

**THE MINUTES OF THE 514th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
10 June 2005**

**1515 Arch Street, Room 18025
Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair**

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
Warren Huff, Director of Urban Design, City Planning Commission
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
Sara Merriman, Special Assistant to the Director, Department of Commerce
David Perri, P.E., Chief Code Official, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Vincent Rivera, AIA
Harris Steinberg, AIA
Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.
Norman Tissian
Scott Wilds, Deputy Director, Office of Housing & Community Development

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Jonathan E. Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Officer
Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner

Lawrence Copeland, Esq., Senior Attorney, Law Department
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Assistant City Solicitor, Law Department

Also

Patrick Hauck, Powers & Company
James Rowe, Agoos/Lovera Architects
Neil Sandvold, Sandvold Blanda Architects
John E. Thrower, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
John F. Tucker, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Lenore Millhollen, Preservation Alliance/Center City Residents' Association
Craig Deutsch, Harman Deutsch Architects
Jesse Carpenter, J. G. Carpenter & Company Wood Workers
Robert Levitt, Second Street Parkominium
Michael Swiszczy, University of Pennsylvania
Mary Matricciano, 620 Hancock Street
Josefa Castineira, 620 Hancock
Richard Russell, University of Pennsylvania
Robert Pisani, 2502 Garnet Place
Kevin Smith Manayunk Neighborhood Council
Serge Nalbantian, Brown Hill Development
Jonathan Mallie, SHoP Architects
John M. Sabatini, AIA, Marshall Sabatini Architects
Dominic Chiacchiero
Dan Griffith, Wachovia
Mike Maddalo, Sr., NW Sign
Mike Maddalo, Jr., NW Sign

Joseph Clark, 2502 South Garnet Place
Chris Kytzidis
Clay Cann, 633 North 16th Street
Stephen Goldner, SPG3
Greg Skaler
Ray Labov
David Dinenberg, Metro Development
Colleen Ginder, Singer Real Estate
Judy Robinson, Woodcock Design
Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers
David Waxman, Rector Street Associates
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association
Shawn Plum, VMA
Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Bransburg & Ellers
Vicki Leon, 4163 Main Street
David Grasso, Metro Development
Jane Glenn, Manayunk Neighborhood Council
Craig Mandenberg, Idletime Network
Jen Pastore
Denise Centafanti
William G. Schwartz, Esq.
Jeff Walter, Brandywine Street
Richard Tyler

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 514th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:05 a.m.

Minutes of the 513th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Upon a motion made by Mr. Wilds and seconded by Mr. Steinberg, the Commission voted to approve the minutes of the 513th Stated Meeting, 13 May 2005, Michael Sklaroff, Chair, as corrected.

OLD BUSINESS

3 Rector Street

Rector Street Associates, Owner

Brett Feldman, Esq., Applicant

DATE: c. 1880 – contributing to the Manayunk Historic District

PROPOSAL: Demolish building; construct 4-story multi-unit residential building with parking

Architectural Committee recommendation: Denial, pursuant to PM § 704.2.1 of the Property Maintenance Code - No buildings or portion of the exterior thereof within the historic district shall hereafter be constructed, altered, repaired, demolished, or partially demolished unless a permit has first been obtained from the Department; and PM 704.2.2 - All applications for such permits shall be forwarded by the Department to the Historical Commission for review and approval, before issuance of the permit. No permit shall be issued unless the proposed work has been approved by the Historical Commission staff as preserving the historical character of the district.

Ms. Spina present the proposal, which calls for the total demolition of the historic building and the construction of a four-story, multi-unit residential building in its place. The inventory for the Manayunk Historic District lists the extant building as contributing to the district. The building reflects the industrial history of the neighborhood. The application includes some financial hardship information making a claim that the building could not be sold and reused as it is; however, the Manayunk Ordinance, which governs Commission reviews in the Manayunk Historic District, does not include hardship provisions.

The application proposes a four-story building with brick facing and stuccoed corners, beltcourses, and balconies. Large industrial-type windows would punctuate the symmetrical facades. Cars would enter the first-level parking from Rector Street. The openings along the tow path would provide ventilation of the parking area.

Mr. Sklaroff reviewed the Commission's jurisdiction in the Manayunk Historic District. He noted that the district was created by the City Council at the request of the Commerce Department, not by the Commission. He stated that the ordinance designating Manayunk as historic is part of the Property Maintenance Code. He reported that applications are to be reviewed by the Commission's staff only under the Manayunk ordinance. He stated that there are no provisions in the code for the Architectural, Hardship, and Designation Committees. He added that the Commission's role likewise is not defined. Appeals of decisions go not to the Board of Licenses & Inspection Review, but to the Board of Building Standards. He further noted that the Board of Building Standards is advisory to the Commissioner of the Department of Licenses & Inspections. Mr. Perri agreed and elaborated on Mr. Sklaroff's comments. Mr. Sklaroff added that Manayunk perhaps should be included on the Commission's long-range planning agenda when it considers the creation of new historic districts.

Mr. Wilds asserted that the Manayunk ordinance is silent on demolition and new construction. He requested clarification on the Commission's role in the matter.

Mr. Sklaroff stated that the applicant has a choice. He must decide whether to proceed to the Board of Building Standards or to accept a review by the Commission. Mr. Sklaroff also stated that if the Commission proceeds, it must decide if it has jurisdiction and, if so, what standards it will apply. Mr. Tissian asked how the Commission's decision in this matter might be appealed. Mr. Sklaroff replied that any decision of the Commission, right or wrong, with or without jurisdiction, would be appealed to the Board of Licenses & Inspection Review or to the courts. Mr. Baron stated that he was aware of at least one appeal of a staff decision for a Manayunk property to the Board of Licenses & Inspection Review.

Mr. Primavera acknowledged the complexities of the case and stated that, if it was easy, he would not have been retained as the attorney in the case. He then reported that Councilman Nutter was the inspiration behind the ordinance, which was enacted to promote commerce. Mr. Sklaroff observed that the ordinance predates Mr. Nutter's election to the City Council by several years. Mr. Primavera noted for the record the letter of support for the project from the Councilman. He then appeared to agree to continue with the review by the Commission, out of respect for the body. Mr. Sklaroff asked him directly if he wished to proceed. He stated that he did.

Mr. Sklaroff then asked the Commission if it wished to proceed. Mr. Sklaroff requested an opinion on the matter from Mr. Copeland of the Law Department. Mr. Copeland offered an informal opinion. He asserted that the Commission cannot simply decline jurisdiction. He also asserted that the staff could refer a matter to the Commission for guidance and that the Commission could, in turn, refer it to the Architectural Committee for guidance. He concluded that, although the ordinance is open to interpretation, it does appear to provide a framework for review; the Commission does hold jurisdiction in this case.

Mr. Sklaroff then presented his opinion. He stated that the Manayunk ordinance is part of the property maintenance code, not the zoning code. He asserted that the code expressly mandates that appeals from decisions of the Commission staff must be heard by the Board of Building Standards. Mr. Copeland agreed. Mr. Sklaroff contended that the Commission itself does not have jurisdiction over Manayunk applications. He then recommended that the Commission vote whether to hear the application as an appeal from the Architectural Committee's recommendation or to refuse to hear it with the understanding that the remedy is an appeal to the Board of Building Standards. He then offered a third alternative: the Commission could review the application and render a decision with the understanding that the applicant could appeal that decision as well as the Commission's claim of jurisdiction.

Based on his reading of the first sentence of Subsection II of the Manayunk ordinance, Mr. Sugrue suggested that the Commission did have jurisdiction. Mr. Wilds added, following Mr. Sugrue's interpretation, that the staff should be directed by the Commission. Mr. Sklaroff noted that the staff has made its determination in the matter: the proposal does not preserve the historic character of the district.

Speaking from the audience, Mr. Tyler offered a legislative history of the ordinance. He stated that the ordinance had been proposed by the Commerce Department in the early 1980s to offer some control over the fast-paced development occurring in Manayunk. He observed that the final decisions on applications had been limited to the Commission's staff to expedite the review process. Whereas the Commission's staff must render its decisions within five days, the Commission's decision process can take six to eight weeks. Final jurisdiction was conferred to the staff in the ordinance to allow for timely reviews and accelerated revitalization. He concluded that he believes that the staff, but not the Commission itself, has jurisdiction in this case.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance interpreted the ordinance as giving the jurisdiction to the staff, not the Commission. However, regardless of the jurisdictional question, the ordinance only allows for the maintenance of the historic character of the district. It does not allow for the review of demolition proposals, much less their approvals. Mr. Sklaroff rebutted Mr. Gallery's claim, noting that the ordinance did address demolition. He added that if Mr. Gallery's claim were true, then he had given Mr. Primavera a basis for appeal. Mr. Wilds asserted that the staff could approve the demolition of a building that was not compatible with the district.

Mr. James stated that past practice should guide the Commission. He noted that the Commission had both approved and disapproved applications; therefore, it should move forward with its review. Mr. Sklaroff agreed. The Commission members decided unanimously to proceed with the review.

Mr. Primavera asserted that the Commission's role in reviewing Manayunk proposals is to advance economic development in the area. He added that Mr. James had expressed this opinion moments earlier. Mr. James denied having made such an assertion and Mr. Sklaroff requested that Mr. Primavera limit himself to the merits of the case.

Stephen Goldner of SPG³ presented the design for the new building to the Commission. He stated that he prepared his design with the assumption that the old building would be demolished. At the request of Mr. Wilds, Mr. Goldner described the site and its surroundings. Mr. Sugrue pointed out that the building to the west of the one in question is very similar and houses a successful restaurant. Mr. Goldner conceded that it is very similar but slightly smaller. Mr. Primavera noted that the restaurant is named Bourbon Blue; a Smith & Hawkins store formerly occupied the building. He stated that Smith & Hawkins store is the model on which Mr. Sugrue would like to see the development of the site in question based. Mr. Sugrue replied that he had no model in mind.

Mr. Goldner continued his overview, opining that the building is not visible from Main Street. Commission members countered that it is highly visible from Main Street. Mr. Goldner conceded that it is visible from Main Street and the canal. He reported that the large building to the north houses the offices of architect Robert Venturi and Denise Scott Brown. He began to discuss the plans for the new building and several Commission members interjected that the new construction should not be addressed until the question of the demolition was resolved. Mr. Goldner explained that he was not charged with securing the demolition approval; his charge was to design the new building. After Mr. Sklaroff inquired about the Architectural Committee's opinion of the new building, Mr. Goldner revealed that he had not presented the plans for the new building to the Committee because the discussion never progressed beyond the question of demolition.

Mr. Sugrue asked about the canal façade. Mr. Goldner explained that the building is two stories at the south, along the towpath. Mr. James asked about the condition of the extant building. The architect explained that it is a large, vacant garage. Messrs. James and Sklaroff asked if it is sound. The architect explained that it is sound, secured, and maintained. Mr. Tissian asked if the building floods and if the flooding would preclude residential development. The architect answered that flooding would not prevent the existing building from being converted for residential use; he stated that getting light into the interior was problematic along one side. Mr. Perri asked how much of the original fabric of the building survives. The architect answered that he did not know. Mr. Primavera referred the question to the current owner, Raymond La Bov, who was seated in the audience. He reported that the building was essentially unaltered.

After Mr. Wilds asked about the new building, Mr. Goldner presented the plans, explaining that there would be 17 units with 17 parking spaces, that it would look somewhat industrial; that it would not be too large; and that it would be compatible with its surroundings.

Ms. Merriman asked about the last use of the building. Mr. La Bov explained that it was last used in 2002 as a plumbing and heating supply business. He also stated that it has been for sale since 2001. The asking price is \$1 million. He added that he has had no offers at that amount. Mr. Tissian asked him what offers he had received. He stated that he had received an offer for \$800,000, but that the buyer had withdrawn the offer. The last tenant paid about \$2,200 per month rent.

Mr. Steinberg asserted that the Commission should concentrate on the question of demolition. Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Primavera to summarize the case for demolition. Mr. Primavera asserted that the Commission was acting as a Committee of the Whole. After a request that he speak more directly, Mr. Primavera argued that this proposal must be viewed in a larger context, the commercial revitalization of Manayunk. He stated that the proposal should be reviewed using the development of Manayunk as the standard. An industrial building is not the best use for Manayunk. Mr. Sklaroff contended that the last use was retail, not industrial. Mr. Primavera countered that it was used for distribution.

Mr. Sugrue inquired if the architect had considered incorporating the existing building into a larger development. He did not respond.

Mr. Primavera concluded that the building is not viable for any use. Its industrial use is not suitable for Manayunk. It should be photographed and then demolished. The new building will advance the Manayunk district. Under the Manayunk ordinance, the Commission should seek to advance Manayunk, not simply preserve buildings.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Primavera if he had any testimony or evidence to present on the architectural or historical merit of the building. Mr. Primavera stated that he accepts the claims made by the staff that the building has architectural and historical merit and would not contest them. Mr. Sklaroff asked him if he planned to address the standards that the Commission normally applies during such reviews. Mr. Primavera replied that only the standard of commercial revitalization is relevant in Manayunk.

Mr. Goldner stated that the surrounding buildings overshadow this one-story building. He added that he cannot adapt the building for contemporary use. One would need to demolish much of the walls to allow light in for residential use. Mr. Sklaroff asked about the square footage. Mr. Goldner replied that it is 60' by 90' and has about 6,000 square feet without the cellar. The total square footage is 11,000 square feet. Mr. Sklaroff asked if a study was done to convert the building to residential use, perhaps using tax credits. The architect answered that no study was undertaken.

Kevin Smith of the Manayunk Neighborhood Council presented a letter and highlighted the points for the Commission and audience. He stated that his organization is opposed to the demolition. He noted a recent master plan for the canal and towpath. He asserted that the new construction would not comply with that master plan. It would not enhance the experience of the users of Main Street, the towpath, or the canal. He argued that it would not revitalize commerce in Manayunk. Mr. Tissian asked Mr. Smith who he represents. He explained that he represents about 150 dues-paying residents. He claimed that the turn-over rate of the building across the street, which houses Bourbon Blue, is no greater than that of the stores on Main Street or in any typical suburban mall. He suggested that other uses could be found for the 3 Rector Street building. For example, he understands that the owner of the Manayunk Brewing Company was willing to pay \$600,000 for the building. Also, a recording studio made an offer on the property. It is premature to assert that this building cannot be sold. The current asking price is simply too high. He concluded that mill buildings throughout the neighborhood have been adaptively reused.

Mr. Gallery claimed that this application highlights the problems presented by the Manayunk ordinance. He offered three points. First, although this ordinance may have

been devised to promote economic development in Manayunk, it is, first and foremost, a preservation ordinance. Its goal is to preserve the historic character of the district; in fact, its historic character is the engine of the district's economy. If Mr. Primavera's argument was accepted, economic development would take precedence over preservation in every case in Manayunk. Second, a clear financial hardship claim has not been made. Third, Manayunk is an industrial district; this building is part of the history of Manayunk.

Shawn Plum, an architect, suggested that this building could be rehabilitated for residential use. She suggested that a rehabilitation by SHoP in New York's meat packing district could provide some guidance for a sensitive adaptive reuse. Mr. Goldner noted that there is no room to expand this building, which occupies 100% of its lot.

Mr. Steinberg stated that he agreed with Ms. Plum that the adaptive reuse of this building should be fully explored. He asserted that it would be irresponsible to approve the demolition without more exploration. Ms. Merriman contended that the proposed building would be an appropriate addition to Manayunk. Ms. Wilds concurred with Ms. Merriman that the proposed building is compatible with the district. He also reminded his fellow commissioners that they were not operating under §14-2007, but under the Manayunk ordinance and therefore needed to consider the implications of this project for the entire district. Mr. Sklaroff interjected that the towpath, like Main Street, is part of the Manayunk district. Mr. Tissian asserted that the Commission would not approve the demolition of this building if it stood in Old City; he contended that the Commission should preserve the building. He suggested that the price at which the building was marketed was too high; preservation would be viable if it was lowered. Mr. Sugrue concurred with Mr. Steinberg, who noted that adaptive reuse had not been fully explored. He added that if the Commission chose to approve the building, it should not allow parking along the important canal frontage. The parking garage would deaden the towpath. Agreeing with Mr. Sugrue, Mr. Huff noted the neighbors concerns about the new building's impact on the towpath.

Mr. Tissian moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the proposal. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 7 to 3. Ms. Merriman, Mr. Wilds, and Mr. Perri dissented.

REPORT of the Architectural Committee

100 North 17th Street aka 1701 Arch Street, Robert Morris Hotel, Wesley Building

1701 Partners, LP, owner

Shelley Frater, Applicant

DATE: Built 1914, 1921; Ballinger & Perrot, architects; designated 1/7/1982

PROPOSAL: Exterior lighting

Architectural Committee recommendation: Approval of the lighting itself, but denial of any external conduits, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired]

This application proposes electrical work on the 17th Street façade of the Gothic Revival Robert Morris Hotel. The exterior of this building is clad in highly ornamented, white-paste terracotta. The Historical Commission approved the installation of recessed lights in the niches at each pier in February 1984. The applicant now wishes to reinstall lights in the same locations. It is unclear, however, how these lights were electrified in 1984. The applicant proposes to run an exposed conduit from pier to pier, which would be painted to match the white-paste terracotta.

Mr. Danta presented the proposal. Mr. Rivera informed the Commission that the Committee believed that the applicant should investigate further how to run the electricity to the lights.

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

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

1617 John F. Kennedy Boulevard, Suite 107

One Penn Management, LLC, Owner

Raymond Rola, Architect/Applicant

DATE: Outstanding Art Deco building constructed in 1930 for the Pennsylvania Railroad Company by architects Graham, Anderson, Probst & White

PROPOSAL: New exhaust louver

Architectural Committee recommendation: Denial of the louver as submitted, but approval of a louver in the soffit and the installation of a black film on the upper portion of the windows.

Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Historical Commission. This application proposes to install a new exhaust louver in an existing glazed transom. This change would take place along the J.F.K Boulevard façade. A similar louver already exists over the doorway to the east of the proposed location. The new louver would match the existing one and have a bronze finish to match the Art Deco window surrounds and door jam. In addition, the applicant proposes to install a black film on the upper portion of the window, which would match the appearance of the other windows.

Raymond Rola, the architect, informed the Commission that he concurs with the Architectural Committee's recommendation to install the louver in the soffit.

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

153 North 3rd Street

Bill Whalon, Owner

Jesse Carpenter, Applicant

DATE: 4-story 2-bay brick Italianate building with storefront. Built c. 1845 by Joseph Rubicam. Designated 08/16/1978; 12/12/2003, contributing to the Old City Historic District

PROPOSAL: Legalize doors

Architectural Committee recommendation: Denial of the 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 with documentary and physical evidence.].

Mr. Danta explained the proposal to the Historical Commission. This application proposes legalization of a double-leaf front door installed at North 3rd Street without Historical Commission approval or a building permit. The designation photograph shows a two-leaf paneled and glazed door with a recessed round knob. The surviving muntins show a typical Greek Revival configuration, which would be expected in a building of this era. The door in the designation photograph has muntins that do not extend the entire height of the glazed panel. They only extend about half the length of the panel. This, however, is likely the result of a later alteration, given that the proportions and distribution of the rest of the door, including the upper glazed section, corresponds to a door of this period.

Historical research in the commission's office yielded an insurance survey of 1847 for this property. The insurance survey describes a two-leaf door with glazed upper panels. The dimensions and distribution correspond to the door in the designation photograph. It confirms the assertion that the door at the time of designation was most likely the original door to this property.

The applicant replaced the door owing to its deteriorated condition. The new door is also a two-leaf design constructed out of solid wood with six true-divided lights. The new handle is a brushed stain steel pull bar.

Jesse Carpenter, the applicant, disclosed that he designed the solid mahogany door to the owner's specifications. Mr. Wilds asserted that the historic door could have been appropriately replicated if the applicant had sought the Commission's advice and approval.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and deny the legalization. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried with 8 votes. Ms. Merriman dissented.

1 South Broad Street

Broad One, LP, Owner

Michael Maddalo, Applicant

DATE: Bell, 1926, Gillett & Johnston Foundry, belfry, 1931, John Windrim, architect

PROPOSAL: Signage on bell tower

Architectural Committee recommendation: Denial as submitted, but recommended approval of two signs that respond to the shape of the building or four five-foot tall signs.

Mr. Danta presented the application to the Historical Commission. This application proposes the installation of a new sign at the base of the belfry atop 1 South Broad Street. The belfry is original to the building and was designed to accommodate the bell, which was moved from the nearby Wanamaker Department Store in 1931. John Windrim designed the building to house the Wanamaker Men's Store and the bell.

In June 2004 the applicant presented a much more elaborate scheme, which included an illuminated Wachovia spiral atop the tower, to the Historical Commission. The Commission approved the proposal as submitted by a close vote of 5 to 4. The applicant now proposes a simpler Wachovia sign on top of the tower where the PNB sign stands. The new sign would consist of internally illuminated letters spelling "Wachovia" on all four sides of the tower. However, the signs would differ in size. The north and south facing signs would be larger than the east and west facing signs.

Mike Maddalo and Mike Maddalo Jr. of NW Sign Industries represented the application. Mr. Wilds suggested that the applicants display renderings of the two alternative signs. Mr. Maddalo presented Options One (two sets of six-foot letters on a curve) and Two (four sets of five-foot letters, one on each side). The applicant stated that his client would accept either option, but Option One would require a new review by the landlord.

The shades in the meeting room were raised to allow the Commission and audience to view the extant PNB sign. Mr. Maddalo explained that the extant letters are 16 feet tall.

Mr. Tissian asked why the applicant had not installed the swirling crown approved by the Commission last year. He explained that the landlord had rejected the proposal. Steven Fingles of Wachovia introduced himself. He stated that Wachovia had decided that the crown was not worth pursuing. Mr. Tissian asserted that the PNB sign has achieved a significance. Other Commission members disagreed.

Mr. Fingles stated that Wachovia prefers Option Two, the four sets of five-foot letters. Mr. Steinberg opined that the letters would be too small, timid, and tepid. Mr. Fingles stated that his company has spent a great deal of money and design time endeavoring to find an appropriate sign and would like an approval. Mr. Steinberg then asked what would become of the signs when Wachovia's lease expires. Mr. Fingles stated that he is obligated to remove the signs when the lease expires. Mr. Steinberg wondered if the PNB sign could be stored and reinstalled after Wachovia vacates the space. Other Commission members rejected that proposal. Mr. Fingles stated that his lease requires him to remove the PNB sign. He also stated that he has the landlord's approval for Option Two.

Mr. Wilds moved to approve Option Two as submitted. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 7 to 2. Messrs. Tissian and Steinberg dissented.

560 North 16th Street

Chris Kytzidis, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855 front rebuilt mid 20th century.

PROPOSAL: Install vinyl windows

Architectural Committee recommendation: Denial, pursuant to 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]; and the installation of wood one-over-one windows.

Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. He explained that the building at 560 N. 16th Street was constructed in the 1850s, but that the front façade was rebuilt in the 1990s. He added that this is considered a contributing building in the Spring Garden Historic District. This proposal requests legalization of two nine-over-nine and four six-over-six vinyl windows in the front façade. Mr. Kytzidis originally proposed wood two-over-two windows in the top floor, where a fire had occurred. He spoke with Ms. Spina over the telephone and was told that he should consider a more contemporary window because the façade is a twentieth-century replacement. Ms. Spina explained the application process to him. He misinterpreted her suggestion to investigate more contemporary windows and ordered vinyl windows with sandwiched muntins.

Mr. Steinberg moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and deny the legalization of the windows. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion.

Chris Kytzidis, the owner, explained that he had replaced the original aluminum windows that had been installed in 1992. He asserted that his building does not contribute to the historic district. He added that the historic façade had collapsed in 1991. He noted that his property is surrounded largely by parking lots, not historic buildings. He explained his initial contact with the Commission's staff and claimed that he subsequently ordered the windows believing that they would be approved.

Mr. Sugrue requested more information on the history of the building. The façade was completely replaced in 1992. The new façade does not replicate the historic façade. Mr. Wilds reported that the aluminum windows installed in 1992 were the standard replacement window at the time, but they are not readily available today.

Mr. Sugrue asked rhetorically why the Commission would require the owner to install replicas of the 1992 aluminum windows. Mr. Steinberg suggested that this application should be judged for its impact on the district and not solely on this one non-historic building. Mr. Tissian recommended that a compromise be struck.

Ms. Spina stated that the two-over-two windows initially proposed by the owner would not be appropriate. She had recommended one-over-one wood windows, but not vinyl windows. She also noted that the applicant was provided with a copy of the district manual and understood the review process.

Mr. Wilds asked if the muntins can be removed from the new windows. Ms. Spina replied that the owner had stated that they cannot.

Mr. Sugrue contended that this is a murky case unlike other legalization cases. He asserted that this case would not set a precedent if the legalization was approved. Mr. Huff noted that the building is surrounded with vacant lots, which will be developed. Therefore, this area will not have a historic character.

Mr. Steinberg withdrew his motion to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and deny the legalization of the windows. Mr. Tissian withdrew his second.

Mr. Tissian moved to approve the windows as installed. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 7 to 2. Messrs. Rivera and Steinberg dissented.

403 South 3rd Street

John Grassi, Owner

John DiNuovo, Applicant

DATE: c. 1827

PROPOSAL: Rear addition and roof deck

Architectural Committee recommendation: Approval of the project subject to the construction of the deck with painted Trex, cedar, or mahogany with simple vertical pickets, pursuant to Standard 9 [*New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*]; and Standard 10 [*New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*].

Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Historical Commission. This application proposes constructing an addition and roof deck at the rear of this row-house. The addition would occupy a space enclosed by the rear ell and a rear addition. The deck would sit on top of that new addition. The work, except the deck railing, would be minimally visible from Pine Street. The applicant also proposes to cut several new windows in the existing rear façade of a non-historic addition, which is partially stuccoed.

Commission members asked the applicant if the decking would be painted. John Sabatini, the architect, and John Grassi, the developer, attended the meeting. Mr. Sabatini noted that the Trex picket railing would be painted, but the decking would not.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and approve the project with provisions, with the staff to review details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

248 South 22nd Street

Abilio Centurion, Owner

Judy Robinson, Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Replace storefront, façade alterations

Architectural Committee recommendation: Approval of a revised design with a four-panel door and larger panes of glass in the first-floor window, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.].

Mr. Baron presented the application and noted that the applicant has revised the design to reflect the Committee's recommendation. This submission proposes alterations to the front façade of an Italianate-style rowhouse. In the mid twentieth century, the first-floor residential windows were removed and a storefront window added. Initially, the applicant proposed to remove the existing store window and install a tripartite small-pane window with an operable center casement; the applicant now proposes more appropriate windows. On the upper floors, the applicant proposes the replacement of the brick molding around the windows. A new door based on a 1920s door from a house around the corner was originally proposed as a replacement; a four-panel door is now proposed.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to approve the revised proposal complying with the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

1812 Fairmount Avenue

Kevin Fleming, Owner

Sabrina Soong, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c.1855

PROPOSAL: New façade, cut garage in front wall

Mr. Baron explained that the applicant had submitted a letter requesting a postponement to allow for the exploration of legal and architectural options.

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

620 South Hancock Street

Ramon and Josefa Castiniera, Owners/Applicants

History: built c. 1880

PROPOSAL: Install vinyl windows, six panel door, replace marble lintels and sills

Architectural Committee recommendation: Denial, 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.].

Mr. Baron described the proposal to the Historical Commission. The applicants propose to change the windows on this rowhouse. Currently, the building has wood two-over-two windows on the first floor and wood one-over-one windows with storm windows on the second floor. The applicants have owned the house for many years, but do not reside in it. They plan to move into this house soon and they would like to install six-over-six vinyl windows with snap-on muntins and a new six-panel door. They would like to repoint the façade and install new stone lintels or rotate the existing ones because the stone is eroding. They claim an economic hardship.

Mr. Wilds stated that all economic hardship information should be presented in a formal application to the Hardship Committee. He noted that a denial today would not preclude a later hardship application.

Mary Matricianno, daughter of the owner, said that many houses on the 600-block of Hancock have vinyl windows. She asserted that her research into wood windows has shown that their requirement would place an enormous financial burden on her parents. Mr. Sugrue suggested that the repair of the existing windows might be an option. Ms. Matricianno replied that her elderly parents cannot operate the windows.

Mr. Wilds asked if the proposed muntins would match those of the correct wood windows. It was determined that they would be flat and therefore not historically accurate. Mr. Wilds suggested that the proposed windows should not be approved and that the owners should seek relief through the financial hardship process.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and deny the proposal. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which carried with a vote of 8 to 1. Mr. Huff dissented.

1101 Spruce Street

Michael Singer, Owner

David Singer, Applicant

DATE: 1889, Brown & Day, Architect

PROPOSAL: Legalize storefront alterations

Architectural Committee recommendation: Legalizing the new storefront, subject to the restoration of the transom, 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.].

Mr. Baron described the application for the Historical Commission. After an automobile damaged the storefront, the café owner replaced the windows without a permit. This submission proposes legalizing the installation of small-paned café windows in a storefront that had had large, single panes of glass. To mitigate, the owner of the building proposes to partially restore the transoms of the storefront and raise the sign above the transom to return some of the building's historic character

Colleen Ginder represented the building owner. She stated that the owner accepted the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. James asked why the Commission was sympathetic to the legalization. Mr. Baron noted that the Commission has approved numerous storefront alterations like those undertaken at this property. He also stated that the applicant is proposing to restore the transom as mitigation. Additionally, the windows on the upper floors have a similar configuration to those installed at the storefront. In response to a question about procedure from Mr. James, Mr. Baron noted that the applicant had appealed a violation directly to the Board of Licenses & Inspections, which remanded the proposal back to the Committee and Commission.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which carried with a vote of 7 to 2. Mr. James and Mr. Steinberg dissented.

262 South Van Pelt Street and 261 South 22nd Street

Christian Street Partners, Owners

Craig Deutsch, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 262 S. Van Pelt – 1921; 261 S. 22nd – c. 1875

PROPOSAL: Amend approved plans; add four feet to rear of building

Architectural Committee recommendation: Approval of the proposal to add four feet to the rear of 262 South Van Pelt Street, 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.].

Architectural Committee recommendation: Approval of the proposal to add four feet to the rear of 261 South 22nd Street, 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.].

Mr. Farnham presented the applications. He explained that in November and December 2004, the Commission approved a complex project to reconstruct an L-shaped building with facades on 22nd and Van Pelt Streets as three separate townhouses at 261 and 263 S. 22nd Street and 262 S. Van Pelt Street. The approval included demolition at the center of the building, dividing the single structure into three. The approval also included new rear facades for all buildings and third-story additions on two of the three buildings. A two-and three-story brick party wall running east-west along the north property line from Van Pelt to 22nd Street was retained and extended up to three stories at the Van Pelt end.

The approved townhouses at 261 S. 22nd Street and 262 S. Van Pelt Street are 66' deep. The developers would like to add four feet in length to each building, making them 70' deep. The approved rear facades would be relocated but otherwise unchanged. The north party wall, which is brick, is three stories at the east and west ends and two stories at the center. At the west, at 261 S. 22nd Street, the north party wall is three stories in height to a depth of 85'-6". Therefore, the party wall would not be altered for the proposed extension of the building. All changes for 261 S. 22nd Street would take place behind the existing party wall out of the view of the public. At the east, at 262 S. Van Pelt Street, the north party wall is three stories in height to a depth of 66'; therefore, the party wall would need to be altered for the extension of the building 70'. A four-foot-wide section of the north party wall would be raised in brick from two to three stories. The rears of the buildings are not visible from the south.

Mr. Wilds made motions to accept the Committee's recommendations. Mr. James seconded the motions, which carried unanimously.

2121 Porter Street

Dominic Chiacchiere, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1914, James & John Windrim, architects

PROPOSAL: Replace tile roof with asphalt shingles

Architectural Committee recommendation: denial, pursuant to Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.], Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old in design, texture, and where possible, materials.]; and the Roofs Guideline [Not Recommended: Stripping the roof of sound historic material such as slate, clay tile, wood and architectural metal.].

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. It proposes removing the original red clay tile roofing and replacing it with red Slateline asphalt-fiberglass shingles. The house at 2121 Porter is a twin in a row of six California Mission style houses. All six retain their original clay tile roofs. The clay tiles are significant, character-defining features. After 90 years, they have reached the ends of their lives; however, their replacements will be problematic. Replacement in kind would be extremely expensive and appropriate substitute materials are not available.

The roof planes of the front cross gable as well as the roof of a side bay are visible from the public right-of-way, Porter Street; the rear sections of the roof behind the peak of the gable running parallel to the street are not. After several discussions and a site visit, the

staff approved a permit application to replace the rear sections of the roof with red Slateline shingles, provided all reusable tiles are salvaged for potential reuse on the front sections of the roof.

The owner of 2125 Porter, a slightly different building two doors to the west that originally had a slate roof, applied to the Commission in 2000 to replace the slate with asphalt shingles. The Commission found that to require the replacement of the slate in kind would induce a financial hardship. That finding led to the amendment of the Commission's Rules & Regulations. The following was added to Section 6.3.c.1, which addresses staff roofing approvals: "the staff may also approve the replacement of slate roofs, with the exceptions of mansards and turrets, with a substitute material that approximates the color and shape of the historic slate." Since that amendment, the staff has typically approved Slateline or Grand Slate asphalt shingles in the appropriate color as the "substitute material" for rectilinear slate. The amendment to the Rules & Regulations did not address clay tiles roofs because no acceptable substitute exists for the roofing that was historically available in myriad shapes and colors. As more and more tile roofs, which last approximately 100 years, require replacement, the Commission will repeatedly face the same difficult problem: require prohibitively expensive repairs or replacements in kind or lose significant, character-defining features.

Mr. James asked the owner if the roof was leaking. Dominic Chiacchiere, the owner, stressed that the roof has been repaired many times, but continues to leak, especially at the rear. He explained that several roofers have looked at the problem and agree that it cannot be resolved reasonably.

Mr. Wilds asked if the owner had completed the approved work on the rear roof. The owner stated that the shingles had been ordered, but the work had not yet begun.

Mr. Tissian noted that the Architectural Committee was unable to offer a solution, yet recommended denial. He stated that that left the applicant in an impossible position.

Mr. Steinberg requested that the Commission employ common sense and approve the application. Mr. Sugrue remarked that the slate roof policy was instituted in a similar situation and could be applied in this situation.

Mr. Rivera asked Mr. Farnham to provide information about the proposed shingle. He stated that it is a red asphalt-fiberglass shingle designed to replicate the look of slate roofing, not clay tile roofing. He added that it is the closest approximation available to the unusual original roofing on this building, but that there are significant visual differences between the shingle and the original material. Mr. Steinberg suggested that a plain red asphalt shingle would be equally appropriate.

Mr. James made a motion to approve the application, with staff to review details. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Rivera dissented.

205 Race Street

Brown Hill Development, Owner

Serge Nalbantian, Brown Hill Development, Applicant

Construct residential building on vacant lot – 45 day review and comment

Architectural Committee recommendation: the Commission comment favorably on the proposed design.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. It proposes the construction of a 10-story building at the corner of N. 2nd and Race Streets. The Commission's jurisdiction is limited to 45 days of review-and-comment. A building stood on the site when the Old City Historic District was designated in December 2003, but a valid demolition permit had been issued for the site before the Commission's district designation notice letters were mailed in July 2003. The building was demolished legally after designation, leaving the lot vacant.

In the new building, the basement would be dedicated to parking, the first floor to commercial use, and the upper floors to residential use. The parking for the retail spaces would be accessed from Florist Street, a service alley at the rear. The parking garage would be accessed from 2nd Street. The innovative building would be clad with zinc panels, clear and grey glass, metal mesh, and cement board. The facades would be enlivened with the revelation of the structure and the innovative interior layout, which consists of interlocking two-story volumes like Le Corbusier's landmark Unité d'Habitation in Marseilles, France. The south facade would be further animated with hanging pods or projections.

The applicant, Serge Nalbantian, identified himself, but stated that he had nothing to add to the overview.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance addressed the Commission. He stated that he had read from the Commission's design guidelines at the Architectural Committee meeting, but would not read them again; he asserted that this proposed building did not comply with those guidelines. He contended that new buildings should be similar in character, height, size, architectural detail, and other features to the surrounding buildings. He acknowledged that this would be an interesting building, but declared that it would not be appropriate to the district. He stated that the nearby buildings are four stories in height and that the area has a 65-foot height limit. He concluded that the Commission should not comment favorably because the proposal is not compatible with the character of the Old City Historic District.

Mr. Steinberg noted that the guidelines are used during the Commission's deliberations, but they do not override all other factors figured into the equation. He asserted that this proposal will greatly enhance the district. He declared that this very high quality of architecture is extremely rare in Philadelphia today and should be applauded.

Mr. Tyler spoke from the audience, stating that this building was designed to relate to the scale of the bridge, which runs just to the north of the lot. He also stated that this proposal is one of the three best he has seen for Philadelphia in the last 15 years. The others were the Venturi Scott Brown laboratory and the Williams & Tsien building, both at the University of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Steinberg moved to comment favorably on the proposal. Mr. James seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

101-113 Walnut Street

101 Walnut Street, LLC, Owner

John F. Tucker, Architect/Applicant

PROPOSAL: Construct 11-story tower

Architectural Committee recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; and Section 14-2007(6)(k)(.4), which mandates that "in making its determination as to the appropriateness of ...construction, the Commission shall consider ... the compatibility of the proposed work with the character of the historic district ...including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings, and the streetscape."

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. It proposes a revised plan for the construction of an 11-story residential building with parking at the ground level. The lot, which is located at the northwest corner of Front and Walnut Streets, is currently vacant. The buildings that once stood at 103-105 and 107-109 Walnut Street were individually designated in 1970. In 1995, the Commission approved the demolition of the buildings, provided a "fence wall" was constructed. The buildings were demolished, but the required wall was never built. In 2003, the Commission created the Old City Historic District; the lot was included in the district and classified as "non-contributing." The Commission, however, has not rescinded the earlier individual listing and therefore maintains plenary or full jurisdiction.

The Architectural Committee reviewed a similar proposal for a building on this site at its April 2005 meeting. It recommended denial because the proposed work was not compatible with the character of the historic district including the neighboring structures, the surroundings, and the streetscape. The applicant revised the proposal, slightly modifying the street-level façade and substituting slate for concrete on the exterior, before presenting it to the Historical Commission at its May 2005 meeting. The Commission remanded the revised proposal back to the Committee because it did not have the benefit of the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Farnham reported that the Architectural Committee determined that the design revisions did not adequately address its earlier concerns and therefore again rejected the proposal. The Committee contended that the massing as a tower is not appropriate for the historic district.

Mr. Farnham added that, after the Architectural Committee meeting, the developer submitted an application requesting the rescissions of the individual designations, which, if approved, would limit the Commission's jurisdiction to 45 day review-and-comment on any subsequent application. Also, the Old City Civic Association issued a statement supporting the Architectural Committee's recommendation of denial.

Larry Copeland, the Commission's legal counsel, noted the existence of a consent decree that resulted from the City's involvement with the historic buildings in the 1990s. He stated that he was unaware of the contents of that decree, but posited that it may have implications for the Commission's review. He suggested that the Commission table the matter for one month to allow the Law Department to investigate the decree. Leonard Reuter agreed with Mr. Copeland and offered additional information about the decree. He stated that the Historical Commission may have plenary jurisdiction over any new construction on the site. He suggested that the Commission delay any final decision on the application. Mr. Sugrue concurred.

Mr. Steinberg moved to table the application for one month. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion.

Mr. Farnham noted that the Committee on Historic Designation will hear the rescission application at its meeting on 28 July 2005. The Commission will review the report of that meeting at its 12 August meeting. Therefore, he suggested that Mr. Steinberg amend his motion to table from one month to two months to allow the Commission to review the reports of the Architectural and Designation Committees simultaneously.

Mr. Steinberg amended his motion to table the application for two months. Mr. Tissian, who seconded, agreed to the amendment.

Mr. Primavera noted that Messrs. Steinberg and Sugrue did not attend the previous Commission meeting at which it discussed the current proposal extensively. He also stated that he was "surprised and chagrined" that Messrs. Copeland and Reuter had not mentioned the consent decree at the previous review. Mr. Primavera recounted the history of the properties. He asserted that the Commission approved the demolitions of the buildings without reviewing plans for new construction because of the imminently dangerous condition. He argued that the most likely requirement mandated in the consent decree was a requirement that the Commission review the new construction. He stated that that was exactly what he was requesting today, a review by the Commission. He requested that the Commission proceed with the review. He added that his client was not the owner of the buildings at the time of their demolition.

Mr. Sugrue again pointed out that the consent decree might nullify any decision made today. He suggested postponing. Mr. Wilds countered that the Commission should proceed with the review. Mr. James recommended that the Commission take the advice of its counsel and postpone the review. Mr. Primavera remarked that "justice delayed is justice denied." He asserted that the consent decree must be irrelevant because the staff does not have a record of it and the Commission's legal counsel had not addressed it earlier.

Mr. Gallery of the Preservation Alliance supported the applicant's request to proceed with the review because he is submitting to the maximum jurisdiction. Mr. Wilds noted that Mr. Primavera's colleague Richard DeMarco disputed the Commission's plenary jurisdiction in a recent letter to the Commission. Mr. Primavera stated that he would submit to the Commission's jurisdiction today, but will argue later that the approval of the demolitions of the historic buildings was a de facto rescission.

Mr. Reuter indicated that he considered it appropriate for the Commission to proceed with the understanding that it has full jurisdiction over the site.

The Commission voted on Mr. Steinberg's motion, seconded by Mr. Tissian, to table the application for two months. The motion was defeated by a vote of 3 to 6. Ms. Merriman and Messrs. Tissian, Wilds, Perri, Huff, and Sugrue dissented.

Mr. Sugrue suggested that the applicants focus on the changes made to the design since the last Commission meeting. Architect Jack Thrower of Bower Lewis Thrower provided an overview of the most recent design. He noted that the height is 142 feet. The cast stone cladding has been replaced with slate. The exercise room has been eliminated and the lobby has been enlarged. An arcade and mural has been added along Walnut Street. A gate has been added at the garage entrance. The building's massing remains the same.

Mr. Tissian asked if two of the four walls would be blank, solid walls. Mr. Thrower confirmed that the north party wall and the west wall, north of the balconies, are solid, unfenestrated walls. Mr. Steinberg asked about the trash room on Front Street. Mr. Thrower acknowledged that the trash and storage are located at ground level on Front Street. Mr. Sugrue asked why the architect changed to a slate cladding. He answered that it softened the appearance.

Mr. Wilds suggested that the height should have been reduced and the building spread across the entire site. Mr. Thrower conceded that the desire for river views drove the design of the building. A lower, broader building would be more difficult to market. Mr. Thrower stated that the developer had several deposits. Mr. Wilds noted that he was taking a risk to sell units without the Commission's approval. Mr. Wilds also suggested that units would sell with or without river views. Mr. Primavera responded that investors in the current real estate market are only interested in "by right" plans because they are not willing to risk long zoning battles. He concluded that the plan proposed conforms completely. Mr. Wilds countered that it may conform to the zoning requirements, but it does not necessarily conform to the Historical Commission's requirements. Mr. Primavera expressed hope that the owner to the north, Mr. Pacetti, would sell his property for development.

Mr. Steinberg asked Mr. Huff to comment from the Planning Commission's perspective. Mr. Huff noted that it was approved without a review by the full Planning Commission and therefore must conform to the zoning overlay at the site. Mr. Steinberg opined that this section of Front Street will soon look like Miami Beach, with its wall of hi-rise buildings. Mr. Primavera reported that they had studied townhouses for the site, but they did not seem feasible because of the environment, which includes transients. Mr. Steinberg replied that it is not "Skid Row."

Gagan Lakhmna, the developer, explained that he had worked with John Gallery on the design revisions.

Marsha Bacall, a neighbor, stated that she is a resident of the area. She asserted that, if approved, this development will lead to numerous other inappropriate buildings. She claimed that this area is a vulnerable place; it is at risk. The developers will erect a new Chinese Wall. Mr. Primavera noted for the record that Ms. Bacall lives in Society Hill Towers, in a building much larger than the one proposed; he implied that Mr. Sklaroff would have cited that fact had he been in attendance. Ms. Bacall countered that her address is not relevant. Mr. Steinberg remarked that the Towers is a large complex of hi-

rise and townhouse buildings designed to fit precisely into its context. Mr. Tissian stated that the Towers complex was built in a very different time and has no relevance to the current argument. Mr. Sugrue requested that Mr. Primavera confine himself to the merits of his case.

Mr. Gallery stated that the developer has been very cooperative and has altered his project to be more appropriate. He has reduced the overall height and changed materials. He conceded that he does have some reservations about the project. He is concerned by the height, the balconies, and the north wall. He suggested that the developer seek a variance to allow the fenestration of the north wall. Comparing this proposal with the recently reviewed proposal for 205 Race Street, he claimed that the Commission was inconsistent. How could the Commission approve one and deny the other? Mr. Steinberg responded, asserting that the Commission reviews projects on a case-by-case basis and looks at each on its merits. Mr. Tissian added that the 205 Race and 101 Walnut sites are very different.

Bridgett Brust stated that she is a resident of the area and that she approved of the proposal. She claimed that the corner is currently dark and unsafe. There is vagrancy. She remarked that young professionals like her want to settle in the area. She asserted that the area is currently not used to its full advantage and that this development would add a vibrant presence. It would increase market value.

Andrea Belter stated that she is a resident of the area and that she approved of the proposal. She claimed that the corner is currently dark and unsafe for a single woman. She asserted that this development would add a vibrant presence.

Jennifer Pastori agreed with the young women who spoke before her, stating that the parking lot is currently dark, unsafe, and an "eye-sore." She asserted that this development would improve the area.

Mr. Steinberg reviewed his reasons for voting against the project. Mr. Wilds noted that this is a weak boundary and should be treated as such. He also stated that the Commission would likely rescind the individual designations when it reviews the pending rescission application in August 2005.

Mr. James moved to approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 5 to 4. Messrs. Steinberg, Tissian, Perri, and Sugrue dissented.

1428-34 Chestnut Street, Packard Building

Chest-Pac Associates, L.P., Owner

David Grasso, Applicant

DATE: 1922, Ritter & Shay

PROPOSAL: Signage and lighting

Architectural Committee recommendation: Approval, with staff to review attachment details.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal to the Historical Commission. The proposal calls for a new commercial storefront, signage, and lighting for the commercial tenant in the building.

The new storefront on Chestnut Street includes two sets of double-leaf, fully-glazed doors. These will replace a non-historic aluminum storefront system. However, the plans do not detail the material of the proposed doors. The historic spandrel will remain.

The signage includes two banners on the Chestnut Street façade and one banner on the 15th Street façade, centered over the mezzanine windows. The attachment details show that the poles will be attached in the limestone face and secured to the back-up masonry with expanding anchor through-bolts. The banners will have gooseneck lights for illumination. A metal sign will hang in the central Chestnut Street entrance and will suspend from the ceiling of the recessed portal; however, the plans do not include any attachment details.

The lighting of the façade includes blue LED lighting at the 26th floor, which this tenant will also occupy, and around the Chestnut Street entry portal. Blue lights will also be emitted from the mezzanine windows. The plans do not include attachment details for the LED.

Several of the awnings that the Commission approved previously will get new skins with the tenant's logo on the face and its name on the skirt.

On the rear, Sansom Street façade, the service entrance will be expanded for a second service entrance for the restaurant.

James Rowe, the architect, and David Grasso, the developer, represented the application.

Mr. James asked about the extensive signage. The applicants responded that it was needed to establish the business's identity. Mr. Rowe and Mr. Grasso provided an overview of the project, which will occupy five floors in the building. Mr. Tissian asked the applicants to describe the lighting and signage. The applicants offered a full description. Mr. Grasso explained that the project is supported by large government subsidies and therefore must draw large crowds. The signage is necessary to draw those crowds.

Mr. James asked the applicants if they intended to apply for the approvals of additional signage in the future. Mr. Grasso stated that he had no plans for additional signage.

Mr. Wilds moved to approve the application as submitted. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 6 to 2. Messrs. Steinberg and Sugrue dissented. Mr. Huff recused.

529 Delancey Street

N. Venture and T. Brubaker, Owners

Jane Wilson, Architect/Applicant

History: 1804; front façade re-faced in tapestry brick, 1920s; façade stuccoed and cornice altered, mid-1960s

PROPOSAL: Restore front façade, cut new openings in side, rear façade and roof
Architectural Committee recommendation: Approval of the facade restoration, side opening, and rear deck, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The 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 Reconstruction Standard 4 [Reconstruction will be based on the accurate duplication of historic features and elements substantiated by documentary or physical evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different features from other historic properties. A reconstructed property will re-create the appearance of the non-surviving historic property in materials, design, color, and texture.].

Ms. Spina presented the proposal to the Historical Commission. She explained that Ralph Fey, the architect for this proposal, had made changes at the request of the owner at the Commission's meeting last month. Therefore, the Commission remanded the application back to the Architectural Committee. For the side façade, the proposal now calls for a single window at the first floor. Although stuccoed, this façade dates to 1804; however, the area has already been compromised for a wall air-conditioner.

On the rear, the proposal includes creating a one-room addition at the first floor, cutting a two-story bay that projects from the second and third floors, and opening the rear roof for a deck (instead of the previously proposed shed dormer). The addition of the deck would require the removal of a large amount of historic fabric that dates to 1804.

The application also calls for reconstructing the front façade according to its 1804 appearance by removing the stucco and tapestry brick façade and following a fire insurance survey for guidance.

The first floor windows in the drawing have a nine-over-nine configuration, but the windows probably would have had six-over-six based on their dimensions, and the dormer window would have had a six-over-six window not a four-over-four window. Also, the cornice line should be revised. The current profile dates to the tapestry-brick façade; it needs to be lowered to match the cornice level at the rear of the building which dates to 1804. The drawing needs to be revised to a ¼-inch scaled drawing that has a detailed cornice profile, door surround and window details.

Mr. Steinberg moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation to approve the project, with staff to review details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

4163 Main Street

Michele David, Owner

Vicki Leon, Applicant

History: c. 1870

PROPOSAL: Façade additions

Architectural Committee recommendation: Denial of the two proposed schemes owing to the Historical Commission's denial of the legalization of the building façade on 8 April 2005.

Ms. Spina presented the history of the property. In November 2003, the owner of the property applied to Historical Commission to demolish the front façade of this building and construct a contemporary façade. At the Architectural Committee, his attorney argued that the historic façade was not conducive to commercial use. The Committee recommended denial of the application, but noted that the first floor was non-historic and offered suggestions for a more open storefront design. The owner then withdrew the application before the Commission reviewed it.

On 11 March 2004, the owner submitted an engineer's report along with a violation from the Department of Licenses & Inspections to the staff stating that front wall was unsafe and required reconstruction. On 5 April 2004, staff approved a permit application to rebuild the front wall to match the historic wall at 2nd and 3rd floors with segmentally-arched, two-over-two windows, a reinstalled historic cornice, and a stucco finish. The first floor would have had a central, double-leaf, fully-glazed door flanked by large storefront windows. In April and May 2004, staff also approved new interior walls and roof framing, interior demolition and a cut through the party wall to 4161 Main Street.

Instead of following the approved plan, the owner built a front façade similar to the proposal denied by Committee in 2003. The owner applied to have the contemporary façade legalized in April 2005, but the Historical Commission denied the legalization. The owner has appealed the decision to the Board of Licenses & Inspections Review; the hearing is scheduled for 30 August 2005.

The current application includes two designs to alter the contemporary façade slightly as remediation for the failure to rebuild the facade according to the approved plan. One plan calls for adding a fan light in the spandrel between the 2nd and 3rd stories and a bracketed cornice like the historic one that was removed illegally. Some landscaping would be added in the sidewalk. The second option includes square panels in the spandrel between the 2nd and 3rd floors and a sign above the 1st floor. This option would also have a plaque with information about the historic building that once stood on the site.

Ms. Spina noted that an appeal to the Board of License and Inspection Review has been filed. Mr. Tissian asserted that the Commission should refuse to review the application until the appeal in August. Mr. Sugrue agreed that the Commission should not proceed until the appeal is settled. Mr. Copeland said that the Commission is not be obligated to hear the same, or essentially the same, application a second time. Mr. Wilds asked which ordinance would direct the Commission during this review. Others agreed that the Commission was bound by the Manayunk ordinance in this case. Mr. Wilds then asserted that the Manayunk ordinance is very specific in this case; it states that new

storefronts shall be compatible with the proportion, form, and materials of the historic storefronts.

Mr. Sugrue asked the applicant to focus on the differences between the current application and the previous one that was denied. Vicki Leon urged the Commission to find a means to approve the facade because the building has already been completed. She offered to revise the completed façade with enhancements, for example to install decorative details to soften the metal archway. She offered an additional design as well. Mr. Steinberg stated that it was an improvement. The applicant explained that it was a building wrap. Mr. Steinberg withdrew his earlier approval upon learning that the new proposal was essentially a large sign and not a new façade. Mr. Wilds reminded the Commission that it should not consider designs not first reviewed by the Committee. Mr. Wilds again pressed the applicant to explain the differences between the façade as built and the design presented for review to the Committee at its last meeting. The applicant explained that a number of minor alterations can be made to the façade. She stated that she would do whatever the Commission wanted. Commission members explained that they could not design the new façade for her.

Mr. James instructed the applicant to work with the staff and community and then return to the Committee with a revised design. He also noted that the Commission is in a difficult situation with the appeal pending.

Mr. James made a motion to adopt the Committee's recommendation and deny the application. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

231-35 North 2nd Street

2nd Street Parkominium, L.P., Owner

William G. Schwartz, Esq., Applicant

PROPOSAL: Relief from requirement to use cast-iron in mural

Architectural Committee recommendation: Approval on the condition that the six remaining historic cast-iron pieces are installed on the rear façade.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Historical Commission. In September 2002, the Historical Commission approved the construction of the parking garage on the condition that the 18 salvaged cast-iron pieces from the façade of 233 North 2nd Street be integrated into a mural on the south side of the property, with a plaque explaining the mural, with staff to review attachment details. The garage sits on the southern property line; in order for the cast-iron pieces to be attached, they would have to project over the property line.

Since that time, the contractor discarded all but six of the pieces of the cast-iron. Also, the neighboring property owner, the Delaware River Port Authority, has refused to allow the encroachment of the cast-iron pieces. The owner is now applying for relief from the condition to have the cast-iron pieces incorporated into the mural. All other conditions of the permit, i.e. the mural and plaque explaining the mural, will be met.

William Schwartz represented the application. He stated that this is a question of storage. The Architectural Committee first wanted the pieces stored by attaching them to the south wall. The Delaware River Port Authority has refused permission to attach anything to their side of the party wall. The Committee then suggested that they be attached to the north wall. He stated that the pieces would extend beyond property if

attached to the north wall. He explained that the alley is three feet wide and his client owns half of it. Mr. Wilds asked about the dimensions of the pieces. He explained that they are as much as 22 inches wide and 11 feet long. He also explained that the east wall is a party wall. He suggested shrink-wrapping them and storing them at a covered setback on the south wall.

Mr. Wilds asked if it would be possible to display them in the elevator lobby or in the parking area. Mr. Schwartz stated that they are too large to be conveniently stored. It was noted that they weigh about 8,000 lbs. each and therefore will not be stolen. Mr. Wilds contended that they should be mounted to the building.

Mr. Reuter informed the members that the developers of this property are involved with ongoing litigation with the Commission. He suggested that the Commission adjourn to an executive session to discuss privileged matters relating to this case.

Ms. Spina noted that the east wall of the garage does not stand on the property line and might be available for storage. Bob Levitt, one of the owners, introduced himself and stated that there is not enough room at the east to store the pieces.

Mr. James asked about the mural. The developer stated that he intended to complete the mural.

George Felici, another owner, asked about the aesthetic implications of attaching the pieces to the building. Mr. Sugrue replied that that would be addressed if a location is identified.

Mr. Tissian asserted that these pieces should be displayed in a place where the public can see them to better understand the history of the building. If they cannot be seen, then there is no point in requiring their retention.

Mr. Sugrue asked the public to leave the room and the Commission entered into executive session.

The Commission ended its executive session and invited the public to return.

Mr. Wilds moved to approve the storage of the historic pieces at the rear of the building as outlined by the applicant, to encourage the applicant to donate the pieces to a public arts program for incorporation in an arts project in a public setting, to assist with the transportation for the pieces if an arts group accepts the donation, and to document the donation for the Historical Commission's records, provided the mandamus action is abandoned with prejudice. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2502 Garnet Place

Joseph and Rosemary Clark, Owners

Robert Pisani, Applicant

History: 1910, James & John Windrim, architects

PROPOSAL: Two-story rear addition

Architectural Committee recommendation: Approval of the proposal, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Historical Commission. It proposes a two-story rear addition, visible from Porter Street. The applicant proposes to infill the space between the rear ell and the neighboring property, altering the solid/void relationship of the rear design. The addition follows the roof lines of the existing rear ell and has asphalt shingles, like the existing roof. It will have stuccoed walls and a recessed porch like the one on the rear ell. The addition will not alter the existing roofline and will not encroach into the rear garden or the side garden that is visible from Garnet Street.

The Historical Commission approved a rear addition that was much larger in scale for the 1700 block of Porter Street, which has raised ire and dismay in the neighborhood. As a result, the Commission staff has fielded nearly 100 phone calls and complaints, and the amount of work in the district performed without building permits has increased. The rise in property values in the neighborhood has fueled more inquiries into the enlargement of these buildings; the desire for additions in this district has increased greatly.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

1709 and 1711 Brandywine Street aka 1712 Green Street

Fred Duling, Owner/Applicant

Built: Non-contributing garage, built c. 1920; demolition approved by PHC, 2004

Construct two new houses with front garages

Architectural Committee recommendation: Approval of the new construction, pursuant 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.].

Ms. Spina described the proposal. The Historical Commission previously approved a four-story, multi-unit building for this property. The present proposal calls for two houses with garages on the lot, separated by a central brick chimney. The houses will have brick fronts, stuccoed sides and rears and two-story bays projecting over the garage doors. The other openings have two-over-two windows. The parapet wall has a simplified

cornice and hides the roof deck for each house.

Mr. Reuter asked if any of the appellants of the previous application for this property opposed this proposal. Ms. Spina responded that Mr. Laver attended the Architectural Committee and he did not oppose this design.

Mr. James moved to approve the revised design. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

633 North 16th Street

Thomas Kelly, Owner

Jonathan Williams, Applicant

New construction on vacant lot

Architectural Committee recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and the Setting Guideline [Introducing new construction into historic districts that is visually incompatible or that destroys historic relationships within the setting.]. The new construction should follow the block's pattern of twins and this property should match its mate, but with a simplified and contemporary design.

Ms. Spina presented the application, which calls for the construction of a new house on a vacant lot. The house will have a brick façade, two-over-two windows, four-panel door with sidelights, and an exaggerated segmentally-arched transom. Multi-light doors with balconettes would open on the 2nd and 3rd floors. A single-car garage would have a wood-paneled door with a multi-light transom, though the property has a double-car-width curb cut.

The Historical Commission previously denied a design for this property. Two key elements prompted that denial: the garage and the fact that the house occupied the full width of the property when all of the other houses on the block are twins, not rowhouses. This design does not remedy those two problems. In fact, the house to the north has a cornice with a return that will be compromised with the construction of this building.

Commissioners rejected the proposed design. Mr. Wilds asserted that the new building should mirror the neighboring twin.

Mr. Steinberg moved to adopt the Committee's recommendation and deny the proposal. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Sugrue passed the gavel to Mr. Wilds.

3700 Locust Walk, Phi Delta Theta

University of Pennsylvania, Owner

Richard Russell, Applicant

DATE: Designed by Robert R. McGoodwin in 1924. Designated 2/7/1974

PROPOSAL: Remove fire escape and doors, infill openings with windows and brick
Architectural Committee recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

Mr. Danta presented the proposal, which calls for changes to the 1924 Georgian Revival Phi Delta Theta fraternity house on Locust Walk. The proposed work would be located on the visible, yet starkly plain, rear façade of the property. This application does not propose any changes to the more elaborate facades along Locust Walk or 37th Street.

The proposed changes include the removal of an existing exterior steel and concrete fire emergency stair. The emergency egress stairs would be relocated to the interior of the building. Eight doorways would be rendered obsolete by the removal of the stairs. The applicant proposes to convert four obsolete door openings to double hung wood windows with recessed brick infill to match the existing and to infill the remaining four openings with recessed brick to match the existing.

Mr. Wilds inquired about the reason for removing the fire escape. Richard Russell, the applicant, offered that the existing fire escape is deteriorated and will be relocated to the interior of the building.

Mr. Tissian moved to adopt the Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which carried with 7 votes. Mr. Steinberg and Mr. Sugrue abstained.

THE REPORT of the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, May 2005

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

HARRY A. MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to approve the expenditure of \$21.08 for lunches for the Architectural Committee. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

THE REPORT on Preliminary Eligibility of Proposed Historic Districts

Mr. Sugrue directed the Commission's attention to the report on the preliminary eligibility of historic districts proposed for Parkside, Overbrook Farms, and East Falls.

Mr. Gallery requested that the Commission state for the record its plans for processing the Spruce Hill, Overbrook Farms, and East Falls nominations. Mr. Wilds replied that the

nominations are under review. Mr. Gallery remarked that one nomination has been under review for three years and a second for six months. The third was submitted more recently. He claimed that the residents of the proposed districts have not been apprised of the Commission's plans. He contended that the Commission is "stonewalling in your usual way."

Mr. Huff remarked that the length and complexity of the monthly agendas indicates that the staff is working diligently. He asserted that the fact that the Commission has not completed its review of the pending nominations is not indicative of any malice; the Commission is "not stonewalling, avoiding, or putting off."

Mr. Gallery stated that his offer to provide assistance with the processing of nominations has not been addressed. He remarked that he can only "reasonably conclude" from the failure to accept his offer that something other than resources is preventing the Commission from processing the nominations "in a timely manner."

Mr. Steinberg stated that the significant addition to the staff's workload from district designation derives not from the processing of the nominations, but from the subsequent design reviews that result from the new designations. He claimed that interns would not reduce the design review workload because those tasks must be undertaken by the staff.

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

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Jonathan E. Farnham
Laura Spina