

**THE MINUTES OF THE 482nd STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
11 October 2002 at 9:00 a.m.**

**City Council Caucus Room, 4th Floor, City Hall
Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D. Vice-Chair**

Present

Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D., Vice-Chair
Duane Bumb, Deputy Director, Commerce Department
Thomas Kilkenny
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
David Perri, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Vincent Rivera, AIA
Robin Schatz, Designee of the President of City Council
Denise Smyler, Esq.
Harris Steinberg, AIA
Norman Tissian
Scott Wilds, Deputy 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 K. Copeland, Esq., Senior Attorney, Law Department

Also

William J. Keenan, Jr., Kiehl's Since 1851
Emanuel Kelly, Kelly/Maiello Architects
Frank Cawley, Philadelphia Sign Company
Jim Karmolinski, Kelly/Maiello Architects
Jeffrey Hadzima, 421 South Iseminger Street
Clarence Norman, Church of Christ, 300-18 North 63rd Street
Alfred D. Whitman, Esq., Church of Christ, 300-18 North 63rd Street
William G. Schwartz, Esq., 300-18 North 63rd Street
Richard Waldron, American Swedish Historical Museum
James D. Grainge, 220 West Washington Square, 3rd floor
Sarah Barcheler, Historic Rittenhouse Town
Amy Chorey, Campbell Thomas and Company

Jennifer Myers, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Brett Powell, Brawer and Hauptman Architects
Joshua Grimes, Esq., 2028 Pine Street
Winchell Carroll, American Revolution Patriot's Fund
Harry Perks, Perks-Reutter Associates
John M. Sabatino, Philadelphia Convention Center Authority
Jim Hansen, Vitetta Group
Nan Gutterman, Vitetta Group
Hether Smith

Lanny Leibowitz
Peter Goldring, Arcollage
Robert Graves, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Randy Cotton, Preservation Alliance
Mary Hunt
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance

Mr. Sugrue, Vice-chair, called the meeting to order at 9:16 a.m.

Minutes of the 481st Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission. Upon a motion made by Mr. Steinberg and duly seconded, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the 481st Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held 13 September 2002, as corrected, Michael Sklaroff, Chair. Mr. Tissian noted the correction of Mr. Sugrue's nomination as Vice-Chair.

Mr. Sugrue informed the Commission about a pending bill proposed by Councilwomen Jannie Blackwell.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee. 24 September 2002
Suzanne Pentz, Acting Chair

1801 West Diamond Street, NW corner of 18th Street

Church of the Advocate, Owner

Bob Shamble, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1891-97, Charles M. Burns, architect

PROPOSAL: New construction for community center

Ms. Pentz, the only Committee member present for the meeting, recused herself from participating, owing to her firm's involvement with the project. The staff recommended approval of the proposal, 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.]. No member of the public objected to proceeding with a staff recommendation only and none raised any question about this submission.

This application calls for constructing a new community center on the ruins of the former chapel. The new structure will incorporate existing fabric on the south and west facades and will salvage stone at the base of the east façade. Plans call for building most of the new structure in a grey brick.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal and noted that the only Committee member present to review the proposal was Ms. Pentz, who, owing to her firm's involvement in the project, had to recuse herself. Mr. Baron recommended that the staff review details. Mr. Wilds asked if the architect objected to the staff's review of details.

Emanuel Kelly, the architect, thought that the details did not warrant review. He stated that the new steel gate with minimal ornamentation would be painted black to complement the existing gate.

Mr. James inquired if it is appropriate to vote on a proposal, without a recommendation from the Committee. Mr. Copeland stated that owing to the lack of a committee and its purely advisory function, it was appropriate to base the Commission's decision on the staff's recommendation. Mr. Steinberg said that the proposed design is very well done.

The Reverend Isaac Miller thanked the Commission for its consideration of the proposal, which will allow the project to move forward and keep the legacy of the late Father Paul Washington alive.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1643 West Diamond Street, NE corner of 17th Street

Ursino Nunez, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1887, architect Frank Furness

PROPOSAL: New storefront

Mr. Nunez decided that, for economic reasons, he would withdraw the storefront proposal and have the staff approve an awning and a door. He will return with an architect's drawing for a new storefront at a later date.

5500-06 Germantown Avenue, NW corner of Schoolhouse Lane

Citizens Bank, Owner

Frank Cawley, Applicant

DATE: c. 1868, mid 20th century addition, architect James Sidney

PROPOSAL: Illuminated signage

Ms. Pentz recommended the approval of all the signs as revised, 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.], with the staff to review details.

The proposal calls for replacing four existing signs with four new signs for the new owner. Sign A, a pylon sign in the parking lot will change to a slightly curved sign face and a single support post. Signs C and D involve refacing illuminated box signs on the mid 20th century addition. Sign B in the entablature over the Germantown Avenue door replaces an existing sign that unfortunately covers original architectural stonework.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal and the Commission concurred.

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

207 Lincoln Drive, Rittenhouse Town

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Andrew Zellers-Frederick, Applicant

DATE: 1707

PROPOSAL: New wood fence around Rittenhouse homestead

Ms. Pentz 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], with the staff to review details.

This proposal calls for replacement of a portion of fence surrounding the David Rittenhouse homestead with a wood fence taken from The Carpenter's Company rule book.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal, and in response to Mr. Wilds inquiry about the wooden fence, said that the fence would be painted.

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

2100 Porter Street, aka 2101 Shunk Street, Gentilhommiere

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Brett Powell, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1760, east wing; 1798-1803, central portion; c. 1825, west wing; c.1810, auxiliary buildings

PROPOSAL: New roof

Ms. Pentz recommended approval pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated 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.] and the roofing guideline [Recommended: Replacing in kind an entire feature of the roof that is too deteriorated to repair. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.], with the removal of the notes for the roof hatch and HVAC unit on the plans and the staff to review details.

This application returns to the Committee and Commission with one major change. Originally, the proposal called for metal shingles. Now the application is for asphalt-fiberglass shingles in a weathered-wood color. The box and pole gutters will be rehabilitated.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal and the Commission members concurred with the recommendation.

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

1900 Pattison Avenue, American Swedish Historical Museum

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Robert Thomas, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1926, John Nyden, architect

PROPOSAL: Elevator tower, final approval

Ms. Pentz recommended approval of the proposal 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.], 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.] and the accessibility guideline [Recommended: Designing new or additional means of access that are compatible with the historic building and its setting.],

with the staff to review details.

This application returns to Committee and Commission for final approval, but with some modifications. The elevator tower will stand on the north side of the building tucked into the corner of the cross gable. Originally the proposed addition extended beyond the projecting area, but now it will be flush with the northernmost wall. The new tower will have a stucco finish, simplified cast stone pilasters at the corner and pieces of decorative stone now found at the bays that will be covered. The primary path to the elevator will lead directly from Pattison Avenue, eliminating the ramp previously proposed. The current path will be regraded and repaved in concrete.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal. Mr. Steinberg questioned the stone decoration and asked if the hipped roof is necessary and if the roofline could be simplified, so that it does not mimic the historic style. He believes that the hipped roof is inappropriate. Ms. Spina said that the asymmetry shows that this is an addition. Mr. Sugrue concurred and said that a flat roof would maintain the symmetry of the building, therefore, he believed that the hipped roof is more appropriate. Mr. Baron said that since the historic stone decorations will be reused, which he believes is a good thing.

Amy Choray, the architect, said that the hipped roof has minimal visibility from Pattison Avenue elevation.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion which carried with 10 votes. Mr. Steinberg opposed the motion.

47-49 North 2nd Street, aka 128 Cuthbert Street

Daryl Rothman, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation of Cuthbert Street façade

Ms. Pentz recommended the approval of the proposal 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.], with the staff to review details.

The application includes reestablishing the first floor openings to the original lintel heights, with a large single-light transom over the front door and a six-pane fixed transom over the double-hung 6/6 window on the first floor. New true-divided light, 6/6 windows will be installed on the second and third floors.

Ms. Spina presented the application and the Commission agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

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

102-106 Arch Street

Brown Hill, Incorporated, Owner

Jennifer Myers, Architect

DATE: 1743, Thomas Green, carpenter

PROPOSAL: New condenser platform, new front gate and steps

Ms. Pentz recommended approval of the removal of the infill, the condenser platform and fence, the addition of two stone treads with the retention of the existing stone and a simplified wrought-iron gate design 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 mechanical systems guideline [Recommended: Installing air conditioning units in such a manner that historic features are not damaged or obscured.], with the staff to review details.

The original alleyway entrance now has a taller lintel, an infilled upper portion and a six-panel wood door. The application is for the installation of a platform at the visible rear of the property at the first floor to support new HVAC condensers, and a new painted wood screen to hide them. On the front of the building, the application is for the removal of the wood door and infill, and the installation of a wrought-iron gate. The proposal also includes the installation of three brick steps.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal and noted the receipt of revised drawings. Mr. Steinberg inquired if the platform currently exists.

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

1301-03 Walnut Street, NW corner of 13th Street, Philadelphia Club

Philadelphia Club, Owner

James Wiesenhutter, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: 1837, attributed to William Strickland, architect, 1888, addition, Frank Furness, architect, 1904-5, bay on rear, Horace Trambauer, architect

PROPOSAL: Legalize windows

The applicant requested a 30-day continuance.

421 South Iseminger Street

Jeffrey Hadzima, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1830

PROPOSAL: New dormer

Ms. Pentz recommended denial of the proposal 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] and roofing guidelines [Not Recommended: Introducing a new roof feature that is incompatible in size, scale, material and color. Not Recommended: Radically changing a character-defining roof shape.]

This proposal calls for the installation of a shed dormer in the front gable. The dormer would have four, 4/4 wood windows.

Ms. Spina presented the application. Commission members acknowledged the existence of similar dormers on the block, which directed its consideration for the approval of the proposal.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation and approve the

proposal as submitted. Ms. Schatz seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

600 Walnut Street, Washington Square

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Philip Steel, Jr., Applicant

DATE: 1682, Thomas Holme

PROPOSAL: Plaque mounted on base

Ms. Pentz recommended denial of the application, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.] and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]

This proposal from the Society of the Descendants of Washington's Army at Valley Forge calls for a plaque measuring 16 x 24 inches on a granite base 20 x 28 x 10 inches. The proposed location is along the southwest path of the Square just before the central circular area. The plaque commemorates the soldiers encamped at Valley Forge.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal and the Commission concurred with the Committee's recommendation.

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

600 Walnut Street, Washington Square

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Winchell S. Carroll, Applicant

DATE: 1681, Thomas Holme

PROPOSAL: Plaques

Ms. Pentz recommended approval of either revised scheme, as submitted, provided the plaque matches the dimension of, and fits into, the existing paving pattern.

At the last Historical Commission meeting, Commission members informally stated that they only would consider an application for a single plaque installed away from the Tomb. This application returns with changes that reflect the Commission's comments. It now calls for a single plaque set in the ground either between the Tomb and fountain or just north of the fountain.

Ms. Spina presented the revised proposal, which has the approval of the Fairmount Park Commission, provided the plaque matches the dimension of, and fits into, the existing paving pattern. Commission members thought the scheme #1 location between the fountain and the tomb appropriate.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the scheme #1 location provided the plaque fits in the existing paving pattern. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

220 West Washington Square, aka 701 Locust Street, 2nd floor

T. McGowan, Owner

Lanny Leibowitz, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1911, John T. Windrim, architect

PROPOSAL: New balcony on north side

Ms. Pentz voted to recommend approval of the straight black metal railing as revised with a row of circular ornamentation beneath the top rail, 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 roofing guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as decks and terraces when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

This application proposes constructing a terrace at the 2nd-floor level of the W.B. Saunders Building at 220 W. Washington Square. It would be built on a 1-story projection in the middle of the north façade. It would be enclosed by a metal perimeter railing with sections of simple metal pickets alternating with heavier metal piers. The railing would be attached to the inside vertical surface with L-brackets, not to the coping. It would be minimally visible from Washington Square down an opening separating the building from the N.W. Ayer Building to the north.

Mr. Farnham presented the application and noted that the applicant has submitted a revised design with smaller piers and a simplified design of the black railing.

Mr. James believed that the drawings lacked details, and noted that there is no access to the proposed patio. In response, Mr. Farnham said that there is a forthcoming application for converting a window into a door. Mr. Leibowitz, the architect, said that another architect has been hired to do the windows and the door. Commission members concurred that the railings for this proposal as well as the next proposal should be consistent and that better drawings for this proposal should be submitted. Ms. Schatz added that the condominium guidelines should also be met.

Mr. Leibowitz said that the original design of the railing was very different, but the current design only differs in the circles, which extend all the way across. To allow his project to move forward, he agreed to match the railings on the 3rd floor proposal.

Ms. Smyler made a motion to approve a railing subject to consistency in the design with the proposed 3rd floor railing. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion which carried with 10 votes. Mr. James dissented.

220 West Washington Square, aka 701 Locust Street, 3rd floor

David Wheadon, Owner

James Grainge, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1911, John T. Windrim, architect

PROPOSAL: New door and deck on north side

Ms. Pentz and Mr. Atkin recommended approval of a simplified straight black metal railing with circular ornamentation similar to that recommended for the 2nd floor railing considered in the previous application and the door as proposed with a new brick lintel that extends to the right side of the former window opening, retention of the arched brickwork; infilling the window opening above the new lintel with compatible brick recessed from the face of the wall and infilling the window below the new lintel with compatible brick flush with the face of the wall.

This application proposes cutting an opening, installing a door, and constructing a deck at the 3rd-floor level of the W.B. Saunders Building at 220 W. Washington Square. The installation of a 4-light, steel door, painted black, would require the infilling of a large, partially-boarded, segmental-arched window in a service tower with brick to match existing in material and pattern.

The deck would be built on a small, 2-story projection housing mechanical equipment at the rear of the north façade. It would be enclosed by a 42-inch tall, perimeter, metal railing. The railing would be minimally visible from Washington Square down a narrow opening separating the building from the N.W. Ayer Building to the north. Low-watt lights would be flush-mounted in the deck.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal and noted that the brick soldier course would be retained as well as the vertical rhythm of the façade. Most of the Commission members believed that the proposal is compatible to the building.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Kilkenny seconded the motion which carried with 10 votes. Mr. James dissented.

1600 Arch Street, SW corner of 16th Street

SAS-1600 Arch Street, LLP, Owner

Robert Graves, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1927, Stewardson and Page, architects

PROPOSAL: Awnings, signage and clock for restaurant

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with revised designs for the clock and awnings, pursuant to Standards 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.]

This application proposes to add awnings, ornaments, signage, lighting, street furniture, and a clock to the Insurance Company of North America building for a new restaurant at the corner of 16th and Cuthbert Streets.

Mr. Farnham presented the project. Mr. James questioned the significance of the clock. Mr. Sugrue inquired about who is responsible for its maintenance. Mr. Tyler stated that the building's owner would maintain the clock and lamppost. Ms. Smyler thought the clock inconsistent with the historic nature of the building. Upon discussion Mr. James thought the motion should eliminate the clock and signage on the lamppost. Mr. Steinberg believed that the clock detracts from the building. Mr. Wilds questioned the Commission's asserting jurisdiction over the lamppost and clock. Mr. Tyler responded that the Commission's jurisdiction is anything that would change the appearance of a property and believes the proposed alterations changes the character of the building. Mr. Rivera disagreed and said that the proposal is not threatening to the building since it is very minimal in scale. The overall consensus of the Commission is that the redesigned canopy, the pylon signage, the screen and furniture as well as the neon signage are appropriate. Mr. Wilds thought the leaded glass on Cuthbert Street façade, which is dark and dim, appropriate. Mr. Sugrue said that the leaded glass on the 16th Street façade is problematic and asked the applicant to consider the elimination of the leaded glass on that façade. Mr. Graves believes that the owner will object to the disallowance of the leaded glass on the 16th Street façade. Most of the Commission members took issue with the leaded glass on the angled window on 16th Street and the 16th Street façade as well as the signage and clock on the lamppost.

Robert Graves, the architect, commented on the intent of the leaded glass behind the existing glass of the windows, stating that with a building of such a massive scale, it gives unique character and softens the nature of the building. He said that the leaded glass is not very bright

and of a small scale which does not diminish the overall historic features of the building.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the redesigned canopy, the pylon signage, the screen and furniture and the neon signs behind the glass, but denial of the leaded glass on the angled window on 16th Street and the 16th Street façade as well as the clock and signage on the lamppost. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Tissian and Mr. Rivera opposed the motion.

1911 Brandywine Street

Robert and Rachel Cheetham, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Legalize roof deck

The applicant requested a thirty day continuance.

135 South 18th Street, aka 1737 Walnut Street

Rittenhouse Management Company, Owner

Chris Harrelson, Applicant

DATE: 1913, McIlvaine and Roberts, architects

PROPOSAL: Re-open windows, signage at storefront

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the revised design, 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.].

The application proposes the rehabilitation of a corner storefront at 18th and Walnut Streets. It stipulates removing the existing awnings, security grilles, grille frames, and aluminum storefront as well as the infill in two 18th Street openings. The original bronze surround would remain and a wood storefront frame with glazing and stainless steel stops as well as a recessed, single-leaf, glazed, brushed stainless steel door would be installed in the existing opening. The sign panel above the storefront would have glazed brick tile topped by pin-mounted, brushed stainless steel letters. A 4-foot long brushed stainless steel banner pole with hanging blade sign would be mounted at the corner, projecting diagonally out over the sidewalk.

Mr. Farnham presented proposal and said that the Art Commission and the Department of Licenses and Inspections rejected the original submission, which dictated that the applicant revise his submission. Commission members thought the revised submission appropriate.

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

2226 Pine Street

Donald Smith, Owner

Perry Benson, Jr., Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: New front windows and door

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal as originally submitted, pursuant to Restoration Standard 9 [Replacement of missing features from the restoration period will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence. A false sense of history will not be

created by adding conjectural features...or by combining features that never existed together historically.], with the staff to review details.

This application proposes the replacement of an inappropriate fluted wood door on the front façade of this Italianate rowhouse with a 4-panel wood door with bolection molding to match the original door, which is documented by the original door still hanging at the neighboring 2223 Pine Street. It also proposes to replace the two inappropriate fixed, single-light windows in enlarged openings at the 1-story of the front façade with 2/2, double-hung wood windows over two-light awning windows.

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

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

2028 Pine Street, SW corner of Capitol Street

Stuart Ford, Owner

Peter Goldring, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850, refaced c. 1900

PROPOSAL: New front and side windows, new rear balcony, new roof deck with penthouse
Mr. Rivera and Ms. Pentz recommended approval of the window opening restoration and window replacement, contingent on receipt of complete details including shop drawings, with staff to review details. Approval of the 2nd-story deck rehabilitation and the installation of the French doors and transom in the existing opening, contingent on receipt of complete details including shop drawings, with staff to review details. Approval of the 3rd-story deck, removal of the window, enlargement of the window opening, and installation of the door and transom, contingent on receipt of complete details including shop drawings, with staff to review details. Denial of the reconstruction of the roof, construction of the roof deck and pilothouse, and alterations to the chimney, 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 works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and the roofing guideline[Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as ... decks and terraces ... when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

In addition to numerous interior alterations, this application proposes myriad exterior alterations. It proposes to remove glass block infill in some window openings in a large bay and install new windows in those openings as well as other openings at the 2nd and 3rd stories. The plans call for the new windows to match the existing, but no details have been provided. The application also proposes to rebuild the railing and decking on an existing deck at the 2nd-story rear along Capitol Street and to replace the existing single-leaf, deck access door with French doors and a segmental-arched transom. No details have been provided for the French doors and transom. Although the plans stipulate that the French doors would be installed in the existing opening, photographs of the existing conditions reveal that the proposed doors would require that the opening be enlarged. The application also proposes to build a deck at the 3rd-story rear along Capitol Street and to remove a window at the 3rd-story rear, enlarge the window opening, and install a single-leaf, fully-glazed door with segmental-arched transom. No details have been provided for the door and transom. It also proposes the removal of the existing, sloped roof, the lowering of the roofline, and the construction of a new, flat roof. It proposes to build a large roof

deck with hot tub and stuccoed pilothouse with stairs. Finally, it proposes to raise the height of a chimney and vent stack and remove another vent stack.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal and said that since the Architectural meeting, the applicant sent a letter, which states that Waverly Street is not within the Rittenhouse-Fittler Historic district and therefore the view of the building from Waverly Street should not be considered. Mr. Wilds rejected the applicant's assertion.

Joshua Grimes, Esq., representing the owner, asked the Commission not to focus on the letter, but the merits of the proposal. Peter Goldring, the architect, presented photographs from Pine Street, which show that visibility only exists beyond the bay from Pine and Capitol Streets. He noted that the property has a slight peak, but the proposal will keep the plane along the front and corner. He showed photographs of roofs on Capitol Street that have the same profile and the point at which the decks can be seen and some existing decks on Waverly Street that have pilot houses. Mr. Grimes thought it important to explain that the current condition of this narrow property is a multi-family dwelling. He stated that he disagrees with the *Standards* and roofing guidelines, and believes the proposed roof deck does not destroy the character of the building. He also opined that the chimney has been altered and that the proposed change to the roofline and chimney will only impact the already altered portion. Mr. Grimes cited neighboring houses that have roof decks and pilot houses and submitted a petition signed by neighbors, who support the project. He said that the deck is only visible from Waverly Street and that based on a precedent, this proposal should be considered on a case by case basis.

Mr. Tissian asked if the applicant would consider the concept of a setback roof deck with a circular stair or roof hatch for access. Mr. Goldring said that the standard stairs are a continuation of the existing stairs in the house. He noted that the railing of the revised roof deck design is set back three feet. Mr. Wilds said that the roof deck is highly visible and that it overwhelms the building.

Lenore Millhollen, speaking as a concerned neighbor, did not support the roof deck proposal and was unaware of any petition signed by neighbors. She also said that the Preservation Alliance does not wish to see this roof deck as a precedent for other buildings.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, with the staff to review details. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

2110 Chancellor Street

Ara Chalian, Owner

Michael Hauptman, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1867

PROPOSAL: Rooftop addition with deck in concept

The applicant requested a thirty-day continuance.

2119 Delancey Street

Harriet Berneman, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1845

PROPOSAL: New wood windows and door

Mr. Rivera and Ms. Pentz both recommended denial of the proposed windows and door, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated 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.].

This application calls for replacing the windows and front door of this mid-19th century rowhouse. After research and a site visit, staff advised the owner that the original design consisted of four-over-four windows on the first, second and third floors, instead of the two-over-two windows proposed. These windows can be seen in the photograph of her house as well as existing on neighboring houses. Mr. Baron also explained that the door should consist of two vertical panels with a bolection molding as seen in the Commission's photographs of 2103, 2117 and 2121 Delancey Street. The owner wishes to install a six-panel door with raised panel molding and two-over-two windows with wide mullions.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal and said that the applicant submitted a letter which Commission members have in their packets. He explained the significance on Italianate buildings of having a wide vertical muntin on four-over-four windows to suggest casement design.

Mr. Wilds asked for clarification of the door's design. Mr. Baron noted that the existing jambs consist of elongated panels, which is consistent with the historic two vertical paneled door with bolection molding.

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

Policy for Slate Roofs

Following the discussion, at the Architectural Committee meeting, the Committee recommended the adoption of the following policy:

The staff may approve the replacement of slate with a substitute material that approximates the color and shape of the historic slate where such replacement has already occurred on a substantial number of properties on the block. This policy does not apply to turrets and mansards.

Mr. Tyler introduced the issue of slate roofs and their replacement. He noted that the Commission needs to address the economics of slate replacement and the emergency nature of many roof repairs. In Girard Estate, the houses originally had -- and many still have -- slate roofs. Now approximately 100 years old, these roofs have reached the end of their life expectancy; indeed, many dwellings now have asphalt and fiber glass shingles. Although Girard Estate is a solid middle-class neighborhood, its population contains many retirees on fixed incomes. For them in particular, replacement in slate may prove extremely burdensome. He cited a recent application to replace the deteriorating slate on a roof with asphalt/fiber glass shingles. Mr. Tyler reported that the owners had secured cost estimates to reroof their house. Slate would cost \$14,000, simulated slate \$12,000, asphalt/fiber glass \$2,400. Either of these two larger sums could easily equal a person's Social Security benefit for a year. This issue extends beyond Girard Estate. As the Commission designates other districts that include buildings with elaborate millwork, slate or tile roofs and other features costly to replicate, the problem will grow and could inundate the Commission and the Committee on Financial Hardship with applications for relief. Mr. Tyler also saw an analogy between a substitute material in a neighborhood such as Girard Estate and the routine approval of asphalt/fiber glass shingles rather than cedar, the historic material, in Society Hill. Unfortunately, roof repair is frequently undertaken upon the discovery of water penetration, and referral to the hardship Committee can consume several weeks or even months. He also noted that the compromise of salvaging shingles to reuse on the front with the use of synthetic shingles on the rear, still can be a costly effort.

Mr. Wilds thought that the language of the recommendation should read as the staff "shall

approve rather than “may approve”. Mr. Sugrue disagreed; he thought that the language should remain the same, but encouraged “that when viable, retain the slate.” Ms. Smyler also thought that the word “may” should remain. In addition, she referenced the portion of the recommendation that states where substantial replacement with a substitute material has already occurred, and said that this should not be a criteria for staff approval of synthetic material replacement, but that each application be taken on a case by case basis. Mr. James inquired about the policy’s effect on the financial hardship process. Mr. Wilds asked if the policy is a change in the rules and regulations. He also said that it is important that the public is aware that the creation of a district is in no way meant to make living impossible. Ms. Smyler suggested that the motion for the policy be subject to review by the legal department.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to allow staff to approve replacement of slate roofs with the exception of mansards and turrets with a substitute material that approximates the color and shape of the historic slate, subject to review by the Law Department. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion which carried with 10 votes. Mr. James opposed the motion.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 2 October 2002
Vincent Rivera, Chair

1328-32 Race Street, Fire Station

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Harry Perks, Applicant

DATE: 1925, architect, John Molitor

PROPOSAL: Complete demolition for Convention Center expansion in concept

Ms. Pentz made a motion to approve in concept the demolition based on public interest with the following conditions:

HABS recordation prior to demolition

Salvage of any artifacts for possible reuse in the proposed exhibition

Issuance of demolition permit only after certification of funding for the project

This is the last property to be demolished on the site.

Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

The application in concept calls for the demolition of this historically designated firehouse, on the grounds of public interest, to build an extension to the Pennsylvania Convention Center. The architect shows three proposals, one reconstructs the firehouse façade in its present location, another moves and reconstructs the façade of the firehouse on the Race Street façade of the Convention Center. The final alternative salvages elements of the building to be exhibited in a room of the Convention Center which will tell the history of the demolished structures at the entire site.

Mr. Tyler presented the proposal. He explained that this is the only building within the footprint of the proposed center expansion that appears on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places and thus subject to the Commission’s jurisdiction. Reviews under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, and the State History Code will address any other preservation issues. Mr. Tyler continued that Philadelphia’s ability to remain competitive in the convention and hospitality industry requires the proposed expansion. He noted the preservation of several significant historic properties that would not have been rehabilitated but for the present Convention Center. They included the Reading Terminal, the PSFS Building, City Hall Annex, One East Penn Square and the Girard Bank complex. Mr. Tyler clarified the salvaged artifacts as the following: two fireplaces from the exterior and exterior details of engaged columns, shields, fireman spring stones and pedestrian doors and surrounds. Mr. Wilds emphasized that the salvaged artifacts, if not used in the Convention Center exhibit, should be retained and used in some other location. Mr. Steinberg expressed concern with any approval at this time, owing to

the absence of funding; however, it was noted that the approval in concept will be valid for one year, after that time the staff can renew the application for six months. Any further consideration of the application would have to come back to Committee and Commission. Mr. Wilds thought that revisiting a conceptual approval is not appropriate, but it was noted that if the design should change, then the application would have to be reviewed again.

Mr. James made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, with the inclusion of the retention of the salvaged artifacts even if not used at the Convention Center. Mr. Smyler seconded the motion which carried with 10 votes. Mr. Steinberg dissented.

THE REPORT of the Committee on Financial Hardship, 8 October 2002
Scott Wilds, Acting-Chair

300-318 North 63rd Street, NW corner of Vine Street, Patterson Memorial Presbyterian Church

Owner: Church of Christ

Applicant: William G. Schwartz, Esq.

Architect: T.P. Chandler

Date: 1884, parish house and bell tower; 1897, sanctuary

Proposal: Complete demolition based on financial hardship

The Financial Hardship Committee recommended tabling the application until the receipt of the engineer's report for a period not beyond 1 November 2002.

Mr. Wilds explained the proposal which the Committee on Financial Hardship recommended tabling until the report of the structural engineer is submitted but not later than 1 November 2002. It recommended that a final decision be rendered at the November Commission meeting; therefore, no vote was taken at this time.

Mr. Schwartz, counsel for the project, asked that the records reflect his objection to the continuance and noted that an appeal of the delay is slated to be heard on the following Tuesday by the License and Inspection Review Board. He also believes that the city has ignored the Imminently Dangerous status of the property and reiterated that this proposal was first presented to the Commission on 15 May 2001.

OLD BUSINESS

100-04 Market Street, SW corner of Front and Market Streets

Michael Yaron, Owner

Richard Wesley, Architect

DATE:

PROPOSAL: New operable café windows

The applicant withdrew the application.

1903-05 Green Street

Loonstyn and Duling, Owners

Liz Zimmers, Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Demolition of 1905 and partial demolition and rehabilitation of 1903, new construction of four-story building, roof decks

The applicant withdrew the application.

NATIONAL REGISTER COMMENT

2200-2218 Arch Street, Larkin Building

Mr. Tyler presented the nomination. He said that this building clearly meets criterion A because of its association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. The Larkin Building occupies an important place in history of manufacturing and commerce in the late 19th and 20th centuries. This appears in its innovations in fully integrated production and in national advertising, marketing with premium gifts, distribution including catalogue sales and Larkin Parties (along the lines of Tupperware). All this helped create a new national consumer culture, a phenomenon still very much with us. The subsequent history of Belber follows in that tradition with a different product. The Daily News, Robert Hall, Ship'n Shore Blouse all have local significance. It also meets criterion C which embodies distinctive characteristics of a method of construction. The Larkin Building utilizes mushroom columns – one of the first generation in Philadelphia of this system, which permitted large open floors capable of bearing heavy loads. The building is important in the history of industrial and distribution buildings.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to recommend the nomination for the National Register of Historic Places. Ms. Schatz seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

THE REPORT on the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, September 2002

Mr. Tyler then asked if members of the Commission had any questions about the report. There were none.

In her absence, Ms. Berneman, owner of 2119 Delancey asked Mr. Baron to suggest an alternate proposal to the Commission on her behalf, the proposal is for four-over four-windows with uniform wide muntins. In response to the suggestion, the Commission voted to let stand its original vote.

Mr. Wilds made a motion not to reconsider the proposal but to stay with the original motion. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

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

The meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary