

**THE MINUTES OF THE 517th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
9 September 2005**

**1515 Arch Street, Room 18025
Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair**

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
James Brown, IV
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
Sara Merriman, Special Assistant to the Director, Department of Commerce
Kathleen Murray, Assistant to City Council President
Vincent Rivera, AIA
David Schaaf, City Planning Commission
Denise Smyler, Esq.
Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.
Norman Tissian
Scott Wilds, Deputy Commissioner, Office of Housing & Community Development

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Jonathan E. Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Officer
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner

Also

Lanny Leibowitz, architect
Matt McClure, Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll
Don Semler, architect, Ballinger
Jill Klazmer, 257 S. 9th Street
Brian Klazmer, 257 S. 9th Street
Hugh Zimmers, architect
Larry Silver, Esq.
Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association
Richard DeMarco, Esq., Klehr Harrison
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Wesley Wei, architect
Janet Kalter, 217 Quarry Street
Joe Schiavo, 217 Quarry Street
Stuart Rosenberg, architect
Janice Woodcock, Capital Programs Office
Thomas Witt, Esq.
Spence Kass, architect
David Lerman, Symphony View, LP
Carl Massara, architect
J. Tackett, architect
Kip Ketchum, 1512 South Street
Michael Her
Elizabeth B. Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Harry J. Kane Jr.

Ralph Haynam, contractor
Brian Johnston, architect
Todd Strine, 421 Chestnut Partners, LP
Craig Deutsch, architect
Virgil Procaccino, 261 S. 22nd Street
Stephen G. Pollack, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll
Andrew Ojamaa, architect
John M. Sabatini, architect

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 517th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:05 a.m.

THE MINUTES OF THE 516TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Upon a motion made by Mr. Sugrue and seconded by Mr. Tissian, the Commission voted unanimously to approve the minutes of the 516th Stated Meeting, 12 August 2005, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

Owing to his firm's involvement in the 223-225 S. 6th Street applications, Mr. Sklaroff recused and passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

CONTINUANCE REQUEST

Matthew McClure, Esq., counsel for John and Mary Turchi, approached the Commission and requested a continuance of the Special Commission Meeting scheduled for 21 September 2005 for consideration of reclassification application for 223-225 S. 6th Street, the Dilworth House. He explained that two of his four main witnesses cannot attend the scheduled meeting; another witness is unable to confirm his attendance. He offered to submit all written materials to the Commission and opposition 14 days in advance of a rescheduled meeting. He also noted that the opposition was willing to submit all new written material seven days in advance of a new meeting. Larry Silver, Esq., counsel for the opposition, nodded in agreement.

Mr. Wilds moved to continue the Special Meeting for the consideration of the reclassification application for 223-225 S. 6th Street, the Dilworth House, to a date in October 2005 to be determined by the staff and mutually agreed upon by the Commission, applicant, and opposition. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Merriman excused herself and left the meeting. Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 1 SEPTEMBER 2005

Thomas Sugrue, Chair

333 Queen Street

Michael Herr, Owner

History: built c. 1830s, cornice altered c. 1860s, demolished and rebuilt 1975

Designated: 25 March 1969

Designation Committee Recommendation: Denial of the rescission request and maintenance of the designation of 333 Queen Street on the Philadelphia Register with the notations that the rear is non-historic in character and proposals to alter the rear should be treated liberally by the Commission.

On 27 February 1975 the staff of the Commission approved a permit to “demolish the front and rear façades and reconstruction according to plans approved by the Historical Commission.” The next day, the staff approved a permit for “complete demolition and construction of a three-story building.” The new building is an accurate reconstruction of the historic building; for example, the front brick façade is laid in a Flemish-bond pattern, just as it was originally laid.

The owner, Michael Herr, purchased the property in April 2001. He is applying for the rescission of the individual designation, pursuant to Section 5.5.c.1 of the Historical Commission’s Rules and Regulations.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Commission. Mr. Sklaroff asked if the building was a reconstruction or a restoration. Ms. Spina explained that the Commission had approved the demolition of the historic building provided it was reconstructed. She added that the front façade was a precise reconstruction, but the rear façade was not. Mr. Wilds noted that the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* consider reconstruction an appropriate intervention in certain situations.

Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the Committee on Historic Designation’s recommendation to deny the rescission request and maintain the designation of 333 Queen Street on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

136 South Front Street

Front Street Development Associates, LP, Owner

History: built 1825, rear tenements c.1790; demolished 1993

Designated: 26 May 1970

Designation Committee Recommendation: Rescission of the individual designation of 136 S. Front Street on the condition that a Phase 1 archeological study is conducted, with follow-up archeological study as required, and maintenance of the designation on the Philadelphia Register with a classification of “non-contributing” in the Old City Historic District.

After purchasing the property in 1988, the Taxin family applied to the Historical Commission to demolish the building for parking. The Commission denied the application. The Taxins appealed the decision to the Board of License & Inspection Review, which sustained the appeal. The City of Philadelphia appealed the decision to

the Court of Common Pleas, but later withdrew the appeal, clearing the way for the building's demolition. The building was demolished despite the Commission's denial.

The current owner, Front Street Development Associates, purchased the property in April 2003. The owner seeks the rescission of the individual designation under the Commission's Rules & Regulations, Section 5.5.c.1. The property appears as "non-contributing" to the Old City Historic District and the rescission of the individual designation would not affect that designation and classification.

Ms. Spina alerted the Commission that the owners of this property and those at 115 and 117 Walnut Street planned to request continuances of the reviews of the rescission applications. Richard DeMarco, Esq., counsel for the owners, explained that he had been retained the previous day and was not yet prepared to proceed with the reviews. He asked that the matters be continued to the Commission's October 2005 meeting.

Ms. Murray moved that the rescission application for 136 S. Front Street be continued to the Historical Commission's October 2005 meeting. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

115 Walnut Street

Gloria R. Taraborelli, Owner

History: built c. 1860, demolished 1994

Designated: 6 February 1975

Designation Committee Recommendation: denial of the rescission of the individual designation

In the course of the demolition of the building at 117 Walnut Street, the building at 115 Walnut Street became unstable to the point that the Department of Licenses & Inspections declared it Imminently Dangerous. The Commission approved the demolition permit on 9 March 1994 on the condition that "upon the future development for 115 Walnut Street, the design of any facades visible to the public shall be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings* and subject to the approval of the Philadelphia Historical Commission. The Department of Licenses and Inspections will not issue a building permit for a new structure at this location that does not comply with this condition." At the Commission meeting, the owners, Gloria and Peter Taraborelli, agreed to the condition. However, subsequent to the Commission meeting, they objected to the requirement that the new construction follow the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards*. Sixty-eight days after the Commission's decision, the Taraborellis appealed the permit's condition to the Board of License & Inspection Review (BLIR). The BLIR announced a tie vote on the appeal, affirming the Commission's conditional decision. They did not appeal the BLIR's decision to the Court of Common Pleas.

Ms. Taraborelli still retains ownership of the property but has not developed it during the last decade. She now would like to have the individual designation of the property rescinded. The property appears as "non-contributing" to the Old City Historic District. The basis for the rescission application is that the property no longer meets the criteria for designation as noted in Section 5.5.c.1 of the Historical Commission's Rules and Regulations, "the resource has ceased to meet the criteria for listing on the Register because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed."

Ms. Murray moved that the rescission application for 115 Walnut Street be continued to the Historical Commission's October 2005 meeting. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

117 Walnut Street

Gloria R. Taraborelli, Owner

History: built c. 1860, demolished 1994

Designated: 6 February 1975

Designation Committee Recommendation: rescission of the individual designation on the condition that a Phase 1 archeological study is conducted, with follow-up archeological study as required, and maintenance of the "non-contributing" status to the Old City Historic District

After a severe fire, the Department of Licenses & Inspections declared the building standing at 117 Walnut Street Imminently Dangerous. The staff of the Commission approved the demolition permit, based on the Imminently Dangerous condition.

The owner, Gloria Taraborelli, wishes to rescind the individual designation of the property, as stipulated in Section 5.5.c.1 of the Historical Commission's Rules and Regulations. The property appears as "non-contributing" to the Old City Historic District and the rescinding of the individual designation would not affect that status.

Ms. Murray moved that the rescission application for 117 Walnut Street be continued to the Historical Commission's October 2005 meeting. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JULY 2005

Vincent Rivera, Chair

4250 Belmont Mansion Drive, Belmont Mansion

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Janice Woodcock, Architect

History: 1742-50 by William Peters; stair tower added, c. 1765; 3rd floor added, c. 1850; repairs from fire, 1905

Project: Restoration and rehabilitation of mansion – final approval

Architectural Committee Recommendation: final approval, with the staff to review details including window and door shop drawings, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 6 and 9

The Commission reviewed and approved an in-concept to restore and rehabilitate Belmont Mansion earlier this year. The Capital Programs Office is now requesting the Commission's final approval of the building's rehabilitation and restoration to the period before a fire in 1905. The substantiation for the restoration can be found in photographs that date to 1871 and the turn of the twentieth century. The most visible elements to be reconstructed include a widow's walk platform at the peak of the house, with a picket railing and flag pole, and a first-floor porch that wraps around three sides of the house. The porch will have a terne-coated stainless-steel roof, wood posts with scroll brackets and a herringbone-patterned brick floor.

The remainder of the rehabilitation includes the restoration of the windows, reconstruction of the shutters on all of the floors, reconstruction of the brick chimneys and restoration of the façade, including the quoins, jack arches, and scored stucco on the rear wing.

The mechanicals for the building will be completely upgraded. The new HVAC system includes four condensers situated at the rear of the property, separated from the house and surrounded by landscaping. Two vents through the attic space will provide necessary ventilation. The proposed railing for the widow's walk will hide these projections. The other vents in the basement will not prove visible owing to the porch or their rear locations.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Commission. Mr. Wilds expressed concern for the preservation of the interior plasterwork during the rehabilitation. Janice Woodcock, the architect, explained that the plaster will be safeguarded. It will be monitored during construction and a new structural system will be inserted that will transfer the loads from the ceilings to the outer walls.

Mr. Tissian moved to approve the proposal as submitted. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

704 North 5th Street

Owner: Anthony Casey

Applicant: Liz Zimmers

History: c. 1870

Project: One-story addition on rear ell, new rear deck, new windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial of the addition, pursuant to Standards 2, 9 and 10. Approval of the door alterations on the back of the rear ell. Denial of the windows on the side, pursuant to Standard 6 and 9.

Last month, the Commission approved the fourth-story, rear-ell addition in concept, but noted the Committee's comments about refining the addition and its connection to the historic mansard. The Commission denied the deck proposed for the roof of the addition.

The applicant has submitted a revised plan for review. The deck on the fourth-story addition has been deleted, but little else has changed. The window in the western end has been expanded to three bays and the deck at the end has been expanded by two feet, but otherwise the massing, materials and overall design have not been refined as the Committee and Commission required.

The proposal also includes changes to the back elevation of the rear ell. Currently there is a non-historic double-leaf door with sidelights and transom that opens onto a deck. The applicant proposes to change this door to an arched transom double-leaf door design, retaining the existing deck.

Last, all of the original wood, six-over-six and two-over-two windows in the rear ell had been replaced with aluminum one-over-one and single-pane windows by the previous owner. The plans call for replacing the first floor single-pane windows with new one-over-one windows.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Commission. Hugh Zimmers, the architect, explained that the owner had not yet arrived at the Commission meeting. He stated that he would change the windows in question to a six-over-six configuration. He reported that the owner did not want to reconfigure the addition as suggested.

Mr. Wilds asked about the fire and visibility. Ms. Spina explained that fire damaged the mansard; however, photographs show that the mansard and its rear dormer remain. She stated that the section of the mansard on the rear of the building is not visible from the public right-of-way. She asserted that the north side wall of the ell is visible down the alley between this building and the building to the north. Mr. Wilds contended that the ell wall is only minimally visible and that the essential factor in Commission's review standard is visibility from a public right-of-way. Ms. Sklaroff dissented, stating that a lack of visibility from a public right-of-way does not license any and all alterations. Mr. Wilds replied that the Commission has a tradition of reviewing liberally proposed alterations not visible to the public. Messrs. Wilds and Sklaroff then agreed that the Commissioners were not unanimous in their thinking on this issue.

Mr. Sugrue opined that Mr. Zimmers was wasting the Commission's time because he had not undertaken the requested revisions. Mr. Sklaroff agreed.

Ms. Merriman returned to the meeting.

Mr. James moved to adopt the Committee's recommendation to approve the door alterations on the back of the rear ell, but to deny the addition and the windows on the side of the rear ell. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which carried with a vote of 8 to 0. Ms. Merriman abstained.

217 Quarry Street

Owner/Applicant: Joseph Schiavo

Project: New construction on vacant lot – 45-day review and comment

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

This application proposes new construction on a vacant lot in the Old City Historic District. The neighboring area on Quarry Street includes several multi-story, brick industrial buildings that date to the nineteenth century. The owners wish to build a four-story single-family house with a roof deck. The first floor would have a garage and pedestrian entrance and the living space would occupy the upper floors. The front façade would be faced in zinc-colored metal panels with grey stone detailing. The west façade would be stucco. The entrance would have a flush metal door and the garage would have a galvanized metal door. The upper floors have balconies with three-pane sliding glass doors over the bay with the garage door and single-light windows in the bay over the pedestrian door. The roof deck has a simple metal railing only visible in the bay over the garage door.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Commission. Owners Joseph Schiavo and Janet Kalter and architect Wesley Wei represented the project.

Mr. Tissian stated emphatically that he disapproved of the garage. He stated that such garage doors are destroying the beauty of Philadelphia and ruining the city. Mr. Schiavo and Mr. Sklaroff discussed the zoning requirements for parking.

Mr. Wilds commented that the building is awkwardly tall when compared with its neighbors. Mr. Wei responded that he had carefully studied the ceiling heights and reduced them as much as possible at the upper floors.

Mr. Sklaroff reminded his colleagues that their jurisdiction in this case was review and comment only.

Mr. Sugrue moved to adopt the Architectural Committee recommendation and approve the proposal. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried with a vote of 8 to 1. Mr. Tissian dissented.

Mr. Sklaroff recused and passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

240-46 Arch Street

Owner/Applicant: Michael Yaron

Proposal: New construction on vacant lot – 45-day review and comment

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with a uniformly-colored brick for the front façade.

This application proposes the construction of a seven-story building on a vacant lot, with commercial space on the first floor and residential space on the upper floors. The irregularly shaped structure would have an interior courtyard to provide the necessary light and air requirements for the adjacent development on North 3rd Street. The first floor would have large plate-glass windows for the commercial space, with large columns dividing the expanse, and a recessed entry leading to the interior courtyard. The next four floors would have brick facing and casement windows. The two top floors would include a recessed section at the east and a sloping mansard in standing seam metal with dormer windows at the west.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Historical Commission. No one appeared to represent the application.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance presented his critique of the proposed building. He stated that the design of the first-floor façade was inappropriate, especially across the street from the Betsey Ross House. He asserted that the windows at the first floor should be articulated and that there is a discontinuity between the first floor and the remainder of the building. The building therefore lacked unity and harmony. He contended that the older buildings in the neighborhood integrated better with their surroundings than this building. He declared that the architect should reconsider his design.

Mr. James stated that the proposed building does not relate well to the neighboring buildings. It is out of scale. Mr. Wilds agreed with Mr. Gallery's censure of the first-floor facade. He suggested that the architect redesign it.

Ms. Smyler opined that the applicant should have attended the meeting.

Mr. Tissian noted the futility of the debate on the proposal, over which the Commission has review-and-comment jurisdiction only.

Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal, provided the front façade is faced with a uniformly-colored brick. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which was unanimously defeated.

Mr. Wilds moved to comment unfavorably on the application and to convey the comments to the applicant. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

22 North Front Street

Owner: Michelle Sweeney

Applicant: Kip Ketchum, contractor

History: bet. 1828 and 1832 by estate of Stephen Girard

Proposal: Remove rear addition, seal rear doorway

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the rubble removal and demolition of the remainder of the rear addition at 22nd N. Front Street, provided a detailed plan of the work is submitted and the opening in the remaining building is infilled with a steel door with lintel and a concrete block wall with a smooth stucco finish, with the staff to review details.

An addition was constructed at the rear of this building, which is significant in the Old City Historic District, in the late nineteenth century. Owing to a neglect of maintenance by several owners, the addition has partially collapsed. The proposal calls for the complete demolition of the rear addition, removal of the debris, and infilling with brick the opening in the original building left by the collapse and demolition. The northern wall of this addition is shared with the southern wall of the rear addition of 24 North Front Street, which still stands but is in need of repair. Care must be taken when performing work at 22 North Front Street to avoid damaging the adjacent structures.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Commission. Mr. Sugrue noted the importance of the Girard buildings and advised that the contractor exhibit great care when demolishing the remainder of the rear addition. Mr. Perri stated that he would advise the building inspector in the area to monitor the demolition.

Mr. Sugrue moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the rubble removal and demolition of the remainder of the rear addition at 22nd N. Front Street, provided a detailed plan of the work is submitted and the opening in the remaining building is infilled with a steel door with lintel and a concrete block wall with a smooth stucco finish, with the staff to review details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

239 Chestnut Street, Lewis Building

Owner: Fresher Start Corporation

Applicant: Noele Parris Huie, architect

History: 1852, Stephen D. Button, architect; cast-iron by Daniel D. Badger of Architectural Iron Works, New York

Proposal: New roof deck on front portion of building

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the deck provided the section of the deck south of the steps on the current plan is deleted from the design, leaving a deck set back 18 feet from the front facade, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guideline.

This application proposes to install a roof deck on the southern (front) portion of this building classified as significant in the Old City Historic District. A hatch at the rear of the building will provide access to the roof and concrete pavers along the roof will lead from the hatch to the deck. The deck, which measures 24 feet by 35 feet, will have a metal-rimmed glass railing and will sit approximately eight feet behind the front cornice.

Ms. Spina presented the application. No one attended the meeting to represent the application.

The Commission debated the question of decks, especially whether visibility from the street should be the primary consideration when reviewing deck proposals. Mr. Wilds reminded the Commission that it denied a deck proposed for a Spruce Street property that would have been invisible to the public at its previous meeting. Mr. Sklaroff noted that Mr. Tyler had always asserted that decks were historically located on rear eaves. He also contended that the applicant's own sight-line study did not support the approval of the deck. Mr. Wilds added that approving this deck would set a precedent for an approval of a deck on the similar building at 241 Chestnut.

Ms. Murray moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the deck provided the section of the deck south of the steps on the current plan is deleted from the design, leaving a deck set back 18 feet from the front facade, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guideline. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which failed with a vote of 2 to 7. Ms. Smyler and Messrs. Wilds, Perri, Tissian, Sugrue, James, and Sklaroff dissented. Mr. Rivera abstained.

Mr. Sugrue moved to deny the application. Mr. James seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 7 to 2. Ms. Murray and Ms. Merriman dissented. Mr. Rivera abstained.

47 North 2nd Street

Owner: Paul Bagga

Architect: Allison Fritch, architect

History: built c. 1865; top three floors later removed

Proposal: Reconstruct top three stories, add roof decks, front restoration, new side openings

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the proposal, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

This application proposes the reconstruction of the top three stories that are now

missing from this commercial building, using the nineteenth-century Baxter's drawing of the streetscape and a detailed insurance survey. The front façade will accurately reproduce the original including the two-entry storefront. The side façade will include the original openings, but will add intermediate windows. These windows will be demarcated by a simplified design that omits the granite lintel of the originals. The applicant proposes cutting a new rear entry and two storefront windows in the side façade on Cuthbert Street. On the roof, the drawings show two roof decks, two stair houses and an elevator mechanical room set back 3'9" from the side facade and 13'3" from the front façade. The building has no rear ell.

Mr. Baron presented the application. Architect Jay Tackett represented the proposal.

Mr. Sklaroff asked if this proposal can be considered a reconstruction. Mr. Tackett stated that it is almost a reconstruction. The reconstruction will be supplemented with a few new windows and two roof decks. Mr. Sklaroff inquired about the specifics of the decks. Mr. Tackett asserted that they would not be visible from any public right-of-way. Mr. Sklaroff noted the similarity of the deck proposal to that proposed in the previous application. He asked if the project could proceed without the decks. Mr. Tackett conceded that it could. He added that the decks would not be visible even if they were significantly enlarged. Mr. Wilds asked if the stair towers would be visible to the general public. Mr. Tackett stated that it would not be visible and noted that it was a fire stair. Mr. Sklaroff asked if it was required. Mr. Tackett replied that the stair was, but not the projection above the roof. He also added that the extra income generated by the decks would support the reconstruction of the historic building. Mr. Sklaroff contended that people infrequently use decks. Ms. Merriman disagreed, stating that decks are very important when condominiums have no other outdoor space. Mr. Wilds contributed that the Commission would approve a penthouse on a building like this one; therefore, a deck must be acceptable. Mr. James requested information about the decks. Mr. Tackett explained that they would be dedicated to the top two units. Mr. Wilds commented that the access to the decks through the common fire stairs was awkward. Mr. Sklaroff noted his general opposition to the decks. Ms. Smyler suggested that this proposal was not like the previously reviewed deck proposal.

Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the Architectural Committee recommendation and approve the proposal, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which failed with a vote of 5 to 5. Messrs. Wilds, Sugrue, Tissian, James, and Sklaroff dissented.

Mr. Sugrue moved to approval the proposal without the roof decks and stair towers, with the staff to review the details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which failed with a vote of 5 to 5. Ms. Merriman, Ms. Murray, Ms. Smyler, Mr. Rivera, and Mr. Perri dissented.

Mr. Tissian moved to approve the proposal except the roof decks and stair towers, with the staff to review the details. Mr. James seconded the motion, which failed with a vote of 2 to 8. Ms. Merriman, Ms. Murray, Ms. Smyler, and Messrs. Perri, Wilds, Sugrue, Rivera, and Sklaroff dissented.

Commission members discussed the ramifications of taking no action on the decks. They agreed that the applicant could be issued a permit for the decks if the Commission took no action within 60 days of the receipt of the application.

Mr. Sugrue moved to approve the entirety of the application other than the decks and stair towers, with the staff to review the details. Mr. James seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. James moved to deny the decks and stair towers. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which failed with a vote of 5 to 5. Ms. Merriman, Ms. Murray, Ms. Smyler, Mr. Rivera, and Mr. Perri dissented.

The Commission informed the applicant that he could seek a permit for the decks and stair towers after the 60-day time period had expired.

421 Chestnut Street

Owner: 421 Chestnut Street, LP

Applicant: Martin Jay Tackett, architect

History: 1857-9, John Gries, architect; rear addition, 1903 Addison Hutton, architect

Proposal: Convert rear bays to balconies, window replacement – final approval

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial of the front windows and denial of the vinyl windows on the west rear façade, but approval of the vinyl windows on the east rear façade, approval of wood windows on the north and west rear facades, and approval of the balconies, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9

This application proposes a variety of window schemes for different facades of this former bank, turned residential building. On the front façade, the applicant proposes wood casement windows with a seven-inch-wide, vertical muntin running down the center and altered frame details. On the rear, the applicant proposes vinyl windows. No details are shown at all. The applicant shows one register of bays converted to balconies as formerly approved in concept by the Commission.

Mr. Baron presented the application. Architect Jay Tackett represented the proposal.

Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the Architectural Committee recommendation. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion.

Mr. Sugrue began the discussion with a note that he agrees with the Committee's recommendation for the east rear façade windows. Mr. Tackett reported that both rear side facades now have aluminum windows. Mr. Wilds asked if the vinyl windows would be white. Mr. Tackett replied in the negative, stating that all of the windows, regardless of materials, would be gray.

Discussion turned to the front windows. Mr. Tackett provided an overview of his proposal. Todd Strine, the developer, introduced himself and lobbied for the approval of the window proposal. Mr. Baron commented on the excessive mullion width and other problems with the proposed window. Mr. Tackett conceded that the historic window could be replicated as a double-hung. Replicating its appearance in the casement type is not possible. Mr. Sklaroff clarified that the applicant prefers casements, but that the historic window could be replicated as a double-hung. Mr. Strine noted that he was granted in-concept approval for the casements. Messrs. Sklaroff and Wilds responded that the Commission now needed to review the details of the casements.

Commissioners questioned Mr. Tackett on the window design. He stated that he might be able to produce windows with the appropriate dimensions and profiles in a composite

material, but he preferred real wood windows. Mr. Sklaroff asked for detailed information on the dimensions of the center mullion. Mr. Baron stated that the historic mullion would have been 2½ inches wide. Mr. Tackett stated the he 5 inches was the minimum acceptable width for the proposed casements. Mr. Tissian suggested further investigation to find a means of reducing the dimension to the acceptable range. Mr. Wilds suggested that double-hung, not casement, windows be installed. The Commission members agreed that a better solution to the window design should be sought.

Messrs. Wilds and Tissian withdrew their motion.

Mr. James moved to approve the plans for the east rear windows and balconies and north rear windows as proposed. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. James asked the architect about the windows currently in the west rear wall. Mr. Tackett responded that they are aluminum windows installed in 1983. Mr. Strine noted that all of the new windows would be almond in color. Mr. Baron pointed out that the applicant had supplied no details for the vinyl windows. He asserted that the Commission should have the details before considering an approval. Mr. Sklaroff agreed.

Ms. Murray moved to approve the vinyl windows at the west rear as submitted. Mr. James seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 6 to 2. Messrs. Sklaroff and Sugrue dissented. Mr. Tissian abstained.

Mr. Wilds moved to deny the proposed windows for the front façade. No one seconded the motion.

Mr. Sugrue moved to table the proposed windows for the front façade to allow the applicant to investigate a narrower mullion. No one seconded the motion.

Mr. Sklaroff summarized the issues related to the review of the proposed front windows, especially the wide rails and center mullions. Mr. Sugrue inquired about the total width of the front windows. Mr. Tackett explained that they are 56 inches wide. Mr. Strine contended that the historic rendering does not provide enough information to dimension the center muntin. Mr. Wilds countered that the rendering clearly shows that the horizontal and vertical muntins were the same width. Mr. Baron explained that the wider window elements would result in a loss of 10 inches of glass across each window. Mr. Tackett offered to redesign the window with each of the four vertical members across the window no more than 2½ inches wide.

Mr. James moved to deny the front windows as submitted, but to approve a casement window with each of the four vertical window members (frame-rail, rail-mullion, mullion-rail, and rail-frame) no more than 2½ inches wide, with the staff to review the details. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 7 to 1. Mr. Wilds dissented. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

257 South 9th Street

Owner: Brian Klazmer

Applicant: Massimiliano Scarchilli, architect

History: c. 1802

Proposal: Exterior rehabilitation, rear demolition and additions – final approval

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9

This application proposes the restoration of the front façade of this brick house with shutters, a bulkhead and new windows. It also proposes additions and alterations to the rear ells and garage. The plans show the demolition of a wood-covered stair hall and brick ell at the rear and construction of a link building in place of the rear ell. The rear of the existing house will be retained, but will receive a second floor addition with a deck and a small modification to the roof of the rear ell. The one-story garage would be rebuilt as a two-story structure with a larger footprint to accommodate a larger house and a two-car garage. This scheme had been previously approved in concept by the Commission.

Mr. Baron presented the project to the Historical Commission. Owners Jill and Brian Klazmer and architect Stuart Rosenberg attended the meeting.

Ms. Murray asked if the appearance of the garage would be improved. Mr. Rosenberg replied that it would be faced with brick. Mr. Sklaroff asked if the front façade would be restored. Mr. Baron replied that it would.

Mr. Tissian moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal, with the staff to review the details, pursuant to 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.]; and 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.]. Mr. James seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1519 Spruce Street

Owner: 1519 Spruce Street Partnership

Applicant: Robert Boyd

History: 1890

Proposal: Legalize alterations to the rear, construct roof deck on main section

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the legalization of the rear alterations and rear deck, but denial of the main roof deck, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guideline.

This application seeks to legalize work that was performed at variance with what the staff had approved in October 2002. Although the back portion of this house only has visibility from other buildings, it features an extraordinary round rotunda room. In 2002,

this architect approached the staff with a proposal to build on the back a restaurant that would sit away from the round walls and attach via a bridge through an ornamental bay on the back of the building. The bay was to be retained in large part and the restaurant was going to have a glazed atrium so that the rotunda would be a feature that could be enjoyed in a semi-public fashion. The new addition was to be covered in a sand-finish, smooth stucco. The development team, which included the architect, constructed the building at variance to the plans, including more demolition of the rear bay, less glass at the addition a rough textured, not smooth, stucco. That development team disbanded and a new investment team using the same architect has bought the building and now plans office and residential use. They seek to legalize the changes to the 2002 plans and approval of a roof deck on the front section of the building.

Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Carl Massara and owner David Lerman represented the project.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Baron to explain what the staff approved in 2002. Mr. Baron stated that the staff approved a rear addition that is not visible from any public right-of-way. He pointed to the drawing distributed with the Commissioners' packets marked "2002." He asserted that the staff has the authority to approve alterations and additions to secondary facades minimally visible or not visible to the public. He then explained that the addition had not been built to comply with the approved plans.

Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Massara to explicate the divergence from the approved plans. Mr. Massara stated that he had been in Italy at the time of construction and claimed that an inspector from the Department of Licenses & Inspections had required the adjustments to the plans. Mr. Wilds then asked why the revisions had not been presented to the Commission and its staff for review. Mr. Massara could not answer the question.

Discussion turned to the decks. Ms. Murray asked if the upper deck would be set back from the front façade. Mr. Massara stated that it would be set back three feet. Ms. Merriman opined that it was located too close to the front façade and should be set back behind the stair tower. Mr. Wilds echoed Ms. Merriman and asked why it had not been set back. Mr. Lerman stated the building would be converted to house his offices at the lower floor and luxury apartments above. He added that the building would not be profitable without the luxurious apartments. He displayed a photograph of the view of the Kimmel Center from the roof of the front of the building and emphasized that the monetary value of the penthouse apartment would be significantly enhanced if the Commission approved a deck with a view of the Center.

Mr. Wilds noted that the deck would be highly visible from the street. Mr. Tissian, who reported that he lives across the street from the site, confirmed that the deck would be highly visible. He signaled his opposition to it. Ms. Merriman, who characterized herself as a supporter of decks, contended that this deck was positioned too close to the front façade and should be pulled back significantly. Mr. Sklaroff reminded his fellow Commissioners that they should consider the roof as the fifth façade according to preservation architect Hyman Myers. Mr. James asked if it could be set back. Mr. Lerman replied that it could be set back. Mr. Tissian declared that the unit would generate sufficient revenue without the deck.

Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and legalize the rear alterations and approve the rear deck, but deny the main roof deck, pursuant to

Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; and the Roof Guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as decks or terraces so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.]. Mr. Tissan seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

314 South Iseminger Street

Owner: Sonia Neilson

Applicant: John Sheridan, contractor

History: c. 1830

Proposal: Legalize demolition of kitchen shed, construct new two-story structure

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial as submitted, but approval if it is constructed in brick with wood windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

This application seeks to legalize the demolition of a brick rear ell and construction a two-story structure with deck in its place.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. No one representing the application attended the meeting.

Mr. James moved to accept the Committee's recommendation and deny the proposal, but to approve the two-story rear addition and deck if built in brick with wood windows, with the staff to review details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion.

Mr. Sklaroff questioned the Committee's recommendation for the new construction. He stated that it is a recipe, not a reaction to a proposal. Mr. Wilds noted that the Committee often gives direction to applicants. Mr. Baron clarified that the rear of the property is not visible from a public right-of-way. He also stated that the demolition has already occurred, but the construction has not yet begun. Mr. Wilds questioned the appropriateness of the Committee's recommendation, which stipulates particular materials in an area invisible to the public. Mr. Baron stated that the Committee envisioned the requirement as mitigation for the demolition without a permit. Mr. Sklaroff asserted that the Commission should comment on the design issues and leave questions of legalization to the Commission. Messrs. James and Wilds agreed to amend their motion.

Mr. James amended his motion and moved to deny the proposal. Mr. Wilds seconded the amended motion, which passed unanimously.

403 South 3rd Street

Owner: John Grossi

Applicant: John DiNuovo

History: built c. 1827

Proposal: Two-story side addition

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval as submitted, pursuant to Standard 9.

This application involves changes to a proposal that was previously reviewed and approved by the Commission. The applicant seeks to enlarge a rear addition and close and open several windows to accommodate the placement of showers in several bathrooms. These changes, although visible from Pine Street, would be made to later additions.

Mr. Baron presented the application.

Mr. Sugrue moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue. David Schaaf of the City Planning Commission joined the meeting.

301 South 8th Street

Owner: Pennsylvania Hospital

Applicant: Ron Norbury

History: built 1960, Rogers & Butler, architects

Proposal: Alteration to steps, installation of ADA ramp, new canopy

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the proposal, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9

This proposal includes the construction of a handicap ramp. The entrance to the ramp would require a cut through a brick knee wall. The marble steps would be demolished and a new straight stair constructed of cement would be substituted. The brick side rails flanking the stair would be modified to remove a stepped design. A canvas barrel awning would cover the stairs and hide the fanlight.

Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Don Sembler of Ballinger Architects explained that the marble steps leading to the front door have deteriorated and require replacement. This has led the hospital to study the ADA access and entrance patterns at the building. Mr. James noted that the building already has a handicap entrance on the side of the building and opined that it suffices. Mr. Wilds reminded his colleagues that this building was constructed in the 1960s, not the eighteenth century. Mr. Rivera asserted that the alterations would not be in the character of the building. Mr. Tissian asked if the existing side ramp was adequate. Mr. Sembler replied that it was too far away and not in the spirit of ADA. He noted that a ramp on the garden side of the building would interfere with tenant spaces. Mr. Sembler displayed the plans and elucidated them. Mr. Wilds noted ramps that the Commission has approved in the past. Mr. James asserted that the proposed alterations were driven by the ambulatory traffic, not the need for a new or better ramp. Mr. Wilds highlighted the

importance of offering disabled persons the option of using the primary entrance.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee and approve the proposal. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six to two. Messrs. James and Tissian dissented and Mr. Schaaf abstained.

Mr. Sklaroff recused.

261 South 22nd Street

Owner: Virgil Procaccino

Applicant: Craig Deutsch, architect

History: c. 1890, garage door alteration 1911, façade demolished 2005

Proposal: Construction of new façade

Architectural Committee Recommendation: split recommendation – one member recommended reconstruction of the corbels and the reinstallation of the historic cornice on the new façade; one recommended approval of the new façade as submitted

This application requests the construction of a new façade. At its last meeting, the Commission approved the demolition of the historic façade based upon its condition. They asked the applicant to store the cornice for possible incorporation into the new design. The applicant has proposed a design to match the neighboring new building.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal. Stephen Pollack, attorney for the applicant, described the deteriorated condition of the historic cornice upon the demolition of the front façade of this building. He claimed that a reconstruction of the historic façade would not be compatible to the contemporary design of the new, neighboring building. He explained that the floor levels of the new façade would be the same as the historic building, the commercial front would be similar and the window patterns would be similar. Mr. Wilds questioned that if so much of the new design would be like the historic façade, why it would prove infeasible to replicate the corbels and cornice of the historic façade. Mr. Pollock asserted that the historic building was not distinctive. Mr. Baron countered that the building was a unique carriage house in the neighborhood.

Mr. Wilds inquired into the cost of replicating the corbels and cornice; Mr. Pollock said that the cost was not investigated. Mr. Wilds noted that the cost of the project totaled approximately \$1.5 million. Virgil Procaccino claimed that the corbels would no longer meet building code owing to their projection. Mr. Perri disagreed.

Ms. Murray moved to approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. Rivera seconded motion, which passed with a vote of seven to zero. Mr. Wilds abstained.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

1528 Waverly Street

Owner: Ursula Hobson

Applicant: Ariel Vazquez

History: c. 1895; new storefront, c. 1950

Proposal: Changes to garage and front doors

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10

This application proposes to change the ground floor of this late nineteenth-century commercial building facing Waverly Street. The Historical Commission approved changes and additions to this building on 30 April 2002. At that time the approval included the enlargement of the ground floor to accommodate two garage doors. The applicant now wishes to reconfigure this ground floor to include two smaller garage doors divided by a central fixed window, which would mirror the window design on the upper floors and complement the verticality and symmetry of the rest of the building. In addition, the applicant wishes to replace an existing door with a new wood door of similar design and place a canvas awning over the opening.

Mr. Danta presented the application. Hugh Zimmers, the architect, represented the application.

Mr. Wilds moved to approve the proposal. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2525 South Garnet Street

Owners: Tina Rago and Harry Kane

Applicant: Ralph Hayden

History: 1910, James and John Windrim

Proposal: Enclose rear porch, construct new rear deck

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval of the project as submitted, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

This application proposes to enclose a screened porch. The porch is located on the rear of the property. It is visible from Shunk Street and partially visible from 19th Street. Currently, the porch is semi-enclosed with screens and siding.

The applicant proposes to place a sliding door in the facade facing Shunk Street, where a screen door exists today. He also proposes to add a double-hung window on the rear portion of the porch. Both areas would be sealed with "Philadelphia Board" or beaded board. The opposite side of the porch, away from Shunk Street, would be closed up completely with beaded board and the existing non-historic steps removed. In addition, the applicant proposes to install a raised wooden deck, which would wrap around the Shunk Street side of the porch and out into the rear yard. The deck would be adjacent to the property line and would have its own railing. The historic hairpin fence between the two properties would remain.

Mr. Danta presented the proposal. Both the owner, Harry Kane, and the contractor, Ralph Hayden, were present. Ms. Murray and Mr. Sugrue noted that the plans are unclear. They asked for an explanation of the proposal. Mr. Kane explained that they are trying to enlarge the kitchen with an eating area by enclosing the porch. Mr. Sklaroff

clarified that the porch was already partially enclosed. He also noted that the rears were originally open and that an approval would further erode the historic openness. He also remarked that the deck would fill some of the historic open space.

Ms. Murray moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; Standard 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.]; and 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.]. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2015 Spruce Street

Owner: Kenneth Balin

Applicant: Thomas Witt, Esq.

History: 1867

Proposal: Remove side bay and wall, construct one-story addition in side yard – in concept

Architectural Committee Recommendation: split recommendation – one member recommended approval of the proposal; one member recommended that the addition to be set back the width of the side yard

This application in concept proposes the removal of a metal and leaded-glass bay facing the side yard of this brownstone on Spruce Street. The existing bay does not extend to the second or third floors. In its place, the applicant proposes to construct a one-story addition, which would infill the entirety of the side yard. The application also proposes to alter the openings of the rear ell facing the back yard, which currently has a sliding door. In the place of these sliding doors, the applicant proposes to place three double-leaf French doors. The entire wall on the ground floor facing the yard would be removed to expand the rooms on this rear ell. However, no structural drawings have been executed yet that detail how the loads of the upper floors would be transferred or dealt with once the ground floor wall is removed.

Mr. Danta presented the proposal. Mr. Witt appeared on behalf of the owner. He explained that the alterations will not be visible. Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Witt if a zoning hearing would be triggered by this application. Mr. Witt explained that the proposal would, in fact, require a zoning hearing. Mr. James and Mr. Schaaf had questions regarding the retention of the fire escape and the rooftop pathway from that stair. Mr. Riviera explained that he thought that some setback of the new addition would preserve a sense of the rear ell. Mr. Witt explained that the owners would like the extra square footage for circulation.

Mr. Wilds moved to approve the proposal as submitted. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 7 to 1. Mr. Rivera dissented.

265 South 19th Street

Owner: Premier Properties

Applicant: Lanny Leibowitz, architect

History: c. 1855; alterations, c. 1950

Proposal: Roof deck on rear ell, exterior alterations

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10

On 26 April 2005 the Architectural Committee reviewed this proposal as part of a larger application. At that time the committee suggested that a staff member should investigate the locations of proposed window openings. Mr. Baron of the staff performed this site visit and found that there was CMU block infill in the locations where the applicant wished to open two new windows for the commercial space. The applicant now returns seeking approval for these openings, which include two at the ground-floor level and two at the rear ell. The two proposed openings on the side of the building would be glazed with fixed-pane display windows for the commercial space. This treatment would be in keeping with the c. 1960 alterations to this commercial ground floor. The two new windows at the rear ell would be wood one-over-one double-hung windows.

Mr. Danta presented the application.

Mr. Wilds moved to approve the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1723 Walnut Street

Owner: Two Nuts, LP

Applicant: H&M, tenant

History: c. 1961

Proposal: Remove original metal and glass entryway, construct new glass entryway

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval

This two-story six-bay modern building is listed as non-contributing within the Rittenhouse/Fitler Residential District. During the creation of this district, a clear distinction was made between residential buildings that had been transformed into commercial spaces through the passage of time versus those structures that were constructed specifically as commercial spaces. This building is an example of the later and as such it was classified as non-contributing.

This application proposes to demolish the original circular bronze and glass entry way of the building. The applicant proposes to reconstruct a new cubic contemporary glass and stainless steel entryway. The new entryway would occupy the same location as the existing one and have roughly the same dimensions.

Mr. Danta presented the proposal. Mr. Wilds asked about the proposal to add upper stories to this building. Mr. Sklaroff explained that it may be in litigation.

Mr. James moved to approve the proposal. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. Mr. Schaaf abstained.

THE REPORT OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE HISTORICAL COMMISSION STAFF, AUGUST 2005

Mr. Farnham presented the report and asked if the Commissioners had any questions or comments. They had none.

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to approve the \$ 15.33 expenditure for lunches for the Architectural Committee. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Sugrue and seconded by Mr. James, the meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Jon Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Officer
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner