

**THE MINUTES OF THE 496TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
12 December 2003**

**City Council Caucus Room, 4th Floor, City Hall
Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair**

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
Duane Bumb, Deputy Director, Department of Commerce
Warren Huff, City Planning Commission
Joseph James, Department of Public Property
Robert Previdi, Director of Communications, Office of City Council President
David Perri, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Vincent Rivera, AIA
Denise Smyler, Esq.
Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.
Norman Tissian
Scott Wilds, Assistant Director, Office of Housing and Community Development

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

Lawrence Copeland, Esq., Senior Attorney, Law Department

Also

Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association
Hy Myers, Vitetta Group
Marvin Gerstein, Temple
J. Douglas Grainge, 558 North Judson Street
Mellon Certified Restoration
Louis Acciavatti
Chip Dunahugh, River Edge Officer, Old City Board
Jeff Glassberg, Old City Civic Association
Marc Morfei, Center City District
Matthew Johnson, Center City District
John Andrew Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Ralph Clapp, 2049 Brandywine Street
George Acevedo, 1601 Mt. Vernon Street
Miguel Santiago, 1601 Mt. Vernon Street
Julie Panassow, The Lighting Practice
David Amburn, Amburn/Jarosinski, 125 Queen Street
Eugene Yanelli, Caldwell Banker
Joseph DiMauro, 1520 North Street
Chris Ames Kroll
James Hanson, Vitetta Group
Jeff DiRomaldo, Marianna Thomas Architects
Sheth Jones, Capital Programs Office

Bill Conley, Burns Engineering, Incorporated
Matthew Wilcox
Suzanna Barucco, 1:16 Techonologies, Incorporated
Theresa Criniti, 1713 Porter Street
Kenneth Johnson, Philadelphia Law Department

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 496th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:03 a.m.

Minutes of the 495th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Mr. Rivera made a motion to approve the minutes of the 495th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, 14 November 2003. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion. Mr. Sklaroff asked for a correction to the minutes. Referring to page 5 of the minutes, he stated that he had not “corrected” Mr. Bumb, but had simply made an observation. With this correction, the Commission voted unanimously to approve the minutes.

Report of the Committee on Historic Designation

Old City

Mr. Sklaroff opened the discussion of the proposed Old City Historic District. He noted that Commission and staff members toured the district recently. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stepped forward and made a brief statement. He recommended approval of the designation of the significant neighborhood.

Mr. Sugrue and Mr. Sklaroff asked the staff to remind the Commission of the outstanding issues related to the proposed designation. Mr. Farnham stated that the Committee on Historic Designation had recommended approval of the designation as defined in the revised nomination. He stated that the recommended boundaries included the 300-blocks of Front and Water Streets and the piers, but not Penn’s Landing, the so-called Bookbinder’s area south of Ionic Street, or several office buildings dating to the 1960s and 1970s at the west. Concluding, he stated that the three open issues were the boundaries, the classification of some buildings, and the end date of the period of significance.

Richard Thom of the Old City Civic Association stepped forward and stated that his organization supports the deletion of Penn’s Landing from the district, but supports the inclusion of the piers. He also stated that he personally believes that the boundary should extend south to Walnut Street between Front and S. 2nd Streets. He added that the civic association trusts that the staff will correctly classify the buildings within the district. Mr. Sklaroff interrupted Mr. Thom, stating that the Commission would act on its Committee’s recommendation, not on the staff’s classifications. Mr. Thom added that his organization would support the redefinition of the terminal date of the period of significance from 1929 to 1976. He did note though that the first Old City project to take advantage of new Federal Tax Credit program was begun in 1978, not 1976.

Mr. Gallery noted that the Preservation Alliance supports setting the southern boundary between Front and S. 2nd Streets at Walnut. He observed that the Commission’s review-and-comment power is an important one and that the Bouvier Building, which is located in this area, is threatened. He questioned classifying the Painted Bride Building as “significant.” He also asserted that the Designation Committee’s decision to label buildings constructed after the period of significance as “contributing” was illogical and inconsistent.

Chip Dunahugh of the River's Edge Civic Association stated that he supports the designation and opined that the 300-blocks of N. Front and Water Streets should be included within the district.

Mr. Huff stated that the southern boundary between Front and S. 2nd Streets should be set at Walnut, not Ionic Street. He added that Penn's Landing should not be included in the district.

Mr. Copeland remarked that the Commission would not be able to exercise jurisdiction over any Delaware River Port Authority property because the authority is an interstate agency and exempt from local law. Mr. Sugrue stated that he considered the Cret-designed bridge plaza as well as the bridge significant and worthy of designation. Some Commission members noted that even if they could not exercise a jurisdiction over the structure, the significance of the bridge should be recognized by its designation.

Mr. Wilds questioned the inclusion of the piers, but Mr. Sugrue countered that the piers and the waterfront in general are essential to the history of Old City. Mr. Tyler added that the steps between Front and Water Streets are very significant reminders of the historic waterfront. Three straw polls indicated that a large majority of the Commissioners were in favor of including the piers, the so-called Bookbinder's area, and the bridge plaza in the district.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the boundaries recommended by the Committee on Historic Designation with the exception that the boundary between Front and S. 2nd Streets be extended south from Ionic to Walnut Street. Mr. James seconded the motion, which passed with seven votes. Mr. Sugrue, Mr. Bumb, and Ms. Smyler opposed; Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

The Commission turned its attention to the period of significance, which was defined in the nomination as 1676 to 1929. Some suggested that the end date should be redefined as 1976. Mr. Wilds asked if the Commission would be called upon to protect later changes to buildings, such as the large signs at the corner of 3rd and Market Streets, if the date was redefined to 1976. He noted that there was a strong argument for including the redevelopment period within the Society Hill Historic District's period of significance, but that a similar argument could not be made for Old City. Mr. Tissian asserted that the problems with the buildings he cited were cosmetic; historic buildings exist under the large signs. Mr. Huff noted that the boldly decorated buildings were as emblematic of their period as any building in the district is of its period. Mr. Sklaroff remarked that the Commission should not attempt to determine which historical periods are the most important; he also observed that Market Street has always been a focal point of the city's commercial activity. Mr. James noted his opposition to changing the date, saying that the period of significance should not be changed just to accommodate a few buildings.

Mr. Tyler cited several reasons why the date should be shifted to 1976. He explained that the Venturi & Rauch study for the redevelopment of Old City, an important turning point, dates to that year. It signaled the change from a commercial and industrial zone to a mixed residential, arts, and entertainment zone.

Mr. Sklaroff asked if any Commission member wanted to move to change the end date of the period of significance. No one accepted his offer.

Mr. Sklaroff turned the discussion to the classification of buildings. He acknowledged the validity of Mr. Gallery's criticisms of the Designation Committee's decision to list buildings erected after the period of significance as "contributing." Mr. Wilds and Mr. Sugrue asked the staff how many buildings in the district not previously designated date to the period 1930-1976. Ms. Spina replied

approximately 10 to 12. Mr. Wilds recommended that buildings constructed outside the period of significance be classified as “non-contributing” unless already designated individually; he added that such buildings may be later designated individually if warranted. Ms. Spina noted that the Rules & Regulations stipulate that a building may be listed as “significant” in a district if it “warrants individual listing,” not necessarily already listed; she noted that buildings constructed outside the period of significance have been classified as “significant” in other districts. In creating the historic district, the Commission fulfills the requirements for notice to the owners and performs the requisite architectural and historical research. To then individually designate these buildings would be redundant. Mr. Wilds asked if any of the 10 or 12 buildings in question could be considered significant. Ms. Spina answered that several might be considered significant; however, both staff and the Designation Committee did not consider the Pincus Brothers Building (a building of major concern to Mr. Gallery) as “significant”, hence its “contributing” classification. Mr. Sklaroff asserted that the Commission could not decide on the merits of individual buildings at this meeting and urged that his fellow Commissioners exercise restraint when creating the district. He added that the staff could, at a later date, nominate individual buildings that might now be listed in the district as “non-contributing.”

Mr. Sugrue suggested that the period of significance be extended from 1929 to 1941. This would eliminate the problem of the classification of the Pincus Brothers building. Mr. Sklaroff agreed that a case could be made for a new end date of 1941. The Commission also discussed the possibility amending the nomination to change the period of significance at a subsequent meeting. Mr. Wilds added that the Commission might later designate individually buildings listed as “non-contributing” in the inventory, thereby raising them to “significant.”

Commission members continued to discuss the period of significance and classifications. Mr. Wilds questioned the proposal to maintain the date of 1929, but Mr. James advocated for it. Mr. Sugrue asked if the Commission was bound to classify buildings in any particular way or if it had some flexibility. Ms. Smyler stated that she was unprepared to discuss the issue. Mr. Baron noted that the Rittenhouse-Fitler District inventory lists some buildings constructed after the period of significance as “contributing.” He claimed the classifications should not be limited by the period of significance, but should also consider scale, materials and use. Mr. Sugrue stated that, under these criteria, the Pincus Building could be considered “contributing” even though it was erected after 1929. Mr. Tyler noted that the Rittenhouse-Fitler District nomination did not specify a precise period of significance.

Mr. James made a motion to accept the Committee on Historic Designation’s recommendation on the date of significance of 1676 to 1929 with the stipulation that all buildings built after 1929 be listed as “non-contributing” unless already designated individually. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 2; Mr. Sugrue and Mr. Huff dissented.

Mr. Rivera made a motion to approve the Committee on Historic Designation’s recommendation to designate the Old City Historic District with the following two amendments: that the boundary between Front and S. 2nd Streets be extended south from Ionic to Walnut Street; and that date of significance be established at 1676 to 1929 with the stipulation that all buildings built after 1929 be listed as “non-contributing” unless already individually designated. Mr. James seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Report of the Architectural Committee, 25 November 2003, Vincent Rivera, Chair

558 Judson Street

John Dogum, Owner

J. Douglas Grainge, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1861

PROPOSAL: Widen front door, remove pent eave, install transom

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the removal of the pent eave and the installation of a transom, and the proposed door replacement, with the staff to review details 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 material].

Mr. Baron presented this application, which calls for legalization of part of the work that was done with the removal of a pent eave and the widening of a masonry doorway. The applicant proposes to close down the masonry opening to nearly its original dimension, install a transom and new door frame, and a door that is still wider and taller than the original.

Commission members thought the proposed alterations appropriate.

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

2049 Brandywine Street

Ralph Clapp, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Roof deck on main roof, new skylight

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the skylight, subject to a determination of visibility, but denial of the roof deck 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 work 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.].

Mr. Baron explained this proposal, which involves adding a large skylight and roof deck on the front portion or main block of the house. The staff has approved a façade restoration and a roof deck on the rear ell of the house.

Ralph Clapp, the owner, presented photographs showing similar decks on the same block specifically 2005 Brandywine Street, which the Commission approved. Mr. Sklaroff said that the Commission made a mistake, which set a bad precedent; however the Commission reviews many applications for roof decks which are denied.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to approve the skylight subject to a determination of its invisibility, but denial of the roof deck. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried with 10 votes. Mr. Bumb dissented.

1503 Green Street

PJR Realty, Incorporated, Owner

Matthew Wilcox, Applicant

DATE: 1859

PROPOSAL: Extend rear deck

The Architectural Committee recommended approval 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 work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

Mr. Baron presented this proposal, which involves extending a visible rear deck at the back of the building to ten feet.

Mr. Wilds questioned the staff's approval of such an intrusive change, and it was noted that the staff's approval was based on the deck being in the rear. Mr. Sklaroff pointed out that the proposed extension changes the scale of the building and believes that it would set a precedent. He noted that the existing deck is on the rear ell, which is within the building's envelope.

Matthew Wilcox, the applicant, commented that roof decks already exist; however, these decks are for different units. Mr. Wilds remarked that the unit has a small deck over the shed already.

Mr. Sklaroff said that the proposed extension would occupy a lot of open space with extensive visibility, and historically decks existed on the rear ell. Additionally, he thought that the applicant should consult with the Department of Licenses and Inspections about the proposed extension's intrusion into the open space.

Mr. Rivera made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation for approval. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion which failed with a vote of 2 to 9. Mr. Bumb and Mr. Rivera favored the motion.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to deny the proposal. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Rivera and Mr. Bumb opposed the motion.

1601 Mt. Vernon Street

Miguel Santiago, Owner

George Acevedo, Applicant

DATE: c. 1859, Home of Robert Purvis from 1875 until 1898, a writer and spokesperson for abolition.

PROPOSAL: Façade rehabilitation, demolish rear building, new 3-story rear addition

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with revisions to the designs for the rear roof and side windows, with the staff to review details.

This proposal was seen several Committee meetings ago, but withdrawn before it reached the Commission. The project involves rehabilitating the vacant structure, demolishing a single story rear addition and constructing a new three-story rear addition with a three-car garage. The applicant wishes to retain the existing commercial front and add a frame and cornice to the window. The applicant will replace windows and add several new windows, rebuild the cornice

and restore the brick side façade. Several open porches and one closed porch will be added on the side and rear of the building.

Mr. James questioned the approval and the possibility of restoring the original facade. Mr. Rivera responded that the property is currently very deteriorated and that there is very little historic fabric remaining. He said that the staff and Committee worked with the applicant and he believes that the proposed design is appropriate for the neighborhood. Mr. Sklaroff opined that making it a productive building will do honor to Mr. Purvis. Mr. Baron said that the storefront is modern and that much historic fabric remains from the residential appearance. The marble lintel remains as well as a model of the door surround on the neighboring building. He said that the floor of the building is being rebuilt anyway and that the door surround could be rebuilt in cast stone. He also pointed out that the property at 1603, which is owned by the community, is in a very deteriorated condition. Mr. Wilds questioned the windows on the sidewall and the two new openings and the window enlargement. Mr. Rivera responded that the proposed new apartments need windows.

George Acevedo, the applicant, said that the proposed windows will match the scale of the existing front windows. Mr. Wilds opined that windows exist front and rear and that he believes these are sufficient. In addition he thought that the addition and decks provide a drastic change. Mr. Sklaroff thought that the applicant should consider a restoration. Mr. Acevedo said that originally the property had five apartments. The proposed alterations will provide larger units with openness and the addition at the rear will be the owner's unit. Some Commission members thought that the front should be restored given the high level of changes requested and the importance of Mr. Purvis. Mr. Acevedo said that the first floor front has been lowered and the cost for a restoration would be prohibitive. Mr. Sugrue believes that the proposed wood infill panels compromise the storefront. Mr. James commented that the proposed balconies are not appropriate, and that the side façade should be preserved. He also questioned the roof design. Mr. Wilds questioned the changing of the windows with infill. Mr. Acevedo responded that without the infill the stairway would need re-configuring.

Mr. Rivera made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Huff seconded the motion which carried with 6 votes. Mr. Previti, Mr. Wilds, Mr. James, Mr. Tissian and Mr. Sugrue opposed the motion.

2236 Mt. Vernon Street

Joseph Pagano, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c.1859

PROPOSAL: Replacement windows with applied muntins, enlarge balconette

The Architectural Committee recommended true-divided light windows with the 1-¼" wide muntin with staff to approve details.

This proposal involves installing new wood windows with applied muntins without spacer bars and narrow muntin bars of 7/8 inch. The proposal also calls for extending the second floor balconies and adding flower boxes.

Mr. Baron said that he met with the owner to determine an appropriate width muntin with true-divided light.

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

1524 North Street

Joseph DiMauro, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1875

PROPOSAL: Demolish and rebuild 3-story building

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, subject to the retention of the front façade and the stuccoing of the addition, 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.]; with staff to review details.

This application calls for demolishing the structure and rebuilding a new structure to match the old reusing the cornice. The rears, which have minor visibility from Wallace Street, would be rebuilt at three stories with a T-111 pressed wood grain siding. The applicant has submitted an engineer's preliminary report, which says that "the front façade and party walls can be repaired and restored for continued use." The drawings show an incorrect door design and give no window details.

Joseph DiMauro, the owner asked for clarification regarding the property at 1520 North Street which was cited as Imminently Dangerous by the Department of Licenses and Inspections. It has been approved for demolition at staff level. Mr. Sklaroff inquired if 1524 is separated from 1520 by 1522 and the applicant responded in the affirmative.

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

1711 Spring Garden Street

George Kaoulas, Owner

Paul McIntyre, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1878 by Charles W. Budd, carpenter/builder; garage, c. 1940

PROPOSAL: Rebuild collapsed garage

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

Mr. Spina explained that during the construction of the carriage house for the Electrical Workers Union next door, the garage at the rear of this property collapsed. The proposal calls for rebuilding the garage with a brick-faced front and painted CMU sides. A wood gate will close off the alley on the western side.

Commission members agreed with the Committee.

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

2000 Spring Garden Street

Robert Ingram and Josh Markel, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1970

PROPOSAL: New windows, doors, awnings, railings and lights

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of expanding the 1st floor windows and aluminum sliding windows in all openings, the proposed railings, cut-outs of furniture installed within the mortar joints over the rear door, replacement doors to match door on the 20th Street façade with diamond-shaped windows, glass awnings with widened glass sections and straight edges, and frosted exterior light fixtures, all with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina explained that the owners have purchased this non-contributing building for apartments and the offices for their custom-made furniture company, and propose several alterations. First, the first floor windows would be expanded and all windows would be replaced with vinyl one-over-one windows. Second, all three entrances would be altered with new metal doors, curved metal railings, and frosted glass and metal canopies. Last, the owners will use the rear door as the main door to their offices and want to install a panel that relates to the building the same way the stone does at the 20th Street entrance. The proposed area will have cut-outs of furniture to reflect their products. Although this is a non-contributing building, its contemporary design is relatively uncompromised.

No one was present to represent the proposal. Mr. Sklaroff asked for clarification for the review of non-contributing buildings. It was explained that the standards set forth by Section 14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code still apply, but that staff may review the proposal or send it on to the Committee and Commission.

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

City Hall, Broad and Market Streets

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Sheth Jones, Applicant

DATE: 1871-1901, John McArthur, architect

PROPOSAL: New windows with louvers on south side

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the basement louver, but denial of the 1st floor, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work 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.].

Ms. Spina presented this application, which calls for installing louvers in windows on the south side to accommodate a central air-conditioning system for the Records Department. Presently the segmentally-arched openings have a double casement with a single-light transom. The proposed louvers will be installed in the transoms of two windows just west of the South Portal on the first floor and in one window in the basement area. The first floor windows are highly visible. Ms. Spina noted that the windows are drawn incorrectly on the plans.

Ms. Spina remarked that the revised drawings show the framing details incorrectly.

Sheth Jones, Capital Programs Office, asserted that the cost for extending ductwork to the courtyard would be an additional \$50,000 while to extend the ductwork to the basement would be an additional \$75,000. Mr. Sugrue thought it important to weigh the cost as well as the public interest in this matter. Mr. Sklaroff asked if the revised plans address the Committee's concerns. Mr. Rivera discussed the inconsistencies in the plans. Mr. Jones said that the plans show the intent of the proposed alterations, which would replace the glass in the transoms with louvers.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the proposal, with the staff to review details. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Sklaroff and Mr. James abstained.

City Hall, Broad and Market Streets

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Marianna Thomas, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1871-1901, John McArthur, architect

PROPOSAL: Security gates, signage, lighting and cameras

Ms. Spina presented this multifaceted proposal, which is for enhanced security throughout City Hall. Once these measures are in place, only City employees with proper identification may enter the building using any entrance. All visitors will have to use the Northeast Pavilion and pass through security to enter. Security cameras, keyless entry systems and signage must be installed at each of the 22 doors into the building. The handicap entrance to City Hall is in the East Portal.

Lighting

The lights around Dilworth Plaza do not provide enough illumination. The proposal calls for installing new sconces that have the same globes as the derivative Paul Cret-designed lighting used throughout Center City. The Modern light standards around the apron of City Hall will be replaced with modified Cobra lights that will provide a larger band of illumination. The lights in the courtyard will be replaced with replicas.

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the lights in Dilworth Plaza, pursuant to Standard 3, but approval of the other lighting designs, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina noted that the proposed lighting for Dilworth Plaza has been withdrawn and that the existing sconces on City Hall would be refurbished. Commission members emphasized the importance that the all City Hall lighting proposals are coordinated.

Cameras

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the cameras, subject to the bases being painted to match the background materials, pursuant to Standard 9.

Security cameras will be placed at all entrances and in various interior spaces throughout the building. Some will be mounted on light poles in the courtyard using armatures, as recently proposed and approved for the Philadelphia Museum of Art. The cameras will have plastic housing and bubble caps.

Keyless Entry

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, subject to the boxes moving closer to the doors where possible, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Boxes that measure approximately 4' x 4" x 2-1/8" will be placed at each door to house the electronic system to read the cards for employees. Some of these will be placed rather far from the doors themselves, owing to the depth of the doors in the thick masonry walls. Emergency release pads must be installed on the inside of the entrances to allow for egress. The handicap entrances are in the central Portals. Presently the doors in the Portals have central swinging doors flanked by wide sidelights. Like the other doors in the building, these will be changed to keyless entry. For handicap visitor access, there will be an intercom system installed in the East Portal and a security guard will go to that entrance to assist the visitor.

Signage

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

All signage will have grey backgrounds and white lettering. At each entrance there will signs giving a map of City Hall and directing visitors to the appropriate entrance. It will have two aluminum posts. On each floor as visitors exit the elevator lobbies, there will be a large floor map and directory for every city office. These will measure 3'4" wide and 5'8" tall (the scale of the enclosed drawings is incorrect).

Security Desk at Northeast Corner

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

The final pieces of the application include the installation of a security counter and turnstiles in the Northeast Pavilion for visitor access. The security counter will have wood paneling and polished granite counters.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to approve all facets of the proposal, with modifications as specified in the Architectural Committee's recommendations. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. James abstained and Mr. Bumb was absent during the vote.

Philadelphia Museum of Art

City of Philadelphia, Owner

222 North 20th Street, Franklin Institute

Franklin Institute, Owner

1801 Vine Street, Family Court Building

City of Philadelphia, Owner

1901 Vine Street, Free Library of Philadelphia

City of Philadelphia, Owner

209-25 North 18th Street, Cathedral of Saints Peter and Paul

Archdiocese of Philadelphia, Owner

Center City District, Applicant

DATE: Phila. Museum of Art: 1919-28, Horace Trumbauer, Clarence Zantzinger, Charles Borie

Franklin Institute: 1932, John T. Windrim

Free Library: 1912-27, Horace Trumbauer

Family Court: 1938-40, John T. Windrim

Cathedral of SS. Peter & Paul: 1846-64, John Notman, John Mahoney, Napoleon LeBrun

PROPOSAL: Lighting

This multi-faceted proposal calls for new lighting for five buildings along the Benjamin Franklin Parkway.

Cathedral of Saints Peter & Paul

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the modified proposal, with staff to review details.

Eight fixtures will be mounted on the roof to highlight the central dome. The plans do not include any attachment details. Seven fixtures will be mounted on posts across 18th Street in the Sister Cities Park and highlight the front façade. Fixtures will also highlight the doorways.

Franklin Institute

The Architectural Committee recommended approval on the condition that the glass from the coffers is stored on site, with the staff to review details.

Thirteen fixtures will be mounted in the limestone along the flanking arcades of the building along 20th Street. In the porticos on 20th Street and on Winter Street, the application calls for mounting five recessed fixtures in the coffered ceiling. This requires the removal of the glass panels. Fixtures will stand on two poles across 20th Street.

Free Library

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, provided that the lighting attached to the front of the building occurs within the mortar joints, with staff to review details.

Twelve fixtures will sit in the recessed arcade behind the columns to light the arcade. Six fixtures with armatures will be attached to the limestone to highlight the façade along Vine Street. Twelve fixtures tucked into the bushes along 19th and 20th Streets will highlight the side façades. Fixtures mounted on four existing poles across Vine Street will highlight the front façade.

Family Court

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, provided that the lighting attached to the front of the building occurs within the mortar joints, with staff to review details.

Twelve fixtures will sit in the recessed arcade behind the columns to light the arcade. Four fixtures with armatures will be attached to the limestone to highlight the façade along Vine Street. Twelve fixtures tucked into the bushes along 18th and 19th Streets will highlight the side façades. Fixtures mounted on new existing poles across Vine Street will highlight the front façade.

Philadelphia Museum of Art

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the application as proposed, with staff to review details, including the location of the light poles.

In each portico, four recessed fixtures would sit in the coffered ceiling. Six fixtures mounted at ground level will highlight the end pavilions. Two, twelve-foot poles mounted in the corners of the end pavilions will carry five fixtures each to highlight the central portico.

Marc Morfei, Center City District, Robert Keppel, the architect, and Julie Panassow, the Lighting Practice, attended the meeting. Mr. Morfei remarked that extensive conversations with the property owners have produced a very favorable response to the proposed lighting.

Mr. Sklaroff inquired if the color of light spectrum had changed and if the proposed lighting would change the nighttime color of these historic buildings. Ms. Panassow described the technology of the proposed lighting fixtures and asserted that the proposed lighting would bring

out the true color of the stone on the historic buildings. She acknowledged that the buildings would look slightly different, but truer to their natural color. Mr. Tissian expressed concern with too much lighting and its effect on the sculptures. Mr. Morfei said that the light would be dispersed and that initially the light will have intensity but that intensity will lessen with time. Mr. Sugrue opined that the proposed lighting plan is appropriate.

Mr. Rivera made a motion to approve proposal, with the modifications as specified in the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion which carried with 10 votes. Mr. James was absent for the vote.

4163 Main Street

Michele David, Owner

Larry Persofsky, Applicant

DATE: c. 1865

PROPOSAL: Demolish and redesign front façade

The applicant requested a thirty-day continuance.

125 Queen Street

Michael and Mario Carosella, Owners

Albert Tantala, Applicant

PROPOSAL: New construction

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

Ms. Spina explained this proposal. The Committee and Commission had denied the owner's application for complete demolition. The owner appealed to the Board of License & Inspection Review (BLIR), and the Commission's decision was overturned. The Commission appealed to the Court of Common Pleas and the BLIR's decision was affirmed. The owner demolished the building earlier this month, but the property remains listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The owner returns for approval of the new construction. The proposed new 3-story residence has a contemporary design. The front façade will have brick facing with cast-stone base and beltcourses and a standing-seam metal gable roof. Single-paned fixed and casement windows will be on all three floors and the front entrance will have a single-leaf, fully-glazed door. The rear façade will have stucco and two sets of double-leaf glazed doors on the first floor with fixed and casement windows on the upper floors. Two skylight will be on the roof and an insulated metal chimney flue will be the central detail of the rear façade.

Mr. Wilds inquired if the new construction relates to the neighboring buildings. Ms. Spina noted that the block has a very mixed context. Commission members concurred with the Architectural Committee recommendation.

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

1800-18 Park Mall aka Liacouras Walk

Temple University, Owner

Hyman Myers, Architect/Applicant

History: 1872, David A. Woelpper, builder

Project: In concept, demolition of buildings except facades, new construction behind facades

The Architectural Committee concurs with the staff and recommends denial because the application is incomplete.

This application for approval in concept proposes the substantial demolition of most of the row of buildings at 1800-1818 Park Mall on the campus of Temple University. The rowhouses at 1800 to 1946 Park Mall were designated as the Park Avenue Historic District in 1990. The buildings at 1800 and 1804-1818 Park Mall are listed as “contributing” to the district; the building at 1802, the home of David A. Woelpper, the builder of the row, is listed as “significant.” In 1998 the Commission approved the demolition of 1820-1830 Park Mall.

This application for approval in concept proposes the substantial demolition of most of the row of buildings at 1800-1818 Park Mall on the campus of Temple University. The rowhouses at 1800 to 1946 Park Mall were designated as the Park Avenue Historic District in 1990. The buildings at 1800 and 1804-1818 Park Mall are listed as “contributing” to the district; the building at 1802, the home of David A. Woelpper, the builder of the row, is listed as “significant.” In 1998 the Commission approved the demolition of 1820-1830 Park Mall.

This application proposes the demolition of most but not all of the buildings. The front facades including the mansards of all ten buildings as well as the side and rear façades of 1800 Park Mall would be saved. The remainder of the buildings would be demolished. A new 5-story building would be constructed within and behind the historic 4-story facades.

Section 14-2007 (7) (j) of the Philadelphia Code stipulates that no demolition permit shall be issued unless the Commission finds that the permit “is necessary in the public interest” or the building “cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.” This application advances neither a public interest nor a financial hardship argument; therefore it must be deemed incomplete.

Mr. Sklaroff recused and passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. He explained that at the Architectural Committee meeting, Committee members discussed the application at length with the architects and representatives of the university and then came to three conclusions. First, they agreed that the application does not comply with Section 14-2007 (7) (j) of the Philadelphia Code, which stipulates that any demolition must be justified by a showing of public interest or financial hardship. Section 9 of the Rules & Regulations defines the requirements for demonstrations of financial hardship by non-profit organizations. The applicants did not address these requirements with their proposal. Second, Committee members agreed that the architectural plans submitted were not complete. Third, they agreed that the sketchy design presented was inappropriate when judged on architectural and preservation grounds. Mr. Farnham also stated that the Architectural Committee asserted that it should work with the applicants to improve the design if the Committee on Financial Hardship validates the hardship claim. Concluding, Mr. Farnham noted that the applicants had submitted an updated proposal subsequent to the Architectural Committee meeting.

Mr. Wilds asked for a summary of the differences between the original and revised designs. Mr. Farnham answered that was little if any difference; the revised submission included perspectival renderings not included in the original submission. Hyman Myers of Vitetta, the applicant, noted one change. He remarked that the new floors extend all the way to the old façades in the revised design; they did not in the original design.

Mr. Tissian asked for information on the condition of the buildings. Mr. Farnham stated that he had not seen the interiors, but that the exteriors appeared to be in very good condition and would be good candidates for restoration. The historic facades were largely intact, he contended.

Commission members asked Mr. Farnham to reiterate the Architectural Committee's conclusions. He stated that the Committee concluded that the plans were incomplete from an architectural standpoint and that the application did not address either the public interest or financial hardship questions as stipulated in the Ordinance.

Ms. Smyler suggested that the revised application be returned to the Architectural Committee for its review. Mr. Myers asserted that it was his understanding that the Architectural Committee had recommended that the application be referred to the Committee on Financial Hardship. Mr. Farnham clarified the Committee's actions, stating that a referral had been considered, but was rejected because no application for hardship had been made. The Committee recommended denial for reasons of incompleteness, he added.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance addressed the Commission. He stated that the Architectural Committee should review the application again if the Hardship Committee determines that preserving the buildings would constitute a hardship. He added that the Commission should send the application to the Hardship and Architectural Committees without it returning to the Commission between the meetings to streamline the process for the applicant. Mr. Gallery noted for the record that he favors a referral to the Hardship Committee at this point. Concluding, he asserted that the Park Mall District should be reevaluated if this application is approved. He contended that, if approved, 60% of the buildings in the district would have been lost, making the remaining district unworthy of designation.

Mr. Wilds maintained that a complete application should return to the Architectural Committee if a finding of hardship is made. Answering a query from Commission members, Mr. Copeland stated that the Commission is free to determine the order in which its committees may review an application; it is not bound to a particular order by the Ordinance. Mr. Tyler disagreed, stating that the Architectural Committee's review of the application will depend upon a finding of hardship and only the Commission is empowered to make such a finding. The committee is only empowered to make a recommendation. Mr. Copeland added that, in either case, the Architectural Committee is bound to apply the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards*. Mr. Myers reminded the Commission that his application is an "in concept" application and will therefore return to the Architectural Committee in the future.

Ms. Smyler made a motion to approve the Committee's recommendation of denial and refer the application to the Committee on Financial Hardship. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Rivera left the meeting.

1713 Porter Street

Theresa Criniti, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1906, John Windrim, architect

PROPOSAL: Fence along sides of yard

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

Mr. Farnham presented this application, which proposes the removal of two historic hairpin fences along the rear, side property lines as well as a historic side gate and the installation of vinyl fences and a gate in their places. The staff recently approved the rear vinyl fence and deck, neither of which required the demolition of historic fabric.

Mr. Wilds asked about Roseberry Street behind the property. It was disclosed that it has no house frontages and only the rear of a school. Commission members determined that only the gate is visible from Porter Street. Mr. Tissian inquired if solid fences exist in the area. Mr. Sugrue commented that the area has a sense of openness and the proposed fence would change the character of the streetscape. Mr. Wilds believes that the Commission should be consistent, but homeowners should be allowed to live on their property comfortably; therefore, he believes that a compromise should be considered. Mr. Huff remarked that side yard originally were designed for purposes of openness; however, he believes that over time things change and there is no compelling reason not to allow the fence. Mr. Wilds suggested that the proposed fence be installed in front of the hairpin fence.

Theresa Criniti, the owner, said that the existing fence does not preclude privacy and that she seeks protection for her children from the neighboring dogs, which the hairpin fence does not provide.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion which carried with 6 votes. Mr. Huff, Mr. Wilds and Mr. Bumb dissented. Mr. James abstained.

Ms. Smyler left the meeting.

1723 Porter Street

Louis and Marylou Acciavatti, Owners

Liz Pisano and Chris Antico, Applicants

DATE: 1906, John Windrim, architect

PROPOSAL: Two-story rear addition

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented this application, which proposes the construction of a 2-story addition at the rear of the twin house at 1723 Porter Street. The addition would be 18' deep and 16'-6" wide, the width of the existing residence. It would be faced with stucco and fenestrated with vinyl windows. Photographs submitted by the applicant show that the rear porch was demolished recently without a permit or Historical Commission approval.

Note that the rear addition and deck at 1721 Porter, 1723's twin, was constructed more than 10 years ago, prior to the designation of the district. It was constructed without a permit and includes windows on the party wall, which would be covered by the proposed addition. The recent 1-story rear addition at 1725 Porter was constructed with a building permit and the Historical Commission's approval.

Louis Acciavatti, the owner, presented photographs showing additions on neighboring houses. He proposes to make the new windows uniform with the existing windows. Mr. Wilds inquired about the size of the existing house and asked if the applicant would consider a one-story addition to match the twin. Mr. Sklaroff said that the design as well as the precedent of a two-story addition is at issue. Mr. Sugrue asked about approval of other large additions in the area and if the proposed addition would damage the historic fabric. Mr. Wilds remarked that if the same addition occurred on Delancey Street, it would be approved; therefore, this addition should be approved. Mr. Spina apprised the Commission that the 1800 block of Roseberry Street faces the back of this property.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. James seconded the motion which failed with a vote of 1 to 10. Mr. Sklaroff favored motion.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Sklaroff dissented.

120 Chestnut Street

Finesse Entertainment, Incorporated, Owner

Hal Banker, Applicant

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: Cut new window openings, cover granite storefront with Corian, new windows and doors, illuminated signage

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, Restoration Standard 7, the Window Guideline, the Entrance Guideline and the Storefronts Guideline. It suggested that the applicant work with the staff to develop an appropriate design.

The applicant withdrew the proposal.

329 Spruce Street

Martin Brown, Owner

Carlitos Hernandez, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1810, altered c. 1950

PROPOSAL: Replace lintels, sills and windows, repoint

The Architectural Committee recommends approval of the following, with staff to review details:

- 1. the legalization of the rear vinyl windows, provided historically appropriate wood windows are installed in the 4th and Spruce Street facades;*
- 2. the installation of the appropriate wood window molding in place of the illegally installed window molding on all facades;*
- 3. the restoration of the original window openings at the 2nd and 3rd stories of the 4th Street façade;*
- 4. the replacement of the 3rd-story lintels in wood, provided the historic lintels are preserved and donated to a local repository such as Independence National Historical Park;*
- 5. the retention of the historic 2nd-story stone lintels;*
- 6. the repointing of the entire façade;*
- 7. and the replacement of the sills in wood.*

This application proposes several façade alterations, some of which are not fully defined. First, it proposes the legalization of the reconstruction of exterior window woodwork. Second, it proposes

the removal of the wood windowsills throughout the building and their replacement in concrete. Third, it proposes the removal of two wood lintels at the 3rd story of the 4th Street façade and their replacements with cast stone or concrete lintels. Fourth, it proposes the repair and painting of two marble and concrete lintels at the 2nd story of the 4th Street façade. The windows were shortened many years ago and concrete was added beneath the historic marble lintels. Fifth, the application proposes to rectify illegal pointing. The 4th Street façade and a portion of the Spruce Street façade were repointed illegally, without a building permit or the Historical Commission's approval. This application proposes cutting out the mortar and repointing the entire building.

This application does not address the illegal vinyl windows, which were installed without a building permit or the Historical Commission's approval. This building contains numerous residential units and would therefore require a building permit for new windows regardless of whether it is listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. This application does propose work related to the windows and therefore should also address the illegal vinyl windows.

Suzanna Barucco, the architect, submitted revised plans to reflect the Committee's recommendation. She asked the Commission to consider letting her client replace the wood windows over a six-year period of time. Mr. Wilds asserted that the applicant could begin the work and not finish it in its entirety and suggested that the windows take precedent over the brick pointing. Mr. Sklaroff commented that the proposed compromise is a trade-off and its approval is based upon the completion of the entire job. Mr. Perri said that if the work is started, then there can be no violation issued. Commission members agreed that the legalization of the rear vinyl windows would be subject to the completion of the installation of the wood replacement windows.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation subject to the completion of the installation of the wood windows. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

306 Cypress Street

Rolf Windh and Karen Tourian, Owners

Martin Jay Rosenblum, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1808, rear ell added in the late nineteenth century

PROPOSAL: Rear addition

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, 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 a small 2nd-story addition (4'-0" x 9'-5") and other alterations at rear ell of the rowhouse at 306 Cypress Street. The addition would be visible from Three Bears Park to the west. The stucco addition would be built on a 1-story section of the rear ell. The brick salvaged from demolition for the addition would be used to infill two 1st-story and one 2nd-story rear ell windows. Wood true-divided-light windows would be installed in the addition and in a new opening in the 1st story. The door at the rear of the rear ell would be moved. A metal fence shielding existing HVAC equipment is proposed as an option.

Commission concurred with the Committee's recommendation.

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

OLD BUSINESS

1627 Wallace Street

Ralph Pungitore

Eugene J. Yanelli, Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Legalize stucco on rear ell, legalize windows

This application proposes legalizing vinyl windows as well as stucco at the rowhouse at 1627 Wallace Street. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the unpermitted windows and stucco in July 2003.

Mr. Wilds inquired about how much stucco had been done, it was disclosed that ninety percent had been done. He pointed out that the transom has been blocked off. Mr. Rivera commented that no details for the stucco have been presented and he believes that the stucco is harmful to the building.

Eugene Yanelli attended the meeting and said that he was unaware that the contractor did not secure the necessary permits. He has no knowledge of when the rear windows were replaced, but that the window manufacturer will install the correct windows on the front façade.

Mr. Sklaroff recommended that the applicant hire an architect or engineer and then return to the Architectural Committee.

Mr. Rivera made a motion for the denial of the legalization of the windows and stucco, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 6. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion which carried with 7 votes. Mr. Wilds abstained.

Report of the Historical Commission Staff, November 2003, Richard Tyler

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

Harry A. Batten Memorial Fund

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to approve the expenditure of \$41.20 for the Architectural Committee lunches.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to approve the Batten Fund expenditure of \$41.20. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Huff seconded the motion.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary