

**THE MINUTES OF THE 488TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

11 April 2003

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

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
Duane Bumb, Deputy Director, Department of Commerce
Thomas Chapman, City Planning Commission
Warren Huff, City Planning Commission
Kathleen Murray, Council President Verna's Office
David Perri, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Joan Schlotterbeck, Department of Public Property
Denise Smyler, Esq.
Harris Steinberg, AIA
Scott Wilds, Assistant Director, Office of Housing and Community Development

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

Lawrence Copeland, Esq., Senior Attorney, Law Department

Also

Jack Panitch, 322 South Lawrence Court
Siraik Zakarian, 2201 Green Street
Sheldon Strober, 327 South Juniper Street
Scott Trull, 327 South Juniper Street
William Caton, 241-43 Chestnut Street
Linda Holberg, 934 Locust Street
Jeremy Wells, 4701 Pine Street
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Bob Hytha, 539 Queen Street
Rick Shaffer, 613-21 Catharine Street
Dave Nasatir, 1617 John F. Kennedy Boulevard
Bill Alesker,
William Merewether, 2135 Green Street
Kalyan Som, 30 N. Preston Street
Jeff Glassberg, 222 Race Street
Michael Stern, 2522 Pine Street
Lenore Millhollen, Preservation Alliance, Center City Residents Association
Fred Duling, 1903-05 Green Street
Al Petursen, 1717 Spring Garden Street
Sandy Lazouriz, 622 Catharine Street
Chip Pressman, 622 Catharine Street
Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association
Stephen Verner, 277 South 6th Street
Mitchell Golding, 637 Catharine Street

Alan Krigman, 211 South 45th Street
Robin Schatz, Councilman DiCicco's office
Mike Lavery, Philadelphia Water Department
Ted Watson, 114 Elfreth's Alley
Brian Reinmiller, 2319 Green Street

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 488th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:05 a.m.

Minutes of the 487th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Upon a motion made by Mr. Wilds and seconded by Ms. Murray, the Commission voted to approve the minutes of the 487th Stated Meeting, 14 March 2003, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

Old Business

158 North 3rd Street

Brad Meyers, Owner

Mark Kaman, Contractor/Applicant

Date: c. 1910

Proposal: Rooftop deck, extend chimney

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with railing set back in line with the chimney.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal and noted that the architect met with George Voight and Ed Jackson at the Department of Licenses and Inspections. L&I did not have concerns with the height of the neighboring chimney, since the chimney and roof deck have uses in opposite seasons. Mark Kaman, the contractor for the project, said that the owner had contact with the neighbor and the neighbor does not object to the deck. With the railing set back to the neighboring chimney, the deck's visibility is minimal. Mr. Sklaroff asked if the neighbor should submit a letter stating his non-opposition to the deck. Mr. Perri replied that since the chimney does not require alteration, he did not think a letter necessary.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal with the railing set back in line with the neighboring chimney. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

2201 Green Street, Bergdoll Mansion

Siraik Zakarian, Owner/Applicant

Date: c. 1890, attributed to James Windrim, architect

Proposal: Side demolition, addition, fencing

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

Mr. Baron recapped the proposal and said that staff and Mr. Rivera have toured the building. The applicant has also submitted the additional drawings requested by the Commission. The only change to the proposal since last month is the position of the fence. He also noted that the work will be visible from Green Street and includes demolition of a major design feature and the covering of another major feature.

Siraik Zakarian, the owner, claimed that the area of work is not very visible, especially when the landscaping matures. She referred to numerous photographs of the building. Ms. Zakarian noted that she wants the addition to connect some interior spaces and create an additional apartment. Although she was not making a financial hardship application, she needed the additional rental income to support the maintenance of the building.

On the site visit Mr. Rivera and staff offered other options that would give her the required space, but retain the important historical features of the house. Mr. Sklaroff emphasized the historical and architectural importance of the Bergdoll Mansion. He noted that other design options may satisfy her needs and also meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. However, Ms. Zakarian did not want to discuss other options. Ms. Smyler opined that the visibility of the alterations was secondary, but she objected to the amount of demolition and covering of important features.

Mr. Sklaroff enumerated several points: the area of work is visible from various perspectives, although not highly visible; the proposal was not based on financial hardship; the addition will include the demolition of the conservatory and cover the two-story bay. In response to a question, Ms. Zakarian noted that the renovation of the conservatory would be costly. Ms. Smyler noted that perhaps the owner should return with a hardship application. Mr. Wilds and Mr. Steinberg concurred.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance noted that absent a financial hardship application, the proposal clearly violates the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Ms. Smyler made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and deny the proposal. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed with seven votes. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

Report of the Architectural Committee, 25 March 2003, Suzanne Pentz, Vice-Chair

Mr. Sklaroff said that the Committee had a full agenda. Since many of the applications involved the Spring Garden Historic District, he asked the Commission to note the increase of work created with the designation of a new district.

265 South 22nd Street

Quaiser Bakht, Owner

Evan Rofheart, Applicant

Date: c. 1890

Proposal: Re-side rear

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial as submitted. Applicant should provide additional information

Mr. Baron explained the proposal and noted that the owner has not provided additional information.

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

1933-35 Spruce Street

George Karavis, Owner

Jane Golden, Mural Arts Program, Applicant

Date: c. 1865

Proposal: Mural on 20th Street façade

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron described the application. No one representing the proposal was present.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and deny the proposal.

Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

241-43 Chestnut Street

Carol Caton, Owner

Doug Seiler, Architect/Applicant

Date: 241: 1857, Stephen Button, architect; 243: 1897, Wilson Eyre, architect

Proposal: add to fire escape on 241, new dormer on 243, rear stairtower and addition

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Conceptual approval of extension of fire-escape on 241 Chestnut Street; changing windows to doors on easternmost bay of 241 Chestnut Street, keeping head and jambs with muntin patterns similar to the existing; conceptual approval of dormer on 243 Chestnut Street, but its location should be restudied and the windows re-configured with a section drawing through the space presented; a railing installed in the steps of the basement areaway of 243; rear addition on 243 with a deck situated below the beltcourse. For the addition, the Committee recommended the retention of the quoins and a more vertical design.

Mr. Baron explained the various aspects of the proposal. He noted that the applicant has spoken with the owner of 239 Chestnut Street and that owner has agreed to sharing the fire-escapes. Mr. Perri stated that sharing the fire-escapes may be possible to meet the building code, but it would be very complicated.

Commission members questioned the recommendation of approval of the dormer on 243 Chestnut Street. Mr. Wilds noted that the Commission has paid considerable attention to this building in the past.

Doug Seiler, the architect for the project, said that the building offered a complicated floor plan. The extension of fire-escapes on 241 Chestnut would offer the required second means of egress for the apartments in that building. The restaurant located in 239 would expand into 241, further meshing the two buildings, although they are under different ownership. If necessary, they can have the fire-stair on the interior of the building, but it would occupy a large amount of square footage; the floors would then be difficult to rehabilitate into usable space. Mr. Seiler noted that the dormer on 243 is not necessary for light and air requirements, but allows additional head room and makes the attic space usable. The areaway in the basement of 243 exists from the mid-19th century building that once occupied the lot. The plan is to make it permanently open with a railing to serve as a second means of egress from the basement.

Commission members discussed the various parts of the proposal at length.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve in concept the additions on the rear of 241 and 243 Chestnut Street and the railing to the basement egress, and denial of the fire-escapes and new

doors on 241 Chestnut Street and the dormer on 243 Chestnut. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six to two. Mr. Huff and Mr. Bumb dissented.

47-49 North 2nd Street

Second and Cuthbert, LLC, Owner

Stephen Mileto, Architect/Applicant

Date: 1858; 20th century, altered with the removal of upper floors

Proposal: Façade rehabilitation, new storefront windows and door

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the window and masonry restoration, cutting a new storefront window on Cuthbert Street façade, storefront elements should have frames with staff to review details. Denial of cutting large windows and infill of basement windows, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Baron presented the application for the property. He explained that the building originally had three additional floors, as shown in a Baxter's survey. Commission members discussed the various windows proposed for the building.

Mr. Bumb made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and approve the window and masonry restoration, cutting the new storefront window in the western end of Cuthbert Street façade and new storefront elements with wider frames; but denial of cutting the large windows and infill of the basement windows on the Cuthbert Street façade. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

539 Queen Street

Vince Talotta, Owner

Robert Hytha, Architect/Applicant

Date: c. 1820

Proposal: Complete demolition, new construction with garage

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9 and 10.

Committee recommended approval of the demolition of the present building and its reconstruction with its historic features, subject to construction documents in place, with staff to review details. This recommendation stems in part from the demolition by neglect of the building.

Over the course of several years, L&I issued several violations on the property for demolition by neglect. Mr. Baron noted that staff approved star bolts to stabilize the property in 2001; however, the owner never performed the work. Suzanne Pentz, a structural engineer, investigated the property and found that it would not be salvageable. The application is for the complete demolition of the property and the construction of a new building with a garage.

Commission members discussed the demolition by neglect. Mr. Tyler quoted section (9)(d) of the ordinance, stating that "any person who alters or demolishes a building, structure, site or object in violation of the provisions of Section 14-2007 or in violation of any conditions or requirements specified in a permit shall be required to restore the building, structure, site or object involved to its appearance prior to the violation." Anthony Talotta, son of the owner, said that his father agrees with the Committee's recommendation.

Councilman DiCicco noted that the new construction, if it matches the original building, does not have a garage. He asked if the owner must go to the Zoning Board of Adjustment for a variance

from the requirement that all new construction have on-site parking. Mr. Sklaroff said that the owner may have to appear before the ZBA, but noted that it is a result of his non-compliance with the violations he received. Mr. Tyler said that he would write a letter of support for the variance and testify to the ZBA if necessary.

Mr. Huff made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and approve the demolition of the building and the construction of a new house on the condition that the details match the original, with staff to review details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

757 South Front Street

Jean Vidi, Owner

R. J. Pisani, Applicant

Date: c. 1790

Proposal: Side addition, rear deck and alter dormer

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

The applicant has withdrawn the proposal.

613-21 Catharine Street

Robert Shaffer, Owner/Applicant

Date: 1838

Proposal: Rehabilitation of historic building, construction of 13 townhouses – final approval

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval on the condition that the historic entrance be restored and the central windows do not have the new mullions, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. She outlined the rehabilitation of the historic building and the design of the new construction. She also noted that although the Commission approved in concept only three houses along Catharine Street, the proposal for final approval includes four houses at the street line.

Mr. Alesker, architect for the project, noted that he has devised a way to have the proper fire rating for the party walls in the historic building without the mullions in the windows. He said that he did not believe the design of the development would be as successful with only three houses along Catharine Street. Four houses at the curb provided a more interesting and cohesive streetscape. Mr. Huff noted that four houses helped restore the street wall; however, Mr. Steinberg noted that the street wall in front of the historic building never existed in the first place. That area along Catharine Street was always a void and should be retained as such. Mr. Sklaroff noted that the view corridor to the building has been unimpaired since 1838 and asked if the development would fail with only three houses along Catharine Street. Mr. Steinberg opined that putting a house in front of this building analogous to having a building in front of Founder's Hall in Girard College.

Rick Shaffer, the developer, said that his office tried to blend the historic building with new construction. They met with the neighbors on several occasions and the development needs only one variance because the rear houses lack a street front. The project also includes a community park to assuage those that used to work in the community garden.

Councilman DiCicco said that he has been working with the developers for the property. Originally the proposal included the demolition of the historic building and the construction of 24 townhouses. The scope has been reduced to only 19 units, six in the historic building and 13 on the vacant land. He wished that the property had been maintained like Founder's Hall, but it has fallen into a state of disrepair and has become a blight in the community. He asked the Commission to consider approval of four houses along Catharine Street.

Mr. Wilds noted that full view of the historic building is available to any pedestrian if they walk up to the fence. Ms. Smyler agreed with Councilman DiCicco in that the property has become an eyesore in the community.

Chip Pressman, a resident across the street, noted that he has an unobstructed view of the historic building now and objected to the fourth house. He argued against the development because the formerly public space would become a gated community.

Paul DiFrancesco objected to the gated aspect of the development. He mourned the loss of the community garden and noted that the historic building can be viewed from three different streets. These views will be obstructed with the new construction.

Mitchell Golding spoke in favor of the development and opined that the fourth house on Catharine Street adds to the streetscape.

Tom Kirk also spoke in favor of the project.

Mr. Steinberg noted that the Commission must balance the needs of development and its job as stewards of the City's historic buildings. He opined that the fourth house along Catharine Street compromised the historic view and destroyed the cadence of the streetscape.

Mr. Bumb made a motion to approve the proposal with four houses along Catharine Street, on the condition that the central windows do not have the new mullions and the historic entrance be restored, with staff to review details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed with six votes. Mr. Sklaroff and Mr. Steinberg dissented.

Mr. Huff left the meeting and Joan Schlotterbeck arrived to represent the Department of Public Property.

2028-30 Fairmount Avenue

Savaas Navrdeidis, Owner

Kalyan Som, Architect/Applicant

Date: c. 1855

Proposal: Replace storefronts, replace façade of 2028, and new 4th-story additions

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the storefront alterations. Denial of the mansard roof and demolition of the façade, pursuant to Standards 3, 9 and 10.

Mr. Baron described the proposal. Mr. Steinberg questioned the mansard roofs on the buildings. Kalyan Som, architect for the proposal, stated that he designed the mansards for several reasons. First, these houses stand across the street from Eastern State Penitentiary and south of Girard College. The view from the fourth floor would include Founder's Hall at Girard College. Second, with the new storefronts, he thought the buildings needed a strong element at the roofline to balance the ornate first floor. Third, the mansard was used often in Philadelphia as a means to

construct an additional floor. Mr. Wilds noted that the allowance of the mansards on the existing buildings would set a dangerous precedent.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and approve the storefront alterations, but deny the demolition of the façade and the construction of the mansard roofs. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of four to two, with two abstentions. Mr. Steinberg and Mr. Bumb dissented. Mr. Sklaroff and Ms. Schlotterbeck abstained.

2032 Fairmount Avenue

Savaas Navrdeidis, Owner

Kaylan Som, Architect/Applicant

Proposal: New construction on vacant lot

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

Mr. Baron presented the proposal for new construction on an empty lot. Mr. Sklaroff noted that since the lot was vacant at the time of designation, the Commission's comments are not binding. Commission members discussed the mansard roof. Mr. Tyler noted that a single mansard roof in a row of Italianate buildings is not uncommon in Philadelphia, especially in the Spring Garden Historic District. Mr. Som added that without the mansard the building would appear as "a cowering little boy." Commission members applauded the owner for not including a garage.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the new construction, but not with the mansard roof. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed with five votes. Mr. Bumb, Mr. Steinberg and Mr. Sklaroff dissented.

2043 Mt. Vernon Street

2043 Mt. Vernon Street LLC, Owner

Benson Goldberger, Applicant

Date: c. 1855

Proposal: Rebuild porches

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the reconstruction of the porches provided they are painted and turned balusters matching the posts are installed at the 2nd-story level, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron presented the application, which proposes rebuilding 2nd and 3rd-story rear porches that were extant at designation. During his presentation, he held up an example of a turned baluster for Commission members to examine.

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

2238-40 Mt. Vernon Street

Jack Jallo and Gage Johnson, Owners

Michael Bruder, Contractor/Applicant

Date: c. 1859

Proposal: 4th floor rear addition with balconies and roof deck

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the fourth-floor addition, rear garden wall, double-leaf doors and balconettes in concept, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Denial of the penthouse and roof deck, pursuant to Standard 9 and roofing guidelines.

The applicant has withdrawn the proposal

2100-10 Fairmount Avenue

Donato Spaventa, Owner

Angela Vendetti, Applicant

Date: 1922

Proposal: Cut new storefront windows, awnings

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval in concept with casement windows provided that the original window openings are reopened, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

The applicant has withdrawn the proposal

625 North 16th Street

Jonathan Oler, Owner/Applicant

Date: c. 1859

Proposal: Legalize side stairs, close rear door and basement windows, stucco watertable; new parking and fence at rear

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the addition of the steps on the side and the closing of the rear door, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10; approval of the addition of the rear fence and parking, pursuant to the site guideline; and approval of the closing of the basement windows and the application of the stucco on the rear ell watertable for a period not to exceed two years, pursuant to Standard 6. Within the two-year period, the stucco must be removed and the basement windows reopened and replaced. All with staff to review details.

Ms. Spina presented the project. The current proposal includes legalizing several items: removing the basement windows in the rear ell and applying stucco to the watertable; redirecting the stairs leading to the existing door on the side elevation; removing the existing door and stairs on the rear elevation. The application also includes installing a black aluminum fence surrounding the rear yard and parking area with a curb cut for three vehicles.

During their discussion, Commission members asked about the condition of the stucco watertable and the process of reopening and replacing the basement windows.

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

1717 Spring Garden Street

Mario Santoro, Owner/Applicant

Date: c. 1878 by Charles Budd for John B. Stetson

Proposal: new rear addition and balcony, new side dormers

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the first-story addition, new side door and steps, balcony with door, and the southern dormer below the mansard roofline, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10; and denial of the northern dormer, pursuant to Standard 9 and the roofing guideline.

Ms. Spina introduced the project for a one-story rear addition, new door and balcony, and two dormers, a north and south, in the mansard of the east façade of the rear ell. Al Peterson, the architect, submitted an updated design to the Commission that included a smaller northern dormer than the one originally proposed. Ms. Spina elaborated on the visibility of the intended changes, noting that all would be visible. Mr. Wilds, Mr. Bumb, Mr. Steinberg, and Mr. Sklaroff inquired about the proposed dormers. Ms. Spina summarized the Committee's reasoning for recommending approval of the southern but not the northern dormer. Following this discussion, the architect noted that his client sought approval of a small balconette not the large balcony shown on the revised drawing. The small balconette had been discussed by the Architectural Committee, which recommended its approval.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the revised design, which includes the first-story addition, new side door and steps, balcony with door, and the southern dormer as well as the smaller northern dormer, provided that a balconette is substituted for the larger balcony, with staff to review details. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

1903-05 Green Street

Fred Duling, Owner/Applicant

Date: 1903: c. 1859, refaced with Roman brick c. 1895; 1905: c. 1935

Proposal: Three-story addition with underground parking at 1905; roof decks on 1903 and 1905

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the addition at 1905 Green with the revisions to the cornice, pursuant to Standard 9 and the setting guidelines. Approval of the rehabilitation of 1903 Green with substitution of a double-leaf door for the proposed single-leaf door, pursuant to the entrance guideline. Denial of the roof decks and penthouses on main roof of 1903 Green, pursuant to Standard 9. All with staff to review details.

Ms. Spina presented the project for a large development of apartments with parking, which included a new addition at 1905 Green and the rehabilitation of 1903 Green. The Commission then discussed it with Fred Duling, the applicant, and John Bushnell, his architect. Mr. Wilds asked about sight line studies and the visibility of the rooftop decks and penthouses. Mr. Bushnell claimed that the rooftop additions would be not visible. Mr. Steinberg inquired about the Commission's jurisdiction for the new construction at 1905 Green Street. Ms. Spina explained that, because of the demolition, the Commission had full jurisdiction over the new building.

Mr. Bumb made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion.

Mr. Steinberg stated that he would prefer a more contemporary look for the new construction. Mr. Bushnell countered that the new building would be able to be easily differentiated from the surrounding historical buildings. Ms. Spina added that the Spring Garden Civic Association preferred and approved of the historicist design. Discussion returned to the roof decks. Realizing

that he had made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, which did not include the decks on the main section of the historic building at 1903 Green, Mr. Bumb attempted to amend his motion to include an approval of the decks. Mr. Wilds seconded Mr. Bumb's amended motion. Ms. Smyler, who had seconded Mr. Bumb's original motion, asserted that she would not withdraw her second. The Chair stated that original motion therefore stood and cautioned Mr. Bumb to craft his motions more carefully.

The Chair called a vote. Mr. Sklaroff, Mr. Steinberg, Ms. Smyler, and Ms. Murray voted to approve Mr. Bumb's original motion; Mr. Wilds, Ms. Schlotterbeck, Mr. Perri, and Mr. Bumb voted against it. The vote was tied and the motion failed.

Mr. Bumb offered a new motion to approve of the proposal as submitted including all decks, provided that the cornice at 1905 Green is revised and a double-leaf door is substituted for the proposed single-leaf door at 1903, with staff to review details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which was passed 5 to 3. Ms. Smyler, Mr. Steinberg, and Mr. Sklaroff opposed the motion.

2319-31 Green Street, St. Francis Xavier Church

Archdiocese of Philadelphia, Owner

Brian Reinmiller, Contractor/Applicant

Date: 1894-98, Edwin Forrest Durang, architect; renovated 1906-08, Durang, architect

Proposal: New light fixtures

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with spherical globes, with staff to review details, pursuant to Restoration Standard 7.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal to add light fixtures. Mr. Sklaroff asked if everyone was in agreement.

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

2135 Green Street

Eve Chaloner and William Merewether, Owners/Applicants

Date: c. 1859

Proposal: New windows with applied muntins, 2nd floor rear addition with bay, roof deck and stairtower

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval with staff to review details including the pane pattern of the front windows, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal including the new windows and work at the rear.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

829 North 29th Street

North 29th Street Association, Owner

William Alesker, Architect/Applicant

Date: 1874

Proposal: Rear addition – final approval

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission had approved the addition in concept provided that the applicant augment the number of dormers. The new plans show two more dormers.

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

328-30 Delancey Street

Richard Cohen, Owner

Christopher Scalone, Architect/Applicant

Date: 1950

Proposal: New construction with garage – final approval

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham explained that the proposed design is very similar to the design given conceptual approval in July 2000. Mr. Sklaroff noted the canted façade and praised the contemporary yet compatible design.

Mr. Bumb made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Ms. Smyler.

227 South 6th Street, Lippincott Building

MCW Enterprises, Incorporated, Owner

Stephen Verner, Architect/Applicant

Date: 1900, William Pritchett, architect

Proposal: New doors and ladders on roof of north elevation

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval, provided a sample of the painted metal is mounted for review by the Committee and staff, pursuant to the roofing guideline.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal for access to the previously approved mechanical rooms on the roof. The new design has three ladders and catwalks on the north façade of the building. She noted that the original proposal for access is now infeasible owing to the floor plan of the mechanical rooms.

Mr. Bumb made a motion to accept the Committee recommendation. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed with seven votes. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

322 South Lawrence Court

Jack Panitch, Owner/Applicant

Date: c. 1970, Bower & Fradley, architects, for Penn Tower Development Corporation

Proposal: Replace windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5 and 6.

Mr. Farnham explained that he and Mr. Tyler visited the house to take measure of the existing windows. He explained that the proposed windows differ from the originals. The originals are wood; the new windows would be aluminum clad. Also, the dimensions of the details of the new windows would differ from those of the originals.

Mr. Panitch explained that he wishes to purchase windows with internal blinds, which are only available on the Pella clad window. He said that he could have new wood windows custom made to match the original; however, this would add \$3,000 to the cost of the project for a total of \$14,000.

Mr. Bumb made a motion to accept the applicant's proposal with staff to review details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of five to one, with one abstention. Mr. Steinberg dissented and Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

12 South 12th Street, PSFS Building

Loews Hotel, Owner

Patrick Dewey, Applicant

Date: 1932, George Howe and William Lescaze, architects

Proposal: Awning

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial pursuant to Standard 9.

The application was withdrawn.

Ms. Smyler returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

327 South Juniper Street

Sheldon Strober and C. Scott Trull, Owners/Applicants

Date: c. 1835

Proposal: Install skylight, roof deck with hatch, stockade garden fence

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and roofing guideline.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal, noting that the deck would have limited visibility from Panama Street. No buildings front onto this block of Panama, which is a narrow alley.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which passed seven to one. Mr. Sklaroff dissented.

235 South 10th Street

Linda Holberg, Owner/Applicant

Date: c. 1840

Proposal: Legalize replacement vinyl windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5 and 6.

Mr. Farnham explained that historic wood windows were removed and vinyl windows installed without a permit. He noted that because the building has multiple apartments as well as a ground floor restaurant that it would require a permit for windows regardless of its historical status. Harris Steinberg asked if the shutters were added without a permit as well. It was agreed that they were not related to the current application.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and deny the legalization of the windows. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Thomas Chapman arrived to represent the Planning Commission

1001 Chestnut Street, Victory Building

Philadelphia Management, Owner

Annette Billups, Applicant

Date: original building, Henry Fernbach, architect, 1873; three floors added by Phillip Roos, architect, 1891; three-bay annex added by Roos, 1895; two bays added to annex by Roos, 1900.

Proposal: New doors in annex

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

The applicant has withdrawn the proposal.

1226-32 Walnut Street

Royal Bank of Pennsylvania, Owner

Liz Pisano, Applicant

Built: 1901-04, Horace Trumbauer, architect

Proposal: Cut new storefront door, install ATM, close existing door

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Table for 30 days for the applicant to conduct additional research.

Staff granted the applicant a 30-day continuance.

24-48 South Broad Street, Girard Trust Bank

The Ritz Carlton, Owner

Myra DeGersdorf, Applicant

Date: dome: 1905-08, McKim, Mead & White and Furness, Evans & Co., architects; tower: c. 1930, McKim, Mead & White, architects

Proposal: Replacement door on Chestnut Street, new awnings

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the replacement door on Chestnut Street and approval of awning over Chestnut Street door, with staff to review shop drawings, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Denial of all other awnings on the domed building, pursuant to the storefront guideline.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal for a new door in an existing opening and awnings. She noted that only the domed building appears on the Philadelphia Register; the Commission does not have jurisdiction over the tower. Photographs from 1908 and 1911, the peak of popularity for awnings for commercial as well as residential buildings, show the domed building without awnings.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed with eight votes. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

1100 Block Sigel Street

Michael Lavery, Water Department, Applicant

Date: c. 1900

Proposal: Replace brick paving with asphalt

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, 9 and 10.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal to the Commission. Part of the Historic Street Paving Thematic District, the 1100-block of Sigel Street is a dead-end street paved with red brick and fronted by commercial and light-industrial buildings. Mike Lavery represented the Water Department. After presenting a letter from the Water Commissioner describing the project, he contended that public money should not be used to relay the brick street because the block was inaccessible and little used. Mr. Wilds questioned Mr. Lavery about the costs of restoring the brick versus paving with asphalt. He replied that he did not have the figures. In response to a question, Mr. Lavery noted that approximately half of the historic brick could be salvaged. He added that relaying the brick would require more labor than laying asphalt. He then clarified that the question of whether or not to relay the historic brick "was not a question of funding but of appropriateness." Mr. Sklaroff asked if other alternatives had been considered. Mr. Lavery replied that none had. Mr. Sklaroff then stated that the application was tantamount to requesting that the Commission decertify the block for reasons of financial hardship. Ms. Smyler quickly clarified that the applicant had specifically stated that appropriateness, not funding, was the basis of the Water Department's application. The applicant was not making a claim of financial hardship, she asserted.

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

New Business

Discussion of Proposed Districts

The Chair initiated a discussion on the Commission's designation of historic districts. Currently, a large segment of the staff's resources are dedicated to reviewing applications for work to buildings and sites on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, he asserted. The staffing levels may not be adequate to accommodate the new work created by the addition of new historic districts such as the proposed Old City Historic District. The Commission, he contended, must recognize the new burdens and responsibilities that accompany the creation of new districts; the Commission must have the staff in place to enforce new districts before they are created. Continuing, Mr. Sklaroff noted that he is working with the administration to find new support for the staff. It must be acknowledged, he noted, that the City has its limits and the Commission must work within those limits. Two solutions to the problem of funding and staffing may include help from other municipal agencies and support from private foundations. Mr. Steinberg inquired

about the help other agencies might provide. Mr. Sklaroff answered that the Commission may be able to borrow staff from other City offices. He then reiterated that he wanted everyone to understand that new districts add new burdens to the staff. Everyone must understand these burdens, he asserted, before new districts can be created. Mr. Tyler stated that he believed that the Commission office would be able to undertake the new work engendered by the creation of the Old City District without more staff, but would not be able to handle additional new districts.

New Policy under Amended Pennsylvania "Right to Know Law"

Mr. Copeland, counsel for the Commission, had planned to present the new policy required for compliance with the amended Pennsylvania "Right to Know Law." Owing to time constraints, Commission members decided to postpone consideration of the policy for one month.

Certified Local Government Comment

1801-23 North 10th Street, Class and Nachod Brewery

Mr. Tyler explained that, as part of its Certified Local Government (CLG) requirements, the Historical Commission must comment on nominations to the National Register of Historic Places. He then presented the nomination for 1801-1823 N. 10th Street, the Class & Nachod Brewery.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to recommend the listing of 1801-23 North 10th Street, the Class and Nachod Brewery, on the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

1825-51 North 10th Street, N. Snellenberg Company Department Store Warehouse

Mr. Tyler presented the nomination for 1825-1851 N. 10th Street, the N. Snellenburg Company Department Store Warehouse.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to recommend the entry of 1825-1851 N. 10th Street, the N. Snellenburg Company Department Store Warehouse, on the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Report of the Historical Commission Staff, March 2003, Richard Tyler

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

Harry A. Batten Memorial Fund

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to approve the expenditure of \$36.82 for the Architectural Committee lunches.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the Batten Fund expenditure of \$36.82. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

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

The meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jonathan Farnham, Historic Preservation Planner
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner