

**THE MINUTES OF THE 427TH STATED MEETING OF THE  
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION  
11 March 1998**

**City Council Caucus, Room 401, City Hall  
Wayne S. Spilove, Chair**

Present

Wayne S. Spilove, Chair  
David Brownlee, Ph.D.  
Duane Bumb, Deputy Director, Department of Commerce  
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property  
Barbara Kaplan, Executive Director, City Planning Commission  
Carol Lawrence  
Edward McLaughlin, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses  
and Inspections  
Shelly Merhige, Office of the City Council President  
Robert Thomas  
Dennis P. Ward, III  
Scott Wilds, Assistant Director for Housing, Office of Housing  
and Community Development  
Caroline Wischmann

Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer  
Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer  
R. Scott Jacob, Executive Secretary to the Commission  
Laura Spina, Historic Preservation Planner  
Kristin Fetzer, Historic Preservation Planner  
Elizabeth Harvey, Historic Preservation Planner

Mark Zecca, Esq., Deputy City Solicitor

Also

Arlene Matzkin, Friday Architects  
Ron Avery, Philadelphia Daily News  
Serge Avery  
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents Association (CCRA)  
Allison Kelsey, Preservation Alliance  
Margaret MacLaren Ulrich, CCRA  
Judith Eden, CCRA  
Philip Scott, John Milner Associates  
Eric Rohe, Bower, Lewis, Thrower Architects  
Sharon LeFevre  
James Stewart

Wayne S. Spilove, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 427th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Tyler introduced Kristin Fetzer and Elizabeth Harvey, both graduates of the Historic Preservation program at the University of Pennsylvania, as the two new preservation planners for the

Philadelphia Historical Commission staff.

Mr. Tyler presented Arlene Matzkin with a gift of a framed 1895 map plate of her neighborhood from the Commission and staff, to thank her for six years of service as Chair of the Architectural Committee and Commission member. Mr. Tyler commented on the numerous responsibilities given to the Committee Chair, and the particularly great amount of time and care that Ms. Matzkin devoted to the task. Ms. Matzkin expressed her gratitude for the gift and for her fond memories of working with the Historical Commission and its staff. The Commission recognized Ms. Matzkin with a round of applause.

**MINUTES of the 426th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission.** Upon a motion made by Mr. Ward and duly seconded, the Commission unanimously approved the Minutes of the 426th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held on 11 February 1998, Wayne S. Spilove, Chair.

**Architectural Committee Report**, 24 February 1998, Robert Thomas, Chair. Mr. Thomas read the Committee's recommendations before discussion of each proposal

**1801 Vine Street, Family Court**

City of Philadelphia, Owner  
Emanuel Kelly, Architect/Applicant  
DATE: 1939-41  
PROPOSAL: Landscape, parking area

*Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.*

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves landscaping and parking areas. The architect plans to re-landscape the various planting areas, to reinstall shade trees around the building, and pave an existing lawn along 18th Street for additional parking. The parking area will abut the stone base of the building. The proposal also includes bollards to protect the base of the building from parking cars. Mr. Thomas described them as eight-inches in diameter, concrete-filled, capped, and painted dark green.

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

**2201 Mount Vernon Street**

N. E. Holland Hull, Owner/Applicant  
DATE: c. 1860  
PROPOSAL: Legalize new front windows and basement grills; new stair rail

*Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the new*

windows. Four of the five members present voted to recommend approval of the new basement grates. Ms. Batcheler dissented. The Committee voted unanimously to recommend denying the rail.

Mr. Thomas described the application to legalize new front windows and recently installed basement grates installed without a permit, and for approval of an iron stair rail made to match the new grates. He stated that the applicant has not installed the stair rail. The owner installed wood, true-muntin, two-over-two windows on the second and third floors, and one-over-one windows on the first floor. Mr. Thomas explained that this window configuration matches other, similar houses on the block, which retain their original windows.

The owner also installed wrought iron basement grates without a permit. These grates prove more ornate than the originals found on most buildings on the block. Mr. Tyler stated that he has seen several different kinds of basement grates on that block. He acknowledged that most appear less ornate, but recommended approving these new grates owing to the diversity of designs on this block. Mr. Tyler stated that the new windows and basement grates conform with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.

Although not yet installed, the owner also had a railing made for the front stoop. The houses on this block have various railings dating from many different years, but these rather simple pipe-style railings appear more appropriate for a modest mid-nineteenth-century house than the highly ornate one made for this building. Mr. Thomas explained that the Committee recommended the applicant install a simple, but elegant pipe-style stair rail with the necessary number of balusters to meet code requirements. Mr. Tyler stated that the proposed stair rail, as submitted, constitutes a new architectural metal feature that is incompatible in size, scale, and design, which does not meet the *Standards*.

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

#### **Cotton Street Bridge, Manayunk Canal**

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Daniel DiMucci, Applicant

DATE: c. 1950

PROPOSAL: Replace bridge

*Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.*

Mr. Thomas described the proposal to replace a low-lying, flat bridge that carries Cotton Street over the Manayunk Canal with a new steel and wood camelback bridge with 4 feet 8 inches of headroom to allow rowers to pass underneath. The bridge will incorporate lighting standards similar to those used by the

Fairmount Park Commission and the Center City District. Mr. Thomas explained that the design of the new bridge allows for pedestrian as well as vehicular traffic. Mr. Tyler stated that the proposal conforms with standard ten of the *Standards*.

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

**23-29 North Juniper Street, City Hall Annex**

Annex Center Limited Partnership, Owner

James Platt, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1927

PROPOSAL: Porte-cochere, grade change, new openings on Commerce Street, door and stairs on Filbert Street

*Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the proposal, with the service doors on Commerce Street painted to match the stone base of building, and combining the compactor and pedestrian doors.*

Mr. Thomas stated that the architects have changed the porte-cochere slightly. They simplified the design and moved the angle of the projecting overhang to a less severe slope, raising the rear of the canopy above the decorative lanterns. Mr. Thomas explained that the architect plans to paint the porte-cochere a bronze color, and to use clear glass.

The proposal includes grade changes for the drive and drop-off around the North Juniper Street side of the building. Mr. Thomas explained that Building Code and accessibility requirements necessitate a gradual grade change that spans the width of the building. The graded levels at the corners of the building will remain the same. Plans provide for the preservation of the existing steps by simply covering them with the new materials.

The proposal also includes a double-bay loading dock and a single-bay loading dock with roll-down doors, and four new pedestrian doors, all on Commerce Street. Mr. Thomas explained that Committee members recommended combining one of the pedestrian doors with the large, grated compactor entrance next to it, to avoid leaving the appearance of unsupported stone, and to paint the new doors to match the stone base of the building. The proposed revolving door and stairs on Filbert Street will match the existing doors and stairs. Plans involve replacing one door on the front facade with a window to match the materials and height of the old door. Mr. Tyler stated that the items in the proposal meet standards nine and ten of the *Standards*.

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

**1003-1005 Arch Street, Trocadero Theater**

Mr. Pang, Owner  
William Giesey, Applicant  
DATE: 1872  
PROPOSAL: Facade lighting

*Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the proposal, with staff to review and approve details, and that the applicant consider fixtures adaptable for installation in a wood sill box.*

Mr. Thomas described the proposal to install three up-light fixtures just above the building's first-floor cornice in non-historic brick below the second-floor windows. The owner wants to highlight the large and ornate second-floor windows. Mr. Thomas explained that the Committee recommended installing the lights within a wood sill, constructed to replace the missing stone sills under the second-floor windows. Mr. Tyler stated that designing and installing new storefront features that are compatible with the historic character of the building meets with the *Standards*. Commission members preferred the originally proposed lighting scheme to the Committee's alternate plan for wood sill boxes.

*Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Architectural Committee's recommendation to approve the original proposal.*  
*Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.*

#### **123-125 Chestnut Street, Corn Exchange Building**

Peter Shaw and Allan Casnoff, Owners  
Paul Curci, Applicant  
DATE: 1900; 1913 addition  
PROPOSAL: Banner and pole

*Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the banner and pole, centered between two windows, and attached to the building in mortar joints.*

Mr. Thomas described the proposal to install a new flag pole attached below a second story window of the four-story addition to the Corn Exchange on South 2nd Street, and a single, blue, oblong banner in canvas-type fabric to hang on the pole. The Committee recommended moving the pole away from the decorative pediment over the entrance, and asked the applicant to center the pole between two windows, so that the bottom of the banner will hang over a pier. Allison Kelsey stated that the Preservation Alliance has a facade easement on this building, and approves of the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Tyler stated that designing and installing new storefront features that are compatible with the historic character of the building meets with the *Standards*.

Mr. Spilove commented that if every interior tenant of this or other buildings wanted exterior banner signage, the numbers would exceed a reasonable amount, and obscure significant historic features.

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

**144 North 2nd Street**

Borough Belsky, Owner  
Patrick Dewey, Applicant  
DATE: c. 1840  
PROPOSAL: Awning and banner

*Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the banner, and denial of the awning proposal.*

Mr. Thomas explained that the owner wishes to install a shed-type awning in the recessed doorway of this restored Victorian storefront, using canvas-like material. The proposal also includes a banner to hang between the windows from the top of the third floor down to the top of the first-floor cornice. Mr. Thomas stated that Committee members thought the awning would hide too much of this significant storefront, including decorative arched openings. The Committee suggested painting signs in the windows for more recognition. Mr. Tyler stated that designing and installing new storefront features that are compatible with the historic character of the building meets with the *Standards*, but that the proposed awning does not conform with the *Standards*, in that it would obscure significant historic storefront details.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation.  
Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried with nine votes. Mr. James dissented.

**69-71 North 2nd Street**

Daniel Dumoff, Owner/Applicant  
DATE: c. 1850  
PROPOSAL: Legalize signage

*Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial of the proposal based on the amount of signage and the materials used, and to encourage the applicant to work with staff in designing a new signage scheme.*

Mr. Thomas explained that the owner seeks to legalize five plastic flat wall signs that he installed without a permit, bringing the number of signs on the two visible facades of this building to seven. He noted that Committee members agreed that a few of the signs resemble earlier models that would have appeared on commercial buildings. However, others seem excessive and inappropriate to the historic character of the building and the area. Mr. Tyler stated that using inappropriately scaled signs and logos or other types of signs that obscure character-defining

features of the building does not meet with the *Standards*.

*Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation.*

*Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which carried unanimously.*

**2021 Rittenhouse Square Street, a.k.a. 2020 Latimer Street**

Frederick Kroon, Owner

Archangelo Guida, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1890

PROPOSAL: Hang air conditioner off rear of building

*Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial.*

Mr. Thomas described the proposal to install an air-conditioning unit on a shelf at the rear of the property over the sidewalk on Latimer Street. He explained that several houses face this block of Latimer Street, so the rear of this building constitutes a highly visible component of the streetscape.

Mr. Wilds commented on the possible dangers of hanging the unit over a public right-of-way. Ms. Kaplan stated that this proposal would require an ordinance from City Council. Mr. Tyler stated that the guidelines of the *Standards* do not recommend installing mechanical equipment so that it damages or obscures character-defining, or is conspicuous from the public right-of-way.

*Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's Recommendation.*

*Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried unanimously.*

**1710 Delancey Street**

Margaret MacLaren Ulrich, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: New shutter

*Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of paneled shutters on all floors, with center rails in the proper location, painted with an opaque stain, with retention of all hardware.*

Mr. Thomas described the proposal involving the replacement in kind of all the shutters on the front facade. The house currently has non-historic paneled shutters on all floors. The first-floor shutters have three panels that do not match the panel configuration of the original front door. Mr. Thomas explained that the second- and third-floor windows have slide bolts that lie above the meeting rail of the windows. Mr. Brownlee noted that on appropriate shutters the strap locks would fall below the meeting rails. Mr. Tyler stated that the upper floors of this house should have louvered shutters and the first floor should have shallow paneled shutters that follow the same configuration as the front door.

Mr. Thomas explained that Committee members did not object to the use of paneled shutters on all floors, with center rails in the proper location, painted with an opaque stain. Commission members questioned the appropriateness of using stain instead of paint. Mr. Baron explained that Ms. Ulrich, the owner, said that stain requires less maintenance than paint. Several Commission members thought the applicant should paint the shutters. Ms. Ulrich stated that her proposal calls only for replacement in kind of the existing shutters, which appeared on the house at the time of designation. Ms. Kaplan pointed out that the *Standards* require historical accuracy when replacing facade features such as shutters.

*Mr. Brownlee made a motion to deny the proposal, and approve the installation of panelled shutters on the first floor with center rails in the proper location, and louvered shutters on the second and third floors, all painted, with staff to review and approve details. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried with nine votes. Ms. Kaplan and Mr. McLaughlin abstained.*

#### **1521 Spruce Street**

Livia Salandria Corman, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1870

PROPOSAL: Storefront lighting

*Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval, with staff or Mr. Levy to inspect a sample and review spacing details. [Mr. Levy reported to the Commission staff that he inspected the lights and recommended spacing the bulbs on six inch centers, and dimmed considerably.]*

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal entails the installation of lighting along the frames of the first-floor windows. *Lumisphere* lighting, the proposed fixture, has clear, spherical bulbs, about two-and-one-half inches in diameter, connected by a black wire. Mr. Thomas described the method of installation, and noted that the clips that support the lights cause minimal damage to the frames, which are not original. The fixtures require one small opening for electrical wires. Mr. Brownlee cautioned that approving these lights sets a bad precedent, and recommended including conditions in the motion for approval to ensure mitigation of impact on the facade.

*Mr. James made a motion to approve the proposed lighting scheme, conditional upon the use of low-voltage, non-blinking, clear or white bulbs. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried with ten votes. Mr. Brownlee dissented.*

#### **1901-1905 Walnut Street, Rittenhouse Plaza**

Paul and Linda Richardson, Owners

Wesley Wei, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1926



PROPOSAL: Remove stained glass windows, install new aluminum windows and custom wood doors at the top-floor unit.

*Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.*

Mr. Thomas recused himself from the discussion and the vote owing to his involvement in another window project for the building. Mr. Baron explained that the new owners of this penthouse apartment want to remove several non-original stained glass windows and install new aluminum windows and wood doors. A previous owner of this apartment installed stained and leaded glass windows in the 1930s or 1940s. They have deteriorated and the present owners wish to replace most of the windows with clear glass. Mr. Baron stated that the owners intend to donate the removed sections to LaSalle University, but they want to retain the stained glass windows in the library. Mr. Brownlee thought the stained glass windows do constitute an historically significant feature of the building, and warrant retention.

Mr. Baron explained that although plans call for the construction of the windows for this apartment using the same manufacturer as those on the rest of the building, they will differ in some respects because of time constraints. The windows for the more visible bulk of the building will contain custom modifications that cannot be achieved in time for this application. The new owners will move in immediately, and construction of the windows for the rest of the building will not begin for several months. This proposal involves leaving the window frames exposed for now to await whatever panning detail the Historical Commission approves for the rest of the building.

The putty slope, minimal in this application, will appear substantially deeper on the rest of the building's windows. Mr. Baron stated that Committee members based their decision to recommend approval on the near invisibility of the top two floors of this building from ground level, and thought the terra-cotta band and various balconies sufficiently demarcate the top floors obviating the need to match exactly the windows with those on the rest of the building. Mr. Tyler stated that the proposal meets with the *Standards*.

*Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, but made it clear that the decision on this application should not prejudice the forthcoming review of the new windows for the rest of the building. Ms. Kaplan seconded the motion which carried with seven votes. Mr. Brownlee and Ms. Merhige abstained. Mr. Thomas recused himself.*

### **2433 Pine Street**

Robin Kohles, Owner/Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1875

PROPOSAL: Demolish first floor of existing bay; new rear fence

*Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.*

Mr. Thomas explained that the owner wants to demolish the first floor of the existing rear bay and support the remaining second-floor bay with posts, exposing the original rear wall. The proposal also calls for the installation of a paired, double-hung, wood window and a door on the first-floor rear. The owners wish to replace a non-historic cinderblock fence with a new wood, flat-topped fence along 25th Street and the alley.

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

### **310 Delancey Street**

Sherry LeFevre, Owner

Arlene Matzkin, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1785

PROPOSAL: Addition on rear ell; new windows in former party wall

*Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial of the proposal, based on the loss of historic fabric and the inappropriate false historic appearance of the rear addition.*

Mr. Thomas described the proposal to expand this house to accommodate the joining of two families. The owner wishes to add a third story to the rear ell to provide space for a bedroom, small study, and a bathroom. The addition will require removing the rear dormer on the main house and the rear ell's roof.

Arlene Matzkin, architect for the project, presented the Commission with a revised design submission, based on a circa 1760 gambrel rather than a circa 1860 mansard roof. Ms. Matzkin commented that the rear of this house was not visible until the Redevelopment Authority demolished its western neighbors to create St. Peter's Way in the 1960s. She noted that the three other houses whose rear portions became visible with the advent of St. Peter's Way have altered rear ells. Commission members reviewed photographs of the rear portions of these three houses.

Commission staff stated that the greenways made during the redevelopment phase of Society Hill contribute to the significance of the district.

Sharon LeFevre, owner of the property, showed the Commission a petition signed by several of her neighbors showing support for the proposed addition. Ms. LeFevre described her ongoing efforts to preserve both the interior and exterior of this house, and her strong desire to remain in it. She asked the Commission to consider her reasons for wanting the new addition, which include creating a comfortable space for her new stepdaughter.

Mr. Brownlee acknowledged Ms. LeFevre's special circumstances, but offered a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation to deny the proposal, owing to the remarkably well-preserved rear of this eighteenth-century house, its high visibility, and the Commission's mission to protect historic fabric. No one seconded

the motion.

Commission members discussed the issue of visibility, and that the house historically sat in the middle of the block. Mr. Wilds suggested moving the rear dormer instead of demolishing it. Ms. Matzkin stated that she looked into that option, but could not make it feasible. Mr. Wilds recommended documenting the demolition of the rear portions of the roof with photographs.

*Ms. Kaplan made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation, and to approve the new proposal, with photographic documentation of the demolition, and staff to review and approve details. Mr. McLaughlin seconded the motion which carried with seven votes. Mr. Thomas and Mr. Brownlee dissented.*

**1115-1131 Market Street, Reading Terminal Headhouse**

Reading Terminal Headhouse Association, L.P., Owner

Philip Scott, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1893

PROPOSAL: Cornice replacement; storefront alterations on Market and Filbert Streets; door and window and architectural detail replacement in the loggia

*Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of storefront replacements on 12th and Market Streets, and the window, door, and stone detail replacements in the loggia. The Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the cornice.*

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for replacing the cornice with a simpler pressed metal cornice. The proposed cornice will project three feet. Misinformation led the Committee to believe that the original cornice extended six or more feet. Mr. Baron stated that since the Committee meeting, the applicant provided copies of original drawings for the cornice that show its dimensions as similar to the proposed replacement, thus negating the Committee's argument against the new cornice. The new cornice incorporates simplified brackets that follow the original shape, but without the acanthus leaf decoration. The metal of the cornice will extend up along the parapet wall. Commission members did not object to the cornice.

The Commission already approved the storefront application in concept. The proposal also includes the installation of two more air-intake vents for the Red Bell Brewery. The storefronts at the east end of Market Street follow plans that the Commission approved in concept. The proposal also calls for replacing the windows and doors leading from the ballroom onto the loggia, including the replacement in cast stone of the columns, spandrels, and the now-missing stone bands and carved details

near the doors.

*Mr. Thomas made a motion to approve the new cornice design, storefront replacements on 12th and Market Streets, and the window, door, and stone detail replacements in the loggia. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.*

Eric Rohe, an architect for the project, presented a new proposal for loading docks on the Filbert Street facade. Mr. Spilove stated that this proposal would have to go before the Architectural Committee. Mr. Rohe asked for approval in concept of the loading docks. Commission members did not object to the concept of loading docks on Filbert Street.

*Mr. Brownlee made a motion to approve the loading docks in concept, with staff and the Architectural Committee to review details prior to next month's meeting. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried unanimously.*

**The Report of the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff**  
February 1998, Richard Tyler.

Mr. Tyler noted a few highlights from the staff report.

*Mr. Ward made a motion to adjourn. Mr. McLaughlin seconded the motion which carried unanimously.*

The Meeting adjourned at 12:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Scott Jacob  
Executive Secretary