

**THE MINUTES OF THE 541ST STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**14 SEPTEMBER 2007
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18029
MICHAEL SKLAROFF, ESQ., CHAIR**

PRESENT

Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D., Vice Chair
Eileen Evans, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Vincent Rivera, AIA
David Schaaf, RA
Joan Schlotterbeck, Department of Public Property
Denise Smyler, Esq.
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing & Community Development

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Jonathan Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner I
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Assistant City Solicitor, Law Department

ALSO PRESENT

David Gustafson
Ann Wickliffe
Julie Panassow, The Lighting Practice
Lonnie Hovey, AIA, Vitetta Group
Al Borden, The Lighting Practice
Mark Alexander
Paul Levy, Center City District
Jessica Bonder, Space Design
Nancy Goldenberg, Center City District
Keith Loudenslager, Eagle Eye Painting
Alexander Rice, Gardner/Fox
Lisa Shapson
Michael Shapson
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Marjorie Muecke
Jonathan Dyer, Space Design
Mark Alexander, Center City District
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
Ron Enrich,
Donna Yohe, Level 5 Construction
Scott Yohe, Level 5 Construction
Mark Gamba
Yao Huang
Lucy Strackhouse, FPHPT
Michael DeSanto, Fairmount Park Commission

David Artman, Kise Straw & Kolodner
Justino E. Navarro, Spring Garden Community Development Corporation

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sugrue, the Vice Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 541st Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:05 a.m. Commissioners Evans, Leonard, Merriman, Rivera, Schaaf, Schlotterbeck, Smyler, Sugrue, and Wilds were in attendance.

MINUTES OF THE 540TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Upon a motion proffered by Mr. Wilds and seconded by Mr. Schaaf, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes, as corrected, of the 540th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 10 August 2007.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 AUGUST 2007

Vincent Rivera, Chair

321-327 SOUTH BROAD STREET, CHAMBERS WYLIE CHURCH

Owner: Chambers Wylie Memorial Presbyterian

Applicant: Nancy Goldenberg

History: c. 1900; Rankin and Kellogg, architect; designated 7/6/1972

Project: Illuminate façade

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of seventeen metal light fixtures with conduit on the front façade of the church building. The fixtures and conduit will attach to the building at the joints in the stone. The emitted light will be white and will highlight particular features of the façade including the gothic arched windows.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Commission. Nancy Goldenberg and Paul Levy of the Center City District, lighting designers Julie Panassow and Al Borden, architect Lonnie Hovey, and Mark Alexander represented the application.

The Commission decided to consider this application and those for 140 S. Broad Street and 200 S. Broad Street simultaneously owing to their interrelationships.

Mr. Levy introduced presented the overall project to light several buildings on S. Broad Street. He explained that they would use both halide and LED fixtures. The halide produces white light; the LEDs can produce any color of light. Mr. Levy noted several examples of similar lighting around the world, especially in Europe, but reported that they are all on public buildings. He plans to light public and private buildings on the Avenue of the Arts. Mr. Levy assured the Commission that the fixtures would not be visible. He stated that the Center City District would control the lighting with a centralized computer. The District would be able to communicate with the light. He reported that the Art Commission had given its preliminary approvals in May 2007. Mr. Levy stated that the project have received commitments of approximately \$800,000 in funding with the Center City District underwriting other costs.

Mr. Wilds expressed his general support but asked how it could be ensured that the area would not look like a carnival. Mr. Levy stated that the guidance of the Preservation Alliance and the District's own lighting design committee would ensure an appropriate design for the lighting. He stated that the District would run regularly scripted programs established in advance and maintained by the District. For example, the District might link the lighting to the theatrical productions on the Avenue. Mr. Wilds asked about the possible colors. Mr. Borden stated that the LEDs are able to project any color humans can see. He assured the Commission that it would not be restricted to red, white and blue. Mr. Levy stated that they would test the lighting on the Terra Building and learn from that experience. He also noted that the lighting will be very efficient. Mr. Sugrue commended the project and noted that he appreciates the lighting on the Parkway installed by this team. Mr. Schaaf inquired about the possibility of light pollution. Mr. Borden replied that the light will be focused on the buildings, which will not reflect much light.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the applicants had done an excellent job and created an exciting project. He acknowledged that the project would be an innovative approach to interpreting historic buildings. He asserted that mounting the fixtures appropriately will be challenging. He commended the applicants on their refinements and stated that this proposal continues to improve.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

140 S. BROAD STREET, THE UNION LEAGUE

Owner: The Union League of Philadelphia

Applicant: Nancy Goldenberg

History: 1864-1865, John Fraser, architect; addition 1910-1911, Horace Trumbauer, architect; designated 5/28/1957

Project: Illuminate façade

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the entire Broad Street façade is illuminated, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation and replacement of metal light fixtures at various locations of the façade and sidewalk. The emitted light will be white and will highlight particular features of the facade. Additional information should be submitted to determine the visibility of the fixtures from the public right-of-way.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Commission. Nancy Goldenberg and Paul Levy of the Center City District, lighting designers Julie Panassow and Al Borden, architect Lonnie Hovey, and Mark Alexander represented the application.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided the entire Broad Street façade is illuminated, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

200 S. BROAD STREET, THE BELLEVUE

Owner: Bellevue Associates

Applicant: Nancy Goldenberg

History: 1904, G.W. and W.D. Hewitt, architects; designated 8/2/1973

Project: Illuminate façade

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of LED light fixtures along the second and eleventh stories on the Broad Street façade. The fixtures would not be attached to terra cotta or railings. They would be attached to concrete balcony slabs and porch roofs. The emitted light is shown as white in the application materials, but could be changed to any color. The light will highlight particular features on the facade.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Commission. Nancy Goldenberg and Paul Levy of the Center City District, lighting designers Julie Panassow and Al Borden, architect Lonnie Hovey, and Mark Alexander represented the application.

Mr. Wilds asked about the reasons behind the lighting of the central section and the fronts of the bays only. Ms. Goldenberg replied that the lighting design was driven by the difficulties in mounting fixtures in the terra cotta.

Ms. Goldenberg requested that the Commission grant the staff the authority to approve their other applications for lighting buildings on the Avenue of the Arts. Mr. Wilds asked for the addresses of the buildings for which Ms. Goldenberg was seeking the authorization. Ms. Goldenberg was unable to provide the addresses. Ms. Merriman and Mr. Wilds suggested that the Commission not grant the blanket authority to the staff. Mr. Levy agreed to present the additional applications to the Commission.

MOTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

112 LOMBARD STREET

Owner: Jerome Millis

Applicant: David Pizzico

History: c. 1970; designated contributing in the Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Legalize aluminum-clad windows, doors, garage door, and enlargement of first-story rear window opening

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize aluminum-clad windows on the front and rear elevations, a wood-paneled garage door, wood entry door with decorative glass, balcony door at the fourth-floor level, infill at grade in the rear, and the enlargement of a rear masonry opening.

The Commission files reflect that, at the time of designation, notice letters were sent to the current owners regarding the Historical Commission's jurisdiction. The letters stated that the Commission must review for approval all proposed exterior alterations to the historic resource.

In addition, the current owners acknowledged the Commission's jurisdiction in the past when they applied for and received an approval on a permit application in June 2005.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect Alexander Rice represented the application.

MOTION: Ms. Leonard moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion.

Mr. Rice acknowledged that the property is listed as Contributing in the Society Hill Historic District and that buildings from the Redevelopment Era, like this one, are important to Society Hill's history, but contended that metal windows were used in the 1970s, when this building was constructed. He noted that it had wood windows originally, but asserted that clad windows are appropriate for this building. Mr. Wilds opined that the illegal door is even less appropriate than the illegal windows. He asked about the finish on the windows. Mr. Rice stated that they are beige with a matte finish. Mr. Wilds stated that a Contributing building constructed in the 1970s is as significant as a Contributing building from any other period. It is subject to the same standards as a colonial structure. Mr. Rice explained that a miscommunication between the design team and the construction team led to the illegal work. The Commission approved a building permit for interior work only, but the construction team was unaware and undertook the exterior work as well. Mr. Wilds suggested to Mr. Rice that the property owner may have a claim against his company, which undertook the work without a permit. Mr. Rice conceded that they may. Ms. Merriman remarked that many similar properties on the block had been altered in similar ways; many have front doors like the one now proposed for legalization. Mr. Sugrue suggested that the staff should be more vigilant. Ms. Sell clarified the prior Commission approvals for similar work undertaken at 114 Lombard Street.

FAILED MOTION: The motion proffered by Mses. Leonard and Smyler to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application failed by a vote of 3 to 6. Mses. Evans, Merriman, and Smyler and Messrs. Rivera, Schaaf, and Wilds dissented.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to deny the legalization of the front windows and front door, but approve all other aspects of the application. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7 to 2. Mses. Leonard and Schlotterbeck dissented.

834 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: Ballroom Management Inc.

Applicant: Brett Harman

History: 1923; Horace Trumbauer, architect, designated 1/7/1982

Project: Install entrance marquee

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the canopy with side panels, provided it does not attach directly to the pilasters, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of a metal canopy at the 9th Street entranceway to a restaurant in the Ben Franklin Hotel building. The canopy would be affixed to the existing limestone cladding with steel anchors. The signage would be backlit with recessed lighting fixtures. Canvas side panels are proposed beneath the canopy.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Architect Paul Drzal represented the application. Mr. Drzal stated that he agreed with the recommendation of the Architectural Committee.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the canopy with side panels, provided it does not attach directly to the pilasters, with the staff to review details. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2108 WALLACE STREET

Owner: David Gustafson

Applicant: Keith Loudenslager

History: c.1859; individually designated 2/07/1974; contributing in the Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Legalize stucco on side wall

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of applying a standard lime and cement stucco with a smooth finish to the side wall with the brick at the corner revealed, provided no Modac or other water sealant is used, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize stucco on the east side wall of this row house. A contractor began apply the stucco without a permit or Historical Commission approval, but was stopped by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. The side elevation is highly visible from the public right-of-way and has always been exposed brick; it is not a former party wall. Currently, the building has severe water and mold problems. The applicant started applying stucco parging to this side facade in an attempt to abate the water infiltration problem. The staff doubts that the brick wall is allowing the moisture into the building. The applicant claims that the roof, flashing, and pointing are not the sources of the water and are in good condition, but has not provided any evidence to support these claims. The application also proposes to coat the stucco with Modac, a vinyl toluene acrylic coating made for highway abutments, parking garages, and other pre-cast and cast in place concrete.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Painter Keith Loudenslager and property owner David Gustafson represented the application.

The owner stated that he agreed with the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Wilds stated that he did not believe that the proposed work would stop the water infiltration and prevent additional mold. Mr. Loudenslager described the deteriorating condition of the brick, which is allowing the water to seep in, thereby causing mold. Mr. Wilds commented on the proposed Modac sealant and noted that masonry walls must be able to breathe. The sealant would prevent breathing. He asserted that interior moisture often has interior sources such as kitchens and bathrooms. Sealing the wall may, in fact, trap more moisture. Mr. Loudenslager stated that he suggested to his clients that they use insulation and drywall that will allow the walls to breathe. Ms. Leonard asked if the stucco had been applied yet. Mr. Danta stated that it had not. Commission members asked why the project had commenced with its approval. Mr. Gustafson stated that the staff had issued a verbal approval over the telephone. Mr. Danta stated that the staff never gives verbal approvals. Only a building permit application stamped "Approved" constitutes an approval. He did acknowledge speaking with the owner and meeting

at the property. Mr. Wilds noted that the Commission should approve stucco like this only if the brick wall is so compromised that it cannot be saved.

ACTION: Mr. Rivera moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application of a standard lime and cement stucco with a smooth finish to the side wall with the brick at the corner revealed, provided no Modac or other water sealant is used, with the staff to review details. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2047 RITTENHOUSE SQUARE

Owner: William Cheeseman

Applicant: William Cheeseman

History: c. 1880; contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995.

Project: Install aluminum-clad windows with simulated muntins

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

OVERVIEW: In June 2006, the Commission reviewed an application for façade alterations for this building. At that time, it denied the second-story window enlargement and alteration to the historic entranceway, but approved the replacement of the existing step with a granite step, a five-panel door to match the existing door, lintels and sills, garage door, and six-over-six, true-divided-light, wood windows, with staff to review details.

The applicant now proposes a revision to the earlier approval. He proposes to install six-over-six, simulated-divided-light, aluminum-clad, double-hung windows, not true-divided-light, wood windows, at the second and third stories of the front facade.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Commission. Owner and architect William Cheeseman represented the application.

MOTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 6. Ms. Evans seconded the motion.

Mr. Cheeseman explained that, after the earlier Commission approval, he searched for a wood window that would meet the Commission's requirements. After searching, he decided that the wood windows available are not satisfactory. He reported that an aluminum-clad window made by Marvin is of a higher quality and looks more like the historic window than any other window he found. He stated that the Marvin window has concealed jamb liners. The wood windows approved by the Commission all have vinyl jamb liners, which are highly inappropriate because they bear no resemblance to the historic jambs and are highly visible from the exterior. Although neither true-divided-light nor wood, the Marvin window will look more like the historic window than any true-divided-light, wood window on the market, he claimed. Messrs. Sugrue and Wilds asked if the frame and brick mold would match the historic. Mr. Cheeseman stated that he would have an extra piece of trim milled to match the historic window frame exactly. He also noted that he would have the edges of the spacer bars painted at an extra cost to give the look of real muntins. He also stated that the windows would be installed at the second and third floors, not the first floor, where pedestrians could inspect them closely. Mr. Baron noted that the Standard's specify replacement of materials in kind, whenever possible. He contended that it is possible in this instance. He also noted that the Commission has only ever approved alternate materials for windows above the fourth-floor level. Several Commissioners noted that the

Commission approved clad windows for the front façade of a Contributing house in Society Hill a few months ago. Mr. Sugrue opined that, as materials evolve, the standards should evolve as well. However, he was wary of encouraging more applications for clad windows. Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Rivera why the Committee had recommended denial. Mr. Rivera replied that he could not remember the details of the Committee's discussion, but offered that he considered the window acceptable. Ms. Smyler stated the applicant had researched his window selection very carefully and had made a well reasoned decision. She advocated for approval. Ms. Leonard advocated for consistency and stated that she would vote against any approval of these windows. Mr. Baron noted that the Commission had approved clad, simulated-divided-light windows for a building at 21st and Pine Streets; he posited that, as it had with that approval, an approval here would prompt many applications for non-historic windows. Others noted that that approval had not resulted in a flood of applications for clad, simulated-divided-light windows.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION: Mr. Wilds and Ms. Evans withdrew their motion to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 6.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the application as submitted, provided the windows are upgraded with the custom wood casings and brick molds and dark-colored spacer bars as proposed by the applicant at the Commission meeting, with the staff to review details. Ms. Evans seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 5 to 3. Ms. Leonard and Messrs. Rivera and Sugrue dissented. Mr. Schaaf abstained.

100 ARCH STREET, UNITS 1A AND 1B

Owner: CE Acquisitions

Applicant: John Leggette

History: c. 1835; individually designated on 08/05/1976; contributing to Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Install exterior security bars

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 3.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install exterior security grates to this Greek Revival building in Old City. The applicant has based the design on the grates on a neighboring structure on the same block. However, this neighboring structure dates from a later period. Exterior security grates were not utilized during the Greek Revival period.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. No one represented the application. The Commission reviewed the application and concluded that the proposed alterations do not comply with the Standards.

ACTION: Ms Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 3. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

115 ORIANA STREET

Owner: William Vessal

Applicant: William Vessal

History: c. 1870. Contributing to Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Revise approved addition; construct roof deck

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a revision to the design of an addition already approved by the Commission as well as the construction of a roof deck. The addition was approved by the Historical Commission on July 2006 with detailed specifications of its height. The addition as shown in the current proposal has revised fenestration and massing that does not conform to the height restrictions specified in the Commission's approval. The proposed deck would be constructed in front of the addition and extend the entire width of the addition. The building has a three-foot parapet that would lessen its visibility.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. No one represented the application.

Mr. Rivera explained that he had received a telephone call from the applicant, who had stated that he would withdraw the application. Mr. Danta stated that he had not received a withdrawal letter from the applicant. Mr. Wilds suggested that the Commission give the applicant an opportunity to clarify his intentions.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to table the application for a period not to exceed six months. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

120 MARKET STREET

Owner: VMA Lounge

Applicant: Brett Webber

History: c. 1835; individually designated 10/07/1976; designated as contributing in Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Install illuminated signage

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application with the revised hanging sign, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install two internally illuminated signs on this Greek Revival commercial building along Market Street. One sign would be a flat wall sign attached to the entablature above the storefront. This ground floor dates from a late twentieth-century restoration of the edifice. The sign will be halo lit with metal lettering. The second sign would be a hanging circular sign. This sign will also be attached to the same location and internally illuminated with an acrylic face.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. No one represented the application. The Commission discussed the revised sign and determined that it was acceptable.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application with the revised hanging sign, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

4600 RIDGE AVENUE, MOUNT PLEASANT BARN

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Lucy Strackhouse, Fairmount Park Historic Preservation Trust

History: c. 1761; designated on 5/26/1956

Project: Reroof barn and construct dormer

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reroof and construct a wide dormer on the south barn at Mount Pleasant in Fairmount Park. There are two very similar eighteenth-century barns at Mount Pleasant. One stands to the south of the entrance driveway; one to the north. This application proposes work to the south barn only. It is anticipated that the Fairmount Park Historic Preservation Trust will move into both barns and use them as its offices and workshops at some point in the near future. The barns have been greatly altered and little of the eighteenth-century fabric survives. Moreover, the south barn has been poorly maintained. Its roof is partially collapsed, exposing the interior to the elements. The application proposes reroofing the structure and constructing a new dormer on the south and less visible side of the roof. The south side of the south barn faces a densely overgrown wooded area. The dormer would allow the currently unusable loft area to be used as space for the Trust's offices. The dormer would set back from the side facade facing Mount Pleasant to reduce its visibility from the historic house.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission with Lucy Strackhouse and Mike DiSanto of the Fairmount Park Commission representing the application.

Mr. Wilds asked the applicants to explain why they wanted to build the dormer. He noted that there is no evidence that the original structure had a dormer. Ms. Strackhouse replied that the dormer would provide additional space to accommodate the Trust offices. She noted that the historic roof and structure were lost in a fire 100 years ago. The replacement roof was not maintained and has collapsed. Mr. Danta explained to the Commission that, after visiting the site, the staff concluded there the proposed dormer would not be conspicuous from the historic house. It would face a wooded area away from the house and street. Mr. Schaaf stated that the dormer was not well designed. He stated that the sill height appears to be much too low. Mr. Wilds agreed and stated that the dormer should be moved up on the roof. Ms. Strackhouse stated that she would be willing to have the dormer design revised to include the Commission's suggestions. Mr. Wilds noted that the staff could review the details. Mr. Rivera advocated for the approval of the design as submitted. Mr. Farnham suggested that Mr. Rivera should recuse if he is involved in the project. Mr. Rivera stated that he would defend his firm's design. Mr. Schaaf reiterated that the dormer design should be improved.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

664 AND 666 N. 15TH STREET

Owner: John Kang DBA, City View Homes LLC

Applicant: Elaine DelDuca

History: Vacant lots at the time of designation in Spring Garden Historic District, 2000

Project: Construct two new townhouses

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend that the Commission comment that the proposed townhouses are generally compatible with the contributing resources of the district. However, street-level garages on front façades are not appropriate for historic districts.

OVERVIEW: The parcels at 664 and 666 N. 15th Street were empty lots at the time of designation; therefore, the Historical Commission has review and comment jurisdiction only. This application proposes to construct two townhouses. The design is respectful of the adjacent buildings in scale and rhythm and maintains the same cornice line. The design incorporates historical elements, but utilizes them in such a manner so as not to be mistaken as original historic fabric. The proposed buildings would be three-stories in height with garage doors. The second and third floors would be engaged by a wood clad bay window. There would be a roof terrace with a penthouse. However, these would not be visible from the street owing to a 19-foot set-back and the use of the parapet and cornice as the terrace's railing.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. No one represented the application.

Mr. Schaaf stated that the City Planning Commission does not approve garages on front facades.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and comment that the proposed townhouses are generally compatible with the contributing resources of the district; however, street-level garages on front façades are not appropriate for historic districts. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 1. Mr. Schaaf dissented.

700 S. 2ND STREET

Owner: Ellen M. Lariviere

Applicant: Ellen M. Lariviere

History: Designated 5/31/1966

Project: Reface first-story rear and construct two-story addition

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate this large corner property for residential use. It proposes add two floors to a one-story rear section of the building, reface the existing portion of the rear section, alter window and door configurations, and install a garage at the Philip Street. Based on atlas research, a portion of the rear section may be a fragment of a much earlier building that stood on Philip Street. This application also proposes to install new shutters. The drawings are incomplete and do not provide any window, shutter, and door details.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Commission. Property owner Ellen Lariviere and architect Yao Huang represented the application.

Several Commission members asked why the Committee recommended approval in concept when the applicant applied for final approval. Ms. Cote stated that the Committee determined that the application lacked several key details and therefore did not warrant final approval.

Mr. Wilds asked about the location of the eighteenth-century portion of the building. Ms. Cote stated that it is located at the corner of Philip and Bainbridge. Mr. Wilds opined that the property is so compromised and retains so little historic fabric that decertifying it may be the best option.

Ms. Lariviere explained that she wanted to situate the garage on Philip Street, not Bainbridge Street. She noted that the block of Philip already has six garages and four parking pads. She reported that she already has a garage and curb cut on Bainbridge, but would like to remove it. She explained that the curb cut on Bainbridge prevents the creation of two parking spaces. There is no parking on Philip.

Mr. Rivera opposed the proposal. He claimed that it is not sensitive to the neighborhood.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application in concept. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 1. Mr. Rivera dissented.

702 S. FRONT STREET

Owner: Mike and Lisa Shapson

Applicant: Mike and Lisa Shapson

History: c.1780; designated 6/24/1958

Project: Demolish rear ell and construct two-story addition with deck

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the historic rear ell and construct a two-story addition with a deck. The second floor of the addition would be cantilevered over the historic alley way. The addition would be parged with stucco.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Commission. Property owners Lisa and Mike Shapson represented the application.

Mr. Wilds inquired about the date of the rear ell. Ms. Cote explained that it is not original eighteenth-century fabric, but dates to the middle of the nineteenth century.

MOTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

150 S. INDEPENDENCE MALL, 170 S. INDEPENDENCE MALL, AND 675 SANSOM STREET

Owner: Walnut Street Capital

Applicant: Jonathan Dyer

History: Public Ledger Building: 1926-27; Horace Trumbauer, architect;
significant to Society Hill Historic District, 03/10/1999

Curtis Building: 1910-14; Edgar Seeler, architect
individually designated 03/07/1974

significant to Society Hill Historic District, 03/10/1999

675 Sansom Street: 1923

contributing to Society Hill Historic District, 03/10/1999

Project: Replace concrete sidewalks with decorative sidewalks

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the concrete panels are larger and textured like honed granite, with the Architectural Committee to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the concrete sidewalks around the Public Ledger Building, the Curtis Building, and 675 Sansom Street, with gray three foot square concrete panels and decorative brick work and the company logo at the entrances.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Commission. Jon Dyer, the architect, and Jessica Byner represented the application.

Mr. Schaaf asked how the proposed sidewalk module would fit on the narrower streets. Mr. Dyer directed the Commission to the updated plans and stated that the module would be resized to fit the narrower sidewalks appropriately. Mr. Wilds asked why the Committee wanted to review the details. Mr. Sugrue asked if this was possible. Mr. Farnham noted that the Committee occasionally reviews details; it could, if authorized by the Commission, review the details for approval at a Committee meeting without sending the application on to the Commission again. Mr. Schaaf asked if the Streets Department had reviewed the application. Mr. Dyer stated that it had not, but added that he would submit it to the Streets Department. Mr. Sugrue noted that the Commission could act on one motion for all three properties.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the applications, provided the concrete panels are larger and textured like honed granite, with the Architectural Committee to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2414 PINE STREET

Owner: Howard A. Trauger

Applicant: Gerry Maguire

History: Non-contributing vacant Lot in Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District

Project: Review and Comment – Construct a three-story building

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend that the Commission comment that the front façade should be set back to reveal the entirety of the quoins on the adjacent building; that the front façade should be brick, not cast stone, at the first floor; and that the height should be limited to that of the taller adjacent building.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a three-story structure on a vacant lot within the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. The proposed building is contemporary in design

and compatible with the district in height, massing, and fenestration. Information about materials is missing from this submission.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Commission. No one represented the application.

Mr. Wilds disagreed with the Committee's recommendation and suggested that the front facade should not be set back, but should align with the neighboring facades on both sides. Mr. Schaaf concurred that the new building should maintain the street line, but he suggested a vertical reveal one foot wide and four or five inches deep along the Horn Mansion property line for the entire height of the new facade. Mr. Rivera suggested that the entire front facade should be set back four inches as recommended by the Committee.

ACTION: Mr. Rivera moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee as well as the comments offered by the Commission members to align the new front facade with the neighboring buildings, or to create a 12" x 5" reveal in the front facade at the east property line, or set the entire front facade back 4" from the neighboring facades. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2121 DELANCEY STREET

Owner: Lean and Tae Kim

Applicant: Rachel S. Schade

History: c. 1865

individually designated, 01/06/1972

contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, 02/08/1995

Project: Restore facade, construct stairhouse and deck on rear ell

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the height of the stair house is reduced by one foot and the windows at the back of the main block and in the historic rear ell are six-over-six, wood, true-divided-light, double-hung windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore the facade by installing four-over-four double-hung windows with true-divided-lights and refinishing the existing shutters. This application also proposes to install one-over-one aluminum clad double-hung windows throughout the rear, infill a window with glass block, convert two doors to double-hung windows, and install two air conditioning condensers at grade and one on the one-story roof. A roof deck with stair house is proposed for the rear ell and a skylight is proposed for the roof of the 1960s rear addition. This application also proposes to alter the rear facade of the 1960 addition by enlarging an opening, relocating a window, removing the sliding aluminum doors and balcony, and installing clad French doors.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Commission. No one represented the application. The Commission members discussed the application and agreed that it was acceptable.

ACTION: Mr. Rivera moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided the height of the stair house is reduced by one foot and the windows at the back of the main block and in the historic rear ell are six-over-six, wood, true-divided-light, double-hung windows, with the staff to review details,

pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1531-33 PINE STREET

Applicant: Donna Yohe

Owner: 1531 Pine Street Associates

History: c. 1865

individually designated and contributing to Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District

Project: Coat brownstone on first-story façade; install railings

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee recommended denial of all four proposed railings and the coating of the brownstone, pursuant to Standard 6.

OVERVIEW: The proposal involves alterations to two rowhouses that were formerly used by an electrical institute and have been converted to condominiums. The proposal calls for legalizing the removal of the paint at the ground-floor façade and the treatment of the brownstone base with an elastomeric coating. The applicant removed the paint with a combination of paint stripper and a rotary grinder. The grinder left a circular pattern in the brownstone. The brownstone was patched with Jahn brownstone patching material and a sample was approved. Other patches did not match the approved sample and the applicant now wishes to coat the stone to hide these patches. Staff recommends that the stone should be lightly sanded with a belt-sander to remove the circular pattern and the mismatched patches should be replaced to match. The brownstone is in fairly good condition and the coating would not allow the stone to breath properly.

The second item is the railings. When the renovation project was approved by the Commission, the applicant's drawings showed that the new railings would match the original ones found on an adjacent property. The applicant was even able to buy several pieces of original railing but found the cost of replicating them too great. The applicant now proposes four different designs.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Donna and Scott Yohe of Level 5 Construction represented the application.

Mr. Baron displayed photographs of the brownstone patches, which he took recently. Mr. Wilds asked why some of the patches do not match the brownstone or the approved patch. Mr. Baron stated that environmental changes, for example in temperature or humidity, can cause the patching material to change color. He noted that Jahn, the company that manufactured the patching material, typically replaces defective material.

Ms. Yohe stated that the patching was done in good faith, but resulted in a mismatched, patchwork façade. She stated that she followed the guidance of the staff and noted that the contractor received the Jahn training. She explained that the brownstone was in poor condition and several of the brownstone details had been lost from the façade. They painstakingly recreated all of those details, but the result is not aesthetically pleasing because of the mismatched colors. She stated that approximately 40% of the brownstone was patched. Ms. Yohe stated that the brownstone facades on several neighboring properties had been coated or painted and now look uniform. She stated that she will be in default of her construction contract with the property owner if she does not fix the brownstone. Mr. Baron countered that real brownstone is not a uniform color; it varies in color and has a sparkle that cannot be replicated with a coating. He also commented that the neighboring properties were already painted before designation. Mr. Wilds asked if the applicants intended to coat the patches only or the entire

façade. Ms. Yohe stated that she would coat the entire façade. Mr. Yohe stated that they wanted to create a more solid and uniform appearance. They would apply a very thin masonry coat, not more than 1/32nd of an inch. It would not change the appearance of any of the fine detail. They are proposing a material called Thorocoat. He stated that many of the neighboring buildings are coated with an identical or similar material. Mr. Sugrue asked the staff what type of coating the Commission typically approves for brownstone. Mr. Baron responded that the Commission should not approve a plastic-based material like Thorocoat because it can trap moisture. Mr. Baron suggested a mineral-based coating such as Silin instead. Mr. Wilds asked the applicants if they would consider a coating like Silin. Ms. Yohe stated that they would. Mr. Baron stated that they should coat the patches only, not the remainder of the brownstone. Mr. Sugrue noted that it would retain the patchwork look if they coated the patches only. Mr. Yohe reminded the Commission that the building had four or five layers of paint on it, which they removed. He explained that they could not remove all of the paint. The façade is not a pristine brownstone façade. The Commission members agreed that they could coat the entire façade.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the coating of the brownstone with a silicate based material, with the staff to review details. Ms. Merriman seconded, which passed unanimously.

The Commission directed its attention to the railing. Mr. Baron stated that the Commission should approve new, simple railings only when the historic stoop had no railings. In cases in which the building had railings originally, such as this one, the Commission should require the restoration of the historic railings. Mr. Wilds asked about their proposal. Ms. Yohe stated that they have collected enough pieces to construct one replacement railing; however, they need two. She explained that it would cost \$15,000 to have two new railings fabricated. She stated that they did not budget for that cost, which is five times what they expected to pay for railings. Mr. Sugrue suggested that they use the salvaged pieces to build one replacement railing and retain one of the existing railings. Mr. Wilds noted that they could retain both existing railings. The applicants stated that they wanted to replace the railings because they are not fitting for the expensive condominiums in the building. Ms. Yohe noted that only 50% of the original railings survive in the row of buildings. Mr. Wilds replied that the other missing railings will be replaced over time. Mr. Yohe stated that they could replace the railing on 1533 with the replica railing fabricated from the salvaged pieces and retain the simple, non-historic railing on 1531, provided they could repair the railing to be retained. The Commission members agreed that they could repair the extant railing.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the replacement of the front step railing at 1533 Pine Street with a new railing fabricated from the salvaged fragments matching the original railing and the retention and repair of the front step railing at 1531 Pine Street. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

31-33 S. 2ND STREET

Applicant: Paul Drzal, Harmann Deutsch, Architects

Owner: EFL Partners V

History: 31 S 2nd, constructed c. 1840

33 S. 2nd, façade constructed c. 1905

Both individually designated and contributing to the Old City District

Project: construct storefronts, lighting and signage

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This proposal involves installing storefronts in two commercial buildings. The existing storefronts are not original.

The building at 31 S. 2nd had a Greek Revival storefront with columns supporting the extant marble architrave. The location of joints and shadow outlines of the former capitols would seem to indicate that the storefront was constructed as part of a pair with 29 S. 2nd Street. The applicant does not wish to reproduce the historic storefront, but rather to restore the marble architrave and add wood faced columns and infill doors. The size of proposed glass panes should be revised to better match the windows above.

The proposed storefront for 33 S. 2nd appears compatible, but research has not uncovered any historic documentation of the original storefront. The applicant also proposes a flat wall sign, a projecting banner sign, and façade lighting.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. No one represented the application. The Commission members agreed that the proposed work is appropriate.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1604 MT. VERNON STREET

Applicant: John Gibbons, architect

Owner: Philadelphia Housing Development Corporation

History: Vacant lot at time of inclusion in Spring Garden District

Project: Construct rowhouse

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend that the Commission comment that the proposal is appropriate, provided the historically appropriate basement windows are installed, pursuant to Standard 4 of the Reconstruction Guidelines.

OVERVIEW: This proposal calls for reconstructing a four-story row house. The application proposes an accurate restoration of all elements of the historic row house except the basement windows and the rear. The Commission has review and comment jurisdiction.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect David Artman and developer Justino E. Navarro represented the application.

Mr. Wilds commended the applicants and stated this exciting project would provide affordable housing.

ACTION: Mr. Rivera moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and comment that the proposal is appropriate, provided the historically appropriate basement windows are installed, pursuant to Standard 4 of the Reconstruction Guidelines. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1619-1621 WALLACE STREET

Applicant: John Gibbons, architect

Owner: Spring Garden Community Development Corporation

History: 1619 Wallace Street, built c. 1863 designated contributing to Spring Garden District 2000, demolished without a permit 2002

1621 Wallace Street, vacant lot at time of designation of district

Project: Construct three-story building and reconstruct illegally demolished building

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 4 of the Reconstruction Standards and Standard 9 of the Rehabilitation Standards.

OVERVIEW: This proposal calls for constructing a single handicap accessible residential building on the site of two vacant lots. A designated row house stood on one of the lots. It was demolished by the Philadelphia Housing Authority without Historical Commission approval or a demolition permit in 2002. The Commission's staff informed the authority in writing prior to the demolition of the Commission's jurisdiction and process as well as the federal Section 106 jurisdiction and process. The proposal essentially restores both lots back to their original row house appearance. The ground floor of 1621 Wallace is an exception; it would include an at-grade entrance to meet ADA requirements. The building at 1619 Wallace Street would be reconstructed with lowered first-floor windows and without its mansard, which was a later addition.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect David Artman and developer Justino E. Navarro represented the application.

Mr. Sugrue commended the applicants for an "excellent project."

ACTION: Mr. Rivera moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 4 of the Reconstruction Standards and Standard 9 of the Rehabilitation Standards. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

601 N. 17TH STREET

Applicant: John Gibbons, architect

Owner: Philadelphia Housing Development Corporation

History: Vacant at the time of inclusion in Spring Garden Historic District

Project: Review and Comment - Construct a three-story building with storefront

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend that the Commission comment that the proposed building is compatible with the district and surrounding buildings in massing, scale, rhythm and materials.

OVERVIEW: The Commission has Review-and-Comment jurisdiction over this vacant lot. The application proposes the construction of a corner building with storefront. The proposed design is compatible with the district and surrounding buildings in massing, scale, rhythm and materials.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect David Artman and developer Justino E. Navarro represented the application.

The Commission commended the applicants.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and comment that the proposed building is compatible with the district and surrounding buildings in massing, scale, rhythm and materials. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2209 PINE STREET

Applicant/Owner: Mark Gamba

History: built c. 1855, added mansard c. 1900, rear altered twentieth century.

Project: Restore façade, alter rear

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This proposal calls for the restoration of the front façade of this rowhouse, and alterations to the rear. The rear is obliquely visible from Panama Street. The plans for the rear show cutting new windows in the base of the building, not visible to the public, closing several windows on the right side, restoring the second floor bay, cutting a two-story window at the 3rd and 4th stories and a two leaf door onto an existing balcony. Because of structural issues the applicant proposes to replace the masonry wall at the 3rd and 4th stories with wood framing and stucco.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Property owner Mark Gamba represented the application.

The Commission reviewed the application and deemed it appropriate.

MOTION: Mr. Rivera moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

423 S. CARLISLE STREET

Owner/Applicant: Marjorie Muecke

History: c. 1850.

individually designated 9/28/1965

contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District

Project: Install fire escape in side alley

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of a fire escape facing out toward the street, provided all property owners sharing the alley join in the application.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to cut openings at the second and third floors of the side elevation on the alley and install a fire escape with a raised stair. The applicant does not own the alley into which the fire escape would extend. It is a common alley shared by several property owners including the owners of 419, 421, 423, and 425-427 S. Carlisle Street and 1413, 1415, and 1417 Lombard Street. All owners must join in this application.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Commission. Marjorie Muecke, the owner, represented the application.

Ms. Muecke stated that, after extensive research, she obtained letters of support from five of the six owners of the shared alley. She stated that the sixth, the Shers, gave their verbal approval of her proposed fire escape. Mr. Wilds stated that the applicant has provided enough evidence of the other owners' support to allow the Commission to consider the application. Mr. Reuter noted that the Commission is not responsible for verifying that the other owners support the project. However, he warned the applicant that the Department of Licenses & Inspections may require her to provide letters of support from all applicants if she is encroaching on the shared alley.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the application. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 11:53 a.m., Ms. Smyler moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Reconstruction Standard 4: Reconstruction will be based on an accurate duplication of historic features and elements substantiated by documentary or physical evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different features from other historic properties. A reconstructed property will re-create the appearance of the non-surviving historic property in materials, design, color, and texture.

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.