

**THE MINUTES OF THE 525TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

12 MAY 2006

1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18029

MICHAEL SKLAROFF, ESQ., CHAIR

PRESENT

Michael Sklaroff, Chair
Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D., Vice Chair
Warren Huff, City Planning Commission
Joseph James, Department of Public Property
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Kathleen Murray, Office of Council President
David Perri, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Vincent Rivera, AIA
Denise Smyler, Esq.
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing & Community Development
John Wurtenberg

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Jon Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director
Erin McGinn, Historic Preservation Planner
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician
Leonard Reuter, Assistant City Solicitor, Law Department

ALSO PRESENT

Burt Wescott, Hunt Engineering Co.
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association
Kevin Rasmussen
Robert Graves, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
Arlene Matzkin, Friday Architects
Michael Green
Eric L. Cramer
M. Donohoe
N. Baiers
Frank Kakos, Kakos Architects
William Kane, Kane Woodworking
Bernard Rothman
Charles Loomis, Loomis McAfee Architects
Deborah Goldberg
Gerry Gutierrez, Group G
Janice Woodcock, Capital Program Office
Jenna Russell
Jon Wagner, architect
Kathleen and Randal Lewis
Steven Shapiro, Acorn Property Development
Michael Greene

525TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 525th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:05 a.m.

MINUTES OF THE 524TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Upon a motion proffered by Mr. Sugrue and seconded by Mr. Rivera, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes as corrected of the 524th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 13 April 2006.

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 APRIL 2006, VINCENT RIVERA, CHAIR

302-304 GASKILL STREET

Applicant: Steven Shapiro

Owner: Randolph Lewis

Project: Demolish party wall, rear façade, and rear roof; construct side and rear addition

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the east party wall, rear wall, rear roof, and interior structure and reconstruct the building with rear and side additions. The side addition would be constructed on a vacant parcel adjacent to the property. The side addition would be three stories tall and faced with brick; a large dormer would punctuate the roof. The design of the side addition would be based on the adjacent historic building. The application also proposes a stairtower addition on the rear of the historic building. This addition would extend above the ridge of the historic gabled roof and would require the demolition of the rear façade and rear half of the gable.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Owners Kathleen and Randal Lewis and architect Kevin Rasmussen represented the application.

MOTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the proposal, pursuant Standards 2, 9, and 10 and New Addition Guidelines. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion.

Mr. Rasmussen provided an overview of the project. He explained that the new construction would more than double the footprint of the property. He would demolish the one-story rear ell at 304 and replace it with a four-story stair tower serving all floors of the new building. Although Mr. Rasmussen acknowledged that the Architectural Committee and community may have concerns, he asserted that his proposal has merit. Mr. Rasmussen stated that the four-story program is critical to the success of the project. He stated that the owners wanted the roof deck and a safe stairway.

Mr. Rasmussen asserted that the stair in the west rear corner works best because it is concealed. He stated that the stair tower could be "tweaked a little," slightly reducing its height. Mr. Rasmussen explained that the historic shape of the building as seen at the party wall would be replicated at the addition, preserving it for the public.

Mr. Sklaroff noted that the Architectural Committee deemed the addition too large and asked if it would be consistent with the zoning at the site. Mr. Rasmussen stated that it would not comply with the current zoning. Mr. Sklaroff asked the architect if he could redesign the building, moving the stair to the new portion of the building, as suggested by Mr. Farnham at the Architectural Committee meeting. He replied that he could revise the design if given clear guidelines.

Mr. Wilds supported the proposal. He reported that the Office of Housing and Development often supports the conversion of two very small houses into one larger house. He recommended approval of the proposal including the design of the new portion. He contended that a contemporary addition would be “jarring.” He stated that this was an appropriate approach to this unique case.

Ms. Smyler expressed concern about the significant demolition; she stated that the proposal would result in the loss of historic fabric. Mr. Baron echoed her concerns. He listed the sections of the historic building to be demolished: the rear ell, rear façade, east party wall, and rear slope of the roof. He posited that the remaining building would not be able to stand after this demolition.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Perri if the Department of Licenses & Inspections would require an engineer to certify the demolition and construction plans. Mr. Perri replied that the Department would impose that requirement for this type of work. Mr. Rasmussen acknowledged that an engineer would be consulted. He then explained that he planned to create large spaces at the first and third floors that would require the demolition of the party wall. Mr. Sklaroff noted that the loss of the party wall was not significant because it would be hidden by any new construction.

Mr. Rasmussen discussed the demolition of the rear façade. He stated that the rear cornice is so low that it is impossible to connect a rear stair to the third floor without breaching it. He claimed that the demolition of the rear slope of the roof was necessary for the implementation of his program.

Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Rasmussen to comment on Mr. Farnham’s proposal to move the stair to the rear of the new portion, thus allowing for the retention of more historic fabric. Mr. Rasmussen replied that it would be possible, but that the revision would shift the tallest portion of the building into a publicly visible area. He stated that he preferred minimizing the scale of the visible portion of the building. Mr. Sklaroff asked where the roof deck is located in the current plan. Mr. Wilds replied that it is on the new portion of the building.

Mr. Rivera opined that the façade of the new building mimics the façade of the old. He commented that the dormer is too large. He suggested that the applicant redesign the façade of the addition. Mr. Sklaroff agreed that the dormer appeared large for the small building. Mr. Rivera asserted that the architect was endeavoring to force too much onto the small building and site. Mr. Rasmussen defended his proposal, stating that the new would be differentiated from the old in the details, not in the massing. Mr. Rivera contended that the design of the addition should be more coherent, not both historic and non-historic.

Mr. Wilds suggested that the current motion could be withdrawn and a motion for

approval in concept of the massing could be proffered. He pointed to the larger buildings on the block as a justification for the large addition.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION: Mr. Sugrue and Ms. Smyler withdrew their motion to deny the proposal.

MOTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to approve the massing of the proposed building in concept, provided the suggestions offered by the Commission are integrated into the revised design. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion.

Mr. Rasmussen asked for a clarification of the motion. Members of the Commission responded that the massing included the stair tower behind either the historic building or the addition. They added that the stair tower could extend above the rear cornice on the historic building. Mr. Rasmussen asked if the motion included the demolition of the rear ell. Mr. Sugrue stated that it did include the demolition of the ell. Mr. Danta clarified that the applicant was requesting approval of the demolition the entire rear façade in addition to the rear ell. Members of the Commission noted that the motion included the demolition of the rear wall.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance asserted that the Commission had ignored the primary issue raised by this proposal, the significant demolition. Quoting from the Commission's ordinance, he reminded the Commissioners that demolition is defined not only as demolition in entirety, but also as demolition in significant part. Mr. Gallery noted that this property was designated individually and as part of a district. Recalling the Commission's denial last month of an application for significant demolition at 316 S. 21st Street, Mr. Gallery suggested that the current application is very similar. Owing to the great loss of historic fabric that would result from the proposed demolition, Mr. Gallery requested not only that the Commission deny the application, but that it acknowledge that the proposed demolition would be demolition in significant part. He asserted that this demolition could only be approved after a finding of financial hardship or public interest. Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Gallery what proposal would be appropriate. He replied that a more modest proposal without so much demolition might be appropriate. He also suggested that the owners buy a bigger house rather than force too much into this small historic building. Mr. Gallery advocated for the classification of this demolition as significant, which would require a finding of financial hardship or public interest before considering an approval. Ms. Smyler asked Mr. Gallery to opine on the demolishing of the party wall. Mr. Gallery responded the party wall alone was not significant, but the aggregate of the demolition was significant. Ms. Smyler asked Mr. Gallery for his opinion of demolition of the party wall; Mr. Gallery stated that he could not draw any conclusions until he saw a plan for the demolition. Mr. Gallery argued that 75% of the historic fabric of this property is proposed to be demolished. Mr. Sklaroff asked if the demolition of the roof tipped this to a significant demolition. Mr. Wilds opined that his percentage was overstated.

Paul Boni of the Society Hill Civic Association noted that this property was not within the jurisdictional boundaries of his association, but that it is within the Society Hill Historic District. Mr. Boni reiterated Mr. Gallery's points regarding the significant demolition. He noted that the ordinance explicitly states that "demolition" includes "the removal or destruction of the façade or surface." Mr. Wilds countered that the "façade" means the "front façade." Mr. Boni asked the Commission to require an engineer's preservation plan to ensure that any demolition would not result in unintended consequences. Mr.

Sklaroff responded that such a requirement is not necessary for a conceptual approval.

Mr. Sklaroff stated that the Commission has discretion when determining whether a proposed demolition is significant. He commented that the Commission must deliberate seriously on this question. Mr. Sugrue stated that the proposed demolition is “concerning.” Mr. Wilds countered that the loss of the roof would be undetectable. Mr. Huff noted that the plans show the preservation of a portion of the rear façade. Mr. Gallery commented that no clear demolition plan had been submitted. Mr. Rasmussen conceded that he had not provided a plan showing the rear ell. Mr. Wilds displayed a photograph of the rear ell and asked if it was original. Mr. Lewis stated that it was not. Ms. Smyler asserted that a demolition plan should be provided. Mr. Rivera stated that the proposal was not appropriate for the site. He suggested that the applicant return to the Commission with a more sensitive approach.

Mr. Sklaroff listed the sections of the building to be demolished: the rear ell, rear wall, east party wall, and rear section of the roof. Mr. Farnham added that the applicants had conceded at the Architectural Committee meeting that, with the demolition of the side and rear walls, not only the rear slope of the roof but also the front roof slope and internal floor structure might be lost. Mr. Sklaroff remarked that the internal structure was outside the Commission’s purview. Mr. Farnham stated that only an L-shaped piece of the historic building, the front façade and west party wall, would survive the demolition. If replaced, the front slope of the roof would not be historic fabric.

FAILED MOTION: The motion proffered by Messrs. Sugrue and Rivera to approve the massing of the proposed building in concept, provided the suggestions offered by the Commission are integrated into the revised design, failed by a vote of 4 to 5. Ms. Smyler and Messrs. Sklaroff, Sugrue, Rivera, and Wurtenberg dissented. Mr. James abstained.

ACTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to adopt the Architectural Committee’s recommendation and deny the proposal, pursuant Standards 2, 9, and 10 and New Addition Guidelines. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which carried with a vote of 9 to 1. Ms. Merriman dissented.

2316 DELANCEY PLACE

Applicant: Alexander G. Waddell

Owner: Acorn Property Development, LLC

Project: Construct rooftop addition with deck on main block; demolish existing rooftop deck on rear ell; infill masonry openings; construct two-car garage with deck

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, provided the masonry infill is inset.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes several alterations and additions to this rowhouse. It proposes to construct an addition with deck on the main roof of the property. The deck would extend up to the front parapet. The addition and deck would require the demolition of an existing light monitor and a roof deck, which is visible from Fitler Square.

The application also proposes to construct a two-car garage at the rear of the property. The rear of this property faces Fitler Square. The proposed garage would require the

excavation of the basement level and would infill the rear yard. The garage would have a single automobile door and a pedestrian door and would be faced with brick. A deck would be constructed on the roof of the garage. The application also proposes to infill several masonry openings along the side-yard elevation.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect Kevin Rasmussen and Steven Shapiro of Acorn Property Development represented the application.

Mr. Rasmussen presented an overview of the project. Mr. Wilds noted the Commission's policy precluding roof decks on the main blocks of row houses. He asked if the deck would be visible; Mr. Rasmussen replied that the deck would not be visible from Delancey Street. Mr. Wilds asked if a person standing on the deck would be visible from the street; Mr. Rasmussen replied that a person probably would be visible from the street. Mr. Wilds asked if the deck would be visible from buildings across the street; Mr. Rasmussen stated that it would. Mr. Sugrue asked about visibility from Fidler Square; Mr. Rasmussen replied that the front roof deck would not be visible from the square. He also noted that the extant deck, which will be removed, is visible from the square.

Mr. Sklaroff asked if there is currently parking at the site; Mr. Rasmussen responded that there is, but it is not sufficient. He noted that the garage that will be sloped into the basement to accommodate two cars. Mr. Sklaroff asked about the height of the proposed structure at the rear; Mr. Rasmussen responded that it would rise thirteen feet above the sidewalk.

Mr. Sklaroff voiced concerns about the loss of the view of the rear of the building from Panama Street and the park. Mr. Rasmussen countered that the construction would define the rear property line as it had been done at the property to the west. Mr. Wilds commented that the view of the rear bay at the first floor would be lost. Mr. Rasmussen stated that the grade at the park is higher than the alley, allowing a better view of the rear of the building. Mr. Sklaroff noted his concern with not only the demolition, but also the occlusion. Ms. Merriman pointed out that the neighboring building to the west has a very similar garage and wall.

Messrs. Sugrue and Sklaroff highlighted the precedent that the Commission would set if it approved a front roof deck, even one that would not be visible. Mr. Sklaroff also objected to the proposed work at the rear.

Ms. Merriman asked why the applicant was proposing the removal of the top deck. Mr. Rasmussen explained that he would need to add a stair enclosure to make it code compliant; he did not want to propose such an enclosure to the Commission.

Mr. Sklaroff suggested that the south side of the building not be treated as the rear, but as the façade that fronts onto Fidler Square. Mr. Baron noted that most buildings on the block retain their open, Victorian rear yards.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to accept the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal, provided the masonry infill is inset. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried with a vote of 7 to 4. Messrs. Sklaroff, Sugrue, Huff, and Wilds dissented.

2142 GREEN STREET

Applicant: Arlene Matzkin

Owner: Keith Mikkelsen

Project: Construct roof deck on main block and rear ell

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck on the main roof of the subject property. The deck would be set back thirteen feet from the front façade. The deck would measure twelve by thirty feet and would have a stair house access. The property has a rear ell.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect Arlene Matzkin represented the application.

Ms. Matzkin noted that the deck would not be visible. She stated that there are no sight lines from street level at the front or rear to the deck. In response to an inquiry from Mr. Wilds, Ms. Matkin stated that the deck would span the main block and rear ell. Mr. Wilds commented on the lack of information supplied by Ms. Matzkin. He remarked that the drawings were poor and that she was capable of producing better documentation. He asked why the deck could not be relocated. Ms. Matzkin stated that a bathroom blocked relocating the deck. She also stated that her client wanted a large deck with expansive views.

Mr. Sugrue stated his concerns about approving roof decks on main blocks. Ms. Matzkin reminded him that the Commission had just approved a main-block roof deck. She asked for consistency from the Commission. Mr. Sklaroff asserted that the deck should be located on the rear ell.

ACTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to deny the deck. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which carried with a vote of 7 to 4. Ms. Merriman, Ms. Murray, Mr. Rivera, and Mr. Wurtenburg dissented.

2113 MT. VERNON STREET

Applicant/Owner: Michael Donohoe

Project: Legalize roof deck on main block; install vinyl windows

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend the legalization of the roof deck, but denial of the vinyl windows, pursuant to Standard 2.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the reconstruction of a roof deck on the main roof of the subject property. The deck sits eight feet back from the front cornice and is accessed through an existing hatch. The property has a rear ell.

In addition, the applicant proposes to replace the existing vinyl six-over-six windows in the front façade with vinyl one-over-one windows. The owner has submitted copies of a signed contract for the installation of six Andersen vinyl windows. The property was individually designated in 1972 and included in the Spring Garden Historic District in

2000.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Owners Nancy Baiers and Michael Donohoe represented the application.

Ms. Baiers explained that she and her husband had employed a roofer to fix their leaking roof. The roofer removed a roof deck, repaired the roof, and then reinstalled the deck. It was reinstalled further back from the front façade than its original location. Ms. Baiers stated that she assumed that the deck was legal because it was a replacement of one that stood on the house for 13 years. When asked by Mr. Sklaroff if they obtained a building permit for this work, she responded that they did not. Ms. Baiers pointed out that the deck is not visible from the street. Mr. Sugrue asked if she hired a contractor who is licensed in the City of Philadelphia. Mr. Donohoe stated that he did not know if the contractor is licensed. His name is Clayton Pell and he is a handyman who was recommended by their roofing contractor, the Loonstyns. The Loonstyns removed the deck. In response to Mr. Sklaroff's question, Mr. Perri stated that a permit is necessary to remove such a deck. He added that a building permit is needed to install a roof. Mr. Sklaroff suggested to the owners that they take this issue up with their roofer, who should not have removed the deck or installed a new roof without building permits. He added that the roofer should not have recommended an unlicensed handyman. Mr. Sklaroff commented that the Loonstyns are active in the neighborhood and should have known that they needed a building permit.

Mr. Donohoe reported that his property was showcased in a movie. He observed that if it was historic enough for the movie, it should be historic enough for the Commission. He asked a "compassionate exemption" because he had already spent \$7,000.00 on the repairs. Mr. Sklaroff informed the owners they should address the matter with the contractors who performed the illegal work.

Ms. Merriman reported that she would vote to approve the deck. However, she questioned the windows. Ms. Baiers stated that they currently have inexpensive vinyl windows that are deteriorating. One at the first floor is broken. They decided to replace them with windows that they believed to be more historic. They have contracted with Anderson Windows to purchase two-over-two windows. They have paid for the windows, which have not yet been installed. Ms. Baiers requested an approval to install the ordered windows provided they replace them with the correct historic wooden windows over time.

Mr. Donohoe acknowledged that they had received the designation notice letters in 2000, which explained the Commission's jurisdiction. Mr. Farnham had provided the applicants with copies of the designation letters at the Architectural Committee meeting. Mr. Donohoe stated that he did not grasp the importance of the letters at the time of receipt, but just filed them away.

Mr. Wilds asserted that the Commission would "never, ever, ever" approve the type of window proposed. Mr. Sklaroff stated that neither the current nor the new windows are appropriate. Mr. Wilds noted that the Commission always requires owners to progress toward restoration. He objected strongly to the windows, but noted that he could consider the deck work as a repair.

Mr. Sugrue and Mr. Sklaroff advised of the owners of their right to appeal any

Commission decision as well as their right to submit a financial hardship application.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to deny the legalization of the roof deck and to deny the installation of the windows. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which carried with a vote of 6 to 3. Ms. Merriman, Ms. Murray, and Mr. Rivera dissented. Mr. Sklaroff and Mr. Smyler abstained.

Mr. Donohoe expressed his displeasure with the Commission's decision.

1600 ARCH STREET

Applicant: Robert B. Graves

Owner: 1600 Arch Street, LP

Project: Install three banners

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval for a period not to exceed 24 months.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install three temporary banners. Two banners would hang on the 16th Street façade and one on the Arch Street façade. The banners would hang twenty feet above the sidewalk and measure twenty-seven feet in height. The banners would be framed. They would not be directly attached to the façade, but would be immovably positioned behind the capitals of large columns. The frames would be tied with cables looped around the shafts of the columns; the cables would be wrapped in protective plastic to avoid any damage to the limestone shafts.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect Robert Graves represented the application.

Mr. Wilds thanked the applicant for diligently adhering to the process. Mr. James asked why the banners were necessary. Mr. Graves responded that the property is being converted from rentals to condominiums. Mr. Graves requested that the approval be granted until 31 May 2008. Mr. Sklaroff noted that the applicant may request an extension if necessary.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to approve the proposal for a period not to exceed 24 months (through 31 May 2008). Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Smyler excused herself from the meeting.

273 S. 4TH STREET

Applicant: Charles Loomis, Loomis McAfee Architects

Owners: Julia Colton Cramer & Eric Colton

Project: Demolish one-story rear addition; construct two-story rear addition with deck

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the addition and deck, but denial of the enlarged dormer, enlarged third-story rear window, and parapet at the rear ell.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story rear addition. This addition would require the demolition of a non-historic glass greenhouse above a one-story addition. The new addition would have a deck, accessed from the rear ell. The application proposes to alter several masonry openings on the rear, including new openings on the rear ell and enlargement of a single window into a double window. It also proposes to enlarge the rear dormer.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Owner Eric Cramer and architect Charles Loomis represented the application.

MOTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the addition and deck, but deny the enlarged dormer, enlarged third-story rear window, and parapet at the rear ell. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion.

Mr. Cramer stated that the minute of the Architectural Committee meeting is in error. It lists his wife's name as Julia Cramer and his as Eric Colton, swapping the surnames. Mr. Danta provided a copy of the application form to the Commission showing that the applicant's architect had completed the form in error. Mr. Danta stated that he would correct the minute.

Ms. Murray excused herself from the meeting.

Mr. Loomis displayed a model of the property with the proposed renovations. This model showed that there is an existing one-story shed addition with a wood deck on it. In answer to Mr. Wild's inquiry, Mr. Loomis stated that the one-story addition is not original but was built in 1979. He stated that he intends to remove the one-story kitchen on the first floor and build a two-story addition. Mr. Sklaroff asked if the addition would remain within the existing footprint of the building. Mr. Loomis replied that it would.

Mr. Sugrue asked if there would be any loss of historic fabric. Mr. Loomis said that the dormer would be replaced with a larger one. Mr. Loomis stated that the view of the back of the house is chaotic. The dormer is not highly visible. He acknowledged that the back is visible from St. Joseph's Walkway.

Mr. Loomis stated that the slope of the roof of the rear ell is minimal; it is not an architectural shape, but he is willing to retain it if required to do so.

Mr. Loomis reported that the owner strongly desired the enlargement of the third-floor bedroom window for more natural light. Mr. Cramer, the owner, stated that the window does not match any other windows in the area, but would match others if enlarged.

Mr. Loomis advocated for the enlarged dormer, contending that the third-floor ceiling is very low and the only usable space is directly under the ridge. In order to gain more usable space, he would like to enlarge the dormer. Mr. Wilds explained that there is little headroom because it is an attic. He remarked that he would vote to approve the enlarged window if the rear ell slope and dormer were retained.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION: Messrs. Wilds and Rivera withdrew their motion to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the

addition and deck, but deny the enlarged dormer, enlarged third-story rear window, and parapet at the rear ell.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the addition, deck, and enlarged third-story rear window, but deny the enlarged dormer and parapet at the rear ell. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2221 PINE STREET

Owner/Applicant: Deborah Goldberg

History: built c.1845

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the project, provided that the front façade is built with brick salvaged during the demolition, appropriate wood true-divided-light windows are installed at the front, and the star bolts are not reinstalled, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application involves the demolition and reconstruction of the front façade of this rowhouse. Noting its poor condition, an engineer's report recommends the rebuilding of the façade. The plans show a new front including a bracketed wood cornice and two-over-two windows, restoring the appearance of an Italianate rowhouse, and matching the twin property next door. The applicant also wishes to demolish the rear ell and append an addition on the highly visible, but stuccoed rear façade.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Owner Deborah Goldberg represented the application.

Ms. Goldberg stated that it was her intention to restore the property and that she would work with the staff to refine the details.

ACTION: Mr. Sugrue made the motion to approve the project, provided that the front façade is built with salvaged brick, appropriate wood true-divided-light windows are installed at the front, and the star bolts are not reinstalled, with the staff to review details. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

FAIRMOUNT WATER WORKS

Applicant: Janice Woodcock, Capital Program Office

Owner: City of Philadelphia, Fairmount Park Commission

Project: Construct dock; install debris screen

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes building a dock with debris screen at the Fairmount Water Works, south of the dam. The floating dock would connect to the Water Works garden with a series of ramps. The paths and ramps will feature new paving, lighting, and relocated signage.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the project. Janice Woodcock of the City's Capital

Programs Office and Burt Westcott of Hunt Engineering represented the application.

Ms. Woodcock explained that this proposal was the last phase of project that involved the construction of four docks. Mr. Sklaroff requested clarification as to the location of the dock. Ms. Woodcock answered that the proposed dock would be located below the dam. Mr. Sugrue noted that this was an appropriate proposal and a good use for the site, given that it had a dock in the past. Ms. Merriman inquired how long the construction would take. Ms. Woodcock answered that they hoped to finish the construction within one year.

ACTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal approval, with the staff to review details. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

122-124 CHESTNUT STREET

Applicant: Jon Wagner

Owner: Chestnut Lofts

Project: Construct two rooftop additions with decks

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the interior ceiling heights are reduced to no more than 8'-6", the shape of the penthouses are simplified, the pergolas are deleted, and the deck railings are black, open, metal railings, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This proposal involves adding rooftop additions and decks to this building. The structure has a partial front parapet. A lower building stands to the east, which will render the front addition visible.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the project. Owner Jenna Russell and architect Jon Wagner represented the application.

Mr. Wagner explained that the penthouse apartments are loft type apartments. The front units currently have no bedrooms; the rear units have one bedroom. The proposed work would create an additional bedroom and bathroom for each unit.

Mr. Wagner described their efforts to minimize visibility along Chestnut and Letitia Streets. He explained that the front addition would be visible at the party wall from Chestnut Street because the adjacent building to the east is shorter. The front addition would be minimally visible from the corner across the street. Mr. Wilds inquired whether a flat roof would be less visible than a pitched roof. Mr. Wagner answered that he believed the pitched roof would work best given the view angle from the street. Mr. Sklaroff mentioned that this proposal was similar to the Ayer building proposal, which the Commission denied because of visibility. Mr. Wagner disagreed with Mr. Sklaroff's comparison and explained that the Commission had approved a similar addition directly across the street.

Ms. Merriman inquired about the height of the additions. Mr. Wagner answered that they would be about 9'-7".

ACTION: Mr. Rivera moved to approve the revised proposal, provided the

penthouse heights are reduced to no more than 9'-7", the shape of the penthouses are simplified, the pergolas are deleted, and the deck railings are black, open, metal railings, with the staff to review details. Mr. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1234 WAVERLY STREET

Applicant/Owner: Jeffrey Wing

Project: Replace front facade windows; legalize front door and door surround

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend legalization of the door surround, provided the appropriate wood windows are installed and the illegal metal door is replaced with an appropriate wood door, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This proposal seeks to partially correct and legalize work done to this rowhouse without a permit. Several years ago, the owner had six-over-six wood windows removed and new four-over-four vinyl windows installed. He received a violation at that time but did not correct the problem. More recently, he had the c. 1950 Colonial Revival frontispiece and door removed and a new, similar frontispiece and metal door installed. The original design, seen on the twin house next door, featured a transom window, without a frontispiece surrounding the door. The original wood door likely featured horizontal panels. The owner now seeks to correct the windows with new frames and sash, but wishes to retain the metal door and frontispiece.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application. Bill Kane, who would manufacture the windows and door, represented the application.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Kane if the owner agreed with the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Kane answered that he is in agreement.

Mr. Wilds asked why the staff recommended approval of the door surround. Mr. Baron answered that the doorway originally had a transom, but that it had been infilled many years ago. A restoration of this element would require the removal of brick and enlargement of the door opening with alterations to the interior. Also, the non-historic door surround was present in the designation photograph from 1969. Mr. Kane noted that the new door surround replicated the non-historic door surround.

ACTION: Mr. Rivera moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and legalize the door surround, provided the appropriate wood windows are installed and the illegal metal door is replaced with an appropriate wood door, with the staff to review details. Mr. James seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1525 PINE STREET

Applicant: Frank Kakos

Owners: Robert Driscoll & Michael Greene

Project: Legalize sidewalk

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to

recommend legalization of the sidewalk, provided the existing light at the entrance is replaced with an appropriate light, and a railing is installed at the basement stair, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the legalization of a concrete sidewalk with a blue tint and small-block patterning. The original sidewalk, extant on the neighboring property, features very large blocks of bluestone. Also, the brownstone door surround was damaged when a light fixture was installed on it.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect Frank Kakos and owner Michael Greene represented the application.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Perri to clarify what if any permits are needed for sidewalks. Mr. Perri explained that the Streets Department issues permits for sidewalks. A permit is not required for small repairs and replacements, but is required if the area to be repaired exceeds two concrete squares. Mr. Sklaroff asserted that the Historical Commission has jurisdiction to review sidewalk work in historic districts. Mr. Baron agreed with the statement and specified that such language is clearly expressed in the Statement of Significance of the Rittenhouse-Fitler District.

Mr. Greene explained that the city had replaced the water main running from the street to the house and had destroyed the entire sidewalk. He asserted that the work was done solely to improve the sidewalk and the streetscape and without any knowledge that it required a review by the Historical Commission. Mr. Greene and Mr. Kakos stated that they agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and legalize the sidewalk, provided the existing light at the entrance is replaced with an appropriate light, and a railing is installed at the basement stair, with the staff to review details. Mr. River seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

116-118 CHESTNUT STREET

Applicant: Gerry Gutierrez, Group G LLC

Owner: Michael Samchik

Project: Construct outdoor dining deck

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the solid front stucco wall does not extend above the plane of the deck and the railing is open, not solid, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a dining deck on top of the one-story portion of the building. A window would be converted to a door on the side façade. The deck would be set back 12'-9" from the front façade. It would have a canopy roof structure to reduce the amount of noise rising to the residences above it.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the project. No one represented the application.

ACTION: Mr. Rivera moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal, provided the solid front stucco wall

does not extend above the plane of the deck and the railing is open, not solid, with the staff to review details. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS:

100 S. BROAD STREET

Owner: LTB LP c/o ASI Management

Applicant: David G. Orphanides, Esq., Nextel Communications of the Mid-Atlantic, Inc.

Install fifteen antennas and rooftop equipment shelter

History: Finest example of Chicago School skyscraper in Philadelphia; built in 1897; designed by D.H. Burnham & Co of Chicago, IL

Project: Install fifteen panel antennas and a rooftop equipment shelter

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend tabling the application to allow for the construction of a mock-up to evaluate visibility and optimize placement.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install twelve panel antennas; some would be installed immediately and others in the future. Each antenna measures 4'-6" by 1'-5". The application also proposes to erect a rooftop equipment shelter.

A set of four antennas would be installed on the west facing wall of an existing penthouse, well above the cornice line of the building. The antennas would expand to a total width of 12' and be spaced at intervals of approximately 3' on center. They would be painted to match the masonry wall. These four antennas would be visible from 15th Street and Chestnut Street owing to the open view across the Ritz parking lot. In addition, two sets of four antennas each are proposed for the east side of the roof. These antennas would be mounted on sleds that would be 12' tall and 8' wide. They would be painted blue-grey.

The application also proposes to install a new equipment shelter. The shelter would measure 22' by 12' and sit on an existing steel platform that holds the HVAC equipment. The shelter would be finished with aggregate stucco. The shelter would support three additional GPS antennas. The shelter would not be visible from the street since it is smaller than the HVAC unit on the roof and that unit is not visible from any location on the ground.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. No one attended the meeting to represent the application.

Elizabeth Blazeovich of the Preservation Alliance stated that, although the Alliance holds an easement on the property, her organization had no comment at this time because it had had no contact with the applicant.

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

THE REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE HISTORICAL COMMISSION STAFF

Jonathan E. Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director

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

HARRY A. BATTEN FUND

Mr. Farnham requested an approval of the expenditure of \$35.27 from the Harry A. Batten Fund for lunches for the Architectural Committee.

ACTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to approve the expenditure of \$35.27 and to grant the Historic Preservation Director the authority to approve all Batten Fund expenditures of \$200 or less without referral to the Commission. Mr. James seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to adjourn the meeting at 12:10 p.m. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED

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 work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportions, and massing, to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

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

New Addition Guidelines: Not Recommended: Duplicating the exact form, material, style, and detailing of the historic building in a new addition so that the work appears to be part of the historic building; Not Recommended: Imitating a historic style or period of architecture in a new addition; Recommended: Constructing a new addition so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that the character defining features are not obscured, damaged or destroyed.

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Farnham, Randal Baron, Jorge Danta, Karen Gonski, Erin Coté