

**THE MINUTES OF THE 530TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**13 OCTOBER 2006
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18029
MICHAEL SKLAROFF, ESQ., CHAIR**

PRESENT

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
James Brown IV
Joseph James, Department of Public Property
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Kathleen Murray, Office of the City Council President
David Perri, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Vincent Rivera, AIA
David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing & Community Development

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Eric Cote, Historic Preservation Planner
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Jonathan Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician
Leonard Reuter, Assistant City Solicitor, Law Department

ALSO PRESENT

David Searles, Dagit Saylor
Peter Saylor, Dagit Saylor
John Gallery Preservation Alliance
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
Ingrid Hyder, East Falls
Stephen DeVito, East Falls
Arlene Matzkin, Spruce Hill
Kevin Maurer, Overbrook Farms
Jay Tackett, Tackett & Company
Lynn Blahusch, C.B. Development Services, Inc.
Bill Steedle, Graboyes Window Company
Terry Graboyes, Graboyes Window Company
Jeff Barr, JRB Historic Restoration
Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Amy Johnston, Mural Arts Program
Aisha Richardson, Uptown Entertainment Development Corporation

530TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 530th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Sklaroff, Brown, James, Merriman, Murray, Perri, Rivera, Schaaf, Sugrue, and Wilds were in attendance.

Chairman Sklaroff eulogized the late Norman Tissian, who served on the Commission from 2000 to September 2006. He also announced Harris Steinberg's resignation from the Commission.

MINUTES OF THE 529TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Upon a motion proffered by Mr. Sugrue and seconded by Mr. Rivera, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes as corrected of the 529th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 8 September 2006.

DISCUSSION OF THE DESIGNATION OF HISTORIC DISTRICTS

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Farnham to update the Commission on the designation of historic districts. Mr. Farnham stated that the Commission has five nominations for proposed districts pending: Spruce Hill, which was submitted in 2002, Overbrook Farms in 2004, East Falls in 2005, Parkside in July 2006, and Awbury Arboretum in September 2006. He stated that the five proposed districts contain 3,035 properties; currently, there are 10,700 properties on the Register. He explained that, with the current staff, his staff would neither be able to administer the five district nomination considerations nor review the subsequent applications. Mr. Farnham stated that each reviewer on the staff will process approximately 385 applications in 2006, about 30 more than the decade average. If the five districts were designated, that number would jump to approximately 495, which is infeasible with the current staff. Mr. Farnham posited that the time limits established for reviews by the ordinance would not be met and deemed approvals would be unavoidable.

Mr. Sklaroff asked about the open Preservation Planner position. Mr. Farnham stated that he will interview a qualified candidate next week.

Ms. Murray commented that the staffing and delayed designation situation was not new; the designations of other districts had been delayed in the past, owing to the staff shortages. She cited Girard Estates as an example. Mr. Sklaroff responded, stating that the Commission does not take its responsibilities lightly. He contended that it would be irresponsible of the Commission to designate a district without having a sufficient staff in place to properly protect it. Mr. Brown opined that the failure to designate promptly was a disservice to the city. He suggested that personnel from other City departments might help during this staff shortage. Mr. Sklaroff responded that every possibility is being discussed. He praised the support of the Department of Public Property. Ms. Murray stated that the budget hearings for FY2008 will begin in February 2007. She encouraged the public to voice its opinions on this issue. Mr. Sugrue added that, given the significant constraints, the staff does an extraordinary job despite being underpaid and overworked. He asserted that staffing is a serious structural problem that the Commission must continue to address.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Commission was merely fabricating excuses rather than confronting the issue. He suggested that the Commission give more authority to the staff to approve applications, thereby streamlining the review process. He claimed that many routine applications are referred to the Architectural Committee and the Commission, wasting staff time. Mr. Gallery then suggested that the Commission clarify its policy on reviewing district designations; would Richard Tyler's first-come, first-serve policy be maintained? Mr. Gallery asserted that his

Parkside and Arboretum nominations would not be reviewed for years if the policy was maintained; by the time they are reviewed, they will be out-of-date and thousands of dollars will have been wasted. He also pointed out that the Commission was still encouraging neighborhoods to submit district nominations despite the de facto moratorium. Mr. Gallery asked the Commission why they were encouraging these neighborhoods to spend tens of thousands of dollars to prepare the nominations if it has neither the intent nor capacity to process with them. He asked why the Commission has not lobbied the Mayor for additional money for staff. He suggested that the Commissioners picket the Mayor's office with signs, demanding more funding. He demanded that the Commission take a public stand on the funding issue. Mr. Gallery requested a specific plan and offered the support of community groups for additional funding.

Mr. Wilds responded to Mr. Gallery's question on the sequencing of the reviews of district nominations; he asked if Mr. Gallery supported the review of nominations on a basis other than first-come, first-serve. Mr. Gallery suggested that the community groups should decide this issue, but he did state that there was merit to the first-come, first-serve policy. Mr. Gallery noted that it was unusual to have five pending nominations at one time. He opined that it may be reasonable to process the smaller, simpler district nominations first. Mr. Gallery asked the Commission to hire consultants directed by the staff to review the Spruce Hill nomination. Mr. Gallery remarked that the City should increase the Commission's Class 200 budget to hire consultants to review the more complicated nominations. Several Commissioners including Mr. Sugrue noted that the processing of nominations is not the stumbling block; the review of applications generated by the new designations presents the real difficulty. The Commission cannot hire consultants to review the applications. Mr. Gallery accepted this statement. He then suggested that the East Falls and Parkside districts would not produce many applications. He then suggested that Mr. Perri have the Department of Licenses & Inspections develop data on the number of building permit applications submitted for the proposed districts.

Ingrid Hyder, who helped prepare the East Falls nomination, echoed Mr. Gallery and asked what the community groups could do to remedy this situation. Arlene Matzkin, speaking on behalf of Spruce Hill, also voiced concerns on the lack of movement on her neighborhood's nomination and offered to have her community group raise funds. Kevin Maurer, a representative of the Overbrook Farms Club, requested that the Commission process his neighborhood's nomination. He also commented that he would not be opposed to the Commission's processing of a nomination for a smaller district prior to the processing of his nomination. He requested that the Commission provide a firm timetable for the reviews. He remarked the Overbrook Farms was placed on the National Register 20 years ago. Mr. Maurer stated that his neighborhood is suffering from development by institutions. He stated that his community will lobby to protect its historic buildings.

Mr. Sklaroff again stated that the Commission should designate districts only if it can manage them faithfully, according to the ordinance. He explained that not only the new but also the existing districts would suffer if the Commission designated the proposed districts without sufficient staff. Mr. Sklaroff echoed Mr. Sugrue's statement that the staff is already stretched to its limit. Mr. Sklaroff reminded Mr. Gallery that the Commission, a City entity, must work within the City system; it can neither lobby the administration or City Council nor protest against its policies. He noted that, as private entities, the

Alliance and civic associations enjoy greater freedoms to express their opinions.

Mr. Perri suggested that the Commission could designate the new districts, but exercise limited jurisdiction within them, reducing the impact to the staff. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the Commission must apply its ordinance uniformly in all districts.

Mr. Gallery requested that the Commission report bimonthly on the status of the pending districts. Mr. Farnham replied that the staff already submits a monthly report to the Commission that includes information on district designation. He explained that the reports are available to the public. He noted that almost every report issued in the last 12 months contains information on the staff's district designation work.

Mr. Sklaroff thanked the representatives of the Preservation Alliance and civic associations for their comments and offered to continue the productive dialogue.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 SEPTEMBER 2006

Vincent Rivera, Chair

1906 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: 1906 Spruce Street L.P., Wayne Spilove

Applicant: Robert Thomas, architect

History: c. 1865, façade altered c. 1955. Contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler District

Project: Reconstruct altered ground floor with modifications

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, provided the pediment is situated in its historic location, the doorway is elongated, and a second transom is added. One member dissented and recommended approval of the proposal as submitted.

OVERVIEW: The Historical Commission approved an application for this property in May 2006. At that time, the applicant proposed to reconstruct the ground floor based on the historic design known from photographs. The application proposed elongating the door surround down to the sidewalk level, but not reconstructing the grand stair that originally dominated the façade. The stair was eliminated during a 1955 alteration, which dropped the interior floor to grade level. The Historical Commission voted to approve the application.

The applicant now proposes to deviate from the approved proposal. The previous application retained the pedimented door surround at its historic location and extended the pilasters down to the sidewalk. The current application proposes to drop the pedimented entrance surround to better respond to the existing height and proportions of the ground floor. It also proposes to maintain the windows at their historic height but with widened surrounds. Remnants of the brownstone façade survived underneath the modern granite façade and show the original location of the windows and doors. The proposed design for the ground floor would present a proportionally pleasing arrangement but one that never existed on this building.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Sklaroff recused, owing to his relationship with property owner, and passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue. Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect Robert Thomas represented the application.

Mr. Thomas stated that he had hoped to find original openings and materials when the 1950s façade was removed, but he found that very little had survived. He explained that most of the original brick and brimstone was lost. He stated that during the 1950s renovations the grand entrance stair was removed, the front doorway dropped, and an elevator was installed on the ground floor; the owner must retain the dropped entrance and elevator for ADA access. Mr. Thomas also explained that the historic doorway was very wide; he would like to install an out-swinging single-leaf door with sidelights. Mr. Thomas proposed restoring an original brownstone planter, which would provide protection from the out-swinging door. He noted that the fundamental question is whether to rebuild the brownstone pediment in its original location or at a lower point, which would allow the doorway to be proportioned appropriately.

Mr. Schaaf asked about the doorway heights at the neighboring properties. Mr. Thomas stated that the neighboring doorways are at various heights. Mr. Wilds noted that the Committee recommended leaving the pediment in its historic location and adding an extra transom. Mr. Baron reported that a small portion of the historic brownstone pediment has survived in place. This surviving remnant would have to be removed if the doorway was lowered. He noted that the historic relationship of the door to the windows would also be lost.

FAILED MOTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal, provided the pediment is situated in its historic location, the doorway is elongated, and a second transom is added. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which failed with a vote of 4 to 5. Ms. Merriman and Murray and Messrs. James, Perri, and Rivera dissented.

Mr. Rivera asserted that leaving the pediment in place and lengthening the doorway is no more accurate than lowering the pediment. Mr. Sugrue agreed, stating that both options include aspects that are not restoration.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to approve the proposal as submitted. Ms. James seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 5 to 4. Messrs. Brown, Schaaf, Sugrue, and Wilds dissented.

315 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: Miriam Schaefer

Applicant: David Searles AIA, Dagit, Saylor Architects

History: 315 Chestnut: 1865-67 by architect John McArthur Jr.; rear addition by John T. Windrim in 1912; individually designated, 1970; Significant in district.

313 Chestnut: 1953, new façade, 1997; non-contributing in district.

Project: Alter historic rear openings, replace windows

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, provided the Franklin Court windows are treated according to Alternative One without brick sills, with the staff to review shop drawings for the windows.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace several windows along Oriana Street. The replacement windows would be wood with true-divided-light muntins. These units would replicate the original configurations. The applicant proposes to alter two windows to accommodate louvers for mechanical system. These louvers would retain the profile

of the windows. Along Chestnut Street, the applicant proposes to install interior storm windows and restore the existing wood windows. At the rear of the property, the applicant proposes to alter two historic openings, which are currently blocked. The alteration will require the removal of the jack arches and the enlargement of the openings to accommodate a double picture window and an enlarged window. The side and rear of the building are highly visible from Orianna Street and Franklin Court.

The application also proposes the addition of a vestibule and awning to the modern annex, which is listed as non-contributing in the Old City Historic District.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Dante presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect Peter Saylor represented the application.

Mr. Sklaroff asked the applicant if he agreed with the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Saylor stated that he did. Mr. Saylor stated that he intended to reopen several windows along the alley that had been infilled. He also stated that his client wanted large rear windows to take advantage of the Franklin Court view. He offered to reopen and elongate the historic windows at the rear facing the court and to cut an additional window. Mr. Saylor noted that he met with National Park Services and obtained its approval of the concept.

ACTION: Mr. Rivera voted to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal, provided the Franklin Court windows are treated as specified in Alternative One, but without brick sills, with the staff to review shop drawings for the windows. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1701 LOCUST STREET

Owner: CDF, Philadelphia Holding, LP

Applicant: Martin Jay Tackett

History: 1923-1925, by Frank Hahn and Brian Baylinson; significant in district

Project: Alter ground floor commercial space and replace windows on floors 14-21.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as submitted, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. The Committee stated that it would, if presented with the appropriate plans, recommend approval of the replication of the historic eight-over-one windows in aluminum at the upper floors and the replication of the historic storefront windows with operability, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install aluminum multi-pane café windows and a door in a commercial space on the east and north sides of the Warwick Hotel. The commercial space, currently used as a restaurant, faces 17th and Chancellor Streets. It does not retain its historic storefront windows, but the original window configuration is known from historic photographs. The same window type is proposed for the two infilled openings along Chancellor Street. In addition, the applicant proposes to install a fabric banner, awnings, and metal lettering directly onto the limestone façade of the building.

This application also proposes the replacement of all windows at floors 14 to 21. The current windows are one-over-one metal units within original wood frames, which are covered by metal panning. The applicant proposes to replace them with one-over-one

metal units. However, one-over-one is not the original window configuration. The building originally had eight-over-one wood units in most openings.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architect Jay Tackett, window salesperson Terry Graboyes, and Lynn Blahusch, a representative of the property owner, represented the application.

Mr. Tackett withdrew all aspects of his application related to the storefronts, awnings, and signage. He asked the Commission to consider only the window proposal for the upper floors. Mr. Danta asked if this withdrawal had been sent to the staff in writing. Mr. Tackett responded it had not; he confirmed that he was withdrawing the segment of the application related to the lower floors. Ms. Blahusch stated that she is a representative of the residential portion of the Warwick Hotel at floors 14 through 21, which is being converted to luxury condominiums. She stated that she does not represent the hotel on the lower floors.

Mr. Danta informed the Commission that the building currently has metal, one-over-one replacement windows in most openings. Historically, the building had wood eight-over-one windows in most openings; some of the small openings had fewer panes in the upper sash. The applicant is proposing to replace the windows in the upper floors with windows that replicate the extant non-historic windows, not the historic windows. Mr. Sklaroff asked when the current windows were installed. Mr. Danta replied that they were in place at the time of designation, but that he was unsure of the exact date of installation. Ms. Blahusch stated that they were installed about 1978. Mr. Wilds remarked that the Commission typically approves alternate materials for windows at upper floors in larger buildings, but requires the appropriate pane configurations.

Ms. Blahusch stated that the hotel at the lower floors is presently undergoing significant renovations. She stated that the hotel is not replacing the windows, but simply repairing the extant one-over-one, non-historic windows. She stated that, after meeting with the Architectural Committee, the owners of the upper-floor condominium project decided to replicate the profiles of the historic wood windows and frames with the new aluminum windows and panning. However, she stated that they would like to retain the non-historic one-over-one pane configuration for consistency across the entire building.

Mr. Wilds asked Ms. Blahusch and Graboyes if it was possible to manufacture eight-over-one aluminum windows to match the historic wood windows. Ms. Blahusch replied that it was. Mr. Sugrue noted that, at some point in the future, the Commission would review a proposal for the replacement of the windows in the hotel; at that point, it could insist on the replacement with appropriate eight-over-one windows, making the building both consistent and historically accurate. Mr. Baron reminded the Commission of a similar situation at 2145 Walnut Street; in that case, the Commission insisted that the owner install historic wood windows even though not all the windows were being replaced and an inconsistency would result. The Commission determined at that time that the appropriate windows would be installed incrementally.

Mr. Sklaroff inquired about the cost differential between one-over-one and eight-over-one windows. Ms. Blahusch replied that there was little or no cost difference.

Mr. James reminded the Commission that the windows were already one-over-one units at the time of designation. Mr. Wilds replied that the Commission endeavors to return

buildings to their original states, even if incrementally, not to their states at the time of designation. Mr. Wilds objected to approving an inappropriate window type, even if it would maintain consistency across the entire building.

Mr. Sklaroff noted that the historic photograph showed other window types in the building. Mr. Baron explained that the majority of the windows were historically eight-over-one, but that the historic pane configurations varied in a few smaller windows. He stated that the staff would work with the applicant to determine the appropriate configurations for all windows.

ACTION: Mr. Rivera moved to deny the application as submitted, but to approve the replacement of the windows at the upper floors with simulated-divided-light, aluminum windows with panning to match the historic profiles, provided the historic eight-over-one and other pane configurations are replicated, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 8 to 2. Ms. Murray and Mr. James dissented.

100 MARKET STREET, A.K.A. 2 S. FRONT STREET

Owner: ESK Ventures, Lilly Biagus

Applicant: Allison Fritch, Tackett & Company

History: 1882; designated individually in 1976 and as contributing to the district.

Project: Replace windows on first floor

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as submitted, pursuant to Standard 9, but approval of the replacement of each large storefront window with two casement or pivot windows, provided the historic transoms are retained, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace four large storefront windows on the Market Street façade and two on the Front Street façade. The proposed windows, while utilizing the existing wood frames and sills, would be wood bi-fold windows with four, tall, vertical, double-glazed panels. To open, these windows would fold, accordion style, to one side.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Sklaroff recused owing to his firm's involvement with the project and passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect Jay Tackett represented the application.

Mr. Sugrue asked Mr. Tackett if he would accept the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Tackett stated that he would and that he had updated his design to reflect it.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application as submitted, pursuant to Standard 9, but to approve the replacement of each large storefront window with two casement or pivot windows, provided the historic transoms are retained, with the staff to review details. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2420 GRAY'S FERRY AVENUE, THE NAVAL ASYLUM OR HOME

Owner: Toll Naval Associates

Applicant: Paul Commito, Toll Naval Associates

History: U.S. Naval Home, William Strickland, architect

complex begun in 1827; wall and guardhouse built in 1836

Project: Demolish guardhouse, rebuild and alter wall, construct residential building and guard house

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend:

1. Approval of the construction of the residential building, provided the exterior chimneys are incorporated into the facades and do not project from them;
2. approval of the rebuilding of missing and unstable sections of the Schuylkill Avenue wall in CMU with a stone base, smooth stucco facing, and masonry cap to match the adjacent sections of wall, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6;
3. denial of the demolition of the surviving section of the guardhouse, but approval of its restoration and incorporation into the wall or new guardhouse, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, and 6.
4. denial of the proposed entrance, but approval of a new entrance based on the designs of the historic wall, piers, and guardhouse, with the staff to review details;
5. approval of new gates at the entrance that are simplified versions of the front gates, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a large residential building on the site of the U.S. Naval Asylum. The Commission has reviewed and approved a series of applications for this site including those for the rehabilitation of the historic buildings and the construction of several new buildings. The proposed building would be constructed on a vacant portion of the site and would be compatible in style, size, scale, massing, and materials with the other contemporary buildings on the site.

The application also proposes to rebuild a section of the wall that runs along the western boundary of the Naval Asylum at Schuylkill Avenue. The historic wall, which is collapsed at the north, has a stone base, stuccoed brick body, and masonry capping. In June 2004, the Commission reviewed a proposal to rebuild several sections of the collapsed brick wall that runs along the northern boundary of the Naval Asylum at Bainbridge Street. The Commission denied the applicant's proposal to replace the missing section of brick wall with brick piers and aluminum fence and instead required the "reconstruction of the missing sections of the Bainbridge Street perimeter wall with a new full-height masonry wall to match the historic wall."

The application also proposes to alter the historic entrance to the site at Schuylkill Avenue. To widen the opening and erect a new guardhouse, a surviving section of the original stone guardhouse and wall would be demolished. The opening in the wall would be widened, a decorative brick section and metal gates added, and a new guardhouse erected. The proposed guardhouse would stand on the site of the original guardhouse. Nationally significant architect William Strickland designed the original guardhouse as well as the two matching, restored guardhouses on Gray's Ferry Avenue in the 1830s. Schuylkill Avenue, which was originally known as Sutherland Avenue, was opened in 1834.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the proposal to the Commission. Developer Paul Commito of Toll Brothers and attorney Brett Feldman represented the application.

Mr. Feldman noted that his client had revised the chimney design at the suggestion of the Architectural Committee and the Preservation Alliance. Mr. Wilds objected to the recommendation for the new construction. He stated that the Commission should not concern itself with details on new construction that have no impact on historic resources. The applicants displayed a rendering showing the chimneys rejected by the Architectural Committee. Mr. Wilds withdrew his objection to the Committee's recommendation on the chimneys. He suggested that the applicants comply with the Committee in this regard.

Mr. Commito presented a revised design for the wall, gate, and guardhouse to the Commission that complied with the Committee's recommendation in every regard but one. He explained that most sections of the wall that originally had a stone base were no longer extant. He requested that the Commission approve his proposal to rebuild the wall in CMU with stucco and a masonry cap, but without the stone base. In response to Mr. Sugrue's query, Mr. Commito replied that the section of wall in question is about 200 feet in length; approximately 60% has been lost and the remaining section needs to be rebuilt. He also stated this wall was built without a foundation; he intends to rebuild the wall with a proper foundation, as he did on Bainbridge Street. Mr. Sugrue asked if it was feasible to retain the stone and put the rebar through it. Mr. Commito stated that the end product would not accord with sound construction techniques. He stated that he was following his structural engineer's recommendation. Ms. Murray asked for a clarification of the location of this wall. Mr. Commito stated that it is on Schuylkill Avenue. The Bainbridge Street wall was already rebuilt to match the historic brick wall. Mr. Commito agreed to retain the extant piece of the guardhouse and incorporate it into the new wall.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the construction of the residential building, provided the exterior chimneys are incorporated into the facades and do not project from them; to approve the rebuilding of missing and unstable sections of the Schuylkill Avenue wall in CMU with a smooth stucco facing and masonry cap to match the adjacent sections of wall, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6; to deny the demolition of the surviving section of the guardhouse, but approve its restoration and incorporation into the wall or new guardhouse, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, and 6; to deny the proposed entrance, but to approve a new entrance based on the designs of the historic wall, piers, and guardhouse, with the staff to review details; and to approve new gates at the entrance that are simplified versions of the front gates, with the staff to review details. Ms Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

205-211 N. 4TH STREET, A.K.A. 329-337 RACE STREET

Owner: Old City Place Condominium Association

Applicant: Jeff Barr

History: built c. 1850 and 1870, additions c. 1870

Project: Replace windows

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal as submitted, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the replacement of windows in wood at four buildings at the corner of 4th and Race Streets that have been combined into one condominium structure. The proposal calls for retaining frames on window types 2-4 and 13-20 excepting 16. The other types will undergo window and frame replacement. The building currently has deeply-set casement frames at windows 2-4 and 22-24. Double-hung windows were installed in them in the 1980s. The building had casement sash in these locations at the time of designation. This proposal calls for removing the casement frames and installing new double-hung frames and sash, not the historic casements, at those locations.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Historic preservation consultant Jeffrey R. Barr of JRB Restoration represented the application.

Mr. Barr stated that he is replacing the sash, but retaining the frames in most openings. He is proposing new wood true-divided-light sash to match the historic sash. He will replace the frames in some openings.

MOTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal as submitted, with the staff to review details. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1515-1521 CHERRY STREET, 1500-20 RACE STREET, RACE STREET MEETING HOUSE

Owner: Friends Center Corporation

Applicant: Mark Ueland

History: 1856

Project: Install fence

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal as submitted.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes removing a three-foot temporary wire fence along the Cherry Street and installing a new five-foot metal fence in its place. The low brick retaining wall installed in the 1980s would be retained. New gates would be installed along the service alley and stairway from the east corner of the complex. Although the historic photos show a brick and metal fence along the front of the property, the site was changed with the addition of the office building and retaining wall in the 1980s, both which will be retained in this project.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Vincent Muller, the executive director of the Friends Center, and architect Mark Ueland represented the application.

Mr. James asked the applicants to explain the need for the fence. Mr. Ueland stated that

the fence would permit the Friends Center to overcome significant security and sanitation problems. He stated that the gates would open from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Mr. James asked the applicants if their situation is an annoyance or a true security hazard. Mr. Muller replied that they faced a real security problem. He expressed their concerns over legal liabilities resulting from the lack of security. He also noted the problems with defecation and urination.

Mr. Schaaf objected to the proposed signage on the gates. He opined that it was not compatible with the simple Quaker aesthetic. Mr. Ueland explained that the large letters are directed at vehicular traffic. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the Commission should never instruct a faith-based institution regarding the exercise of its beliefs. He declared that the Commission should never question whether applications from religious institutions are true to the religious tenets of the institutions. He suggested that the Commission should not pursue Mr. Schaaf's line of questioning.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal as submitted. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 9 to 0. Mr. Schaaf abstained.

OLD BUSINESS

2240-2248 N. BROAD STREET, UPTOWN THEATER

Owner: Uptown Entertainment Development Corporation

Applicant: Jane Golden, Mural Arts Program

History: 1927-1929, Magaziner, Eberhard & Harris, architects

Project: Legalize mural

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Section 6.8.A.4 of the Commission's *Rules & Regulations*.

OVERVIEW: This application seeks to legalize a mural on the south party wall of the Uptown Theater. The Architectural Committee reviewed an identical application at its April 2006 meeting and recommended denial. The applicant withdrew that application before the Commission reviewed it. The party wall was stuccoed and painted white at the time of designation.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Amy Johnston of the Mural Arts Program and Aisha Richardson of the Uptown Entertainment Development Corporation represented the application.

Mr. Danta explained that the staff had researched the property and determined that the south wall was a party wall shared by both property owners. The applicant submitted a letter from the owner of the adjacent property supporting the application. She also submitted other letters of support. Mr. Sugrue questioned whether the Commission has any jurisdiction over the mural if it is on the property to the south, which is not designated. Mr. Wilds suggested that the Commission exercise caution regarding its jurisdiction. Mr. Reuter stated that it is generally accepted in urban areas that party walls are jointly owned by both adjoining property owners. He asserted that the wall can be considered designated and part of the Uptown Theater.

Mr. Sugrue and Mr. Wilds asked about the circumstances surrounding the painting of the mural. Ms. Johnson answered that the Mural Arts Program was not aware of its historic designation at the time it painted the mural. She cited recent cases in which the Mural Arts Program had consulted with the Historical Commission's staff about whether potential sites for murals were designated. Ms. Johnson assured the Commission that the Mural Arts Program sought to comply with the preservation ordinance. She apologized to the Commission for the Program's past failures to comply with the preservation ordinance.

Mr. Sklaroff noted that the Committee was concerned with the size and scale of the mural. During the Committee's review, Mr. Thomas had stated that the mural overwhelmed the building. Mr. James spoke of his involvement in the development of the mural policy. He stated that this was a case of well intended actions which missed the mark. Once it was brought to its attention, he stated, the Mural Arts Program attempted to correct the matter with the Commission. Mr. James contended that the size and scale are not inappropriate; he noted that the significant architecture is at the front of the building, not the side. A smaller mural would not have the same effect. He voiced his approval of legalization.

Mr. Wilds observed that a rendering of the building represented the wall in question as finished, not a party wall that was later re-exposed. Others remarked that the rendering was not accurate in many regards and probably did not represent the building as constructed.

ACTION: Ms. Murray moved to approve the application and legalize the mural. Mr. James seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 0. Mr. Sugrue abstained.

NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATION COMMENT

100 INDEPENDENCE MALL WEST, ROHM & HAAS CORPORATE HEADQUARTERS

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Commission recommend to the Pennsylvania Historic Preservation Board that the Rohm & Haas Corporate Headquarters at 6th and Market Streets in Philadelphia satisfies National Register Criterion C (it embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values) as well as Criteria Consideration G (less than 50 years old) and is therefore worthy of inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places.

OVERVIEW: Designed by world-famous architect Pietro Belluschi and constructed in 1964, the Rohm & Haas Corporate Headquarters at 6th and Market Streets is a significant example of Modern architecture. Sited on Independence Mall, it is an important example of urban redevelopment. Employing materials manufactured by Rohm & Haas, it embodies the landmark company.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the National Register nomination for Rohm & Haas Corporate Headquarters at 6th and Market Streets in Philadelphia to the Commission for its comments and recommendation to the Pennsylvania Historic Preservation Board.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to recommend to the Pennsylvania Historic

Preservation Board that the Rohm & Haas Corporate Headquarters at 6th and Market Streets in Philadelphia satisfies National Register Criterion C (it embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values) as well as Criteria Consideration G (less than 50 years old) and is therefore worthy of inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 11:40 a.m., Mr. James moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

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.

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.

Rules & Regulations 6.8.A.4: The Philadelphia Historical Commission, its committees, and staff shall not consider a mural's content as a part of its review of any application for a building permit but may consider size, scale and relationship to the historic context.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jonathan Farnham, Randal Baron, Jorge Danta, Karen Gonski, Erin McGinn-Cote