proposal calls for a rear deck built on an existing one-story rear addition. The proposal includes changing the 9/9 double-hung window into a multi-light door, without altering the size of the opening. The staff recommended approval per Standard 9 and 10.

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

415 South Perth Street

Charles and Lillian Messick, Owners/Applicants
DATE: c. 1840
PROPOSAL: Visible rear addition

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of a revised proposal with larger, continuous vertical-oriented windows, and lowering the new roof to retain the integrity of the half-gambrel.

This application calls for a rear addition on the third floor, with contemporary, horizontal fenestration. The house has a half-gambrel roofline, and the proposed addition would meet the historic roof at the ridgeline. The staff recommended approval of the addition with two changes: the roof line of the addition should be a shallow shed roof that starts below the historic ridgeline and the fenestration should have more vertical features.

Ms. Spina noted that the revised proposal elongated the windows but did not show continuous windows as the Committee requested. The plans do show a drop in the roofline as requested.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the revised proposal. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Mr. Sklaroff delegated Mr. Huff to acting chair, owing to his firm's involvement with the project.

1113-31 Market Street, Reading Terminal Headhouse

Headhouse Realty Associates, Owner
Valerie Rogers, Applicant
DATE: 1891-93, Frances Kimball and Wilson Brothers, Architects
PROPOSAL: Signage

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the sign with a brushed finish with the staff to review details.

This proposal calls for signage for the Verizon Wireless store. The signage matches the previously approved Dunkin Donuts sign in size, shape and overall appearance, as requested by the Committee and Commission. The staff recommended approval per Standard 9.

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

1113-31 Market Street, Reading Terminal Headhouse

Headhouse Realty Associates, Owner

Glenn Brown, Applicant

DATE: 1891-93, Frances Kimball and Wilson Brothers, Architects

PROPOSAL: Signage

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the sign with a brushed finish with the staff to review details.

This proposal calls for signage for the PNC Bank branch. The sign matches the previously approved Dunkin Donuts sign in size, shape and overall appearance, as requested by the Committee and Commission. The staff recommended approval per Standard 9.

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

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 \$18.45 for the Architectural Committee lunches.

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

Mr. Perri apprised the Commission of the Department of Licenses and Inspections budget proposal for the hiring of two inspectors to work out of the Historical Commission office which will expedite enforcement and response time for violations and related issues.

Lenore Millhollen, representing the Center City Residents' Association and Preservation Alliance, reiterated that the Association is in support of the hiring. Mr. Tissian also responded in support of the proposal.

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

The meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary