

**THE MINUTES OF THE 503rd MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

9 July 2004

City Council Caucus Room, 4th Floor, City Hall

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair

Duane Bumb, Commerce Department

Warren Huff, City Planning Commission

Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property

Kathleen Murray, Special Assistant, President of City Council

David Perri, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections

Denise Smyler, Esq.

Harris Steinberg, AIA

Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.

Norman Tissian

Jonathan Farnham, Historic Preservation Planner

Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary

Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner

Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Also

Jim O'Brien, Clemons Construction Company

Barbara Botting, 318 Lawrence Street

Jim Datz, 318 Lawrence Street

Gerry Gutierrez, Group G

John McGovern, 4111 Main Street

Samuel Weiner, Dov Properties, 1636 North 17th Street

Ian Cope, 1621 North Street

Stan Tang, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects

Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers LLP

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance

Robert Fitzpatrick, 1811 Spring Garden Street

Don Ventresca, Cornerstone Building Group

Coni Soifer

Perry Whidden, Gluckman Mayner Architects

David Amburn, Amburn/Jarosinski Architects

Richard DeMarco, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers LLP

Robert Hotes, DPK&A Architects

Gina Williams, Steven Singer Jewelers

Todd Strine, 421 Chestnut Street

Jay Tackett, AIA, Tackett & Company

Jim Karmolinski, AIA, Kelly Maiello Architects

Benjamin Nia, Matthew Millan Architects Incorporated

Lew M. Halas/Tantala Associates, Barclay Condominium

Lori Salgonicoff, Fairmount neighborhood, Fidelity Mutual Building

Craig Rosenfeld, Barclay Condominium
Joe Kelly, Barclay Condominium
George Assprung, J.J. White Incorporated
George Ross, Philadelphia Museum of Art
Dan Kopple, DPK&A Architects

503rd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 503rd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:10 a.m.

Minutes of the 502nd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Upon a motion made by Ms. Smyler and seconded by Mr. Sugrue, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the 502nd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, as corrected, held 11 June 2004, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 29 June 2004

Vincent Rivera, Chair

4111 Main Street

John McGovern, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Legalize altering storefront window and door

The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend approval of removing the storm door, but denial of the storefront and transom alterations, pursuant to Standard 6.

Ms. Spina explained that the owner altered the storefront window and door without a permit or Historical Commission approval. The storefront window originally had a two-light transom above a large, plate-glass window. After a vandal broke the window, the owner removed the transoms and installed a single, plate-glass window in the opening. At the entrance, the owner removed the aluminum storm door and aluminum covering the transom, and infilled the transom with a wood panel.

John McGovern, the owner, stated that he did not realize that the transoms were historic and that he wanted to enlarge the window. He noted that he has received support of the alterations from the tenant as well as from Councilman Michael Nutter. Mr. McGovern informed the Commission that he received approval from the State Historical & Museum Commission for the tax credits. Ms. Murray asked about transom prior to the alterations. Mr. McGovern responded that the transom contained an air-conditioning unit. Mr. Steinberg noted that the building originally was residential and had two double-hung windows at the first floor.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to accept recommendation. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which failed unanimously.

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

4113-25 Main Street

Daniel Neducsin, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 4113-15: c. 1930; 4119, 4121, 4123 & 4125: c. 1860s

PROPOSAL: Complete demolition of 4117-25, new construction of 4-story mixed use building, with infill construction at 4115 and rehabilitation of 4113

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposal, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.], Standard 3 [Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.], Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.] and Standard 10 [New additions and related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

The proposal calls for the rehabilitation of the power station at 4113 Main Street, infill construction at 4115 Main Street, complete demolition of 4117-25 Main Street, and the construction of a four-story building with a single commercial space on the first floor and residential units above. The rehabilitation of 4113 Main Street involves removing the brick panels below the steel windows and inserting plate-glass storefront windows.

The new four-story building will sit on the properties at 4115-25 and have a set back at the third and fourth floors. The design at 4115 consists of an aluminum curtain wall at the first floor and multi-light windows at the second floor. The rest of the new façade will mimic the historic buildings at the first two floors with storefront windows on the first floor and six-over-six double-hung windows on the upper floor. The upper floors will have stucco walls and one-over-one windows. The roof of the second floor will have a deck with an aluminum pergola and a metal railing. The entrance to the commercial space will be through what is now 4123 Main Street, with a double-leaf, fully-glazed door with sidelights set in a two-story bay.

The Station Street façade will have stucco with single-paned windows and a recessed balcony at the third floor with a standing-seam metal roof and a metal railing. The rear of the power station will have glass and metal panels in the garage door. The entrance to the residential units will be from this façade with a double-leaf, fully-glazed door.

Ms. Spina explained the project. Mr. Sklaroff emphasized that the real issues presented by this proposal are the demolition of historic fabric and the scale of the new construction. He noted that it is important to balance historic preservation with economic development. Mr. Sklaroff pointed out that the Manayunk Ordinance is very explicit with regards to scale and retention of facades, and that the Commission should give deference to City Council who authored the Ordinance.

Daniel Neducsin, the owner, David Amburn, the architect, and Carl Primavera, Esq., attended the meeting. Mr. Amburn explained that the proposed alterations will accommodate a single tenant. He said that the new construction would be set back 23 feet at the third and fourth floors, and engineering and cost studies established the need for the demolition, owing to the interior walls making it difficult to accommodate a single usage property. Mr. Neducsin said that Manayunk has a strong presence in retail furniture and believes that the proposed tenant will be an anchor for Main Street. Mr. Primavera cited Ligne Roset as a precedent for a similar demolition and new construction in the area. Ms. Spina

responded that the original design of the neighboring development was to incorporate the façades of the historic buildings. It was only after construction started and Mr. Neducsin returned with engineering reports to show that the facades were rendered unstable that the Commission approved the complete demolition of the properties. Additionally, the Commission did not approve most of the demolitions in Manayunk, many were granted on appeals to the Board of License and Inspection Review.

Mr. Steinberg asked if the proposal has received support from the Manayunk Development Corporation. Mr. Neducsin responded in the affirmative. Mr. Steinberg thought that the rebuilt portions of the project should receive a more contemporary design. Mr. Bumb interjected the Commission's view on facadectomy. Mr. James commented that the scale of Main Street should be maintained. He thought that a single front façade, with symmetry and a uniformed design, would be more appropriate. Mr. Steinberg concurred. He believes that there is merit to the development, but expressed his concerns about the loss of historic fabric and the importance of instituting the best architectural expression for the project.

Kevin Smith, president of the Manayunk Neighborhood Council, speaking on its behalf, said that there is no strong attachment to the houses which are to be demolished. He emphasized that the historic character of Main Street should not be eroded with blank stucco facades such as the Ligne Roset. Mr. Smith also disagreed with Mr. Steinberg about the contemporary design, which would give the strip mall appearance. He supports the project with a re-designed façade.

Councilman Michael Nutter offered his support for the project. He remarked that the Ordinance should be reviewed periodically by City Council to relate it to the cumulative effects of what happens overtime. He noted that the proposed area for the development is a challenging portion of Main Street, owing to the lack of activity. Mr. Nutter believes that the project is sensitive to the historical nature of Main Street and will not destroy its historical components. He committed himself to becoming versed in historical issues and districts to fully re-examine the Ordinance and return to the Commission with findings and action with regards to the 4th District and Manayunk.

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance, thought that all the arguments for the demolition in this project relate to financial hardship, which has its own procedural process. He believes that the application should be denied and referred the Committee on Financial Hardship, rather than give conceptual approval. Mr. Gallery offered his support of the design issues, since it is important to maintain the elements of the scale and character and not create a strip mall on Main Street. Mr. Tyler disclosed that Manayunk was not designated under the Preservation Ordinance; therefore, it cannot receive hardship relief under the Historic Preservation Ordinance.

Mr. Sklaroff asserted that two significant issues arise: the massing of the residential segment at the rear and the question of the treatment of the historic buildings on Main Street. Mr. Gallery remarked that economic development should be of a lower priority for the Commission than preservation. Mr. Sklaroff contended that historic preservation, which is the revitalization and restoration of historic fabric, will restore activity to this part of Manayunk.

Ms. Smyler made a motion to approve in concept the demolition of 4117-25, on the condition that the owner returns with a revised design that retains the boiler plant but does not give a false historical impression for the remainder. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Steinberg abstained.

1030-32 Spruce Street

Michael Carosella, Owner

David Amburn, Architect

DATE: 1030: c. 1840, George Witman, bricklayer

1032: between 1832 and 1840, George Witman, bricklayer

PROPOSAL: Alter window openings, rear addition between buildings, entrance ramps, elevator tower

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]

The fire that destroyed the building next door also severely damaged these two buildings on the interior. The work involves the rears and includes installing an elevator tower on 1032, cutting all of the windows for balconies in the piazzas, and an addition that would link the rear ells at the second and third floors. The addition has a bank of windows with fully-glazed, single-leaf doors at each end leading out to balconies with metal railings. The historic piazza areas would be kept, including the curved portion of 1030. Handicap-access ramps would be installed at the first floor. The ground will be excavated at the basement level and new fully-glazed doors will be cut leading to a courtyard area.

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

1034 Spruce Street

Central Apartments, LLC

Jim O'Brien, Applicant

DATE: between 1832 and 1840, George Witman, bricklayer; façade alterations and metal bays added, c. 1890s; complete demolition after major fire, 2003

PROPOSAL: Construct 7-story, multi-unit building on vacant lot

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, with the red brick extending up the entire façade.

The Historical Commission individually designated 1034 Spruce Street in April 1973. After a severe fire last year, the Department of Licenses & Inspections declared the building imminently dangerous and had it demolished.

The owners wish to build a seven-story, multi-unit contemporary building. The building will have red brick panel-facing up to the 5th floor and then white or tan brick panels at the upper two stories. At the corner of 11th and Spruce there will be a storefront with a door angled to the corner and large, plate-glass windows. The main entrance to the residential units will be in the middle, along 11th Street, with a large, double-leaf door with sidelights. The upper floors will have vertical lines of projecting metal bays.

Richard DeMarco, Esq., Jim O'Brien, contractor for the project, and Stan Tang, the architect, attended the meeting. Ms. Spina described the proposed new construction. Mr. DeMarco said that he has been working with the Washington Square West Civic Association and the Clinton Street neighbors on the design.

Mr. Steinberg remarked that the previous building's windows at the party wall had a subtle detail; he thought that this detail should be replicated. Mr. Tang noted that the building speaks for itself and that

the floor heights do not match the original. Mr. Tissian expressed concern about parking. It was noted that there will not be on-site parking, but provisions for parking at a nearby lot.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance thought that the design should be modified and presented photographs of nearby buildings. He pointed out that some buildings are significant and contributing by future if their design. Mr. Gallery concluded that the façade should be red brick entirely; the boxed bays should be changed to angled bays; and that the 10th Street elevation should have bays in every room, since the bays give a distinctive scale to the building.

Mr. Tyler thought that the proposal should be approved as submitted, owing to the pending application for rescission of the designation because the resource is gone.

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

117-21 Chestnut Street

Michael Samschick, Owner

Stephan Potts, Applicant

DATE: c. 1840 with alterations c. 1885 and c. 1910

PROPOSAL: Rooftop addition, new windows and door

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]

The applicant withdrew the proposal.

318 North Lawrence Street

Jim Datz and Barbara Botting, Owners

Gerry Gutierrez, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1920, declared Imminently Dangerous by L&I June 2004

PROPOSAL: Construct 3-story residence

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, with a metal panel system at the third story, with the staff and Committee to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]

An application to demolish the vacant one-story building and construct a 3-story single-family residence on this site was reviewed by the Architectural Committee in February 2004. The Committee recommended denial of the project owing to the demolition of the building, which is listed as Contributing to the Old City Historic District. The Committee suggested that the applicant file a financial hardship application to justify the demolition. The applicant withdrew the proposal prior to its review by the Commission.

Since that aborted review, an inspector from the Department of Licenses & Inspections examined the building and declared it Imminently Dangerous because of severe structural problems that might lead to a

collapse onto the sidewalk and street. Therefore, the staff can approve a demolition permit because of the threat to public safety. Despite the demolition, the Commission retains full jurisdiction over the new construction.

The first story of the new building would evoke the historic building that stood on the site. It would be faced with brick and include a garage on Wood Street. It would require the extension of the chimney on the neighboring house to the south. The owner of that property has consented to the alteration and will join in the permit application. The Old City Civic Association wholeheartedly supports the project.

Gerry Gutierrez, the architect, attended the meeting and submitted a letter from the neighbor to the south, giving authorization for the extension of the chimney.

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

421 Chestnut Street

421 Chestnut Street Partners

Michael Euker, Applicant

DATE: 1857-1859, John M. Gries, architect; penthouse, 1903, Theophilus Chandler, architect

PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing penthouse, construction of 6th floor addition, cut new windows, replace windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the front façade window replacement; approval of the penthouse, provided it is set back; approval of the deck, provided the railing is all glass and is set back 2' from the front parapet; approval of the five northernmost 5th-story windows on the west façade but denial of the two southernmost; denial of the sunscreen as proposed; with staff to review details; pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

This application proposes alterations and additions to the Bank of Pennsylvania building, a highly significant building on Bank Row in the Old City Historic District by important architect John Gries. It proposes the replacement of windows on the front façade with historically appropriate windows; the demolition of a penthouse and several skylights; the construction of a penthouse with deck; and the addition of windows in new openings at the west facade.

The proposal calls for the demolition of a penthouse added by prominent architect T.P. Chandler in 1903 and the construction of a new penthouse. The penthouse would consist of frameless glass and metal panels. It would open onto a deck at the front of the building. The deck would be surrounded by a glass and aluminum railing and shaded by an aluminum sun screen. The building has little or no parapet wall at the roofline; therefore, the railing would be visible at every point except the center of the front façade, where the façade peaks. The addition would likewise be visible from the south, east, and west including Independence National Historical Park.

Windows in new openings would be added at the top floor of the west wall of the historic building. They would be visible from the west including Independence National Historical Park.

Mr. Farnham introduced the application. Architect Jay Tackett and developer Todd Strine represented the project. Mr. Tackett presented an overview of the project. He objected that his client wanted to install "French windows" in the historic front façade, but the staff had insisted at the Architectural Committee

meeting that he install one-over-one windows. Mr. Farnham noted that Mr. Tackett had not attended the Architectural Committee meeting and that there had been no discussion of the front windows at that meeting. He added that, based on two nineteenth-century images of the building from commercial panoramas, the staff would approve of either the four-over-four casement-like windows, referred to by Mr. Tackett as the “French windows,” or the one-over-one windows shown on the applicant’s drawings. Mr. Tackett withdrew his objection.

Mr. Tackett displayed renderings of the design submitted to the Architectural Committee and a design that incorporated the Committee’s recommendations. He described the penthouse addition as a “modest glass box.” He stated that his client was willing to accept the Architectural Committee’s recommendation to move the deck railing back two feet from the parapet and to remove the sunscreen. He further stated that his client was not willing to accept the Committee’s more significant recommendations: to set back the west façade of the penthouse and to forego the two southernmost windows on the west façade at the 5th story. He contended that the differences between the views of the two designs, one proposed by the applicant and the other recommended by the Committee, would be “minor.” Mr. Sugrue agreed that the views of the penthouse with and without the setback would not differ significantly. Mr. Steinberg disagreed strenuously with Mr. Sugrue, stating that the larger penthouse would greatly compromise the scale and massing of the historic building. He noted that the developer based his argument for the larger penthouse on economics and asserted that any case predicated on economics should be reviewed by the Hardship Committee.

Mr. Huff reminded the applicant that this project must be reviewed by the City Planning Commission.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance reported that the Alliance holds an easement on the property. He stated that the Alliance would not approve the project. He asserted that the applicant had provided insufficient information for a complete review of the project. He contended that floor plans should have been submitted for a thorough evaluation of the need for the windows at the 5th floor. He also argued that the penthouse should be compatible and sympathetic with the historic building, not remarkably different from it. He objected to the removal of historic fabric and stated that the National Park Service should have an opportunity to comment on the application. He suggested that the Commission table or deny the application. Mr. Steinberg agreed that the lack of complete floor plans rendered the application difficult to assess.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Perri if the Department of Licenses & Inspections takes note of easements when reviewing permit applications. Mr. Perri replied that it does not. He added that if an applicant submits an application without the agreement of all owners, then L&I would consider it a false application.

Mr. Strine, the developer, noted that he had met with representatives of the Alliance as well as Mr. Baron of the Commission staff. He stated that he is a lawyer and had read the easement agreement. He highlighted the clause in the agreement that states that the Alliance’s approval will not be “unreasonably withheld.” Mr. Sugrue asked the applicant if he was willing to withdraw his application. Mr. Sklaroff asked the applicant if he was willing to have his application tabled. Mr. Strine replied that he would accept tabling if the Commission was not willing to approve it. He added that he preferred a final decision and would be willing to reopen discussions with the Alliance.

Mr. Tissian asked the applicant to redesign the penthouse. Mr. Strine answered that he was unwilling to redesign it. Mr. Bumb reminded the applicant that he could submit an updated design to the Commission for a later review. Mr. Strine rejected the offer. Mr. James reminded his fellow Commissioners that the

Committee's recommendation did not address all of Mr. Gallery's significant concerns.

Mr. James moved to accept the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 1; Mr. Steinberg opposed.

739 Walnut Street

Danad, Incorporated

Gina Williams, Applicant

DATE: c. 1928, storefronts altered, 2001

PROPOSAL: Two banners

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the signs located within the two center panes of the window frame for a period not to exceed six (6) months.

The proposal calls for two banners on the building, one on Walnut Street and one on 8th Street. The banners measure nine feet by ten feet and would be attached on the inside of the building through the windows.

Gina Williams, the applicant, attended the meeting. Ms. Williams noted her willingness to comply with the Committee's recommendation, which would reduce the size of the banners by half and put time constraints on their allowance.

Mr. James thought that the application should return to the Architectural Committee owing to the lack of details about the banners. Mr. Perri disclosed that banners were installed without a permit in February but then removed. He stressed that the owner should have a letter drawn up by his attorney stating the banners, with zoning approval, will not exceed a six month period under penalty of a 300.00 a day fine after the time allowance. Mr. Warren informed the applicant that the Art Commission and the Planning Commission also have jurisdictional review.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to table the proposal for a period not to exceed six (6) months. Mr. James seconded the motion, which failed with 3 votes. Mr. Perri, Mr. Bumb, Mr. Steinberg, Ms. Smyler, Ms. Murray and Mr. Sklaroff opposed the motion.

Mr. Perri made a motion to approve two banners, set with the two central panes of the windows, subject to zoning approval, the receipt of a letter from the owner's attorney stating that the banners will be removed within six months under penalty of a \$300 a day fine. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which carried with 7 votes. Mr. James and Mr. Sugrue opposed the motion.

227 South 6th Street, Lippincott Building

Irv Green, Owner

Stephen Verner, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1900, William Prichett, architect

PROPOSAL: Alter Locust Walk entrance, install gate

The applicant withdrew the proposal.

238 Christian Street

Cornerstone Building Group, Owner

Don Ventresca, Applicant

DATE: c. 1819

PROPOSAL: Façade rehabilitation, garden wall demolition for parking on Bodine Street

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with metal capping and an asphalt shingle roof on the rear ell if enough slope exists, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.] and Standard 10 [New additions and related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

The owner proposes to rehabilitate the property, including the restoring of the front façade. However, the side and rear of the building is also visible. On the side, the house now has a non-historic one-story addition in the piazza and the owner wishes to remove the addition and replace it with another one-story addition for an entry vestibule. The very top of it would be visible over the garden wall. On the rear, the rear ell has a later addition, to which the owner would like to add a small balcony. Lastly, the proposal calls for cutting the non-historic CMU garden wall for parking. The sliding gate would be made of wood.

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

1811-17 Spring Garden Street

Metropolitan Regional Council Carpenters' Union

Anthony Rabutino, Applicant

DATE: 1925

PROPOSAL: Alter windows, entrance and façade details, install new canopy, install balustrade at grade and roof

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the windows, the balustrade at the base, the four pylons or lights, flags, door as proposed, and a simplified canopy. It recommended denial of the piers, Dryvit framing and the cornice with a balustrade at the roof, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.], Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old in design, texture, and where possible, materials.], Standard 7 [Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.] and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.].

Without referral to the Historical Commission, the Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a permit for alterations to the front of the Art Deco building. Work has started; the black granite has been removed from the base and the windows have been replaced with aluminum ones.

The proposal calls for covering the stone façade with coatings typically used for Dryvit. A new cornice with a balustrade will be installed along the roofline. A matching balustrade will also be installed along the base and will have four pylons or lights. The two balustrades will have a pseudo-Classical diamond

shape.

At the entrance, the proposal includes moving the recessed entry out to be flush with the face of the building. The new double-leaf doors have decorative cross designs and sidelights of similar dimensions. The new four-light transoms also have decorative muntins. Above the entrance the building now has a large panel of glass block flanked by black granite with decorative mosaic squares. The application calls for removing the granite and mosaics and installing piers with flagpoles. The plans do not specify the material of the piers. The same piers will also be installed at either end of the building. The simple canopy will be replaced by a substantial canopy with a hipped roof, modillioned entablature and columns.

Bob Fitzpatrick and Carl Primavera, Esq. attended the meeting.

Mr. Sugrue said that this building is a very early and unusual building for 1925 and believes that it should receive great care. Mr. Steinberg remarked that the proposed alterations are egregious and will reflect greatly on the union and its work. Mr. Sklaroff inquired about the architect, which is from Maryland and noted that this is an important building for the city and the Spring Garden neighborhood. He said that anything that is added to this building would be problematic; however, he believes that the applicant and Commission can come to sensitive compromise. Mr. Sklaroff said that since the Architectural Committee made a favorable recommendation, then the proposal could be tabled for dialogue between the Commission and the properties' representatives. Mr. James questioned the outside ornamental alterations. Mr. Primavera responded that the union wishes to personalize the building for its own uses and believes that the proposed alterations add value to the building.

Mr. Primavera asserted that the union has shown sensitivity to the neighborhood. He said that the proposed alterations are a strong sense of what the union wishes to accomplish, which is reflected in the plans for this public building to make private statement.

In conclusion, the original motion was withdrawn in the spirit of compromise and Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Steinberg, Mr. Rivera, Commission staff and representatives from the union to meet in order to reach a mutual compromise.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to table the proposal for a period not to exceed six (6) months. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

1620 North Street

Spring Garden Community Development Corporation, Owner

Ian Cope, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1886

PROPOSAL: Façade rehabilitation, partial demolition in rear, penthouse and roof deck additions

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with several conditions: the central opening at the second floor should be changed to double-leaf doors with glazing, the garage door should have a larger frame and the transom incorporated into the door itself, and the fence should be brought to the streetline, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9 and 10.

This proposal involves several parts. First, the front façade will be rehabilitated, with new, wood four-over-four windows, a four-panel front door and a cross-buck, overhead garage door. In the second floor opening that used to have doors, the proposal calls for a multi-light window. Second, the proposal calls

for moving two window openings on the west façade and re-installing the extant, wood, four-over-four windows. Third, there is a stuccoed penthouse addition leading to a roof deck. The penthouse is set back about 13 feet, but would be visible from North Street. In the area between this building and the new construction next door, the owner must install a PECO transformer at grade and proposes an eight-foot, metal picket fence for security.

Mr. Sklaroff remarked that the addition's thirteen foot setback is the moral equivalent of a rear ell. Ian Cope, the architect, attended the meeting to answer questions and explain the project.

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

1622-30 North Street

Spring Garden Community Development Corporation, Owner

Ian Cope, Architect/Applicant

PROPOSAL: New construction on vacant lots

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of this submission, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.] and Setting Guideline [Recommended: New work should be compatible with the historic character of the setting in terms of size, scale, design, material, color, and texture.].

This application is for seven new townhouses on vacant lots. The houses will have brick facing, with rustication at the first floor, and cast-stone door surrounds and lintels. All of the houses will have single-leaf, four-panel doors, but some will have sidelights as well as transoms. Four-over-four windows and multi-light single-leaf doors leading to balconettes are in the upper stories. Four of the houses have two-story, wood bays with four-over-four windows. The roofs of the properties will have a stuccoed penthouses leading to roof decks.

The 17th Street façade has similar detailing as the front. The southern portion has a roll-down garage door that leads to the alley for all of the houses and 1620 North Street. The alley is covered and on top there are decks for each house.

The south or rear elevations have stucco facades with multi-light doors leading to balconies and four-over-four windows.

Mr. Tissian inquired about the garage's location. Ian Cope, the architect, responded that the garage would be situated at the rear, with a common entrance on 17th Street.

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

636 North 17th Street

Aaron Weiner, Owner/Applicant

PROPOSAL: New construction on vacant lot

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of this project with the transom over the door of the

third floor east elevation, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.] and Setting Guideline [Recommended: New work should be compatible with the historic character of the setting in terms of size, scale, design, material, color, and texture.].

This proposal is for new construction at the southwest corner of 17th and North Streets. On a lot that used to have a single house, the application calls for two houses with garages. The houses will be oriented towards North Street with a central garden area. The main entrances will be from the garden area. The facades on 17th and North Streets will have brick facing, four-over-four windows and multi-light, double-leaf doors leading to balconettes. The garden area will have a metal garden fence at the street line. The facades that face the garden will be stucco with single-leaf doors, four-over-four windows and balconettes at the 3rd floor.

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

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

2501 Fairmount Avenue

Philadelphia Museum of Art, Owner

James Karmolinski, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1927, Zantzinger, Borie & Medary, architects

PROPOSAL: Partial demolition at rear, 3-story rear addition, façade rehabilitation

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, provided that the louvers are finished to match the surrounding windows, with staff to review the details of the exterior restoration work, pursuant to [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; Standard 3 [Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.]; Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.]; Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]; and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

This application proposes the demolition of a rear projection; the construction of a 60,000 square foot glass and masonry rear addition; the restoration of exterior envelope of the historic building; the addition of skylights; and the replacement of windows with louvers. The Preservation Alliance holds a façade easement on this property.

A relatively insignificant projection, which the applicant is calling a “knuckle,” would be demolished. It stands at the rear of the building and is not visible from the front along the Parkway, Pennsylvania Avenue, or Kelly Drive. The addition would be constructed at the rear, behind the wing of the historic building that runs along Fairmount Avenue. It would not be visible from the front, but would face onto

25th and Olive Streets. Olive Street is a very narrow street. Three rowhouses front onto this block at the east. The “back-of-house” facilities for the museum building would be located along Olive Street.

The proposal includes plans for the restoration of exterior envelope of the historic building such as the masonry, windows, and tile roof; the addition of skylights on the rear roof slopes; and the replacement of windows with louvers in the two towers. The skylights would not be visible from the front. The louvers would replace windows in original openings in the two towers. Some of the louvers would be visible from the front.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance informed the Commission that the Alliance holds an extensive easement on the property. He commented on the outstanding design and gave his support of the Architectural Committee’s recommendation.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee’s recommendation. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

1514 Waverly Street

Hugh and Eleanor Zimmers, Owners

Liz Zimmers, Applicant

DATE: c. 1880

PROPOSAL: Demolish 1-story stair tower, erect rooftop addition, reopen infilled windows

The applicant withdrew the proposal.

1518 and 1520 Latimer Street

Owner: Gold Street Financial & DuBar Development Partners

Applicant: Liz Zimmers

History: c. 1885

Project: Alter façades, construct rooftop addition and decks, construct 3-story rear addition

The applicant requested a thirty (30) day continuance.

1530 Spruce Street

Owner: Al Shapiro

Applicant: Michael DelRossi, Jr.

History: 1898, Thomas Bennett, architect

Project: Replace wood windows with aluminum windows

The applicant withdrew the application.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff and left the meeting.

1913 Spruce Street

Owner: Dan Nasser & Caren Cohen

Applicant: Benjamin Nia, Matthew Millan Architects, Inc.

History: c. 1875

Project: Façade rehabilitation, rear roof deck and alterations

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval, with staff to review details, especially the windows and cornice, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]; and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

This application proposes window replacement throughout the building, sliding glass door replacement at the rear, changes to four window openings at the rear, infilling of basement windows at the rear, masonry restoration, repair or replacement of the front cornice, the addition of a roof deck with small stair tower on the rear ell, and the replacement of the garage door. No details of the front cornice repair or replacement have been provided. The alterations at the rear including the window infill, changes to window openings, and stair tower and deck addition would be minimally visible or invisible from Manning Street, which runs along the rear of the property.

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

237 S. 18th Street, The Barclay

Owner: The Barclay Condominium Association

Applicant: Albert Tantala

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

Project: Legalize vents and alarms on east façade of building

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the legalization, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

This application proposes the legalization of several vents and a large metal box containing overflow alarms added to the east façade of the Barclay along Bouvier Street, also known as Mozart Place. The Historical Commission approved and the Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a permit for related interior work, but not this exterior work. The permit application stated "Interior non-structural alterations" and was stamped "No Changes to Exterior" by the Commission staff. In addition, all exterior work was crossed out with large Xs on the Commission-approved plans used to obtain the interior-only permit. Nonetheless, the exterior work was undertaken.

The vents and alarm box are highly visible from public rights-of-way. Their installation damaged the limestone façade of the building.

The Commission recently reviewed and approved a sensitive proposal for venting on the same façade for the restaurant under construction in the Barclay. That approved application is unrelated to this current legalization application.

Craig Rosenfeld, Esq., acknowledged that the work undertaken exceeded the scope of the permit. He offered a revised submission to the Commission. Mr. Sklaroff suggested referring the new submission to the Architectural Committee for review.

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

271 S. Van Pelt Street

Owner/Applicant: John Morris

History: c. 1870; modified c. 1970

Project: Install garage door and metal grille, replace brick sidewalk

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

This application proposes the addition of a garage door and a metal security grate in existing openings in this much modified carriage house at 271 S. Van Pelt Street. It also proposes the replication of the extant brick sidewalk.

The garage door depicted in the elevation drawing is oddly configured and proportioned. The staff should review shop drawings of the door.

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

NATIONAL REGISTER COMMENT

700-34 Schuylkill Avenue, Marine Corps Depot of Supplies, Schuylkill Warehouse

Although not an obvious candidate for the National Register, this property meets criterion A: a linkage with logistics and manufacturing, a cliché in the interpretation of Allied victory in World War II. It is also a linkage with Philadelphia as a primarily industrial city and its variegated transportation facilities. Criterion C: Eugene A. Stopper, a prolific architect of industrial, commercial and institutional buildings from telephone exchange buildings through banks, factories and stores to gas stations.

Mr. Bumb questioned the ownership of this property and it was determined that the building is owned by the School District of Philadelphia.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to recommend the entry of this property to the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

3637 Locust Walk, University of Pennsylvania Campus, St. Anthony Hall House

The property was designated by the Philadelphia Historical Commission last December. As a work of Cope & Stewardson, a major contributor to and definer of the architecture of the University, it clearly meets criterion C. The development of the fraternity system and houses in American universities and at Penn reflects criterion A.

Mr. Tyler commented on the nomination's referral to Collegiate Gothic Jacobean Revival architecture, which is an unheard of type of architecture; therefore he believes that the nomination should be edited.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to recommend the entry of this property to the National Register of Historic Places, subject to the editing of the nomination. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

THE REPORT on the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, June 2004

Mr. Tyler asked if members of the Commission had any questions about the report. They had none.

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to approve the expenditure of \$30.45 for the Architectural Committee lunches.

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

Mr. Bumb made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned 12:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary

As corrected 8/13/04