

**THE MINUTES OF THE 524th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
13 April 2006**

**1515 Arch Street, Room 18029
Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair**

PRESENT

Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D., Vice Chair
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Kathleen Murray, Office of Council President
David Perri, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Vincent Rivera, AIA
David Schaaf, City Planning Commission
Denise Smyler, Esq.
Norman Tissian
Lowanda Scott, Department of Public Property

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Jon Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician

Leonard Reuter, Assistant City Solicitor, Law Department

ALSO PRESENT

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Jennifer Rice
Lisa Reeves
Ray Bender
S. Bradstreet
Monica Malpass
Stephen Marshall, Parc Rittenhouse
James Garrison, Hillier Architecture
Cooper Schilling, Hillier Architecture
Joseph Matisoff, Hyperion Bank
Christina Rovner, Partridge Architects
Harry Kim, Partridge Architects
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
David Marshall, Parc Rittenhouse
J. Tackett, Tackett Architectects
Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison
E. Bartolotta
Edward Bell, EBA
R. Volpe, EBA
B. Feldman, Klehr
Brett Hartman, Harman Deutsch
Michael Mattioni, Mattioni, Ltd.
Monica Malpass
Dawn Marie Tancredi, Esq.

524TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Thomas Sugrue, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 524th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:25 a.m.

MINUTES OF THE 523RD STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Upon a motion proffered by Mr. Tissian and seconded by Mr. Rivera, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the 523rd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 10 March 2006, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 MARCH 2006, VINCENT RIVERA, CHAIR

219-229 S. 18TH STREET

Owner: Rittenhouse Regency Affiliates

Applicant: Robert Cook, Sullivan Company

History: Built 1925, Zantzinger, Borie & Medary, architects, as Penn Athletic Club

Major alterations 1957, Cronheim & Weger, architects

Project: Alter facades, construct additions

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised design with the reinstated restoration, provided the Locust Street façade of the penthouse is redesigned to better correspond to the historic building and the details of the non-historic balconies are refined, with the Architectural Committee to review the penthouse and balconies, and the staff to review other details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the conversion of the former Penn Athletic Club building at the northeast corner of 18th and Locust Streets to residential use. The Commission approved a similar proposal in concept in December 2004; that approval was not renewed and therefore expired in December 2005 (§6.7.c.2 of the *Rules & Regulations*). The Architectural Committee reviewed a second in-concept application in January 2005, but the applicant withdrew it prior to the Commission's review.

The important Zantzinger, Borie & Medary architectural firm designed the building. The original design of 1924 called for an elegant 12-story building with subtle detailing. It was not erected. In 1927, a somewhat clumsy version of the original design was erected. It was taller than the original design and devoid of much of the gracious detailing. The clumsy building was substantially and unsympathetically altered in 1957, when it was converted to an Army Corps of Engineers office building. During the insensitive conversion, several important decorative features were removed and many new features were added.

The in-concept application approved by the Commission at its December 2004 meeting offered significant restoration in exchange for significant modifications and additions. This application initially proposed significant modifications and additions, but little restoration work. Since the initial submission, the proposal has been revised to include more restoration work.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Developer David

Marshall and architect James Garrison represented the application.

Mr. Garrison noted that he agreed with the Committee's recommendation. He then proceeded to present the project in detail. Mr. Garrison clarified that he is not applying for alterations to the ground floor at this time; he will present a separate application when the tenant issues have been resolved. Mr. Farnham reiterated that ground-level alterations will be reviewed as a separate proposal.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance opined that this is an unusual submission; it proposes significant alteration and addition, which may be acceptable in this specific case because the building had undergone numerous unsympathetic alterations in the past. He noted that the design of the rooftop addition has evolved and is now very appropriate.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to approve the revised design with the reinstated restoration, provided the Locust Street façade of the penthouse is redesigned to better correspond to the historic building and the details of the non-historic balconies are refined, with the Architectural Committee to review the penthouse and balconies, and the staff to review other details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2004 DELANCEY STREET

Owner/Applicant: Monica Malpass

History: constructed c.1860

Project: Legalize window alterations and vent

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the legalization proposal, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize work on the highly visible rear ell of this townhouse. A developer was issued a permit for interior work to the house, but sold the property to the current owner without undertaking the work. Without seeking a new permit, the owner undertook interior and exterior work, some of which was not included on the interior permit issued to the previous owner. To accommodate renovations to the kitchen, the owner infilled one window and moved two others. Inappropriate windows were installed in the openings. The altered windows no longer align with the historic windows above. The original windows had plank frames and six-over-six sash; the new windows have thin frames and two-over-two sash. After the owner received a violation, the current owner continued to have the kitchen remodeled and installed a highly visible vent on the exterior. The application includes no elevation drawings showing the exterior work.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Owner Monica Malpass and attorney Dawn Marie Tancredi attended the meeting.

MOTION: Ms. Murray moved to legalize the window alterations and vent. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion.

Mr. Schaaf asked if the windows in the ground floor were six-over-six before the change. Mr. Baron answered that the windows were originally six-over-six with wood plank frames.

Ms. Tancredi displayed photographs of the interior and exterior of the house. She stated that her client is aware of the historic value of the house and that she purchased salvaged brick for

the work.

Mr. Sugrue asked why the work was originally done without a permit. Ms. Malpass explained that she had purchased the property with a building permit and that she believed that the permit included the alterations. Ms. Malpass noted the deteriorated condition of the previous windows and the urgent need to replace them. She noted the extent and great expense of the rehabilitation of the property. Mr. Sugrue commented that the permit application was clearly stamped "no exterior work." Ms. Malpass stated that her contractor was unaware of the limits of the permit.

Ms. Malpass stated that the wall of the rear would be damaged or perhaps collapse if her kitchen cabinets were removed. Ms. Murray commented that the remedy would be as bad if not worse than the illegal work and would destroy more historic fabric. Ms. Merriman agreed with Ms. Murray's assessment. Ms. Merriman stated that the work should be legalized given the circumstances and misunderstanding related to the permit. Mr. Sugrue noted again that the work was undertaken illegally without a permit.

Ms. Smyler commented that the vent detracted from the historic facade and should not be legalized.

Ms. Tancredi mentioned that the vent could be painted any color stipulated by the Commission. Ms. Smyler asked Ms. Murray to amend her motion to include painting the vent to disguise it. Ms. Murray and Ms. Merriman agreed to amend their motion.

ACTION: Ms. Murray moved to legalize the window alterations and vent, provided the vent is painted to match the brick, with the staff to review details. Ms. Merriman seconded the amended motion, which passed with a vote of 8 to 0. Ms. Sugrue abstained.

2004 DELANCEY STREET

Owner/Applicant: Monica Malpass

History: constructed c.1860

Project: Add parking, deck, sun-room, and doorway

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the sun-room, deck, parking, wall, and entrance, provided the parking doors, which are not defined, are appropriate; and the transoms at the new entrance are redesigned to correspond to the doorway below; with the staff to review details; pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to excavate the rear yard for subterranean parking. The yard is already used for parking; the Commission approved a rear wall with a parking entrance in 1983. A deck would be constructed above the parking space and a rear window reconfigured into a doorway to the deck. A small sun-room would be added at the rear of the rear ell, where a small deck now stands; the Commission approved the small deck in 1983. A brick and metal wall would replace a non-historic stucco wall that runs along the east property line at the rear.

The application does not provide information about the proposed parking doors. If a roll-down gate is proposed, the housing and motor should be located inside the wall, not outside. Also, the design of the doorway to replace the window should be revised; the transoms should

correspond to the door and sidelights below.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Owner Monica Malpass and attorney Dawn Marie Tancredi attended the meeting.

Ms. Malpass presented an overview of the project. Mr. Perri warned that such an excavation could be undermine the rear ell and suggested that a competent engineer oversee the project.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the sun-room, deck, parking, wall, and entrance, provided the parking doors, which are not defined, are appropriate; and the transoms at the new entrance are redesigned to correspond to the doorway below; with the staff to review details; pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

226-228 S. 4TH STREET

Owner: Michael Forman

Applicant: Michael Frebowitz, Tackett & Co.

History: 226, built c. 1840, Contributing; 228, built c. 1805, Significant to the Society Hill District.

Project: Construct two garages with deck, one-story addition with pergola addition, and rear curtain wall.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the parking area, garage with deck, and doors, with the staff to review details; and denial of the demolition of the rear ell and the replacement of the rear wall with a curtain wall, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

OVERVIEW: The applicant proposes several renovations to this pair of rowhouses. Most of the work is proposed for the rears of the two buildings; the rears are visible from Leithgow Street and the Rose Garden, which is public.

For 226 S. 4th Street, the plans show the construction of a 13-foot-high wall at the rear of the property. The rear would have an open air parking space with a garage gate. The plans also show a new stuccoed dormer on the rear roof slope; the Commission previously approved an identical dormer. The applicants also propose to replace doors and door surrounds on the front and side doors.

For 228 S. 4th Street, the plans show the demolition of the rear ell and the entire original brick rear wall and its replacement with a glass curtain wall. The building would receive a garage addition with roof deck on top, a version of which the Commission also previously approved.

Mechanized cellar bulkhead doors would be installed at the fronts of both buildings. No details have been provided for the bulkhead or other doors.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Architect J. Tackett, attorney Carl Primavera, and owner Jennifer Rice represented the application.

MOTION: Ms. Smyler made a motion to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the parking area, garage with deck, and doors, with the staff to review details; but deny the demolition of the rear ell and the replacement of the rear

wall with a curtain wall, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion.

Mr. Baron expressed concern regarding the proposed mechanical bulkhead systems at the side walk and noted that no details had been provided. Mr. Tackett explained that the mechanical assist mechanisms for the bulkhead doors on S. 4th Street were intended to facilitate emergency exiting. The additions of the mechanisms would not alter the current exterior appearances of the bulkheads.

Mr. Tissian requested that Mr. Tackett clarify the extent of the demolition of the rear ell. Mr. Tackett explained that the existing rear ell houses a stair and secondary spaces. He added that very little of the original rear ell remains and most of it is an addition constructed in the 1970s. He stated that their intention is to demolish all of the rear ell to create a courtyard space and that its demolition was a key element in meeting the thirty percent open space zoning requirement. Mr. Sugrue remarked that the extent of historic material remaining at the rear ell was unknown. Mr. Baron replied that the ell was historic from the main block to the downspout. The section west of the downspout is modern construction.

Mr. Tackett mentioned that Leithgow Street dead-ends at the Contributorship parking lot. Mr. Primavera opined that this street was a “kinda almost a dead end” that would ultimately be stricken from the city plan and become private property between the neighboring properties. Mr. Reuter clarified that such action had not taken place yet and that it was not part of the application, thus irrelevant to the discussion.

Mr. Tissian inquired whether the Society Hill Civic Association had approved this development. Mr. Tackett responded the association did not like the garage elevation, but were accepting of the other points.

Ms. Rice, the owner, spoke to the need for outside space and light for her small children. Mr. Tissian asked about the size of the courtyard, to which Mr. Tackett responded 150 square feet. Mr. Schaaf expressed concern about demolishing historic fabric to gain open space. Mr. Baron explained that a large walled deck on top of the garage at the back of the property was part of this application and would provide significant outdoor space.

Ms. Smyler asked for a better explanation of the proposed demolition. Mr. Tackett stated that the rear ell of the 228 property would be demolished to create a rear courtyard. Mr. Baron noted that it would create a gaping hole in the rear of the main block. Mr. Tackett suggested that the historic bricks from the rear ell could be used to infill the hole in the rear façade created by the demolition. Ms. Smyler approved of the reuse of the historic material.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION: Ms. Smyler withdrew her motion. Mr. Tissian withdrew his second.

Mr. Reuter cautioned that Leithgow Street may not being stricken and asked that no assumptions be made about it.

Mr. Primavera stated that the curtain wall segment of the proposal had been withdrawn.

ACTION: Mr. Tissian moved to approve the revised proposal without the rear glazed curtain wall, provided the rear brick wall of the main block is retained and the opening in this wall created by the demolition of the rear ell is filled with brick salvaged from the

demolished rear ell, with the staff to review details. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1201-1209 N. 2ND STREET

Owner: Sedo Sanchez

Applicant: Jeffrey Laufer, architect

History: built 1871, altered 1907, architect Thomas Levy

Project: Add ADA ramp, exterior stairs, canopy, and ingress and egress doors, alter ground-floor windows

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, provided the historic windows are restored on N. 2nd Street, the ramp is clad with granite, and the signage is adhered, not pinned, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes renovating this long-vacant bank building to house a new bank. The building has suffered from the removal of historic fabric including its stoop and doors on 2nd Street and the enlargement of window openings. The application proposes adding a ramp and reopening the main doors on 2nd Street and Girard Avenue. A new ramp and door will allow wheelchair access. The masonry window jambs, windows, and doors will be restored on 2nd Street and Girard Avenue except that the applicant proposes to retain non-historic single-pane windows on the west façade and taller windows on the south façade to allow greater visibility into the bank. The plans show metal signage over the doors, with individual letters pinned to the stone. On the east façade, which is stuccoed, the applicant proposes to partially remove a metal canopy structure and install a covered stair. On a back building, largely hidden from public view, he proposes new windows and the closing of two openings with brick set in a reveal. Skylights structures on the roof would be covered with a new roof. The plans show a parking area on the western portion of the lot.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Architect Jeffrey Laufer and banker Joseph Matisoff represented the application.

Mr. Laufer submitted revised drawings showing a minor change to the rear steps. Mr. Laufer explained that this change satisfied a zoning requirement to move the egress steps at the rear of the building. The Commissioners agreed with the change.

Mr. Tissian asked if the building was to remain a bank. Mr. Laufer introduced Mr. Matisoff, who is rehabilitating the building for his business. He stated that the building will be the headquarters for a new bank, but that it will also include some rental space.

ACTION: Ms. Murray moved to approve the proposal with the changes to the rear steps, provided the historic windows are restored on N. 2nd Street, the ramp is clad with granite, and the signage is adhered, not pinned, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2100 DELANCEY STREET AKA 328-30 S. 21ST STREET

Owner: Lily Properties, Robert Volpe

Applicant: Edward Bell, architect

History: built 1905, architects, Okie, Duhring & Ziegler

Project: Construct penthouse addition with roof deck

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, with the Architectural Committee to review the details at a regularly-scheduled, monthly, public meeting.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a rooftop addition and roof decks on this apartment building, which is being converted to condominiums. The building currently has an original elevator penthouse and a small apartment unit on the roof, which the owners wish to expand on three sides. The new penthouse would feature a metal roof and cream-colored stucco and tile walls. A staff member met with the architect and owner on site to review a mock-up of the addition. The addition would be highly visible from directly across 21st and Delancey Streets, looking south from 21st Street, looking up from 21st Street toward the south façade and somewhat visible from points east and west on Delancey Street. The balustrade is also very open; the new penthouse would be highly visible through it. The existing historic penthouse is currently visible from the public right-of-way in every direction; any addition to it would be highly visible.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Architect Edward Bell represented the application.

Mr. Bell agreed with the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Sugrue asked if the penthouse would provide more than access to the roof. Mr. Bell explained that the rooftop addition will house a residential unit. He also noted that he would retain several historic interior features including a leaded glass skylight on the stairwell.

Mr. Schaaf noted that the roofline of the addition did not complement the historic building. He also noted that the slope of the roof and the back wall of the building were not meant to be seen. Mr. Schaaf suggested that the roof should be squared off.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance asked if the staff had the opportunity to view a mock-up. Mr. Baron answered that he had reviewed a mock-up.

ACTION: Mr. Rivera moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and to approve the proposal, with the Architectural Committee to review the details at a regularly-scheduled, monthly, public meeting, Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 8 to 0. Ms. Smyler abstained.

313-15 N. 3RD STREET

Owner/Applicant: Esme Bartoletta

History: built c. 1865

Project: Construct rooftop addition

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes adding a rooftop addition to this corner building. The building is a narrow Italianate commercial building with a cast iron façade. The addition would have no setback from Wood Street and would be highly visible. A park occupies the north side of Wood Street, allowing for open views of the building.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Owner Esme Bartoletta attended the meeting.

Ms. Bartoletta presented revised sketches of the proposal that showed the rooftop addition set back approximately eight feet from the facade as suggested by the Architectural Committee.

Ms. Smyler suggested to the applicant that she should return to the Architectural Committee to allow it to review the new design.

Mr. Reuter commented that the Commission could table this proposal.

Mr. Sugrue asked Ms. Bartoletta if she would like to submit her revised plans to the Architectural Committee. Ms. Bartoletta agreed to withdraw the current application and submit a new application to the Commission.

WITHDRAWAL: Ms. Bartoletta withdrew her application.

31-35 S. 2ND STREET AND 18-22 LETITIA STREET

Owner: EFL Partners V.

Applicant: Brett Harmon

History: 18-22 Letitia, built c. 1855; individually designated and contributing

31 S. 2nd Street, built c. 1840; individually designated and contributing

33 S. 2nd Street, built c. 1905; individually designated and contributing

35 S. 2nd Street, built c. 1885; individually designated and significant

Project: Add additions and roof decks on main roofs of buildings

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architecture Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the height of the addition is reduced at 35 S. 2nd Street and a metal railing is substituted at 31 S. 2nd Street, with the option of true-divided-light windows in the new openings on Blackhorse Alley, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations to a number of buildings that face both S. 2nd and Letitia Streets. They have been combined into a single residential development. The Commission has reviewed aspects of this development a number of times, approving a stair tower set between the buildings in the middle of the block as well as a deck set back from the front façade on the Letitia Street properties. The Commission has also approved some window alterations on the Blackhorse Alley façade. The stair tower has been constructed; it is taller and in a different configuration than approved, making it highly visible.

The latest application seeks to modify and legalize this stair tower, and demolish the roof and add an additional floor and multiple roof decks on 35 S. 2nd Street. These additions and decks would have a high degree of visibility from Front, Letitia, and 2nd Streets and Trotter's Alley because the adjacent buildings are shorter, the lot to the east of these buildings is open from Front Street, and Trotter's Alley is perpendicular to the west façade of 31-35 S. 2nd Street.

For the facades of 31 and 33 S. 2nd Street, the plans call for new four-over-four windows. The windows are not appropriate for 31 S. 2nd Street. The roof of 31 S. 2nd will be raised and a highly visible roof deck. On the north and west façades of 18 Letitia Street, the applicant proposes to cut new window openings and install one-over-one windows. Few window details have been provided.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Architect Brett Harman represented the application. Mr. Rivera explained that the Architectural Committee reviewed this application at great length. He advised the Commissioners to accept the Committee's expertise and trust the recommendation.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal, provided the height of the addition is reduced at 35 S. 2nd Street and a metal railing is substituted at 31 S. 2nd Street, with the option of true-divided-light windows in the new openings on Blackhorse Alley, with the staff to review details. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 7 to 0. Ms. Murray and Mr. Sugrue abstained.

224 FITZWATER STREET

Owner: Ray Bender

Applicant: Arlene Vega, RCH Architect & Engineer

History: 1805

Project: Add roof deck on one-story rear ell

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the deck, provided a less intrusive metal railing is substituted for the proposed railing, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck on a one-story section of the rear ell. The rear of the property is visible from Fulton Street across a parking lot and from an alley in front of four designated buildings.

The proposed deck would be accessed from an existing door in a two-story section of the rear ell. Owing to the change in elevation between the two-story and one-story sections of the rear ell, the deck would include a small L-shaped bridge connecting the deck to the access door. The deck would have an elaborate railing of wood turned posts and wood spindles.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Attorney Michael Mattioni opened the discussion by presenting letters from the surrounding neighbors on Concordia Place supporting the application. He also presented a supporting petition.

ACTION: Mr. Tissian moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the deck, provided a less intrusive metal railing is substituted for the proposed railing, with the staff to review details. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1617 JOHN F. KENNEDY BOULEVARD

Owner: The Realex Capital Corporation

Applicant: Christina Rovner, Partridge Architects

History: 1930, Graham Anderson Probst & White, architects

Project: Install black-out film to four ground-floor windows.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to the Commission's decision of January 2005 and Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: In January 2005, the current tenant submitted an application to the Historical Commission proposing to apply blackout film on the four windows that face John F. Kennedy Boulevard. That application proposed covering the entirety of one window and three-quarters of the other three windows. At that time the Commission, voted to deny the blackout film, but allowed the tenant to apply a frosted film on up to one-half of the windows.

The same tenant now returns with an application similar to the one denied 14 months ago. It proposes to install blackout film to the same four windows in the ground-floor of Suburban Station. The film would be applied to three windows up to a height of approximately 8 feet from the ground. The existing signage on the glass would remain. The fourth window would be blocked in its entirety.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architects Christina Rover and Harry Kim represented the application.

Mr. Sugrue asked the staff if the current film was installed to the height approved by the Commission. Mr. Danta answered that it covered less of the windows than approved.

Ms. Rovner and Mr. Kim stated that the submission was being made on behalf of the building owner, whereas last year's application was submitted by the tenant without the owners knowledge.

Mr. Kim proposed an alternative to the film, historic photos of Suburban Station and One Penn Center displayed in the same fashion as those at the nearby drug store.

Ms. Merriman asked if the frosting already applied would be taken off the glass, to which Mr. Kim replied that it would. He also stated that the frosting is on the interior of the glass. Mr. Kim reported that the photographs would be silk-screened onto the backdrop inside the glass, not applied to the windows themselves. They would hang inside the windows. Mr. Sugrue questioned the Commission's authority if the material does not actually touch the windows themselves. Mr. Sugrue commented that the revised proposal was similar to curtains, which are outside the Commission's authority. Mr. Reuter stated that the Commission does not have jurisdiction over interior alterations.

Ms. Merriman opined that covering the windows of a take-out business is counterproductive. Mr. Kim stated that the tenant wants to block the view of the kitchen equipment. Mr. Sugrue asked why the approved material was not adequate. Ms. Rovner asserted that it did not resolve their problem.

Mr. Tissian commented that covering the windows detracted from the pedestrian experience. Ms. Merriman lamented Walgreen's photographic backdrops. Mr. Sugrue agreed. Mr. Farnham stated that the Commission had decided that it did not have jurisdiction over the Walgreen's

window treatments, which are situated several inches behind the glass.

Ms. Smyler suggested that the revised design was a totally new application and should be submitted anew.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance strongly supported the Architectural Committee's recommendation of denial.

ACTION: Mr. Rivera moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and deny the application, pursuant to the Commission's decision of January 2005 and Standard 9. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2200-2202 PINE STREET

Owner: Romi Trading Corporation

Applicant: Allison Fritch

History: 2200 Pine: Built c. 1895; designed by Cope & Stewardson

2202 Pine: Built c. 1860

Project: Construct two new roof decks, refurbish a third existing roof deck

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of both decks at 2200 Pine Street, provided the railings are simple, black, metal pickets; but denial of the deck on the main roof of 2202 Pine Street; pursuant to the Commission's deck policy, Standards 2 and 9, and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application involves two properties, 2200 and 2202 Pine Street. The applicant listed them as one on the building permit application. However, they are separately listed in the inventory for the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District and are considered two separate properties by the Board of Revision of Taxes.

2200 Pine: The application proposes to construct a new roof deck on a one-story section of the rear ell. The deck would measure 22' by 13' and extend to the edge of the roof, which is highly visible along 22nd Street. A window would be converted into a wood and glass door for access to the deck. In addition, an existing roof deck located on a two-story section of the rear ell would be refurbished, retaining its existing dimensions. A new wood and glass door is also proposed for this location. The application also proposes cleaning and spot repointing the brick façade and replacing some windows in kind.

2202 Pine: The application proposes to install a new roof deck on the main roof of this property. The building has a rear ell. The deck would be set back five feet from the front façade. The deck would measure 22' by 16' and would have simple wood posts and spindles. The deck would be accessed through an existing door on the gable end of 2200 Pine.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Mr. Danta presented a letter from the applicants stating that they could not attend the meeting, but that they were in agreement with the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve both decks at 2200 Pine Street, provided the railings are simple, black, metal pickets; but deny the deck on the main roof of 2202 Pine Street; pursuant to the

Commission's deck policy, Standards 2 and 9, and the Roofs Guideline. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

316 S. 21ST STREET

Owner: William Hozack

Applicant: Alvin Holm

History: Designated on 8 February 1995

Project: Demolish wall of rear ell, construct new addition with mansard

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 9, and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to significantly alter and add to the Cypress Street façade of a property that stands on the corner of Cypress and S. 21st Streets. The application proposes demolishing the Cypress Street facade of the rear ell, the rear ell chimney, a bay window on the main block, and a non-historic sunroom addition. The Cypress Street facade of the rear ell would be completely rebuilt in a different location. A Tuscan-Doric colonnade would be created at the ground level. New second- and third-floor facades would be built at the sidewalk line, several feet out from the plane of the historic façade. A fourth-floor mansard with two dormers would be added to the reconstructed rear ell. A grand, pedimented entrance would be added on Cypress Street at the intersection of the main block and ell.

The inventory for the local Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District was created from the National Register Historic District Inventory. The local district inventory lists this property as an "Intrusion." However, this term is not used by the Philadelphia Historical Commission when classifying properties. Section 2 of the Rules & Regulations defines "Significant," "Contributing," and "Non-contributing," but not "Intrusion." The classification of this building as an "Intrusion" in the local inventory is a mistake.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architect Alvin Holm and owner Vesna Hess represented the application.

MOTION: Mr. Tissian moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and deny the proposal, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 9, and 10. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion.

Mr. Holm presented a written document addressing many of the issues raised during the Commission meeting and mentioned that they would accept an approval of the proposal without the mansard on the rear ell. Mr. Sugrue asserted that the Commission meeting was not the appropriate venue in which to present such a lengthy new document. Mr. Holm acknowledged that he thought the Commission meeting was the forum to present changes made in response to the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Rivera suggested that the applicant present his revised plans to the Architectural Committee.

Mr. Reuter spoke to the applicant and explained that he had the option to withdraw and submit a new application or to request that the Commission table his current application for a period not to exceed six months.

Mr. Holm questioned the designation of the property. Mr. Sugrue explained the Designation Committee was the appropriate venue for a discussion of the classification in the district. Mr.

Holm noted this property was listed as an “intrusion”. Mr. Farnham stated that classification as an “intrusion” was a clerical error and that the Philadelphia Historical Commission does not recognize the term “intrusion” as a designation classification. The property therefore has no classification. Mr. Reuter stated that the designation question should be addressed by the Designation Committee.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance emphasized that this application does not propose a minor change, but, in fact, proposes major demolition.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION: Mr. Tissian and Ms. Smyler withdrew their motion.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to table the application for a period not to exceed six months to allow the Architectural Committee to review the new design and the Committee on Historic Designation to review a reclassification application prepared by the staff. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

The Commission directed the staff to prepare an application to amend the historic district inventory and classify the property.

1736 ADDISON STREET

Owner: Dan Barton

Applicant: Joseph Serratore

History: two story Italianate rowhouse; designated on 2/8/1995, contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District.

Project: Roof deck on front block and rear ell

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the deck as proposed, but approval of a deck and stair house that is located on the rear ell only, pursuant to the Commission’s policy on decks on main roofs, Standards 2 and 9, and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck that would be located on the main block and the rear ell of the house. The deck would be set back 5’-10” from the front façade. This set back would be equivalent to that of deck on an adjacent building, which is not visible from Addison Street. The deck would measure 15’-4” by 30’-10”. In addition, a stair enclosure would be built over an existing roof hatch. The enclosure would measure 3’-8” by 9’-1”. The deck would have a simple wood post and spindle railing.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the deck as proposed, but approve a deck and stair house that is located on the rear ell only, pursuant to the Commission’s policy on decks on main roofs, Standards 2 and 9, and the Roofs Guideline. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

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.

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.

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.

DISCUSSION OF “NOTICE OF APPLICATION TO ALTER HISTORIC PROPERTY”

On behalf of Council President Verna, Ms. Murray requested the implementation of a notification system to alert neighbors of Historical Commission reviews. Ms. Murray suggested posting signs on properties explaining the proposed alterations and times and locations of reviews. Ms. Murray stated that Council members are very concerned about notification to neighbors and community groups.

The question of verification of postings was discussed. Mr. Perri noted that the Department of Licenses & Inspections monitors the postings. He remarked that the Commission’s staff will not be able to undertake similar monitoring. He posited that a posting requirement might prompt more litigation.

Ms. Smyler opined that the posting requirement was an excellent idea, but it should be further studied.

Mr. Perri asked if it would add a significant burden to the staff. Mr. Farnham stated that it would not. Mr. Perri noted that the postings may create unrealistic expectations among members of the public. He suggested a yearly mailing to all owners of historic properties to remind them of the designations.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance pointed out that amendments to the Rules & Regulations require 10 votes for passage. Only nine members were in attendance. He also suggested that the Commission inform interested parties of this discussion.

Mr. Sugrue suggested that Ms. Murray, Mr. Perri, and Mr. Reuter explore the issues and

present recommendations to the Commission.

NATIONAL REGISTER COMMENT

101-121 W. Johnson Street, Theodore Presser Home

221 W. Johnson Street, George Nugent Home

3002-3028 Cecil B. Moore Avenue, American Railway Express Company Garage

OVERVIEW: The Bureau for Historic Preservation of the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission has requested that the Philadelphia Historical Commission comment on three National Register nominations.

The first site, 101-121 W. Johnson Street, the Theodore Presser Home, is well known to this Commission. It was placed on the local Register in 2004. The nomination asserts that the site with two buildings is eligible for the National Register because it satisfies National Register Criterion A (It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.) and Criterion C (It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values.). The staff agrees that it is eligible for the National Register and recommends that the Commission advise the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission of its eligibility.

The second site, 221 W. Johnson Street, the George Nugent Home, is also well known to this Commission. It was placed on the local Register in 2004. The nomination asserts that the site with one building is eligible for the National Register because it satisfies National Register Criterion A (It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.) and Criterion C (It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values.). The staff agrees that it is eligible for the National Register and recommends that the Commission advise the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission of its eligibility.

The third site, 3002-3028 Cecil B. Moore Avenue, the American Railway Express Company Garage, is not listed on the local Register. The nomination asserts that the building is eligible for the National Register because it satisfies National Register Criterion C (It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values.). It was designed by Harris & Richards. Constructed in 1922, it is a very early example of a parking garage. The staff agrees that it is eligible for the National Register and recommends that the Commission advise the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission of its eligibility.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Sugrue asked if anyone objected the review of the nominations as a group. No one objected.

Mr. Gallery suggested that properties being nominated for the National Register be nominated for the Philadelphia Register as well. Mr. Baron stated that in the past it was agreed that automatically processing National Register nominations for the local Register would not be undertaken because it would discourage nominations to the National Register, which carries many fewer restrictions.

ACTION: Mr. Tissian moved to recommend that 101-121 W. Johnson Street, Theodore Presser Home; 221 W. Johnson Street, George Nugent Home; and 3002-3028 Cecil B. Moore Avenue, American Railway Express Company Garage are eligible for and should

be added to the National Register. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE HISTORICAL COMMISSION STAFF

Jonathan E. Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director

Mr. Farnham presented the report to the Commission. When asked if they had questions about the report, the Commissioners replied that they had none.

HARRY A. BATTEN FUND

Mr. Farnham requested an approval of the expenditure of \$28.42 from the Harry A. Batten Fund for lunches for the Architectural Committee.

ACTION: Mr. Tissian moved to approve the expenditure of \$28.42 from the Harry A. Batten Fund. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to adjourn the meeting at 12:15 p.m. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron
Jorge Danta
Jon Farnham
Karen Gonski