

**THE MINUTES OF THE 492nd STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
8 August 2003**

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

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
James Brown, IV
Duane Bumb, Deputy Director, Department of Commerce
Michael Fink, Director of Construction Codes Compliance, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Warren Huff, City Planner IV, City Planning Commission
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
Kathleen Murray, Special Assistant to President of City Council
Vincent Rivera, AIA
Harris Steinberg, AIA
Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.
Norman Tissian
Scott Wilds, Deputy Director, Office of Housing and Community Development

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

Lawrence Copeland, Senior Attorney, Law Department
Eileen Quigley, Assistant City Solicitor, Law Department

Also

Lenore Millhollen, Preservation Alliance and Center City Residents' Association
Neil Sklaroff, Esq, Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll
Linda Rosanio, Catelli Restaurant Group
Florence Bruy, 12 Queen Street
Peter Bruy, 12 Queen Street
Peter Saylor, Dagit Saylor
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Michael Bruder, Michael A. Bruder Associates
Warren E. Woldorf
Matthew Weeks White, 2336 St. Albans Place
Marc A. Curcillo, 2440 Christian Street
Barry J. Kaplan, Firsttrust Bank
Tom Prettyman, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll
Kenneth Lomar, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Hugh Zimmers, Zimmers Associates, Architects
Alan Delfiner, 902 Spruce Street
Lori Salganicoff, Fairmount Community Development Corporation
Jerry Roller, J.K. Roller Architects
Timothy Hemsmith, Charles Loomis/Chariss McAfee Architects

Fred Tropea, Ruggiero Development Group
Joe Ippolito, Ruggiero Development Group
William Caton
Doug Seiler, 241-43 Chestnut Street
Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Jason Beccaris, 508 South 3rd Street
Jon Wagner, 214 Chestnut Street
James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Company
Mitchell Kotler, Toll Brothers
Paul Commiato, Toll Brothers
Adam Barzilay, Toll Brothers
Jerry Simon, Lessard Architects
Kevin Smith, Toll Architecture
Matthew Koenig, J.K. Roller Architects

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 492nd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:05 a.m.

Minutes of the 491st Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Mr. Steinberg asked the staff to review the motion and vote for 12 Queen Street; he did not recall seconding the motion.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Sugrue and seconded by Mr. Wilds, the Commission unanimously voted to approve the minutes of the 491st Stated Meeting, 11 July 2003, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

Mr. Sklaroff explained that he would abstain from voting on the first several items and passed the gavel to the Vice-Chair, Mr. Sugrue.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 29 July 2003
Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair

Fairmount Waterworks

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Robert Thomas, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1812 and 1822

PROPOSAL: Conservatory addition and canopy in concept

Architectural Committee Recommendation: tabling the proposal for a period not to exceed 6 months.

Ms. Spina described the proposal and noted that the applicant would like a continuance.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to table the proposal for a period not to exceed six months. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2420 Grays Ferry Avenue, Naval Home

Toll Naval Association, Owner

Paul Commito, Applicant

DATE: 1827-33, William Strickland, architect

PROPOSAL: Revised site plan, new construction in concept, new roof, dormers and skylights on Biddle Hall

This application has four major parts: a revised site plan, new construction in concept, the addition to Biddle Hall in concept, and a design for the new roof, dormers, monitor and skylights on Biddle Hall.

Site Plan

Architectural Committee recommendation: approval, subject to the following details returning to the Committee and Commission for review: landscaping plan for the site, details of the treatments to the historic walls and fencing, and details of the rehabilitation and location of the gazebo. The Committee asked that the architect restudy the siting of Building #12 and its proximity to the Governor's House.

Ms. Spina presented the application. In 1999, the Commission approved in concept a site plan for the property, on the condition that further investigation and landscaping be done to minimize the parking area in front of Biddle Hall. A revised site plan comes for final approval. The application includes a plan that Toll Brothers put together in 2001, which City Council approved. The main differences from the current proposal and that of 2001 are: the large triangular building at the corner of 24th & Grays Ferry Avenue is now broken into smaller rows of houses; the parking garages at the rear of the site have been eliminated; the specific shapes of the buildings at the rear of the property have changed slightly, but the overall massing remains the same; a new parking lot is proposed off of the circle in front of the Surgeon's Quarters; and the driveways are widened to accommodate a second lane of traffic.

Although not on the plans, the owner wishes to demolish the solid brick wall on the Grays Ferry Avenue elevation and install a low brick wall with brick piers and wrought-iron fencing. Also, the proposal includes widening the historic openings in the main wall and installing a gate house and gate set further in site.

Ms. Spina noted that Toll Brothers submitted a letter responding to the Architecture Committee minutes.

Mr. Wilds moved that the Commission accept the recommendation of the Architecture Committee with the understanding that the restudy of the proximity of the new structures to the Governors House would be a suggestion rather than a requirement. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion.

Mr. Harris asked if the plan will have to go back to City Council for approval. Mr. Huff explained that because the site is zoned RC6, any changes to the previously approved plan must go back to the Planning Commission and City Council for approval.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance commended the effort of Richard Tyler, the Commission staff, Kevin Hanna and Catherine Califano of OHCD, and Toll Brothers for working so hard on the redevelopment of the site. He said that the Preservation Alliance supports the approval of the site plan, with further review of details, as well as the other Committee recommendations.

Mr. Wilds added to his motion that the landscaping only, not the gazebo or wall details, should be reviewed by staff and the State and Federal government without returning to the Commission. Mr. Bumb agreed.

Mr. Wild made a motion to approve the site plan, with the wall alterations and gazebo rehabilitation and relocation returning to the Committee and Commission and the landscape plan to be reviewed by staff subsequent to the approvals of the State Historic Preservation Office and the Advisory Council. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

New Construction on Site

Architectural Committee recommendation: approval in concept of a simplified version of the new construction, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9 and Site Guideline.

The conceptual designs for the new construction include front elevations only. Many of the buildings will have visible rears with garages, but their design is still in development. Whether townhouses, stacked townhouses or smaller condominiums, the overall design remains the same. All are four-story and have paneled doors, multi-light windows, and gabled roofs. Each house is articulated with different facing color, fenestration, or cornice and window hood ornamentation. For the 16' and 18' houses (yellow buildings on the site plan), the fourth floors have recesses to accommodate balconies.

Harris Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation stressing the need for simplification. Mr. James seconded the motion.

Jerry Simon of the Lessard Group explained that they used the various brick colors to articulate the different units and break the massing of the development. Mr. Steinberg asked if the architects considered using a more contemporary design for the new construction. Mr. Simon responded that they thought brick was a compatible material to Biddle Hall. Mr. Huff noted that the revival of many different styles can be found in the history of American architecture. Mr. Steinberg agreed, but opined that Colonial Revival buildings should not surround the Neo-classical Biddle Hall. Mr. Simon responded that simplifying the design may harm the development's marketability. Commission members debated the proposed designs, and the applicant agreed to restudy the issue of brick color.

For clarification Mr. James added that he understood that "simplification" referred to the colors only, not the other elements of the design. Mr. Sugrue reread the Committee's recommendation and the Commission members agreed that the recommendation referred to simplification of the overall design, not just the brick color.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal in concept, with simplification of the design. Mr. James seconded the motion, which failed with a vote of five to six. Mr. Brown, Mr. Rivera, Mr. Steinberg, Mr. Sugrue, and Mr. Tissian voted in favor.

Mr. Wilds then made a motion to approve the proposal in concept with the applicant to restudy the brick color. Mr. James seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of seven to three. Mr. Brown, Mr. Steinberg, and Mr. Tissian dissented.

Addition to Biddle Hall

Architectural Committee Recommendation: denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

Ms. Spina noted that in February 2000, the Committee reviewed a conceptual plan for the addition to Biddle Hall. The E-shaped addition attaches to the historic building at the two ends and in the center, creating two interior courtyards. In the conceptual design, the contemporary-styled addition was stucco with brick and a series of projecting bays and balconies. The Commission never voted on the application.

The revised proposal returns for approval in concept. The new design retains the glazing at the juncture of the historic building, but little else remains. The new concept calls for breaking the façade into different “buildings” visually by changing the color of the facing, window patterns and other ornamentation of the cornices and window hoods, and strong breaks in the roofline. Only a scored stucco base remains on the two “end” houses. Again, the overall look of the buildings resembles rowhouses found in Northern Virginia rather than Philadelphia.

Mr. Simon explained the concept of the addition, using the details and different color of the bricks to break the mass of the structure and create individuality. He noted that because of the site, one would not see the entire side façades of the addition to Biddle Hall.

Mr. Wilds thought that the project should be approved in its present form. He said that the design is consistent with the new townhouses and is less overwhelming than that seen in the past by the Committee. Ms. Murray emphasized that the neighborhood supports it.

Mr. Steinberg thought that the proposed concept was completely unacceptable because of the faux historical nature of the façade. Mr. Steinberg suggested that the architects study the additions by Frank Furness and William Strickland to the Pennsylvania School for the Deaf and Dumb, now the University of the Arts. He thought that the addition should have some design unity and relate to the architecture of Biddle Hall. In fact, he observed that the design for the whole project should start with Biddle Hall and work out from that point because of its significance.

Mr. Sugrue said that a pseudo row of brick houses attached to the large marble Classical building seemed incongruous. Although the previous design from 2000 may have had some problems, its contemporary design and articulation reflected its use as an apartment building. Mr. Simon responded that he thought the previous design competed with Biddle Hall and their present design injected a necessary verticality of design.

Mr. Tissian, noting that the addition is an apartment building and not a row of houses, objected to the false nature of the front, which has no relation to the divisions within the building. Mr. Huff reminded the Commission that Revival styles have long existed in the history of American architecture and he did not object to the design. Mr. Simon responded that they used the design of a row of “houses” to break the massing of the addition. Mr. Wilds agreed that the massing should be broken into pieces to minimize its impact on the surrounding houses. Ms. Spina noted that the massing could be articulated in other ways, such as using bays and recesses like the previous design.

Mitchell Kotler of Toll Brothers said that the plan is to renovate Biddle Hall and build the smaller rows of condominiums on the site first. The two larger condominium buildings will be built in a later phase. The firm of JK Roller is working on the interior floor plans for all of the pieces. Mr.

Kotler said that they have met with representatives from the State Historic Preservation Office and the Advisory Council and they gave oral approval of the proposed design.

John Gallery, while basically supporting the design, thought it should be revised to have more relation to Biddle Hall particularly at the courtyards where the buildings would be viewed together.

Representatives from Toll explained that they had studied the issue and had brought a revised design, which they showed. The new design has a stone watertable across all of the “houses” and a hipped roofline that reads more as a single structure, but retains strong breaks mimicking party walls through the roof. Some details have been simplified creating a more horizontal design and there is more unity of color with three rather than four colors of brick.

Discussion about voting on the new design versus remanding it back to the Architectural Committee occurred, but it was decided to vote on it at the present meeting. Commission members agreed that the redesign was an improvement and could serve as the basis for a new motion if the first design was denied. Some members thought that the faux party walls at the roof should be removed. Mr. Gallery urged the Commission to approve the revised plan.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee’s recommendation and deny the proposal in concept. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 9 to 2.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve in concept the revised proposal shown in the Commission meeting. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which passed with nine votes. Mr. Steinberg and Mr. Tissian dissented.

Roof Replacement

Architectural Committee recommendation: approval of the new roofing material and pattern of seams, with staff to review details. Approval of the oculus skylight, on the condition that the aluminum have a painted finish rather than raw aluminum, with staff to review details. Denial of the aluminum-clad windows and use of Fypon on the dormers and monitor, but approval of the vents. Windows should be wood, true-divided-light and the details should be made of wood. Denial of the cornice as proposed. All pursuant to Standard 6.

Ms. Spina described the proposal. The five-alarm fire earlier this year resulted in the destruction of the roof of Biddle Hall. All major elements of the roof will be reconstructed, including the dormers, monitor and central oculus, but the proposed roof and elements differ from the historic in several ways. First, the historic standing-seam metal roof had numerous flat seams where the metal sheets met and on the dormers and monitor. The new roofing material is made of larger sheets, so many of the flats seams will be eliminated. Second, the new skylight over the oculus will have an aluminum frame. The historic skylight is completely missing and may have had a steel frame originally. Third, the dormers presently have coupled, six-light wood windows and wood detailing. The proposal calls for installing aluminum-clad, simulated-divided-light windows and using Fypon, a synthetic material, on the facing. The proposal also includes installing vents in the eaves of the dormers, altering the slope and eaves of the dormers slightly. Fourth, like the dormers, the monitor would have Fypon on the facing, aluminum-clad windows and a slightly altered roof to accommodate new vents. Moreover, the historic fascia of the monitor had a half-round, which does not appear in the proposal. Lastly, the proposal calls for rebuilding the cornice to include venting, but only some of the historic moldings or profiles are included in the proposal. The design of the historic cornice does allow the installation of the

vents without sacrificing the details.

Ms. Spina explained that the revised cornice design still did not match all of the details of the original and calls for cladding the cornice in aluminum and that the State Historic Preservation Office has not approved the proposed cornice details. Also, Ms. Spina noted that although the historic cast-iron columns on the verandahs are no longer necessary to support the roof structure, the Committee members believed that they should be rehabilitated and reinstalled. James Campbell, an architectural consultant for Toll Brothers, noted that the columns were not part of the present application.

Mr. Wilds asked for an explanation of the proposed Fypon. Mr. Campbell explained that Fypon is a plastic material that has the same appearance as and wears better than wood. Toll wishes to use it for ease of maintenance. Mr. Campbell said that the areas with Fypon would be away from the cornice-line, lessening their visibility. Mr. Sugrue noted that the owner does not have the same financial constraints as most other property owners and the Commission consistently requires others to use wood, true-divided-light windows. Mr. Kotler said that the State Historic Preservation Office approved the use of the Fypon and aluminum-clad, simulated-divided-light windows.

John Gallery said that he supports approval of the proposal, with the exception of the cornice.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the proposal, except for the cornice, with staff to review details. The approval includes the use of the Fypon details and the aluminum clad, simulated-divided-light windows. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

On the next item, both Mr. Sklaroff and Mr. Sugrue abstained.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to appoint Mr. Bumb as temporary chair of the meeting. Mr. James seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

3260 South Street, University Museum

University of Pennsylvania, Owner

Joanne Aitken, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1897-99, Wilson Eyre, Cope & Stewardson, Frank Miles Day, architects

Addition – 1971, Mitchell Guirgola, architects

Addition – 2001, Atkin Olshin Lawson-Bell, architects

PROPOSAL: Replace lion head in fountain, new guardrails

Architectural Committee recommendation: approval of the replacement lion head, as proposed, and new simple black metal railings, with vertical pickets, and staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

Ms. Spina noted that the Committee and Commission previously approved the renovations to the main garden. However, two items need additional review. First, the marble lion head, attributed to Alexander Stirling Calder, cannot be reinstalled owing to its condition. The application calls for making a cast of the head for a replica; however, conservators are concerned that even a casting would damage the piece.

Second, the original skylight design called for pyramidal skylights at the end points of the lateral walkways. These skylights have been eliminated and the walkways will terminate at the building as they do now. To meet code requirements, guardrails must be installed at the sides of the

walkways to prevent pedestrians from falling into the newly installed skylights along the museum walls. The proposed guardrails have simple steel posts and handrails with horizontal cables.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to approve the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Riviera seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Bumb returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

12 Queen Street

Peter and Florence Bruy, Owners

Jose Hernandez, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830, permastone façade, c. 1955

PROPOSAL: Partial demolition in concept

Architectural Committee recommendation: approval of the demolition of the rear ell, piazza and rear wall of main portion of the house in concept. Denial of the partial demolition of the side walls and roof of the main portion of the house, pursuant to Standards 2 and Standard 9.

The Commission voted to deny the demolition of 12 Queen Street last month. The developer has returned for a conceptual approval of removing a portion of the rear of the main section, the rear ell and additions of the building. Demolition of the main section would destroy the historic roofline, which is slightly visible from the east next to the proposed development and highly visible from the west. The proposal includes an addition on the rear of the remaining structure to accommodate a garage. Other than a bare floorplate of the structure, the application does not include any information.

Ms. Murray moved to accept the Committee recommendation and approve the demolition of the rear ell, additions and rear wall only of the main section. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Sklaroff again passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

1901 Walnut Street

Rittenhouse Plaza, Incorporated, Owner

Joanne Phillips, Esq., Applicant

DATE: 1926, McLanahan & Bencker, architects

PROPOSAL: Alter storefront, install glass enclosure

Architectural Committee recommendation: approval provided the glass is non-reflective and a catalog cut of the light fixture is submitted to staff for review.

Ms. Spina noted that the Committee saw this proposal previously, but the applicant withdrew the application before the Commission reviewed it. As before, the proposal calls for removing a wrought-iron gate and installing a glass wall and door at the street line, making the recess an interior vestibule. The tenant in the commercial space, Firsttrust Bank, says the glass is necessary for the security and comfort of its patrons. The condo association has approved the work, on the condition that the wrought-iron gate is given to them to store on site. The applicant also proposes to install a ceiling mounted fixture in the vestibule where an electrical box exists.

Mr. Huff explained that the proposal would come to the Planning Commission for review, but that ordinarily the Planning Commission accedes to the Historical Commission's review on historical matters. Mr. Harris said that the proposal destroys a void which is an important

architectural feature facing Rittenhouse Square.

Neil Sklaroff, counsel to the applicant, explained the problem of the vestibule being used as a trash area and toilet. Mr. Harris suggested that a proviso be attached to the approval to require that the glazing be removed when this tenant left the premises. Other Commission members did not agree.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the proposal, with the staff to review a catalogue cut of the light fixture. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed with eight votes. Messrs. Harris and Tissian dissented and Mr. Huff abstained.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

1714 Locust Street

David Michie, Owner

Timothy Hemsath, Applicant

DATE: c. 1830, ground floor altered mid 20th century

PROPOSAL: New windows, façade rehabilitation

Architectural Committee recommendation: approval of the project as proposed, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Baron described the proposal. It calls for installing new divided light windows in place of the single sheet of glass in the modern storefront of this row-house. The applicant will restore the brick façade in locations where it has through wall air-conditioners. The plans also call for cutting a new window and closing a door in the rear façade.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal, with staff to review details. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1709 Pine Street

Carl Maybry, Owner

Joseph Serratore, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1870

PROPOSAL: Roof deck

Architectural Committee recommendation: approval of the proposal, on the condition that the railing is not visible, with staff to review details and a mock up, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Baron explained the proposed roof top deck on the main section of the house. He noted that the structure has no rear ell and, because of its mid-block position, the deck will have little if any visibility.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal, with staff to review details and a mock-up. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

1011-13 Chestnut Street

Philadelphia Management, Owner

Jonathan Broh, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1890, Phillip Roos, architect for addition

PROPOSAL: New storefront in annex

Architectural Committee recommendation: approval of the storefront design with metal frames, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron described the proposal, which involves rehabilitating the storefront of the annex. The architect based the proposed design on old photographs. Mr. Baron noted that clear glass will substitute for the missing original prism glass in the transoms. The design of the storefront bulkheads cannot be seen in the old photographs, but follows the design of the transom bars.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the storefront design with metal frames, with staff to review details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1238 Pine Street

Fitima Soudi, Owner

Cheon Won Suh, Applicant

DATE: 1831

PROPOSAL: Legalize exhaust fan

Architectural Committee recommendation: denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron presented the application, which calls for legalizing the installation of a fan to vent kitchen exhaust from a first floor restaurant. Mr. Tyler noted that he spoke with the owner and the restaurant owner will not have cooked food on the menu, negating the need for the fan. The owner will remove it and restore the glass transom.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and deny the proposal. Mr. James seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

902 Spruce Street

Brian Management, Owner, Principal, Matthew Semola

Hugh Zimmers, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1831, Thomas U. Walter, architect

PROPOSAL: Shed dormer on rear ell

Architectural Committee recommendation: approval of the shed dormer with wood windows and clapboarding and approval of the basement alterations, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron described the proposal for the excavation of the basement level for a stair and windows, and a large dormer addition on the roof of the ell. The roof addition has been reduced in size from that seen at the last meeting and now preserves more of the historic roof structure. The excavation of the basement includes two sliding-glass doors.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal, with wood windows and clapboarding on the shed dormer. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

1700 Green Street

Allen Scott, Owner

David Hauser, Applicant

DATE: 1987, John Bushnell, architect

PROPOSAL: Replace front doors

Architectural Committee recommendation: approval of the legalization.

Mr. Baron explained the application for legalizing a set of recently installed double-leaf, solid-panel, wood, front doors. The doors were installed without a permit on a non-contributing rowhouse constructed as part of a larger development in the Spring Garden Historic District in 1987. The solid doors replaced the original double-leaf glazed doors. The house originally had double-leaf glazed doors, as found on other houses in the development. Ms. Spina noted that the house is non-contributing because it was built after the period of significance for the district; however, the development is an excellent example of contemporary construction in an historic district. She also noted that none of the other houses in the development have been changed. Mr. Baron said that the owner wanted solid wood doors to provide security.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and legalize the doors. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed with eleven votes. Mr. James dissented.

2238-40 Mt Vernon Street

Jack Gallo and Gage Johnston, Owners

Michael Bruder, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: 4th floor addition on rear ell with balconies, new garden wall

Architectural Committee recommendation: approval, provided the height of the wall is reduced from 8 feet to 6 feet, with a step in the south wall if needed, preferably at the gate, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

This application proposes the addition of a 4th story with French doors and balcony on a portion of the rear ell of 2238 Green Street, the addition of a balcony with French doors at the 2nd story of the same rear ell, and a garden wall at the rears of 2238 and 2240. The parcels at 2238 and 2240 have been consolidated into one property. Owing to its location at the southeast corner of 23rd and Mt. Vernon Streets, the rear of this property is highly visible. The existing rear ell at 2238 is not historic. The addition on the rear ell would be small, about 12 by 12 feet, and faced with a stucco-like material. The balconies would be simple metal structures. The 8-foot wall would be constructed of CMU and finished with stucco and a stone cap. Details of the gate are not provided and its position is not consistent between drawings.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Mr. Sklaroff asked for clarifications. Michael Bruder, the applicant and contractor, explained that the addition would replace a small roof deck. Mr. Wilds asked for further information on the wall. Mr. Bruder stated that the eight-foot height was necessary at the 23rd Street sidewalk because the ground slopes up to the east and the wall would be only four or five feet tall at the eastern end. Mr. Sklaroff contended that an eight-foot wall would be too tall along the sidewalk. Commission members agreed and concluded that stepping the wall to maintain a six-foot height was appropriate.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal with a six-foot wall. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which passed

unanimously.

1607 Wallace Street

Ralph Pungitore, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Legalize stucco on side and rear

Architectural Committee recommendation: that an inspector from the Department of Licenses & Inspections examine the property and determine if the stuccoing of the rear ell facades is necessary or if the repointing of the brick would be sufficient. If the stucco is necessary, the Committee recommends legalization; if not, it recommends denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5 and 6.

This application proposes legalizing the stucco recently applied to the side and rear of the rear ell of the rowhouse at 1627 Wallace Street. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a violation for unpermitted stucco and window replacement on 21 July 2003. This application does not address any window replacement. The rear ell is highly visible from 17th and North Streets across a large vacant lot.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Mr. Sklaroff commented on the unusual nature of the Committee recommendation. Mr. Wilds noted the likelihood that the vacant lots along North Street would be built upon in the near future, blocking the view of the rear ell at 1627 Wallace Street. Mr. Sklaroff contended that any assumption that the lots would be built upon was mere speculation. He then asserted that the application should address the stucco and the windows because the violation issued by the Department of Licenses & Inspections includes both stucco and windows. Mr. Farnham added that Edward Jackson of the Department of Licenses & Inspections had inspected the property subsequent to the Committee meeting and has requested that the building owner retain an engineer to assess the structural stability of the walls. Mr. Sklaroff asserted that the application could be denied for two reasons: the applicant has not made a case for legalization and the application does not provide complete information on the stucco and does not address all aspects of the violation.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to deny the application and suggested that the applicant return to the Commission with a complete application. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

625 North 16th Street

Jonathan Oler, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Retaining wall

Architectural Committee recommendation: approval, pursuant to Standard 9. The Committee suggested that the applicant consult with an engineer for the structural details.

This application proposes adding a CMU retaining wall to separate the rear yards of 625 and 627 N. 16th Street. The yards, which slope to the south, will be leveled, creating a 2-foot drop at the property line. The owners of both properties approve of the construction of the wall. The wall would be faced with stucco (champagne color, sand finish) and capped. It would be visible from Wallace Street, which runs along the south side of the yard at 625; the wall would run along the north side of the yard. Although not proposed, the retaining wall may require a fence along the top to meet the building code.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to accept the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve proposal. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

224 Market Street

Scott and David Stein, Owners

Thomas Citro, Applicant

DATE: c. 1920

PROPOSAL: New storefront

Architectural Committee recommendation: denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, 6 and Restoration Standard 7.

This application proposes the renovation of the four-bay storefront at 224 Market Street. The proposal stipulates single-leaf glazed doors in the outer bays and bi-fold windows in the inner bays. Double transoms would be installed in all bays. No details such as materials are provided for the doors and windows. At its February 2003 meeting, the Architectural Committee reviewed and recommended denial of an even less appropriate proposal by the same applicant. The application was withdrawn before the Commission meeting. Although this proposal is an improvement over the previous one, no attempt has been made to restore the existing historic fabric and recreate the missing elements. Much of the historic storefront exists and the missing elements such as the double-leaf doors and transoms are thoroughly documented by Commission photographs.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Mr. Sklaroff asked if Mr. Citro, the applicant, or anyone else representing the project was in attendance. No one representing the project came forward. Mr. Huff asked that the record reflect the fact that the City Planning Commission must review the project.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to accept the Architectural Committee's recommendation and deny the proposal. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. James suggested that the Commission consider the 508 S. 3rd Street application prior to the 241 Chestnut Street application so that the two Chestnut Street applications, the 241 application

and the 241-243 application, could be heard concurrently. The Commission agreed and proceeded with the 508 S. 3rd Street application.

508 South 3rd Street

Jason Beccaris, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830, new façade, c. 1950

PROPOSAL: Roof deck

Architectural Committee recommendation: legalization of the deck, provided the railing is set back to a point where it is invisible, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

This application seeks the legalization of a roof deck reconstructed without a building permit. An informal roof deck consisting of planks laid directly on the roof and a metal railing existed at the time of designation. The applicant removed and replaced it. The new deck is much more visible owing to the new structure, which raises the level of the deck above that of the original deck, and the new wood railing, which is much less transparent than the original metal railing. This rowhouse does not have a rear ell, the most appropriate location for a roof deck. Also, a small penthouse with a door providing roof access was erected many years before designation.

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

Mr. Sklaroff clarified the facts of the case. Mr. Wilds noted a similar case for a deck located at 12th and Pine or Spruce Streets, which the Commission legalized. He stated that this deck, unlike the other, is now very visible from the street. Mr. Sklaroff noted the Committee's recommendation and asked if the Committee had estimated how far the railing would need to be set back. Mr. Farnham explained that the Committee had left the determination of the appropriate set back to the staff. Mr. James suggested that the set back dimension should be determined in advance of the Commission's ruling to avoid any potential problems. Mr. Sklaroff agreed with Mr. James. Mr. Wilds noted that the clause "staff to approve details" appears in many Commission decisions and that this clause would allow the staff to determine the set back dimension. Mr. Sklaroff countered that the set back was more than a mere detail. Mr. James contended that the Commission should approve an exact set back and not put the burden on the staff to make the final decision. In light of the discussion, Mr. Wilds withdrew his initial motion. Mr. Tyler reminded Commission members that an existing deck does not entitle an owner to a new deck. Ms. Murray asked for clarification on the railing height. Mr. Sugrue asked if the new railing conformed to the building code. Commission members stated that they thought that it did.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to deny the application without prejudice and suggest that the applicant submit a revised proposal with the railing set back to a point where it is not visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

241 Chestnut Street

Carolyn Caton, Owner

Jon Wagner, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1857, Stephen Button, architect

PROPOSAL: Canopy

Architectural Committee recommendation: approval, provided an opaque material is substituted for the transparent material.

This application proposes the addition of a three-piece canopy to the storefront at 241 Chestnut Street. At its July 2003 meeting, the Commission approved new windows, a frameless door system, concrete steps, and sidewalk panels for the easternmost three bays of this four-bay storefront. At that time, it referred a revised canopy design presented at the Commission meeting back to the Committee. This application proposes that revised design. The canopy would consist of three aluminum and colored acrylic components, one over each bay. The canopy would be held aloft with cables tied into the storefront cornice.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Rivera to elaborate on the Committee's interest in the transparency of the awning. Mr. Sugrue and Mr. Steinberg asked about the color of the canopy. Jon Wagner, the architect, further explained the proposal to the Commission. Mr. Wilds asserted that the plans were misleading; he claimed that, with the inclusion of one bay from the neighboring building, the canopy appeared to be centered on the storefront. Jon Wagner, the architect, further explained the proposal to the Commission. Mr. Wilds asked about lighting and signage. Mr. Sklaroff asked if the proposal had been submitted to the Art Commission yet. The applicant answered in the negative. Mr. Huff asked that the record reflect the fact that the City Planning Commission must review the project as well. Mr. Steinberg asked if the architect had considered snow load when designing the canopy. The architect replied that he had.

Mr. Bumb made a motion to accept the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approval the proposal with opaque material rather than transparent. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

241-43 Chestnut Street

Carolyn Caton, Owner

Douglas Seiler, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 241, c. 1857, Stephen Button architect, 243, c. 1897, Wilson Eyre, architect

PROPOSAL: Storefront restoration at 241, HVAC at 241, two-story addition to 243

Architectural Committee recommendation: approval of the storefront restoration; approval of the HVAC equipment; and approval of the 2-story rear addition at 243, provided that the canopy is deleted from the design; with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and Restoration Standard 7 and the Roofs Guideline.

This application proposes additional pieces of the ongoing rehabilitation at 241-243 Chestnut Street. The Commission approved some aspects in concept, including the 2-story rear addition at 243 Chestnut in April 2003. In May 2003, it gave final approval to several pieces of the project. At that meeting, it denied the proposed 2-story rear addition at 243. It rejected the addition not for its overall design but because of a few key details. In July 2003, the Commission refused to hear the current application because of a pending appeal to the Board of Licenses and Inspections Review. As confirmed by the letter dated 1 August 2003 and distributed to Commission

members, that appeal has been withdrawn.

Mr. Wilds asked for an update on the status of this application, which returned as old business. Mr. Sklaroff asked if the Commission had received the minutes of the Architectural Committee's review of this project. Mr. Farnham noted that the Commission's packet included the Committee and Commission minutes for the most recent reviews of this application. Mr. Sklaroff inquired into the status of the appeal to the Board of Licenses & Inspections of the Commission's earlier decision on this application. Mr. Farnham noted the 1 August 2003 letter withdrawing the appeal. Mr. Sklaroff asked the applicant to explicate the design. Carl Primavera made a brief statement and introduced Douglas Seiler, the architect. Mr. Seiler stated that the canopy had been deleted from the design. Mr. Sklaroff noted that the application was now congruent with the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Sklaroff asked the staff to review concisely the application; Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Commission members asked for clarification on several issues. Mr. Steinberg inquired about the addition's materials and about its relation to the building to the north. Mr. Seiler assured him that the addition would not harm or obscure the building to the north. Mr. Sklaroff asked that the record reflect that the current application under consideration does not include the canopy on the addition.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the proposal, provided the canopy is removed. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMENT ON NATIONAL REGISTER

At Mr. Hack's request, the Planning Commission reviewed the nomination of the boundary increase of the Upper Roxborough Historic District. Mr. Huff read the report generated by the Planning Commission. In summary, the Planning Commission found that there is a paucity of historic structures and those that remain are in a deteriorated state. The Commission recommends listing the remaining structures listed on the Philadelphia Register, but the area should not be included on the National Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Tyler stated that he and Mr. James also toured the site. Mr. Tyler believes that the site does meet Criterion C for the National Register, but concurs with the Planning Commission in that the site lacks integrity. He noted that the neighbors have concerns about the possible development of the site. Mr. Tyler recommended against designation, owing to the lack of integrity. Mr. James, on behalf of the Department of Public Property, noted that owner, the City of Philadelphia, objects to the designation.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion not to support increasing the boundaries of the Upper Roxborough National Historic District. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed with eleven votes. Mr. James abstained.

THE REPORT of the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, July 2003

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

Mr. Sklaroff explained that the Historical Commission is working with the Pennsylvania Bar Institute to hold a day-long seminar on historic preservation law. The eight-hour seminar will

provide continuing education credits to attorneys and would satisfy the members' eight-hour training requirement by the Certified Local Government program. The seminar will be given on December 2nd in Philadelphia and December 8th in Pittsburgh. All Commission members and staff will be able to attend without cost. Mr. Sklaroff named some of the individuals preparing lectures and noted that the keynote speech will address 1st Amendment issues.

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to approve an expenditure of \$ 24.42 for Architectural Committee lunches.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to approve the expenditure. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Wilds questioned the balance of the Batten account. Mr. Sklaroff suggested using the fund to purchase Historical Commission polo shirts, like those of other City departments. The Commission debated the appropriateness of using the Batten fund for such an expenditure. Several Commissioners volunteered to purchase their own. Mr. Sklaroff said that he would secure money from another source to buy some as well. He asked Mr. James to order two dozen shirts. Mr. Wilds noted that much of the money in the Batten fund came from the appointed members who signed over the stipends they received for the Commission meetings.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron
Jonathan Farnham
Laura Spina