

**THE MINUTES OF THE 493rd STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
12 September 2003**

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

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
Duane Bumb, Deputy Director, Department of Commerce
James Cuorato, Director, Department of Commerce
Warren Huff, City Planner V, City Planning Commission
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
Kathleen Murray, Special Assistant to President of City Council
David Perri, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Vincent Rivera, AIA
Denise Smyler, Esq.
Harris Steinberg, AIA
Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.
Scott Wilds, Deputy Director, Office of Housing and Community Development

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary
Jonathan Farnham, Historic Preservation Planner
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner

Lawrence Copeland, Senior Attorney, Law Department
Henry Schwartz, Esq., Law Department

Also

Robert Acosta, HSBC Bank USA
Robert Powers, Powers and Company
Jean K. Wolf, Wolf Historic Preservation
Sal D'Angelo, 258 South 20th Street
Gerhard Mayer, United Savings Bank
John Mitkus, Smith Mack Real Estate
Jeffrey Hawver, Agoos/Lovera Architects
Jeff Morgan, Cubellis Associates
David Blumenfeld, Metro/111 South 15th Street Associates
Greg G. Nelson, Nelson
Howard Dorf, Nelson
Sheila Shapira, 2043 Rittenhouse Square
Niki Gianopaulos, Keast and Hood Company
James C. O'Neill, L.F. Driscoll Company
Mike Delo, L.F. Driscoll Company
Stacy Gao, 941 Race Street
Ruo Wu Zhang, 941 Race Street
Lenore Millhollen, Preservation Alliance/Center City Residents' Association
Joanne Phillips, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews and Ingersoll, LLP
David Zalesne, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg and Ellers, LLP

Albert G. Weiss, Binder and Weiss
Michele Williams
Tuong Huynh Partridge Architects
Arlene Matzkin, Friday Architects
Wendy Born, Metropolitan Bakery
Kevin Rasnussen, AIA, 1923 Brandywine Street
Geoffrey Posner, Owner, 1923 Brandywine Street
Gregory M. Harvey, Esq., 1939 Panama Street
Jason Beccaris, 508 South 3rd Street
Marianna Thomas, AIA, 1253 South 19th Street
Bernice Hamel, Society Hill Civic Association

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 493rd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:10 a.m.

Minutes of the 492nd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Upon a motion made by Mr. Steinberg and seconded by Mr. Rivera, the Commission voted to approve the minutes of the 492nd Stated Meeting, 8 August 2003, as corrected, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 26 August 2003
Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair

1917 Panama Street

Michele Williams, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1920, W.F.B. Koelle, architect

PROPOSAL: Legalize window alterations

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal, pursuant to Standards 2, 6 and 9.

Ms. Spina presented this application for the legalization of the front windows and light. The owner without a permit or Historical Commission approval enlarged the first floor window opening and installed large, casement windows. All of the front windows now have ornate wrought-iron grilles, also installed without a permit. Lastly, the owner installed an ornate light-fixture that has wrought-iron detailing. The owner has received numerous violations over the last few years for this work.

Michele Williams, the owner, attended the meeting and referred to a letter from her neighbor, which she believes is in support of the alterations. Ms. Williams said that the grates were installed for security reasons, and noted that the previous windows did not match those on the neighboring house.

Mr. Wilds questioned the grates on the third floor. Mr. Sklaroff inquired about the dates of installation for the ironwork and light fixture. Ms. Williams responded that she installed them two years ago.

Gregory Harvey, Esq., a neighbor, spoke in opposition to the alterations. He pointed out that the contractor who did the work contacted the Historical Commission to inquire if a permit was necessary, and proceeded to do the work at night.

Mr. Sugrue emphasize that the work was done without a permit and also included the removal of historic fabric.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation for denial of the proposal, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which carried with 9 votes. Ms. Murray dissented.

2401 Spruce Street

John Wolf, Owner

Jean Wolf, Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Demolish rear shed, new garden fence

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with a simplified picket gate, with the staff to review details including a brick match, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina explained this proposal, which calls for demolishing a non-historic garden shed and installing a wrought-iron garden fence and gate. The rear yard will be used for parking. The proposed gate has arrow-topped pickets and heart-shaped scrolls – a sharp contrast to the simple picket pedestrian gate also on the property. The historic brick sidewalk and patio will be re-installed with a gravel and sand bed, but some patching is required.

Mr. Sklaroff expressed concern about the lost of parking spaces on the street. At the Committee meeting, the applicant noted that the Streets Department may move a parking sign so that no street spaces will be lost.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal with a simplified gate. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

1428-32 Chestnut Street aka 111 South 15th Street, Packard Building

111 South 15th Street Associates, Owners

David Blumenfeld, Esq., Applicant

DATE: 1922, Ritter & Shay, architects

PROPOSAL: Enlarge windows on the 25th floor, signage, alter Chestnut Street storefront

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the 25th floor window enlargement, but denial of the legalization of the signage and the removal of the revolving door, pursuant to Standard 9 and the window guideline.

This application has several parts. First, the windows on the 25th floor are long and narrow. The application calls for cutting the four windows in the light-well on the east side of the building to install larger one-over-one, double-hung windows that match others on the façade. The SHPO has already approved this scope of work.

Second, without a permit or Historical Commission approval the owner installed three large signs on the limestone façade, two on Chestnut Street and one on 15th Street. The signs, measuring 9'6" x 21'0", have aluminum frames. They were attached using screws, but the application does not specify the number of penetrations into the stone. The owner claims that the signs are temporary.

Third, also without a permit, the owner removed the non-historic doors in the Chestnut Street storefront and installed a large, single-light window flanked by single-leaf doors. Again, this may be a temporary change.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal. Mr. Sklaroff asked Commissioner Perri if a permit is required for signage and he responded in the affirmative.

David Blumenfeld, counsel for the owner, said that, owing to the temporary nature of the signage, he believed that a permit was not necessary. He noted other buildings that had similar signage and urged the Commission to allow the signage for a period of 90 days. He remarked that the replaced entranceway was not original and it also was intended to be a temporary solution.

Mr. Huff reiterated that the façade alterations require a review by the Planning Commission and Art Commission because of the buildings location on Chestnut Street. Mr. Wilds thought it reasonable as a marketing tool to allow the temporary signage. Mr. Steinberg expressed concern with the setting of precedent and making exceptions for developers, while holding homeowners to the *Standards*.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the 25th floor window enlargement, but deny the storefront alterations to the Chestnut Street façade. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the temporary signage for a period not to extend past 12 December 2003. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried with 6 votes. Mr. Huff, Mr. Rivera, Mr. Steinberg, and Mr. Sugrue dissented.

2020 Chancellor Street

Cary Borish, Owner

Neil Sandvold, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1880

PROPOSAL: New casement windows, carriage house doors

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the doors, with staff to review details, and conceptual approval of the windows pursuant to Standard 9 and the window guideline.

Ms. Spina presented this proposal, which involves a property that has two garage entrances, one on Van Pelt Street and one on Chancellor Street. The application calls for switching the paneled, overhead garage door to the Van Pelt Street façade and restoring the original bi-fold doors and installing them on the Chancellor Street façade. The proposal also includes removing the arched, non-historic, single-paned windows in the upper floors with wood, double-leaf casement windows. The original windows would have been two-over-two, double-hung windows. The casement windows would have two-panes to simulate the original pane configuration, but the dimensions of the central mullion would be much thicker than the original.

No one representing the applicant attended the meeting. Commission members concurred with the Committee's recommendation.

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

255 South 20th Street

Young Ju Kim, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c 1880

PROPOSAL: Alter storefront

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the blade sign and storefront alterations, with the elimination of the lighting, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

This application is for renovations to the historic storefront. The proposal calls for new overhead lighting sconces to correspond with the transom windows. The transoms break the storefront into a tripartite configuration. The owner wishes to turn the southern third into a door opening. The new fully glazed wood door would have a wood surround and new marble steps to match the original. The rest of the storefront would be restored. The plans also call for replacing the existing blade sign.

Ms. Spina explained the application and asked that staff be allowed to review details. Mr. Steinberg inquired about the signage.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to approve the proposal of the blade sign and storefront alterations, with the elimination of the lighting, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, with the staff to review details.

1509 Walnut Street

John Lee, Owner

D. Lance Muscara, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1902, Newman, Woodman & Harris, architects, c. 1985, storefront cut

PROPOSAL: Alter storefront, signage

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the window alteration and small signage in the storefront cornice, pursuant to Standard 9 and storefront guideline [Not recommended: using inappropriately scaled signs and logos or other types of signs that obscure, damage, or destroy remaining character-defining features of the historic building.]. The Committee split on the proposed frameless glass door.

Ms. Spina presented this proposal, which calls for refurbishing the building for a new store. The fully-glazed wood door would be removed for a frame-less glass door. A single storefront window would replace the bi-fold windows and railing. The owner wishes to install a 4'0" x 11'0" sign at the top of the storefront window, which would cover the cornice area. A 5'0"-long florescent light would be mounted above the signage for illumination. Howard Dorf and Greg Nelson attended the meeting.

Mr. Steinberg inquired about façade alterations. Ms. Spina noted that the area around the storefront window was altered prior to designation; however, the transom and door surround are original.

Mr. Nelson believed that a precedent existed for the replacing of the doors. Mr. Sklaroff remarked that a clear glass door is neutral, while Mr. Sugrue said that glass doors would not have been historic in 1901. Mr. Rivera opined that the windows allow for enough transparency. Mr. Wilds asked about the type of door that would have existed as a residence. Mr. Nelson responded that it would have been a solid wood door.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the storefront alterations, the signage, and the frameless glass door, with the staff to review details. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Rivera and Mr. Sugrue dissented.

2043 Rittenhouse Square

Boris and Sheila Shapira, Owners/Applicant

DATE: c. 1870, c. 1970 façade alterations

PROPOSAL: Infill door

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal.

Ms. Spina presented the application. In the early 1970s one of the front windows was cut down into a door. This application calls for removing the non-historic door and infilling the area; however, the historic window opening will not be restored.

In response to Mr. Steinberg's query about putting a window into the opening, Ms. Spina informed the Commission that the applicant does not wish to install a window. Sheila Shapira, the owner, attended the meeting and explained that the opening has been sealed on the interior already.

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

1600 Locust Street

Michael J. Stack, Jr., Owner

Jeffrey Hawver, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1948, Walter K. Durham, architect

PROPOSAL: Review in concept of stair tower, ATM machine, night deposit box, and signage

The Architectural Committee recommends approval of the window signs and stair tower, provided the faux dormer is redesigned to avoid confusion between the historic fabric and new addition, but denial of the projecting signs, ATM, and night deposit box.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. This application for review in concept proposes several alterations to the Colonial Revival building at the southwest corner of South 16th and Locust Streets. A 3-story stair tower addition is planned for the rear. It would be built in the rear garden and would open onto Latimer Street. The Latimer Street façade would be brick, the 16th Street façade would be stucco and glass, and a steel and glass link at the 2nd and 3rd stories would connect the tower via a faux dormer to the building. The ATM machine would be installed in a new opening in the historic brick 16th Street façade, partially in and partially above the watertable. The night deposit box would be installed in a new opening in the historic brick Locust Street façade. The signage would include two very tall aluminum signs with cut-out lettering and neon illumination, one on each of the primary facades, and logo signs on the windows.

Jeff Hawver of Agoos/Lovera Architects, Gerhard Mayer of the United Savings Bank, John Mitkus of Smith Mack Real Estate, and Michael J. Stack, Jr., the building owner, represented the application. Mr. Sugrue made a motion to approve the Committee's recommendation; Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion.

Mr. Wilds asked for clarifications on the ATM. Mr. Stack described the ATM and night deposit box installations. He noted that installing the ATM and night deposit box in the garden wall would require the construction of a small building and would present a security risk. Placing them in a lobby would also pose logistical and security problems, he claimed. The applicants then noted other nearby ATMs including the one diagonally across the street. Staff members replied that the ATM diagonally across the street predates the district. The applicants asserted that their proposed ATM would have a minimal impact on the façade. Mr. Wilds asked further questions about the ATM. Ms. Smyler contended that the ATM size and location was appropriate; she asked if the night deposit box could be relocated. The applicants stated that they would be willing to move it to the 16th Street façade.

Mr. Sugrue inquired about ADA compliant access at the Locust Street entrance. He stated that the application did not address the historic step at the Locust Street entrance. He asked if the applicants planned to build a ramp or remove the step. He suggested that the ADA access be added to the stairtower and the ATM moved to the vestibule. The applicants responded that ADA access from the rear was impossible because it would necessitate public access to restricted areas of the bank. They also explained that the side entry could not be used; it was for access to the upper floors. Mr. Wilds asked if they might remove the step at the Locust Street entrance and construct a ramp in the building.

Mr. Steinberg asserted that the projecting signs were too large. He also questioned the removal of the flagpole, which he believes to be original. He added that the proposal included too many window signs. Other members suggested that the projecting signs and flagpole be considered during the final review of the project.

Mr. Sugrue amended his original motion to approve the Committee's recommendation, eliminating the window signs from it. The motion failed with only two votes.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve in concept the stairtower, provided the dormer is redesigned, the ATM as proposed, the night deposit box, provided it is moved to the 16th Street façade, and the window signs as proposed. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed with 8 votes. Mr. Sugrue and Mr. Steinberg dissented.

1901 Spruce Street aka 262 South 19th Street

Wendy Born, Owner

Arlene Matzkin, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1950

PROPOSAL: Legalize painting, new awnings

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal.

Mr. Farnham explained the application and communicated the building in question is non-contributing to the district. This application proposes new awnings for the 19th and Spruce Street facades of this commercial building. It also proposes the legalization of the painting of the upper portion of the 19th Street façade and the approval of the painting of the remainder of the building. The 1st story was painted at the time of designation. An inspector from the Department of Licenses and Inspections issued an oral stop work order during the painting. Although the 2nd-story windows appear to have been changed since designation without the Commission's approval, this application does not propose the legalization of the new windows.

Mr. Wilds inquired about the applicant's options for paint removal if the application to legalize the paint is not approved. He believed that it would be more appropriate to complete the painting. Commission members discussed the appropriate type of awning and conceded that an open shed-type awning would be more appropriate.

Arlene Matzkin, the architect, and Wendy Born, the owner, attended the meeting. Ms. Born declared her willingness to install the historically correct awnings.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the painting and a revised awning design, with staff to review details. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion, which carried with 8 votes. Ms. Smyler and Mr. Rivera dissented.

256-58 South 20th Street

Salvatore D'Angelo, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1840, storefront at 258 c. 1885

PROPOSAL: Legalize storefront alterations

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommends approval, provided the storefront is painted a subtle color such as cream, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; 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 of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.].

This application seeks the legalization of storefront alterations executed at 258 S. 20th Street, which, together with 256 S. 20th, forms D'Angelo's Restaurant. A violation was issued on 25 February 2000 for the work performed without a permit. The Architectural Committee reviewed this application at its 24 June 2003 meeting. The Commission reviewed the application and Committee recommendation at its 11 July 2003 meeting. It decided to table the application for up to 90 days to allow the applicant and staff to meet and identify the unresolved issues. Since the Commission meeting, the staff has re-examined the storefront and conferred with the applicant. The applicant subsequently withdrew the segment of the application proposing new work.

The application now proposes (numbers correspond with notations on photograph):

1. legalizing the removal of the storefront awning
2. legalizing the storefront window alterations, but removing the wood panels below the front and recessed windows
3. legalizing the addition of a transom approximating the existing transoms
4. removing the plywood facing and molding applied to the recessed single-leaf Queen Anne door and reglazing and restoring the door
5. legalizing the double-leaf doors, which are new, not historic
6. legalizing the molding on the bulkhead below of the storefront window

The Commission as well as the applicant concurred with the Committee's recommendation.

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

1912 Delancey Street

Albert and Rosa Esquenazi, Owners

Richard Wesley, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c.1880

PROPOSAL: Side additions in concept

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommends approval in concept, 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.].

This application for review in concept proposes the construction of additions to the carriage house at 1912-1914 Delancey Street. Richard Wesley is the local associated architect. The architect is Isaac Broid of Adria, Broid & Rojkind, an internationally renowned firm in Mexico City. The additions would extend out from the east façade into the side yard. The east façade is a stuccoed former party wall; a carriage house once stood at 1908-1910 Delancey Street. An existing 8-foot brick wall topped by a 3-foot wrought iron fence runs along the Delancey Street frontage of the side yard obscuring the view of much of this facade. The additions to the carriage house would include a 2-story stair tower clad in slate nearest Delancey Street, a shallow 2-story glass and aluminum projection in the center of the façade, and a large 1-story glass and aluminum projection with rooftop terrace at the rear of the façade. Further information for the alterations at the 3rd-story level of the south or rear façade should be provided.

Mr. Steinberg commented that the design of the addition was well executed. Mr. Huff concurred.

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

508 South 3rd Street

Jason Beccaris, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830, new façade, c. 1950

PROPOSAL: Legalize roof deck

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommends approval of the revised design, 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 that decking and railing and replaced it with a new deck. 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.

At its 29 July 2003 meeting, the Committee reviewed an application to legalize this deck and recommended legalization, provided the railing is set back to a point where it is not visible from the public right-of-way, with staff to review details. At its 8 August 2003 meeting, the Commission reviewed the application and Committee recommendation and decided that the railing setback constituted more than a detail. It therefore denied the application without prejudice

and suggested that the applicant submit a revised proposal specifying a particular setback determined by the applicant and staff.

The staff and applicant met at the site on 12 August 2003 and assessed the visibility of a mock-up of the front railing in various positions. Using the mock-up, the staff identified a position in which the railing, excepting a few inches of the top of the northernmost post, would not be visible from the public right-of-way. The application now proposes a deck with the front railing in this position; the railing is set back from its original position 9½ feet at the north and 6½ feet at the south.

Commission members deemed the revised design appropriate.

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

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

223-25 South 6th Street

John Turchi, Owner

John Partridge, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1957 by architect G. Edwin Brumbaugh for Philadelphia Mayor Richardson Dilworth

PROPOSAL: Demolition rear wing and garden wall, construction of rear wing, garage, garden wall, trellis, addition of window and multi-light doors with balcony in new openings

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommends denial of the proposal. However, the Committee members urged the applicants to incorporate their suggestions into a revised design and return for another review.

This application proposes several alterations including a very large rear wing and a detached garage to the Colonial Revival house designed by architect G. Edwin Brumbaugh for Philadelphia Mayor Richardson Dilworth in 1957. Dilworth was an early advocate of the redevelopment of Society Hill and erected this house to encourage the effort. His house is considered a "significant" resource in the Society Hill Historic District. The property faces Washington Square from the east across S. 6th Street, backs up to Randolph Street, and is visible from St. James Street.

Significant alterations are planned for the main block of the original building. A window would be removed, the opening enlarged, and double-leaf multi-light doors with an ornate lintel and a metal balcony added at the 3rd-story level of the south façade. A window with an ornate lintel would be added at the 1st-story level of the same façade. The doors, balcony, and window would be visible from S. 6th Street.

The construction of the 2-story, rear wing would necessitate the demolition of the original rear wing. The staff questions whether the demolition of the two-story section of the original rear wing is necessary. It may be able to be incorporated into the new construction, thereby preserving a substantial portion of the historic fabric. Three additional aspects of the design for the proposed rear wing raise concerns. A stucco wall at the western end of the new rear wing would be visible from Washington Square above the original two-story stair tower at the north, disrupting the massing of the historic building. The new rear wing, which would be taller than the original rear wing, would cut awkwardly across the rear cornice of the original building, disrupting the cornice line of the historic building. The large, medieval revival-style chimney on the new rear wing,

which would be visible from Washington Square, would be stylistically unrelated to the historic Colonial Revival building. Also of note is the fact that the new rear wing would be highly visible from Randolph Street.

The construction of the three-car, 2-story garage as well as a stucco and limestone garden wall with gate along Randolph Street would necessitate the demolition of the existing garden wall with gate. The garage and garden wall would be visible from Randolph and St. James Streets.

A 20'-3"-tall prefab metal trellis system would be erected along the party wall with the property to the south. The trellis would cover windows in the north façade of the Lippincott Building and would be visible from S. 6th Street.

Mr. Sklaroff recused himself from the Commission's consideration of the proposal and passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue. Joanne Philips, the owner's attorney, represented the applicant. Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Architectural Committee's recommendation; Mr. Rivera seconded the motion.

Ms. Philips stated that her client intended to return the Dilworth House to a single-family residence. Mr. Sugrue noted his concern that the new wing would block the Athenaeum's light and air. Mr. Wilds stated his desire to better understand the visibility of the new construction from Washington Square. Ms. Philips answered that there would be minimal visibility down the alley at the south along the Lippincott Building. Commission members stated that they were more concerned with visibility above the small extension to the north. Pointing to visibility from other directions, Mr. Farnham noted that neighbors to the east across Randolph Street had expressed concerns about the scale of the project. Mr. Steinberg asked how tall the new rear wing would stand. Mr. Wilds inquired about the visibility from Randolph Street. The architect, Tuong Huynh, stated that the new construction would be visible; he also added details about the new wall, fence, and gate.

Discussion turned to the stability of the north party wall, which is shared with the Athenaeum. The architect stated that he had moved the foundation for the new wing to accommodate the wall.

Mr. Sugrue turned the conversation back to the visibility of the new wing. He pointed to the stucco wall that would appear above the original 2-story stair tower at the north. He also noted the large chimney. Mr. Wilds contended that the chimney was stylistically unrelated to the original building and should be redesigned. He also questioned the addition of the doorway and balcony on the south façade of the original building. Commission members discussed the addition of the balconette.

Mr. Steinberg stated that the architecture of the new wing should not mimic the original Colonial Revival building. The architect claimed that it did not. Mr. Steinberg added that he considered the addition too large for the property. He contended that the design should be reconsidered, especially at the juncture between new and old and in relation to its neighbors. Ms. Philips, the counsel for the applicant, asserted that the design was appropriate. Commission members reiterated their concerns about the design.

Mr. Turchi, the owner, addressed the Commission. He stated that he was willing to have the roof redesigned as a double-pitched roof to eliminate the visibility from Washington Square and to reduce the impact on the Athenaeum. He stated that the chimney could be redesigned as well. He

also stated that he was willing to compromise on the French Doors and balconette; he would relinquish the balconette for a railing that would not extend out beyond the plane of the façade. Commission members clarified the proposed revisions to the design.

Bernice Hamill of the Society Hill Civic Association expressed her support of the Architectural Committee's recommendation and asked that the proposal be revised.

David Zalesne, an attorney representing the owner of the Lippincott Building, voiced his client's opposition to the trellis on the Lippincott party wall. Commission members agreed that this venue was not the appropriate forum for litigating the trellis question.

The Commission voted 2 to 8 to defeat the original motion to accept the Architectural Committee recommendation; Mr. Rivera and Mr. Steinberg voted in the affirmative.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the proposed design, provided that the balconette at the 3rd story of the south façade was replaced with a simple guard rail not extending out beyond the plane of the façade, that the roofline of the rear wing was changed to a gable or A-frame shape, that the chimney was redesigned to harmonize with the Colonial Revival building, and that none of the new rear wing except the chimney was visible from 6th Street or Washington Square above the original 2-story stair tower at the north, with staff to review details. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which passed 8 to 2. Mr. Rivera and Mr. Steinberg opposed the motion; Mr. Sklaroff recused himself.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

436 Walnut Street

One Beacon Insurance, Owner

Mark Coffey, Applicant

DATE: c. 1915

PROPOSAL: Remove window for louver and exhaust fan

The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

This application proposes the installation of two exhaust fan louvers in non-historic window openings at the 1st-story level of the east façade. The louvers would be minimally visible from Walnut Street down a gated alley.

The Commission agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

Ms. Smyler made a motion to approve the proposal, provided the louvers are set back to the plane of the glass in the other windows and are painted to match the window frames. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

700-18 Walnut Street, York Row

P & A Associates, Peter Shaw, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1807

PROPOSAL: Reconstruct cornice in alternate material

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal pursuant to Standards 2 and 6.

Mr. Baron presented this application, which involves reconstructing damaged marble cornices in

fiberglass. This comes to the Commission as a piece of a previously approved larger project, which demolished a substantial portion of York Row to build an attached residential tower. The applicant said he would restore the facades of York Row since he would be demolishing a substantial portion of the buildings. In spite of numerous requests on the part of the neighborhood and the Commission to secure the remaining facades better, the carved marble cornices collapsed in the early part of 2003 and largely destroyed the ornate marble stoops and wrought iron railings. Numerous windows have also been destroyed. The staff believes this constitutes demolition by neglect.

Peter Shaw, the architect, attended the meeting. He acknowledged responsibility for the retention of the façade. He said that the dormers would be re-created and that the gutters would be rebuilt to match the existing. Mr. Shaw communicated his intent to remove and replicate the cornice in fiberglass. He said that he was unaware that the original cornice material was marble, additionally the fiberglass is proposed for economic reasons, with a difference of 5 to 6 thousand for fiberglass and 100 thousand dollars for marble. He believes that the appearance from the sidewalk would match the original material. He remarked about the concessions made with the rehabilitation of the PSFS Building. It was his contention that all of the elements, which were left, exposed to the inclement weather would be removed.

Mr. Wilds clarified the requirements that 15 feet of the roof be kept and that the dormers be reconstructed historically.

Michael Delo acknowledged responsibility for the management and construction of York Row. He noted that a restoration firm was hired to restore York Row. Mr. Delo explained that he relied on the judgement of the engineer, that leaving the backs open would not compromise the structure. He said that in February 2003 when the cornice fell, he retained the services of a structural engineer. The basis of the engineer's report was as follows: the homes were unoccupied and suffered water infiltration; damage to the roof, and the severe weather resulted in the falling cornice, which damaged the stoops and railings.

Nick Gianopolis, the structural engineer, said that the building has sustained a lot of water inside, which damaged the mortar, along with heavy winds, which caused the cornice to fall. He noted that the roof had been replaced and the wall internally braced. With regards to the replication of the cornice in fiberglass, he cited Independence Hall as well as the Wallace Building as examples for this type of replication. Mr. Gianopolis pointed out that the existing gutter is inadequate to support the replication in marble. He said that a different dimension would be required for the gutter since the cross section is so thin. He believes that visually the fiberglass is not distinguishable. With this discussion about the differentiation in the gutter dimensions, the original motion was withdrawn.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to approve the replication in fiberglass, with the staff to review details. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

224 St. Mark's Square

Kara and Paul Schmidt, Owners/Applicants

DATE: 1877-80. Architects GW & HD Hewitt

PROPOSAL: Legalize rear deck, cut window into door

The Architectural Committee recommended approval subject to painting the stair a dark green or black color, with staff to review details.

Mr. Baron presented this application, which calls for legalizing a rear deck and circular metal stair leading to the yard as well as applying to cut a window down into a single-leaf door.

Commission members concurred with the recommendation of the Committee.

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

1027 Arch Street, Pitcairn Building

1027 Arch Street Development, Owner

Liz Pisano, Applicant

DATE: 1901, architect, Hewitt Brothers

PROPOSAL: Legalize signage, add two projecting signs

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the legalization of the window signage and the addition of the new signs with staff to review details including the attachment methods.

Mr. Baron presented this application, which calls for legalizing signage. The proposal includes two illuminated window signs, illuminated signage for cash machines, and two projecting, illuminated, plastic signs.

Ms. Smyler made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried with 9 votes. Mr. James dissented.

941 Race Street

Ruo Wu Zhang, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1900, architect, E. Gilbert

PROPOSAL: Legalize projecting sign and illuminated awning

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the refaced sign and a revised awning design, which eliminates the illumination and the egg crate bottom to expose the arches.

Mr. Baron explained this proposal, which calls for the legalization of the refacing of an existing internally illuminated projecting sign and the installation of an awning. The plastic awning features internal illumination, an egg crate bottom and a shape that stretches across several openings, obscuring the arched openings.

Albert Weiss, counsel for the owner, informed the Commission that the owner is willing to remedy the situation by complying with the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

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

1253 South 19th Street

19th Street Baptist Church, Owner

Marianna Thomas, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1874-75, architects, Furness and Hewitt

PROPOSAL: Alter roof

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, with the staff to review details.

Mr. Baron presented this application, which calls for re-roofing the church with asphalt shingles in a pattern to match that shown in an historic photograph. The pole gutters will be replaced with a hanging gutter. A major difference will be that the architect proposes to change the roof shape over the side entrance to provide a greater slope.

Mr. Wilds inquired about the reason for the change in the roofline. Mr. Baron responded that water infiltration dictates the modification.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried with 9 votes. Mr. James abstained.

225 Race Street

John Beirs, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1855, cast iron facade

PROPOSAL: Legalize new doors to basement with railings

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the application pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal to legalize the removal of a pair of metal doors at the basement level and the installation of a wood, double-leaf multi-light door, to allow more light, and a railing for safety. The doors do not match the light pattern described in the insurance survey of 1865. The historic doors had 6 lights each; the new doors have 15 lights.

Mr. Baron noted that the owner made the alterations to acquire additional light and chose the doors used for economic reasons. Mr. Wilds inquired about the rejection of the proposal, since the removed fabric was non-historic. Mr. Baron noted that the same configuration in the door should continue up to the windows. Mr. Huff pointed out that the railing height is incorrect. Mr. James believes that the entire design is inappropriate. He expressed his criticism legalizing work done without a permit, and objected to absence of the owner at the meeting.

Mr. James made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and deny the proposal, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

1923 Brandywine Street

Geoffrey Posner, Owner

Kevin Rasmussen, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855, alterations 1987

PROPOSAL: Replace roof deck

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with a simple metal picket railing.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. This application calls for alterations to a rooftop addition approved by the Commission in 1987. Besides new windows, this proposal calls for moving the railing of the roof deck forward so that seating can be installed on the cornice. This will result in considerably greater visibility than before. In the old scheme the cornice and parapet hid most of the rail. There are rear alterations as well. Mr. Baron said that a mock-up with flags showed minimal visibility.

Kevin Rasmussen, the architect, presented photographs that were taken from across the street. Mr. Baron pointed out that the elimination of the seat would lessen the visibility of the railing. Mr. Rasmussen asked that the seating be allowed and cited another such similar condition in the neighborhood; however, it was noted that the said condition had not been approved.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried with 7 votes. Mr. Wilds, Mr. James and Mr. Sklaroff opposed the motion.

2028 Latimer Street

Allaire Wohlgemuth, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c.1850

PROPOSAL: Window replacement

The Architectural Committee recommends that the Commission refer the application to the Committee on Financial Hardship.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal, but the applicant did not attend the meeting. This application calls for the replacement of windows with non-historic, aluminum-clad, double-hung, 1/1 windows. The applicant priced historically appropriate windows and claimed that she cannot afford them, citing economic hardship. The applicant, at the Committee meeting, stated that security issues complicate her application. She said that her house has been broken into twice by reaching through a 1st-story window to unlock her front door and contends that the existing windows do not lock properly.

Commission members discussed the proposal. They noted that historically accurate windows would solve the security problems as well as the proposed windows. The Committee did not deny the proposal, but referred it to the Committee on Financial Hardship. Some Commission members believed that the applicant had not presented a basis for hardship.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to deny the application. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

Rescission of 114-120 North 2nd Street

Eileen Quigley of the City's Law Department explained to the Commission the reevaluation of the rescission application and stated that, from a litigation standpoint, the issue involves jurisdiction over a vacant lot. Commission members discussed the implications of the rescission. Commission members conceded that after the designation of the proposed Old City Historic District, its jurisdiction would only be a 45-day review and comment.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to rescind the individual designation. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

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

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

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Farnham asked the Commission to approve an expenditure of \$ 25.05 for Architectural Committee lunches.

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

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

The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary