

**THE MINUTES OF THE 507th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
12 November 2004
Municipal Services Building, 16th Floor, Conference Room Y
1401 John F. Kennedy Boulevard
Michael Sklaroff, Esquire, Chair**

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
Warren Huff, City Planning Commission
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
Sara Merriman, Department of Commerce
Kathleen Murray, Assistant to the President of City Council
David Perri, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Vincent Rivera, AIA
Denise Smyler, Esq.
Thomas Sugrue, Ph. D.
Norman Tissian

Lawrence Copeland, Esq., Law Department
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department

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

Also

Robin Komita, Becker Winston Architects
Rick Shaffer, Shaffer Group, 619 Catharine Street
Virgil Procaccino, 200 Christian Street Partners
William Youngblood, 921 Spruce Street
Nicole Westerman, 921 Spruce Street
Craig Deutsch, 432 East Sedgwick Street
Virginia Beier, 253 South Van Pelt Street
Decinia Anderson, 251 and 252 South Van Pelt Street
David Knapton, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Michele Williams, 1917 Panama Street
John Clausen, T-Mobile
Doug Covnan, T-Mobile
Caroline MacMoran, 264 South Van Pelt Street
Amy Johnston, Mural Arts Program
Neil Sandvold, Sandvold Blandi Architects
Mike Choi, SGRA
Van B. Strother, New Covenant Church
Charles Capaldi, 2118 Locust Street
William S. Kreindler, 251 South 22nd Street
John A. Beirs, 225 Race Street
John Moore, 258 South Van Pelt Street

Jim Rowe, Agoos/Lovera Architects
 Therese May, Agoos/Lovera Architects
 Helma Weeks, 3623 Pearl Street, Powelton Village Civic Association
 Michael Bagwell, FSB, LLC
 Sylvie Fataiha, FSB, LLC
 Lawrence J. Biond, 3414 Hamilton Street
 A. Clinton Hewes, 256 South Van Pelt Street
 Joy Donnelly
 Art Elwood, 200 Christian Street Partners, LLC
 Fred Duling
 Don S. Ventresca, 238 Christian Street
 Pablo Lopez
 Marc D. Brookman, Esq., Duane Morris
 M. Buczek, 123 Pemberton Street
 Joshua Grimes, Esq.
 John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
 William G. Schwartz, Esq., 1904 Spring Garden Street
 Jane Golden, Mural Arts Program

506th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 507th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:10 a.m.

Minutes of the 506th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Upon a motion made by Mr. Tissian and seconded by Mr. James, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the 506th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, as corrected, held 8 October 2004, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

The Report of the Committee on Historic Designation

4865 Market Street, a.k.a. 111 North 49th Street, Pennsylvania Hospital for the Insane, Kirkbride Center

Kirkbride Realty Corporation, Owner

Date: 1854-59, Samuel Sloan, architect, with Dr. Thomas Story Kirkbride; addition, 1929; service buildings, c. 1920; hospital building, 1959

At the October 2004 Historical Commission meeting, Mr. Wilds made a motion to table the designation for a period not to exceed six (6) months to allow a sub-committee of the Committee on Historic Designation to visit the site with representatives of the staff, owner, and nominator and to recommend bounds and other conditions of the Commission's jurisdiction over the buildings, site, and appurtenances at 4865 Market Street. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Ms. Spina described the site visit undertaken by Randy Cotton of the Preservation Alliance; Janet Klein, Warren Huff and Harris Steinberg of the Designation Committee; Jonathan Farnham and herself of the staff, and Thomas Fleming, Rose DiOttavio and Gardner Kahoe of CoreCare Systems. The Committee suggested boundaries that encompassed the 1859 building as well as the 1929 addition, but excluded the support buildings and 1959 hospital to the north and the open space to the south.

Thomas Fleming was troubled by the nomination of the entire site, but he is in favor of the designation of the Kirkbride building. He remarked that the community would like to see the southern portion this property developed.

Mr. Sklaroff recommended the tabling of the designation to allow the owner to review in detail the proposed boundaries.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance disagreed with the tabling. He thought that a vote for the designation should occur without any further delay.

Ms. Murray made a motion to table the designation for a period not to exceed one (1) month. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to direct the staff to meet with the owner and discuss any boundary issues. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Sklaroff dissented.

1307 Locust Street, New Century Guild

The New Century Trust, Owner

Date: c. 1870s; 1906

The New Century Guild building at 1307 Locust Street has served as the organization's headquarters continuously from 1906 to the present. Founded in 1882, the New Century Guild (NCG) was one of the earliest, largest, and most successful of the many organizations created across the country in the 19th century to deal with the serious problems that arose as more and more women entered the labor force. Although these clubs had several characteristics in common with the middle-class women's clubs of the day, they were unique because they directly addressed employment-related problems. The Guild explicitly stated from the outset that its goal was to address the specific needs of "self-supporting women," a bold step at a time when many Americans believed that no self-respecting woman would work for pay outside the home. Not only was the Guild among the first of such organizations formed anywhere in the United States, but it was also among the most flourishing and long-lived. The NCG meets three of the criteria delineated in Section 14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code. It has significant character, interest and value as a part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth or Nation and is associated with the life of persons significant in the past (Criterion A). As a part of the women's movement and the reformation of labor, it is associated with events of importance to the history of the City, Commonwealth and Nation (Criterion B). Finally, the Guild exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social and historical heritage of the community (Criterion J). The Committee on the Historic Designation voted unanimously to recommend the designation of 1307 Locust Street, the New Century Guild, as historic and the listing of it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Ms. Spina noted that she met with a representative, Mary Montague, of the New Century Trust about the ramifications of designation.

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance, added that he also spoke with Dr. Montague and asked her to call him back once she had spoken to Ms. Spina if there were any other concerns. Mr. Gallery stressed to the Commission that owner's consent is not

necessary for designation.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to approve the nomination for listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

The Report of the Architectural Committee

7500 Germantown Avenue

New Covenant Church, owner

Van Strother, applicant

History: Eagles Hall, 1890-1892, Wilson Brothers, architects and engineers

Sanctuary, 1997, John Teets, architect

Project: Construct 3-story addition to sanctuary and pedestrian bridge – in concept
The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval in concept of a rear addition to the sanctuary and approval of the concept of a bridge between the sanctuary and hall, but denial of this particular bridge design, pursuant to the incompleteness of the application 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.]

This application requests the in-concept review of a large addition to the New Covenant Church sanctuary and a pedestrian bridge connecting the sanctuary to Eagles Hall on the church's large campus in Mt. Airy. The sanctuary was erected with Commission approval in 1997.

The addition would stand at the rear of the 1997 sanctuary and would house a Children and Family Center. The construction of the addition would not require the removal or alteration of any historic fabric. At the back of the large campus, several hundred feet from Germantown Avenue and W. Gowen Street, the addition would not be visible from any public right-of-way.

The pedestrian bridge would link the sanctuary to Eagles Hall, historically Cresheim Hall. The Commission's nomination classifies it as equivalent in importance to a significant resource in a district. The bridge would be visible, albeit at a great distance, from a public right-of-way. More significant, the application provides very little information about the proposed bridge and the impact of its construction on historic fabric. The rendering and "master plan" do not specify how much or what types of historic material would be obscured or removed for the addition of the bridge.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. Mr. Sklaroff questioned the denial of details in a conceptual approval. Others countered that the overall plan of the bridge and its intersection with the historic building are not mere details. Architect Van Strother attended the meeting and acknowledged his acceptance of the Architectural Committee's suggestion to redesign the bridge to reduce its impact on Eagles Hall.

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

921 Spruce Street

William Youngblood and Nicole Westerman, owners/applicants

History: c. 1890

Project: Demolish garden wall, add garage and HVAC equipment, cut door and windows
The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the new entranceway, window openings, windows, and HVAC equipment, with staff to review details, but denial of the demolition of the garden wall and addition of the garage, 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.].

This application proposes several alterations to the Hutchinson Street façade of the rowhouse at the northeast corner of Spruce and Hutchinson Streets. This block of Hutchinson is included in the Historic Street Paving District. Nearly all of the buildings facing onto the block are designated as historic. A garden wall, which encloses a small courtyard, would be demolished and a garage constructed on the court and into the rear ell. A new entrance doorway and four new window openings would be cut into the façade. A set of large, non-historic windows would be replaced with double-hung windows. HVAC equipment would be added and non-historic skylights removed.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. Owners William Youngblood and Nicole Westerman and architect Robin Komita attended the meeting. Ms. Komita said that the Washington Square West Civic Association believes that the rehabilitation plans are appropriate. She remarked that the proposed alterations will not impact the Spruce Street façade. Ms. Komita pointed out that the proposed garage will not be disruptive to the pedestrian experience. She noted that there would not be any loss of on-street parking because parking is prohibited on this very narrow street. Ms. Komita offered to work with the Commission on details of the garage's appearance, which she believes will add life to the street. She stressed the precedent for parking on this block of Hutchinson Street. There is one garage; it was added about 1900, when the rowhouse was converted for commercial use.

Mr. Sugrue questioned the staff recommendation of approval in light of the Committee's denial of the demolition of the garden wall and garage. Mr. Farnham unequivocally asserted that the staff had agreed that no significant historic fabric would be lost with the addition of the garage.

John Gallery addressed the Commission. He stated that his comments were those of a resident of the 900-block of Spruce Street, not those of the Executive Director of the Preservation Alliance. He claimed that the historic buildings of Washington Square West have been ravaged to accommodate automobiles. Mr. Gallery remarked that the previous owners of this property expended great efforts to rehabilitate the building. He also contended that an approval of this garage on this narrow, historic street would establish and regrettable precedent. He asserted that the character of this important street has survived and should be preserved.

Mr. Tissian stated his opposition to garage facades throughout the city and said that he believes that a garage in this location is not necessary. Mr. Rivera thought that the garden wall should be preserved. Ms. Smyler disagreed, owing to the fact that the wall is not historic fabric. She offered her support of the project and concluded that the applicant should work with staff on the details of the garage. Mr. Sklaroff acknowledged valid arguments for and against the garage, but noted his support of the proposal. He claimed that the design is intelligent, that it makes the building more livable, and that the spirit of a wonderful building will not be compromised by the garage.

Ms. Westerman asserted that the proposal is respectful of the streetscape. She cited nearby blocks of Cypress and Manning Streets, which have garages.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which failed with a vote of 2 to 8. Mr. Sklaroff, Mr. Huff, Mr. James, Ms. Merriman, Ms. Murray, Mr. Perri, Ms. Smyler, and Mr. Sugrue dissented.

Ms. Smyler made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Tissian and Mr. Rivera dissented.

261-63 South 22nd Street aka 262 South Van Pelt Street

200 Christian Street Partners, owners

Craig Deutsch, applicant

History: 261 S. 22nd/262 S. Van Pelt Street, c. 1875

263 S. 22nd Street, 1957

Project: Demolish facades and rears, rebuild facades, erect additions with decks

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend the following, with staff to review details:

- 1. approval of the demolition of the rear sections to create yards;*
- 2. approval of the demolition of the facades at 263 S. 22nd and 262 S. Van Pelt*
- 3. approval of the restoration of the façade at 261 S. 22nd with a center window at the second story, with staff to review window, door, and other details, but denial of the details as proposed*
- 4. approval of the third-story addition and overall layout of the façade at 263 S. 22nd, with staff to review window, door, and other details, but denial of the details as proposed*
- 5. denial of the massing and façade at 262 S. Van Pelt*
- 6. denial of the inset entranceways at all three buildings. The building line at the sidewalk should be maintained.*
- 7. approval of small fourth-story additions for rooftop access, but denial of the large penthouses as proposed*
- 8. approval of the roof decks, provided their railings are the simple black metal picket type*

These recommendations were made 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.].

This application proposes the partial demolition of a large L-shaped building and the construction of three residential buildings with garages and decks in its place. At the north, the property extends from 22nd Street to Van Pelt Street and includes the 261 S. 22nd and 262 S. Van Pelt facades. At the south, the property extends east about 120 feet from the 263 S. 22nd façade. The site is listed as three buildings in the Rittenhouse-Filter Historic District inventory; all three are classified as Contributing.

The site has a complex history. The structure extending from 261 S. 22nd to 262 S. Van Pelt was constructed about 1875. Fronting on both streets, the structure was used as a livery stable and had stable doors at both facades. The 261 S. 22nd façade has been altered several times, but most of the brick, the third-story window frames, and the uncommon pierced Neo-Grec cornice survive. The brick of the Van Pelt Street façade, which is covered with several layers of paint, is original; the windows and door on Van Pelt are not. To the south, a four-story rowhouse once stood at 263 S. 22nd. It was demolished by 1957, when the two-story brick structure was erected as an addition to 261 S. 22nd/262 S. Van Pelt building.

The proposal stipulates the demolition of the facades at 263 S. 22nd and 262 S. Van Pelt. New facades would be constructed. Garages would be included in all three new townhouses. The proposal also stipulates the demolition of the center section of the 261 S. 22nd/262 Van Pelt building and the rear section of the 263 S. 22nd building to create rear yards for the three new townhouses. A fourth-story addition would be constructed on the three-story section at 261 S. 22nd; two-story additions would be constructed on the two-story sections at 263 S. 22nd and 262 S. Van Pelt. Roof decks would be added atop all three buildings.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Craig Deutsch and developers Virgil Procaccino and Arthur Ellwood represented the proposal. Mr. Sklaroff commented on the complexity of the proposal and asked if the developers were willing to accept some or all of the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Deutsch suggested that some clarifications were in order. He stated that what had been termed a "large" penthouse was, in fact, not too large. Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Deutsch to address larger issues such as massing and design before addressing the details. Mr. Procaccino stated that he believed that the new design for the Van Pelt Street building, which includes a mansard at the third floor, complies with the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Rivera stated that he had visited the site and determined that the proposed rear demolition would create significant open space and that the surrounding buildings on Van Pelt Street are not two-story carriage houses, but are three and four story buildings. He disputed the Architectural Committee minute and recommendation, asserting that the Committee had not denied the massing and façade of the Van Pelt building. He countered that the Committee left as an "open issue" whether or not the mansard provided a sufficient setback and whether or not the penthouse was too large. Mr. Sklaroff noted the dilemma created by Mr. Rivera's repudiation of points 5 and 7 of the Committee's recommendation. He reminded the audience that Mr. Rivera is the chair of the Committee. When questioned by Mr. Sklaroff, Mr. Rivera stated that the Committee

had not “really decided one way or another.” Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Farnham to recount his recollection of the Committee’s recommendation. Mr. Farnham replied that he had pressed the Committee for specificity when making its recommendation and that those Committee members who voiced opinions had recommended denial of the Van Pelt building for the reasons cited. Mr. Sklaroff suggested that the Commission consider as issues the massing, façade, and penthouse of the Van Pelt building.

Mr. Sklaroff asked the applicants if some common ground might be reached or if they intended to go forward with the application presented to the Committee. Mr. Procaccino answered that they were essentially going forward with the design presented to the Committee. He stated that the penthouses had been reduced to the smallest possible size. He also stated that they had pulled the third story of the Van Pelt façade back with the mansard.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Deutsch to walk through the plans and discuss the Committee’s recommendations. Mr. Deutsch discussed the two-story building on 262 S. Van Pelt Street first. He noted the third-story addition with mansard. Mr. Sugrue asked if the Van Pelt building already includes a garage; Mr. Deutsch answered in the affirmative. Mr. Sugrue asked if there is on-street parking on Van Pelt; Mr. Deutsch answered in the negative.

John Moore, the neighbor at 258 Van Pelt Street noted his opposition to the project. He also pointed out an inconsistency in Mr. Deutsch’s drawing and demonstrated that Mr. Deutsch had misrepresented the height of the proposed building. Mr. Deutsch stated that he would be willing to reduce the height of the Van Pelt building to that of the neighboring building at the south.

Mr. Deutsch then turned to the penthouse. Mr. Sklaroff questioned him about the height of the penthouse relative to the building to the south. Mr. Deutsch stated that his penthouse would be shorter than or, at most, as tall as the penthouse to the south.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Rivera about the Committee’s concerns with the massing and façade of the Van Pelt building. Mr. Rivera stated that he remembered a split between Committee members on these aspects of the designs. Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Rivera to elaborate on the concerns of those Committee members who rejected the design. Mr. Rivera replied that he could not recall, but that it probably had to do with the height. Mr. Sklaroff then asked the staff to comment on the opposition to the Van Pelt design. Mr. Farnham stated that some Committee deemed the mansard setback insufficient and had suggested an eight or ten-foot setback above the second story. Mr. Sklaroff inquired about their reasoning. Mr. Farnham answered that some Committee members sought to retain the sense of the historic two-story building and also to prevent the new construction from overwhelming surrounding buildings and the narrow street. He added that the neighbors opposed the larger addition because it would block light and air to the property to the north including the open lot adjacent to the proposed construction. Mr. Rivera reiterated that the majority of the buildings on Van Pelt Street are three and four story buildings, not smaller carriage houses. He asserted that the new construction would not overwhelm the street. Mr. Moore stated that he and the neighbors had met and assembled a counter-proposal that has neighborhood support. Mr. Sugrue asked him about his position on the penthouse. Mr. Moore stated that the neighbors do not support the penthouse.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Rivera if the Committee had concerns about the lower two stories of the Van Pelt building. He replied that the Committee did not. Mr. Moore stated that the community was concerned about the proposed recessed door for reasons of safety and sanitation. Mr. Deutsch countered that the recess was important to his design; it offered the homeowner a sheltered spot to search for keys. Mr. Sklaroff asked if a vestibule would serve the same purpose. Mr. Deutsch conceded that it would.

Mr. Sklaroff summarized the community position: no penthouse and a significant setback above the second story for reasons of light and air. Mr. Moore added that the neighbors also sought to protect the historic streetscape, which included a two-story building at this site. He added that the addition would be highly visible from the north.

Mr. Sklaroff asked if the proposed Van Pelt building would require variances. Mr. Deutsch stated that the penthouse would require a height variance. Mr. Procaccino clarified that the three-story structure would not require variances.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that his organization is in accord with the concerns expressed by the neighbors. Mr. Gallery explained that the mansard provides almost no real setback. Pointing to the drawings, he showed that the mansard window, which stretches across most of the façade, is only negligibly set back from the front façade.

Mr. Moore pointed out other problems with the drawings. Disagreeing with Mr. Rivera, he reported that although there are four-story houses at the Locust and Spruce Street corners of Van Pelt, most of the buildings on the block are two stories tall. Charles Capaldi, an architect retained by the neighbors, presented a drawing depicting a design for the Van Pelt building approved by the community. It showed a third-story addition set back 10 feet from the façade and a third-story roof deck, but no penthouse or fourth-story deck. Joan Hook, the owner of 264 Van Pelt Street, stated her support for the counter-proposal. Mr. Tissian noted the four-story building at 264 Van Pelt Street, which is owned by Joan Hook. Mr. Capaldi stated that the fourth story at 264 occupies a much smaller footprint than the addition proposed for 262. Mr. Moore noted that he and the other neighbors object to Ms. Hook's recent addition at 264, which was approved by the Commission. He stated that they fear a proliferation of such additions if the current proposal is approved.

Mr. Sklaroff restated point 6 of the Committee's recommendation, the denial of the inset entrances, and noted the possibility of vestibules instead. He then asked Mr. Deutsch to point out the penthouses, which the Committee recommended be denied. He asked if they were for rooftop access. Mr. Deutsch explained that the penthouses accommodate stairs, elevators, and light wells. Mr. Sklaroff asked him if the light well could terminate at the roof of the third story. Mr. Deutsch agreed that it could.

Mr. Sugrue asked if garages now exist at the two buildings on 22nd Street. Mr. Deutsch answered that they do. Mr. Tissian corrected him, asserting that there is now a garage at 261 S. 22nd Street, but not at 263. Mr. Deutsch explained that he would like to change the storefront at 263 to a garage door. Mr. Sklaroff summarized the Committee's recommendations regarding the 22nd Street buildings. He noted that the applicants had agreed to delete the inset entranceways from the designs. Mr. Sugrue asked Mr. Rivera to comment on the Committee's position on the garage doors on 22nd Street. Mr. Farnham replied that the Committee did not discuss the garages extensively because it

understood that garages stood at 261 S. 22nd and 262 S. Van Pelt Street since the late nineteenth century and may have stood at 263 S. 22nd Street from its construction in 1957 into the 1980s, when the storefront was added.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Moore to comment on the community's position on the 22nd Street buildings. Mr. Moore stated that the neighbors oppose the penthouses and decks. Mr. Capaldi added that they would oppose these features at the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Mr. Sugrue asked the applicants why they seek to build such large penthouses. Mr. Deutsch again stated that his design depended upon the large penthouses.

Mr. Sklaroff asked the Commission to consider the 262 S. Van Pelt Street segment of the proposal alone before proceeding with any further review of the 22nd Street proposals. He noted that the applicants have already agreed to pull the entranceways of all three buildings to the sidewalk lines, thereby eliminating the insets at the entrances.

Ms. Murray moved to approve the design of the townhouse at 262 S. Van Pelt Street as presented by the applicants at the Commission meeting of 12 November 2004, with staff to review details, provided that the penthouse is reduced in size to the minimum necessary to accommodate an elevator and stair only and provided that the profile of the new building does not exceed that of the building at 264 S. Van Pelt Street. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six to four. Mr. James, Mr. Perri, Mr. Tissian and Mr. Sklaroff opposed.

Mr. Sklaroff suggested that the Commission turn to the 22nd Street proposals. He asserted that the vestibule question had been decided; the insets at the entrances would be eliminated.

Mr. Gallery stated that the Architectural Committee had rejected the details of the 22nd Street buildings because of the mediocrity of the designs. He contended that the staff must review the facades designs very carefully and comprehensively. He also objected to the inclusion of the two garages despite any historical precedent for them. He noted that this is not a restoration; therefore the garages should not be accepted simply because the buildings may have included garages in the past. He recommended that, at a minimum, the garage at 263 be denied, but added that both should be denied.

Mr. Sklaroff suggested that the Architectural Committee review the façade details, not the staff. Mr. Rivera countered that his Committee would accept a staff review of the details. Mr. Sklaroff reiterated his conviction that the Committee itself should review the details. Mr. Sugrue declared his opposition to the garages on 22nd Street; he stated that they would "deaden" the street.

Ms. Murray moved to accept the Architectural Committee's recommendations for the 261-263 S. 22nd Street townhouses, with staff to review details. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which failed with a vote of 5 to 5. Mr. James, Mr. Tissian, Mr. Sugrue, Mr. Sklaroff and Ms. Merriman opposed.

Mr. Tissian moved to deny the façade including the garages, penthouses, and details for the 261-263 S. 22nd Street townhouses and to suggest that they be redesigned and resubmitted to the Architectural Committee. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion, which failed with a vote of 3 to 6. Mr. James, Mr. Rivera, Ms. Murray, Ms. Smyler, Mr. Huff and

Mr. Perri opposed; Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

Mr. Sugrue moved to approve in concept the proposal for the 261-263 S. 22nd Street townhouses with the Architectural Committee to reconsider the garages and penthouses. No one seconded the motion.

Mr. Rivera urged that the Commission take an action that would allow the developers to move ahead with this project. He noted that the project had undergone numerous reviews. Mr. Sklaroff countered that the reviews has been extended because the drawings were not sufficient.

Mr. Tissian moved to remand the application to the Architectural Committee for an additional review of the 22nd Street façades, but not the notion of the garages. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion. The motion was not acted upon.

Mr. Rivera asked if the Commission wanted the staff and the Committee to review the details. Mr. Sklaroff responded that the Committee, not the staff, should review the details. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the proposal “ought to go back to the Committee, if there is a motion, to look at the design issues of the façade, not to revisit whether there should be a garage.” He also stated that the Commission members agreed that the penthouses on the 22nd Street buildings would be reduced in size.

Mr. James moved to approve the notion of garages in the two 22nd Street facades. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 6 to 3. Mr. Tissian, Mr. Sugrue and Ms. Merriman opposed. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

Mr. James moved that the applicant submit an updated design for the 22nd Street façades including the penthouses for review by the Architectural Committee and resubmission to the Historical Commission. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 7 to 3. Ms. Murray, Ms. Merriman and Mr. Rivera opposed.

2201-03 Pine Street

Sheldon and Phyllis Moss, owners

John Clausen, applicant

History: c. 1925

Project: Install telecommunications equipment on roof

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial and suggested that the applicants develop alternate solutions, 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 Roofs Guideline [Recommended: Installing mechanical and service equipment on the roof ... when required for the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

This application proposes the installation of telecommunications equipment on the roof of the two-story garage building at the northwest corner of 22nd and Pine Streets. The building is bounded on the north by Panama Street. It is classified as Contributing to

Rittenhouse-Filter Historic District.

The rooftop equipment would include three sleds with antennas, one at the northeast and two at the southeast; a platform with six equipment cabinets; and two pole-mounted antennas. The sleds with antennas and pole-mounted antennas would be highly visible. Views of the equipment cabinets would be blocked by an existing elevator penthouse.

Mr. Farnham presented a revised application, which relocates the antennas to the southwest corner of the building on the elevator penthouse. He explained that the revised application includes two options, one of which reflects the Committee's recommendation. The design without the screening complies with the Committee's recommendation.

John Clausen, Douglas Calum, and Pablo Lopez represented the project at the meeting. In response to Mr. Sugrue's query about the equipment to be placed on the roof, Mr. Clausen replied that an equipment platform would be situated behind the penthouse on the roof. Mr. James asked about the location of the cabling and it was noted that the cabling would be located on the backside of the penthouse; it would not be visible from the street. Mr. Sugrue inquired into the possibility of moving the antennas further back. Mr. Lopez said that moving back the antennas would require raising them to attain the required coverage.

Mr. James made a motion to accept the revised proposal. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried with 9 votes. Ms. Merriman abstained.

2031 Walnut Street, upper-floor residential units

FSB LLC, owner

Sylvie Fataiha, applicant

History: c. 1855-1860

Project: Add roof decks on rear ell, cut window into door

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval, provided the upper deck does not extend north of the chimney, subject to the review of complete plans by the staff, 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 Roofs Guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as ... decks and terraces... when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

This application proposes roof decks on the rear ells at the 3rd and 5th-story levels. It was reviewed by the Architectural Committee in August 2004, deemed incomplete, and withdrawn. Some supplementary information has been provided since the first application. If the upper deck does not extend north of the chimney and the new door maintains the appearance of the historic window, well-designed decks in these locations would be appropriate.

The Commission concurred with the Committee's recommendation.

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

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

1822 Addison Street

Howard Trachtman and Ivy Gilbert, owners

James Rowe, Agoos Lovera Architects, applicant

History: c. 1840

Project: Build rear addition, cut new windows, replace windows, paint masonry

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend the following:

- 1. approval of the infill addition;*
- 2. approval of the bay window;*
- 3. approval of the new window opening at the rear of 1824;*
- 4. approval of six-over-six, true-divided-light, double-hung, wood replacement windows at the front facades;*
- 5. approval of six-over-six, double-hung, replacement windows at the rear of 1822, but denial of the proposed one-over-one windows*
- 6. approval of paired casement windows for the rear of 1824;*
- 7. denial of the painting of all masonry trim. Paint should be stripped from the masonry watertable, lintels, and sills. If stripping proves infeasible from a conservation perspective, the masonry may be painted white.*

With staff to review 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.].

This application proposes several alterations to the pair of adjoining rowhouses at 1822-1824 Addison Street. Most of the work is proposed for the rear. An infill addition would be constructed at grade below an existing second-story bay. A bay widow would replace a smaller double-hung window at the first-floor rear. A new window would cut into the rear façade of the 1824 building. All of the windows in existing openings would be replaced. All of the trim on the front façade would be painted including some masonry.

No details have been provided for the replacement windows. The appropriate windows, six-over-six double-hung windows, are proposed for the front facades. They should be wood, true-divided-light windows. The one-over-one windows proposed for the rear of 1822 are not appropriate; they too should be six-over-six. The paired casement windows proposed for the rear of 1824 are appropriate to the façade, which was significantly altered when the penthouse was added in the 1970s or 1980s.

Therese May, the architect, stated that her clients had accepted the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

1710 Walnut Street

Joan W. Keiser, owner

Mike Choi, applicant

History: c. 1840; storefront added, c. 1930

Project: Add signage

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the banner and internally illuminated sign in the transom, but denial of the infilling of the transom, which should be glazed; with staff to review details, 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.]; 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.].

This application proposes two signs for the storefront at 1710 Walnut Street. A Sunbrella banner would project from the face of the storefront at the east. A metal and plastic illuminated sign would be mounted at the transom above the door. A space above the sign would be infilled with an Exterior Insulation and Finish System (EFIS) material to match the color of the building.

Mike Choi, the architect, attended the meeting. He informed the Commission that he no longer intends to infill or glaze the transom. He noted that the sign would occupy the entire opening.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

1917 Panama Street

Michele Williams, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1835/1920 alts

PROPOSAL: Legalize cutting of masonry, install new windows, remove ironwork

The Committee unanimously recommended the approval of the cutting down of the first-floor window and the installation of wood casement windows and a decorative metal sconce next to the door, subject to the removal of the decorative bars. The Committee suggested that these could be retrofitted to operate on the inside of the windows.

Mr. Baron summarized the history of this application including the illegal work, the denial by the Committee and Commission and the review by the Hardship Committee that ended with Ms. Williams withdrawing that application. Several Committee members expressed concern about the very wide pointing.

Michele Williams, the owner, offered the Commission her acceptance of the Committee's recommendation.

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

2028-30 Fairmount Avenue

Savaas Navrosidis, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1855, 1970 storefronts

PROPOSAL: Replace storefronts

The Architecture Committee unanimously recommended approval of the proposal.

Mr. Baron explained that Mr. Gutierrez returned with the details for the replacement storefronts that the Committee asked for at the last meeting.

Commission members concurred with the Committee's recommendation.

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

613 North 18th Street

Steven Westbrook, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c.1855

PROPOSAL: Demolish and rebuild front façade and rear ell with decks

The applicant withdrew the proposal.

1904 Spring Garden Street

1904-08 Spring Garden LLC. Owner

David Nasatir, Esq., Applicant

DATE: c. 1975

PROPOSAL: Demolish non-contributing building

The Committee unanimously recommended approval of the demolition of this non-contributing building subject to the Committee and Commission's review of the new construction with particular concern for the bay at 1902 Spring Garden and the stone wall on Nectarine Street.

Mr. Baron explained that the applicant is in his due diligence period, considering the purchase of the property. The outline of the new structure will fill the property to the front property line. Parking will be from the rear on Nectarine Street.

The developer Mr. Duling, was represented by his lawyer, William G. Schwartz, Frank Groff, his project supervisor, and his architect, Neil Sandvold.

Commission members inquired if the stone wall on Nectarine Street would be demolished and it was noted that it would remain.

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

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue

1113-31 Market Street, Reading Terminal Headhouse

SEPTA, Owner

Michael J. Gavin, Applicant

DATE: 1893

PROPOSAL: Add antenna

The Committee unanimously recommended denial of the proposal, 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.].

The Committee discussed alternative locations for this highly visible antenna with Mr. Gavin. He presented digitally altered photos to explain that it would not be very visible. The Committee members thought the photos were not an accurate representation. Mr. Gavin said that Septa does not wish to install the antenna under the bridge at Filbert Street or higher on the roof of the building because they do not own those areas and would have to lease them to use them. He explained that the signals are beamed to a receiver across the street and that this antenna represents a secondary receiver of those signals.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal and noted that he met with the applicant at the site to try to find a less visible location. The applicant and Mr. Baron thought that placement flush against the sign would be more appropriate. Since the meeting, on the advice of a structural engineer, the applicant has revised his proposal to locate the antenna at a right angle to the sign with the cable along the stone painted to match the cornice. The structural engineer cautioned that the sign would not be strong enough to support the antenna.

Commission members discussed the possible locations of the antenna at length. It expressed concern about the attachment owing to the penetration of the stone. Mr. James asked if the antenna could be attached to the base of the shed, which proved not to be a viable option. Mr. Baron noted that placement at the arm of the SEPTA sign will negate any damage to the stone.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to approve the revised proposal which mounts the antenna to the arm of the SEPTA sign and positions it behind that sign. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried with 8 votes. Ms. Smyler and Mr. Sklaroff recused.

225 Race Street

John Beirs, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Legalize railing and removal of cellar doors, restore doors

The Committee unanimously recommended approval of the proposal.

Mr. Baron explained the history of the proposal which had previously been denied by the Commission and been appealed to the Board of License and Inspection Review. The applicant proposes a compromise to legalize the removal of the grate and installation of the railing subject to the restoration of the doors to their correct muntin pattern.

John Beirs, the owner, attended the meeting and expressed his concurrence to the Committee's recommendation.

Ms. Murray made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which carried with 8 votes. Mr. James and Mr. Sugrue dissented.

238 Christian Street

Mark Bojanowski, Owner

Don Ventresca, Applicant

DATE: c. 1815

PROPOSAL: Install rear vestibule, demolish garden wall, install fence, add landscaping
The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the demolition and rebuilding of the fence on the south and west sides of the property; approval of the alterations to the porch and door in the piazza; denial of the changes to the approved plans along the east property line including, opening the yard, and installing shrubs and a piece of fence on the walkway, 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.]

Mr. Baron explained that Mr. Ventresca had obtained several permits from staff, including for the restoration of the windows, masonry, and new chimney. From the Commission he had obtained approval for cutting a gate for a car in the rear yard. The new proposal includes removing a fence along the three sides of the yard, and the construction of a small porch and multi-light door in the piazza area, where the main house and rear ell join. He proposes a new wood fence along the south and west sides of the yard. There is now a small two-foot wide walkway along the eastern side of the property which Mr. Ventresca proposes to plant with shrubs and fence across at the rear. Mr. Baron noted that when he had recently visited the property it became clear that the property extends over a hundred feet back to Montrose Street and that it was recently cleared for construction. He noted that if that property is part of this address that any new construction on that ground may also be subject to the Commission's review as well.

Don Ventresca, the applicant, informed the Commission that he had intended to reduce the masonry wall, which runs parallel with the property, to 40 inches but owing to its deteriorated condition, he took the wall to grade level. He proposes to run cedar a fence from the south side with a rolling gate with an additional 6 feet of fence. Mr. Ventresca noted that the property occupies two lots and that the masonry wall is 90% of the property.

Mr. Baron noted that an increase in the size of the opening would allow for additional car parking and that the proposed two-foot wide landscaping zone now serves as a narrow sidewalk for the community. He pointed out that the Commission had approved a ten foot opening, now all the fencing has been removed, which exceeds the permit. Mr. Ventresca said that he would retain this band as a sidewalk.

Diane Fink, a neighbor, expressed concerns about using Bodine Street for parking, which would leave her property susceptible to cars backing up to her door or rendering the street inaccessible for fire trucks and emergency vehicles.

David O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighbors, said that the street in question is charming with intact original houses with lots that extend to Bodine and Montrose Streets. The neighbors' association would like the two-foot sidewalk re-constructed since the visual appearance of the streetscape is very important.

Mr. Rivera made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation modified with a denial of any work on the fence on the east property line. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Perri dissented and Mr. James abstained.

806 South Hancock Street

Therese Zeccardi, Owner

Scott Larkin, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Replace larger roof deck with smaller roof deck

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended approval of the proposal, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and the Roofs Guideline [Recommended: designing additions to roofs such as decks and terraces so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

Ms. Spina presented the project. The building presently has a roof deck that covers the entire roof, built by the previous owner without a permit or Historical Commission approval. The proposal calls for demolishing the current deck and installing a roof deck towards the rear portion only. The deck will be set behind the chimney and almost behind the front slope of the roof. The access to the deck will be through a roof hatch that is converted from an old skylight at the peak of the roof; the Historical Commission approved the placement of the skylight in 1976. Since the house now stands alone, the deck will still be slightly visible from both sides.

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

611-19 Catharine Street

Rick Shaffer, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1838

PROPOSAL: Legalize roof

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended approval of legalizing the black asphalt shingles and extending or "scabbing" the joists to accept a cornice matching that

on the front and rear, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement, the new feature will match the old in design, texture, and where possible, materials.].

Ms. Spina explained the proposal. The Committee and Commission approved work to this building last year; however when the final construction plans were submitted to the Department of Licenses and Inspections they did not come to the Historical Commission for review. The plans included replacing the roof and installing asphalt/fiberglass roofing to replicate the original cedar shingle roof, but they are the wrong color; the shingles are black instead of weathered wood. The proposal calls for legalizing the darker roof and replacing the cornice with a plain board.

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

48-50 South Front Street, 101-03 Chestnut Street

Allied Holding, LLC, Owner

William G. Schwartz, Esq., Applicant

DATE: c. 1840 for all

PROPOSAL: Add stair and elevator penthouse, roof deck, flower boxes and awnings
The Committee unanimously recommended approval of the penthouses, awnings as revised, and roof deck with the position of the railing at the Front Street elevation to be determined with a mock-up, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work 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 Roofs Guideline [Recommended: designing additions to roofs such as decks and terraces so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

This property returns for just a rooftop deck with a penthouse for an elevator and stair. The elevator and stair penthouses will be sheathed in vertical metal siding, painted a grey color, and will have flush metal doors. The penthouses will be set back over twenty-five feet from the Front Street façade and will sit along the northern party wall of 48 South Front Street. These will be visible from Front Street, owing to the empty lot next door. The deck will be set back five feet from both the Front Street and Chestnut Street facades and will have a metal picket railing. The application also includes installing flower boxes on all of the windows and fabric marquees at three entrances.

William Schwartz, counsel for the project, disclosed to the Commission that the submitted plans include a site-line study set at 45-degree angle from the sidewalk.

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

22 South 3rd Street

Helen and David Cohen, Owners

Karen Robinson, Applicant

DATE: 1837, William Strickland, architect; John Struthers, stonemason

PROPOSAL: Legalize blue paint on marble façade

The Committee unanimously recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 7 [Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.].

No one representing the application attended the meeting. Ms Spina presented the proposal. Without a permit or Historical Commission approval, the tenant in this highly significant building painted the front, marble façade blue. The owner granted the tenant permission to do the painting.

Commission members noted that the paint should be removed immediately, following conservation guidelines and with a building permit, so that the marble suffers as little damage as possible.

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

28 North 3rd Street

Alexander Generalis, Thomas Miles and Theresa Stigale, Owners

Theresa Stigale, Applicant

DATE: 1857 for Henry Korn by Stephen Button, architect

PROPOSAL: Cut opening and install garage with roll-up door

The Committee unanimously recommended approval, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and 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.].

Ms. Spina presented the application. The owner wishes to install a garage in an alley at the rear of the building. The opening will have a roll-down metal door with the mechanicals on the interior.

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

1010 Arch Street

Israel Shenker, Owner

Jennifer Grafton, Applicant

DATE: 1902, William Prichet, architect

PROPOSAL: Cut window openings in west façade, enclose rear loading dock for lobby

The Committee unanimously recommended approval of the windows, on the condition that they are changed to have a more vertical orientation, and approval of the infilling of the loading dock area, all with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials,

features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work 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.]; the Windows Guideline [Recommended: Designing and installing additional windows on rear or other non-character-defining elevations if required by the new use. New window openings may also be cut into exposed party walls. Such design should be compatible with the overall design of the building, but not duplicate the fenestration pattern and detailing of a character-defining elevation.]; and the Entrances Guideline [Recommended: Designing additional entrances on secondary elevations when required for the new use in a manner that preserves the historic character of the buildings.].

On the west façade, the owner wants to cut eight hopper windows. The building will have two new mezzanine floors with bathrooms, and the floors would bisect double-hung windows. The Committee had asked for section drawings at a previous meeting, which have been submitted.

At the rear of the property, the building has a loading dock. The application calls for infilling the area with brick and windows to create a lobby space. The windows will match those approved for the upper floors and the door will be a single-leaf and fully-glazed.

Ms. Spina presented the application and noted that the applicant concurs with the Committee's recommendation.

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

3620 Hamilton Street

Joy Donnelly, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Legalize deck and conversion of a window into a door

The Committee unanimously recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work 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.].

Ms. Spina noted that the owner requested a six-month continuance in order to file an application for rescission. Mr. Sugrue stressed that the legalization of the deck should be considered as a separate issue. Mr. Sklaroff pointed out that the Designation Committee convenes as needed; therefore, six months is an appropriate time frame.

Joy Donnelly, the owner, asserted that her position is that her property should never have been designated.

Mr. Tissian expressed concern about the six month time period with regards to the legalization.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to grant the applicant a continuance for a period not to exceed six (6) months. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Sugrue dissented.

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

Old Business

306-08 South 19th Street aka 1901 Delancey Street

Henry McNeil, Owner

Adam Jacob, Applicant

DATE: 1900, Cope & Stewardson for E.B. Smith

PROPOSAL: Roof decks, new gates on Delancey Street and railings on 19th Street
The Architectural Committee recommended that the application be approved without the planters on the front stoop, the screen door at the first-floor rear, or the trellises on the roof decks.

This application proposes several alterations to the Colonial Revival mansion at the northwest corner of S. 19th Street and Delancey Place. It was designed by important architects Cope & Stewardson and is listed as Significant to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District.

At the front, the plans specify the replacement of the front step, front railings, and basement grates at grade as well as the addition of planters and railings at a tree. The existing front step and the decorative parts of railings are original. Also, basement window grates would be refurbished.

At the rear, the application proposes the replacement of gates, fences, and walkways with simple metal picket gates, fences, and walkways. An existing concrete wall would be stuccoed. It also proposes bars on some rear windows, a large sliding screen door at the first-floor rear, and a new door with sidelight at the basement rear. The basement door will not be visible, but the sliding screen door will be. The screen door will not fit within the existing door opening; instead, it will cover the entire doorway. Also, lights are proposed, but no details about the fixtures or mounting have been provided.

The application proposes an interlinked set of three roof decks with a stairway, trellises, and planters on the roof of the western end of the building. The lowest of the three decks will not be visible owing to a very tall parapet, but the upper decks as well as all of the trellises would be visible from Delancey Place.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Attorney Mark Brookman and architect Jeffrey Krieger represented the application. Mr. Brookman asserted that two issues remain unresolved; the front railing with the planters and the roof decks privacy screens or trellises. He informed the Commission that the owner is willing to eliminate the planters from the railing; however, he believes that the sun screens are not readily visible. Mr. Brookman asserted that the wrong *Standard* is being applied with regards to the sun screens. Mr. Krieger projected a computer simulated movie to show that visibility is very limited. Some Commissioners asserted that the movie demonstrated the significant visibility of the proposed rooftop additions. Mr. Brookman

said that the property in question is surrounded by tall buildings and only a portion of the lowest sun screen at the southwest corner of the building would be visible. He said that the sun screens offer protection from the sun.

Mr. Sugrue reviewed the *Standards* concerning the sun screens and noted that the sun screens do affect the appearance of the structure. Ms. Smyler thought that the screens would not significantly impact the building and suggested the approval of all screens except the most visible screen southwest corner of the building.

Mr. James made a motion to accept the proposal as submitted with the elimination of the trellis or sunscreen at the southwest corner of the lowest deck. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

119, 121, and 123 Catharine Street

200 Christian Street Partners, Owners

Craig Deutsch, Applicant

DATE: unknown

PROPOSAL: Complete demolition of existing buildings; construction of four three-story buildings with garages and roof decks

Ms. Murray made a motion to grant the applicant a continuance for a period not to exceed six (6) months. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

MURAL AD HOC COMMITTEE

David Perri, Chair

The Commission agreed to table the discussion of the mural report until the 12 December 2004 meeting of the Commission.

NATIONAL REGISTER COMMENT

8500 Pine Road, Fox Chase Farm

The nomination cites criteria A, association with broad patterns of history and Criteria C, distinctive characteristics of type, period, etc. for local significance. Although this property straddles the county line, as the last surviving farm context in Philadelphia, it has obvious local significance. Agriculture was the dominant land use for much of the city's history. This applies especially to the Northeast which was largely agricultural until after World War II.

This property should be recommended for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

Mr. James made a motion to recommend the listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

1719-1725 North 33rd Street, 3226-3228 Clifford Street, Plaza Apartments, Vernon House

This nomination argues under Criterion A the importance emergence of the urban apartment building as opposed to the urban tenement, as a genre in the early 20th century. In addition, under Criterion C, Sauer and Hahn, possess significance as important and prolific, Philadelphia architects of commercial, residential, industrial, institution and theater buildings.

Ms. Murray made a motion to recommend the listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

200 Chestnut Street, United States Custom House and Appraisers' Stores

This building meets criterion Av for its place in the history of government, particularly the Works Progress Administration, and in the larger context of the Port of Philadelphia. As the work of Ritter and Shay, architects, and George M. Hardin, muralist, it meets Criterion C.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to recommend the listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

THE REPORT on the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, October 2004

Mr. Tyler asked if members of the Commission had any questions about the report. They had none.

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to approve the expenditure of \$30.56 for the Architectural Committee lunches.

Ms. Murray made a motion to approve the expenditure. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

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

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary