

**THE MINUTES OF THE 504th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
13 August 2004
City Council Caucus Room, 4th Floor, City Hall
Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair**

Present

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

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

Also

Hyman Myers, AIA, Vitetta Group, Temple University
Oskar J. Udel, AIA, Oskar J. Udel Architects
Sandra Kelly, National Liberty Museum
Tony Forte, Esq., Saul Ewing
Bob Hawk, National Liberty Museum
Ted Watson, 114 Elfreth's Alley
Tom Barton, Barton & Associates
Charles Rue, Matrix
Jessica Senker, Sam Harris & Company
Ross Wilson, Parkway Corporation
Jim Hanson, Vitetta Group
Marvin Gerstein, Temple University
Philip H. Ahn
John Lister, AIA, John W. Lister Architects
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Bob Fitzpatrick, Carpenter's Union
Beth Richards, Elfreth's Alley Association
Robin Towey, Michael Shannon Designs
Michael Shannon, Michael Shannon Designs
Roslyn Herchick, 220 West Rittenhouse Square, 11D
Lois Brodsky, 220 West Rittenhouse Square, 14D
Jean Henry, 220 West Rittenhouse Square, 11A
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department

Lew M. Halas, Tantala Association, Barclay Condominium
Amy R. Johnston, Mural Arts Program
Craig Rosenfeld, The Barclay, 237 South 18th Street
Joe Kelly, The Barclay
Michael Ott, Penmont/Barclay
Daniel Neduccsin, 4111 Main Street
David Amburn, AIA, Amburn/Jarosinski Architects
Stephen Verner, AIA, Cecil Baker & Associates
Jane Green, Cecil Baker & Associates
Jane Golden, Mural Arts Program
Annabelle Dilworth, 1702 Manning Street
Stephen Potts, Janice Woodcock, Architects
Tina Makoulain, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll

504th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 504th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:10 a.m.

Minutes of the 503rd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Upon a motion made by Mr. Steinberg and seconded by Mr. Tissian, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the 503rd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, as corrected, held 9 July 2004, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 27 July 2004
Vincent Rivera, Chair

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Wilds.

1800-18 Park Avenue, Liacouras Walk

Temple University, Owner

Hyman Myers, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1872, David A. Woelper, builder

PROPOSAL: Construction of new steel building behind facades - final approval

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend final approval of the proposal.

This application is part of a larger project that includes the demolition of all but the facades at 1802-1818 Park Avenue, the restoration of the facades as well as the building at 1800, and the construction of a 5-story building set back behind historic facades. This particular application seeks final approval of the new construction. The Commission has approved in concept a very similar design.

The façades of the historic buildings stand along Park Avenue and wrap around onto Montgomery Street at the south. On the south side, behind the façade of 1800 Park Avenue, the new structure will include brick

panels and a band of windows at the fifth floor. The west façade of the new building, which will begin at 1802 Park Avenue, will include ribbon windows and bands of EIFS panels. The north façade, which faces the courtyard, will consist of a bowed, two-story bay clad with simulated stone panels and a brick façade punctured by small windows. At the northeast corner, the juxtaposition of the historic façades and new construction is accentuated. A small entrance with a double-leaf glazed door is tucked into the corner and a large “T” for “Temple” hangs at the top for identification.

Tony Forte, counsel for Temple University, explained the revised design. He pointed out the texture change at the juncture of the historic facades and new construction. This change addressed concerns of the Committee.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance commended Temple University on the project. He offered the support of the Alliance.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee’s recommendation. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried with 10 votes. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Wilds returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

109-31 North 2nd Street, and 117-25 Arch Street

MP Residential Properties, LLC, Owner

Anthony Forte, Esq., Applicant

DATE: 109-11: c. 1880; 115-17: c. 1875; 199-21: 1957-58; 123: c. 1880; 1925: 1957-58; terra cotta façade: 1957-58 and expanded c. 1965; 117-25 Arch St: c. 1980

PROPOSAL: Severing of 128 Elfreth’s Alley, demolition of all but the facade and construction of 6-story building at 109-25 North 2nd Street, construction of 10-story tower at 117-25 Arch Street, construction of 3-story townhouses on interior of lot - in concept

The Architectural Committee recommended conceptual approval of the overall site plan and demolition, approval of the new design for the National Products building, approval of the townhouses, approval of the ten-story building, but with a revised design that eliminates the central glass core.

The Commission previously approved the project in concept in February 2003; however, that approval has lapsed and the design for the new construction has changed. The proposal still calls for severing 128 Elfreth’s Alley from this property, demolishing all but the façades and constructing a new 6-story building at 109-25 North 2nd Street, constructing a 10-story tower at 117-25 Arch Street and 3-story townhouses in the interior of the property.

The new 6-story building will have aluminum panels and a series of projecting and recessed balconies. The roof provides a strong horizontal element. Overall, the building takes its design cues from the historic Modern façade. There is a five-foot setback from the terra cotta façade, which the Commission previously approved. In earlier versions, the design for the new construction slavishly adhered to the design of the nineteenth-century buildings that exist behind the terra cotta façade. This new design acknowledges the historic Modern façade, but is more uniform in appearance.

The building on Arch Street is very different from the one previously approved. Originally the Commission approved a 15-story tower; the proposal now calls for a 10-story tower. The new brick design

has a central glass column. It originally included a flared arched cap at the roofline, but that has been replaced by a flat roof.

The three-story townhouses located at the interior of the lot will not be visible from any street. The contemporary buildings will have brick and glass with projecting balconies.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Mr. Sklaroff urged the applicants to focus on the major changes. He asked if the massing as well as the details and materials were part of the conceptual approval. Ms. Spina said that the applicant is prepared to present information about the details and materials.

Tony Forte, counsel for the applicant, Tom Barton, architect, and Jessica Senker representing the preservation consultant attended the meeting. Mr. Forte explained the changes mandated by the Zoning Board of Adjustment and the community. The major changes are as follows: the elimination of the stacked townhouses, the removal of a one-story projection facing Flag Pole Park, the addition of a penthouse with interior court roof decks, and the reduction of the height of the tower on the Arch Street. Mr. Forte believes that the new contemporary design for the National building preserves more of the historic orange tile. He informed the Commission that the Zoning Board imposed restrictions on materials. The Zoning Board specified that the exterior materials must be limited to brick, cast stone, and glass. Mr. Forte asked that the Commission incorporate into its conceptual approval specific reference to the approval of a broad palette of materials including metal panels.

Richard Thom disclosed that the Old City Civic Association did not support Zoning's limitations on materials.

Mr. Sklaroff and the Commission deemed appropriate the approval of a broad palette of materials. Mr. Wilds commented on the glass core for the Arch Street building, which he believes looks too commercial. Mr. Steinberg concurred and asserted that the earlier design was a poor facsimile of Michael Grave's 1980 Postmodern Portland Building in Oregon. He also supported the expanded palette of materials.

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance, noted that the overall design continues to move ahead in the spirit of the earlier approval. He said that the revised submission maintains the integrity of Flag Pole Park. He added that the reduction of the height of the tower is an improvement. However, he believes that the previous design of the addition behind the National Products Building façade was more neutral, while the revised design is too aggressive and overwhelming. Mr. Steinberg concurred.

Beth Richards stated that the Elfreth's Alley Association supports the treatment of the North façade for the National building. She stressed the importance of the setbacks.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to approve the proposal in concept, with the broadest palette of material, albeit not the specific design details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

114 Elfreth's Alley

Edward Watson, Jr., Owner/Applicant

DATE: bet. 1751 and 1762 by Thomas Patterson, house carpenter, significant in district

PROPOSAL: Demolish 1-story rear addition, construct 2-story rear addition

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, with staff to review the brick color, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials,

features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The 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 related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.]

This important eighteenth-century row house at 114 Elfreth's Alley includes a non-historic one-story addition at the rear. Plans prepared by the Historic American Buildings Survey in 1932 and the model created in 1938 under the Works Progress Administration in the collection of the Atwater Kent Museum, document that the building originally had a two-story rear ell that extended to the rear property line.

The proposal calls for demolishing the one-story addition and constructing a two-story addition that has the same width as the historic rear ell, except for a bay window at the first floor. The addition would be brick with cast-stone sills and the bay will have cedar siding and a pent roof that extends over a single-leaf door. The windows will consist of single and coupled six-over-six and one-over-one windows. On the rear elevation, the second floor will include a double-leaf door leading to a balconette. The roof of the addition will be a half-gable with asphalt/fiberglass shingles.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Edward Watson, Jr., the owner, attended the meeting and remarked that his interaction with the Committee, Commission, staff and the neighborhood association has been very educational.

Beth Richards stated that the Elfreth's Alley Association supports the project.

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

48-50 South Front Street, 103 Chestnut Street

Allied Holdings LLC, Equitable owner

William G. Schwartz, Applicant

DATE: 48: c. 1840; 50: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: Façade rehabilitation, 2-story rooftop addition with decks

The applicant requested and was granted a thirty-day continuance.

7 North 3rd Street

Bruce Feinberg, Owner

Philip Ahn, Applicant

DATE: c. 1845; commercial front added, c. 1930; glass tiles in storefront replaced with ceramic tiles, 1988

PROPOSAL: Legalize illuminated sign

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

Without a permit or Historical Commission approval, the tenant installed an internally-illuminated plastic

box sign on an existing bracket. The sign measures 6'-0" x 4'-5" and projects a total of 7'-6".

Philip Ahn, the owner, informed the Commission that the sign company's representative did not acquire a permit. He noted that the newly installed illuminated sign is only 5" thicker than the flat sign it replaced.

Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association, acknowledged the importance of signage for businesses, but asserted that the Association does not support internally illuminated signs. He encouraged the Commission to approve a sign similar to the previous one.

Commission members inquired about the sign. Some members concluded that if the sign, which is a close approximation of the previous sign, was never illuminated, it would be acceptable. Mr. Huff suggested that a letter be sent to the sign company reprimanding it for the installation of the sign without a permit.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to legalize the existing sign, provided that it is never internally lighted. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried with 9 votes. Mr. James and Mr. Sklaroff opposed the motion.

102 North 2nd Street

Alan Karpo, Owner

George Baker, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1840-50

PROPOSAL: Install lottery window, remove bulkhead

The applicant requested and was granted a thirty-day continuance.

321 Chestnut Street, National Liberty Museum

National Liberty Museum, Owner

Sandra Kelly, Applicant

DATE: 1901, Hewitt Brothers; 3rd floor added, c. 1910

PROPOSAL: Signage

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the sign on the rear of the property, but denial of the signs on the front, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.].

The Liberty Museum returns to the Commission with another sign application. The Museum has removed all of the illegal signage and installed the two banners and one sign at the front pursuant to the Historical Commission's 1997 approval.

The Museum now proposes three new signs for the building. Two will be black plastic panels attached to the front window grilles below the banners; they will feature quotations about the Museum. They measure 6'-3" x 5'-0". The third sign will be attached to the rear of the building, facing Franklin Court and measure 9'-5" x 1'-3". The National Park Service has written a letter supporting the rear sign.

Bob Hawk attended the meeting and informed the Commission that the museum is in agreement with the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

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

321 Chestnut Street, National Liberty Museum

National Liberty Museum, Owner

Sandra Kelly, Applicant

DATE: 1901, Hewitt Brothers; 3rd floor added, c. 1910

PROPOSAL: Extend glass enclosure and handicap access ramp

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend the approval of a new shelter with a canopy over the landing at the top of the ramp, provided the new shelter is limited to the location of the existing shelter and the one bay to the north and does not extend onto the projecting section of the historic building, with staff to review details.

This application proposes expanding an enclosed entranceway with ramp at the Liberty Museum at 321 Chestnut Street. The entrance stands on the east or Orianna Street façade of the building. Numerous visitors to Independence National Historical Park use this section of Orianna Street to access Franklin Court, which borders the museum to the north. The Historical Commission approved the addition of the extant glass and aluminum entranceway and ramp in 1980. The extant glass and aluminum entranceway occupies a single bay of the museum building; the new entranceway would span several bays. The applicant states in a cover letter that the larger enclosure is needed to shelter visitors waiting to enter the museum.

This application was initially reviewed by the Architectural Committee on 30 March 2004 and by the Commission on 8 April 2004. The Committee recommended that the shelter be reduced in size. The Commission tabled the application until the applicant verified the ownership of the Orianna Street bed, upon which the shelter would encroach, and proved that the owner agreed to the encroachment.

Mr. Farnham explained the updated proposal, which has been revised to reflect the Committee's recommendation. He noted that the applicant had included materials documenting that the National Park Service owns the street bed and that the Park Service had granted the museum permission to encroach on its property. Commission members reviewed the ownership documents and deemed the revised proposal acceptable.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to approve the revised submission. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Wilds.

117-21 Chestnut Street

Chestnut Street, LT, Owner

Stephen Potts, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c.1840 with alts c.1885, c.1900 and c.1950

PROPOSAL: 2-story rooftop addition, roof deck

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the revised proposal, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not

destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize 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.]

This application proposes the construction of a rooftop addition as well as the rehabilitation of the facades of three consolidated loft buildings on the 100-block of Chestnut Street. The buildings were constructed about 1840 in the Greek Revival or Utilitarian Classical style. They were altered about 1885; one-story additions and Queen Anne cornices were added to 117 and 119 Chestnut; an entirely new Queen Anne façade above the storefront was added to 121 Chestnut. The properties were again altered about 1910, when a central Neoclassical style entrance and new storefront were added.

In June 2004, the Architectural Committee reviewed and recommended denial of a similar application. That application was withdrawn prior to Commission review. This new application responds to the Committee's criticisms related to the placement and design of the addition as well as alterations to the storefront.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal and reported that the applicant has revised the application to reflect the Committee's comments. The addition will not be visible from Chestnut Street. It will be minimally visible from Letitia and Front Streets over other buildings. New construction should block much of this view in the near future.

Tina Makouljian, counsel for the applicant, and Stephen Potts, the architect, noted their acceptance of the Committee's recommendations, which have been incorporated into the latest design scheme.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to approve the revised submission. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried with 10 votes. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Wilds returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

2202 Brandywine Street

Kevin and Monika Klatt, Owners

Robert Boothroyd, Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Legalize vinyl siding on visible rear ell

The Architectural Committee recommended denial 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.]

This application proposes the legalization of vinyl siding installed on a rear ell without Commission approval or a building permit. The siding is visible from both Brandywine and Spring Garden Streets.

Mr. Farnham presented the application and noted that no one would represent the proposal at the meeting. Commission members concurred with the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

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

220 West Rittenhouse Square

220 West Rittenhouse Square Condominium Association, Owner

Robert Doughy, Abstract Door Company, Applicant

DATE: c. 1958

PROPOSAL: Legalize replacing front doors

The Committee recommended denial of this application for legalization, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]

This proposal calls for the legalization of a new sliding door, which replaced the original hinged doors.

Mr. Farnham presented the application. Jean Henry, a resident in the building, expressed her opposition to the newly installed doors. She commented that the new doors only open halfway. Lois Brody, also a resident, offered her disapproval of the doors.

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

237-247 South 18th Street, The Barclay

Barclay Condominium Association, Owner

Albert Tantala, Applicant

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

PROPOSAL: Legalize and alter vents and alarms on east facade of building

The Committee recommended denial of this application, 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.]

This application, only slightly changed since its last review, involves the legalization of a large alarm box as well as tall ducts rising out of the sidewalk on the east side of the building. The Committee and Commission denied a similar application at the last meeting.

Mr. Farnham introduced the application to the Commission. Mr. Tissian remarked that the alterations, which are highly visible, are extremely distasteful.

Craig Rosenfeld, the building's manager, explained that oil tanks that require venting were recently installed in the basement. He said that there is no common space on the 1st floor to run the ducts. He added that he conferred with the restaurant owner about the possible usage of space; however, no space was available.

Mr. James asked if the vents could be run internally. Commission members agreed that coverings and disguises for mechanical equipment often draw more, not less, attention to it. Mr. Rivera pointed out that the Committee struggled to find a workable solution. Commission members noted that the applicant had obtained a permit for interior, but not exterior, work related to the new oil tanks; all exterior work had been deleted from the plans approved by the Commission. Therefore, the exterior work was executed without a permit.

Mr. Brown made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Rivera and Mr. Steinberg dissented.

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Wilds.

258-62 South 17th Street and 1706 Rittenhouse Square Street

Parkway Corporation, Owner

Thomas P. Witt, Esq., Wolf Block, Applicant

DATE: 1706 Rittenhouse Square Street built c. 1920 with c. 1960 storefront addition

PROPOSAL: Demolition of 1706 Rittenhouse Square, construction of 31-story residential building with underground parking at 58-62 South 17th Street and 1706 Rittenhouse Square Street

The Committee recommended the denial of this application on architectural grounds and its referral to the Committee on Financial Hardship, pursuant to 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.]

The application proposes the demolition of a contributing row house at 1706 Rittenhouse Square Street and the construction of a 31-story condominium tower on the site of a parking lot and the row house.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Brian Flaherty, counsel to Parkway Corporation, and Ross Wilson of Parkway, attended the meeting. Mr. Flaherty asked for clarification of the Architectural Committee's recommendation. It was his belief that the application would not be approved or denied, but would instead be referred to the Committee on Financial Hardship. Mr. Flaherty pointed out the proposal is solely for demolition, not the new design.

Mr. Tyler asserted that the submission would be automatically approved if not acted upon within sixty (60) days. He urged the Commission to act.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance urged the Commission to support the Architectural Committee's recommendation, because the Committee did not review the architectural merits of the building. For this reason, the proposal should return to the Architectural Committee.

Mr. Wilds said that the recommendation is consistent with procedures. The Commission discussed how to expedite the Architectural Committee and Financial Hardship Committee application. Mr. James noted that the application is for demolition only.

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

Mr. Wilds returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

1530 Spruce Street

Al Shapiro, Owner

Michael Del Rossi, Jr., Applicant

DATE: 1898, Thomas Bennett, architect

PROPOSAL: Replace wood windows with aluminum

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, with staff to review details such as color.

This application proposes the replacement of 200 wood windows with aluminum windows in this residential building on Spruce Street. Two types of one-over-one windows would be replaced. Type A would be replaced above the cornice line at floors 5, 6, 7, and 8. Type B windows (in the bays) would be replaced at floors 2 to 8. A similar application was reviewed by the Committee in June 2004, but was withdrawn before the Commission meeting owing to a recommendation of denial. The applicant returns with improved plans.

Mr. Farnham described the proposal and the Commission concurred with the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

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

1223 Pine Street

Kendall Cameron, Owner

Robin Towey, Applicant

DATE: built c. 1830, storefront altered c. 1905

PROPOSAL: New shed dormer addition at rear, rebuild roof deck

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the simple deck railing, the re-opening of the historic window, provided that evidence of it exists, but denial of the shed dormer addition, 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.].

The proposal calls for demolishing the rear slope of the roof and constructing a new roof addition and roof deck, all of which would be highly visible on this corner building. The adjacent buildings to the west, where owners have undertaken similar work, stand away from the corner; these alterations are not visible from the public right-of-way.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal and noted that Mr. Baron visited the site and verified the existence of the historic window opening.

Robin Towey, the designer, and Michael Shannon, the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Shannon said that it is his intention to replicate the approved alterations of the neighboring house. He believes that the design is sensitive to the appearance of the roofline. The dormer would be set back from the street and faced with stucco and wood siding.

Mr. Steinberg deemed the dormer appropriate; it would provide more space. Mr. Wilds disagreed; he said that the recommendation is consistent with dormer expansions at corner locations. Mr. Tissian inquired about the dimensions of the upper floor with and without the dormer alterations. Mr. Sklaroff remarked that the alterations would substantially change the building. Mr. Wilds inquired about the setback of the dormer. Ms. Towey responded that the plans are preliminary; she is willing to increase the setback. Mr. Steinberg expressed concern about the submittal of drawings without an architect's seal. Others commented that the Commission has never required sealed drawings; the Commission reviews many types of applications that do not require the services of a registered architect or engineer. Commission members discussed the review processes by the Commission staff and Department of Licenses & Inspections. As a result, Mr. Sklaroff asked that a Committee consisting of Mr. Rivera, Mr. Perri, Mr. Huff, Mr. Reuter, and a staff member convene a meeting to discuss the process policy.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which failed with a vote of 5 to 6. Mr. Rivera, Mr. Huff, Ms. Murray, Mr. Tissian, Mr. Steinberg, and Mr. Brown opposed the motion.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the proposal with the dormer set back three (3) feet from the Camac Street wall. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which carried with 8 votes. Mr. James, Ms. Smyler, and Mr. Sklaroff opposed the motion.

1001-13 Chestnut Street, Victory Building

Philadelphia Management, Owner

Deanna Collins, Architect/Applicant

DATE: built c.1870 altered c 1890

PROPOSAL: New doors, illuminated signage

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal including a single-light ADA door with side lights and no divisions in the door, with staff to review details.

The application initially proposed new metal doors for the first-floor corner and illuminated projecting and flat wall signs. A Starbucks coffee shop is moving into the space. At the Architectural Committee meeting, the applicant added that he would also like to install a single-leaf ADA door on the Chestnut Street façade in the location of an existing double-leaf window. He noted that the building owner had originally offered to build an ADA ramp, but had recently rescinded that offer.

The Commission reviewed the application and concluded that it was acceptable.

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

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Wilds.

227 South 6th Street, Lippincott Building

Irv Green, Condominium Owner

Stephen Verner, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1900, William Prichett, architect
PROPOSAL: Alter Locust Walk entrance

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of scheme A, recessed as far as possible.

This application proposes alterations to an entrance to this condominium building. The entrance on Locust Walk will lead into a private condominium unit rather than a lobby space for the building. This doorway originally led to the internal fire-escape that was open on all floors. The arched windows on the upper floors did not have glazing originally and the photographs submitted by the architect show that the entrance did not have doors.

The condominium's owner wishes to remove the existing door and transom and install a double-leaf frameless glass door. The plans show two options for the sidelights: one would remove the entire sidelight and install a single pane of glass; the second would keep the panels below and install glass in the upper portion.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal.

Jane Green, the owner, and Stephen Verner, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Verner disclosed that the room beyond the entrance is a garden room. Ms. Green believes that the proposed scheme A replicates the original. She noted that the Society Hill Civic Association supports the proposal.

Mr. Rivera thought that scheme B better replicates the original. Mr. Huff thought that the bevel at the base of the columns, which turns from brick to stone, should be retained.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which carried with 10 votes. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Wilds returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

4113-15 Main Street

Daniel Neduccsin, Owner/Applicant

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

PROPOSAL: Demolition of 4117-25 Main Street, rehabilitation of 4113 Main Street, construction of 4-story building at 4115-25 Main Street - final approval

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of a revised submission, with the addition of a bay on the Main Street façade, the elimination of the pergola, the addition of windows on the rear, and the addition of 4 to 6 feet more of setback from the front facade at the end units on the 4th floor.

The Commission approved the demolition of 4117-25 Main Street in concept on the condition that the owner return with a new, more contemporary design that retains the boiler plant. The proposal has returned for final approval. It is very similar to the last design, except that a series of 2-story bays replaces the recreated historic façades at 4117 to 4125.

The proposal calls for the rehabilitation of the boiler plant at 4113 Main Street, infill construction at 4115 Main Street, the complete demolition of 4117-25 Main Street, and the construction of a four-story building with a single commercial space on the first floor and residential units above.

The rehabilitation of 4113 Main Street involves removing the brick panels below the steel windows and inserting plate-glass storefront windows.

The new four-story building will sit on the properties at 4115-25 and have set backs at the third and fourth floors. The design at 4115 consists of an aluminum curtain wall at the first floor and multi-light windows at the second floor. The rest of the façade is a series of four two-story stucco bays with plate-glass windows at the first floor and multi-light, industrial sash at the second floor. The door to the commercial space is a double-leaf, fully-glazed unit.

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

Ms. Spina presented the proposal, which is recommended for final approval.

Daniel Neduccin, the owner, and David Amburn, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Amburn gave an overview of the proposal and showed a sample of the proposed cast stone.

Mr. Bumb made a motion to approve the revised submission. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

THE REPORT of the Ad-Hoc Committee on Murals, 2 July 2004

Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property

Mr. James gave an overview of the report and noted that the Committee took a sensitive approach in setting the guidelines. An integral part of the guidelines is the posting of a notice of a proposed mural at that location. The notice will allow the community to attend the meeting and comment on the proposed mural. Mr. Sklaroff asked who bore the responsibility for the posting. He was informed that the applicant is responsible. Commission members concurred that the posting should remain in place until after the Commission meeting. They also concluded that the context of a mural is not its purview. Mr. Wilds disagreed; he thought if the content of a mural overwhelms the streetscape, the Commission should find the mural inappropriate. Mr. Steinberg concurred. Ms. Smyler urged the Commission to consider content carefully and its usage. Mr. Sklaroff pointed out that the artistic merits are never a consideration as long as it does not detract from the historic structure or fabric. Mr. Wilds stressed the importance of the visual appearance of a mural, for its approval could imply tacit approval in the future of any type of mural in an historic district. Mr. Huff asserted that the Mural Arts Program has benefited the city over many years and it is a vital service to the city. He concluded by offering the thought that murals by definition should not be precluded from historic districts. Mr. James pointed out that it is not the intention of the Commission to preclude or restrict the program and get involved with First Amendment issues.

Mr. Sklaroff said that he was glad that the word content generated a very productive discussion on murals which led him to believe that the matter should be continued for further discussion. Mr. Tyler cited a mural approval in which the Commission stipulated that the mural not extend into the gable. He also asserted that the ordinance gives the Commission the authority to regulate appearance including scale without violating the First Amendment.

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance, commended the Commission for the policy. Mr. Gallery concurred with Mr. Sklaroff about continuing this matter until further discussion can be undertaken. He believes that proposed policy should be circulated to Civic Associations and the community before its adoption. Mr. Gallery believes that while the content is not evaluated, he encourages murals in a district which contribute and celebrate the district.

Jane Golden, Director of the Mural Arts Program, concurred with Commission members about the continuance of the policy discussion until the November meeting. She noted that it is not the program's intent to venture into a neighborhood where the program is not welcomed. It is her hope that the policy will provide more interaction with the community with regards to murals.

Mr. Sklaroff invited the Mural Arts Program to attend the meeting to become part of the process in the evolution of the policy.

Mr. James made a motion to continue the discussion of the proposed policy until the November meeting. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

1811-17 Spring Garden Street

Metropolitan Regional Council Carpenters' Union

Anthony Rabutino, Applicant

DATE: 1925

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

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

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

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

Ms. Spina presented the application and noted that the Ad-Hoc Committee met to discuss controversial issues and reach a mutual compromise.

Bob Fitzpatrick, representing the Carpenter's Union, submitted revised drawings to reflect the

Committee's recommendations. He took each issue individually:

1. front doors would be situated in line with the plane of the building and have a simplified transom, with material to match the windows;
2. Bas-relief (basso-rilievo or low-relief) sculpture retained;
3. Pilasters on the end eliminated;
4. Zodiac signs would be restored or a carved woodwork placed over them;
5. Railings on the bottom and the same railing extending across the top. He noted that setting back the top railing would be problematic and that it would look out of place.
6. The canopy would be simplified and the inset would be lowered to be level with the frame.

Mr. Fitzpatrick said that the Union would do a stain rather than the Dryvit covering for the stone, but would prefer a gray color to match other neighboring buildings, which would cover the patched areas. Commission members thought that the color should be selected to mimic the existing color of the building.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to approve scheme "B" with a railing at the roof and the review of the revised drawings by the Ad-Hoc Committee. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

1518 and 1520 Latimer Street

Owner: Gold Street Financial & DuBar Development Partners

Applicant: Liz Zimmers

History: c. 1885

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

The applicant requested and was granted a thirty-day continuance.

APPOINTMENT TO THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE

Mr. Tyler apprised the Commission of the vacancy on the Architectural Committee. With the concurrence of the Chairs of the Commission and of the Architectural Committee, he recommended the appointment of Robert Thomas, AIA, former chair of the Architectural Committee, to fill the vacant position.

The Commission voted unanimously to appoint Mr. Thomas to the Architectural Committee.

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

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

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to approve the expenditure of \$30.48 for the Architectural Committee lunches.

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

Mr. Sklaroff informed the Commission members about the upcoming continuing education seminar scheduled for 16 November 2004.

Mr. James made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary