

**THE MINUTES OF THE 475th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
8 March 2002 at 9:00 a.m.**

**Commission Conference Room 18th Floor, 1515 Arch Street
Duane Bumb, Acting Chair**

Present

Duane Bumb, Deputy Director, Commerce Department, Acting Chair
James Brown, IV
Gary Hack, Chair, City Planning Commission
Melissa Heller-Batzer, Director of Economic Development, Office of City Council President
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
Thomas Kilkenny
David Perri, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Vincent Rivera, AIA
Michael Sklaroff, Esquire
Denise J. Smyler, Esquire
Harris Steinberg, AIA
Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.
Norman Tissian
Scott Wilds, Deputy Director, Office of Housing and Community Development

Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Lawrence K. Copeland, Senior Attorney, Law Department

Also

Christopher Anderson, The Starmark Group
Reverend Jermaine Quick, Mars Hill Baptist Church
John Blatteau, John Blatteau Architects/Mars Hill Baptist Church
Robin Schatz, Office of Councilman Frank DiCicco
Mary Ellen Strain, Towers Miller Architects
Ari Miller
David W. O'Donnell, Secretary, Queen Village Neighbor's Association
Sara Jane Elk, Eastern State Penitentiary Historic Site
Sheth Jones, Capitol Programs Office
Noa Maliar, Loomis McAfee Architects
Carl Freedman, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects
Mary Patel Jisinki, 33 North 3rd Street, #14
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance
David Amburn, Amburn/Jarosinki Architects
Peter Miller
Jerry Roller, J. K. Roller Architects
Frank Kakos, Kakos Architects
Joel Goldstein, J.R. Goldstein & Associates, Architects, P.C.
Rachel Schade, Schade and Bolender Architects
Paul Rosen, 1830 Rittenhouse Square, Unit 7C, owner
William Menke, Landscape Architect, Menke and Menke

Theresa Stuhlman, Fairmount Park Commission
Bernice Hamel, Society Hill Civic Association
Carol Gangewere, Capitol Programs Office
Susanna Barucco, Martin Rosenblum Architects
Richard Cole
Norma and Virgil Procaccino
Kiki Bolender, AIA, Schade and Bolender Architects
Michael Lane, Hillspring Landscaping Architects
Joanne Aitken, Dagit Saylor Architects
Peter Saylor, Dagit Saylor Architects

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to designate Duane Bumb the acting-chair for the meeting. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Duane Bumb, Acting Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

Minutes of the 474th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission. Upon a motion made by Mr. Tissian and duly seconded, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the 474th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held on 8 February 2002, James Cuorato, Acting Chair.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 26 February 2002, Vincent Rivera, Chair.

2101-2199 Fairmount Avenue, Eastern State Penitentiary

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Sally Elk, Applicant

DATE: 1823-36, John Havilland, Architect

PROPOSAL: New roofing on rotunda and links

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with the staff to review details.

This application involves roofing and repair of masonry walls on the link structures and rotunda. Eastern State Historic Site has raised \$1,000,000 to fund these repairs. The proposal calls specifically for building a new higher roof for the intersection of links 2, 2N and 10. The intersection of the two wing links, when added onto original link 2, destroyed the structural integrity and rain shedding ability of the original design. The masonry walls supporting the roofing structures as well as decorative corbelling will be restored. The metal roofs on links 2, 4, 5, 6, 10 and the rotunda will be rebuilt and covered with standing or flat seam metal and painted. Plans call for the stabilization of link 3S and covering the skylights with protective boxes.

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

1936 Wallace Street

Spring Garden Limited Housing Partners, Owners

John Gibbons, Architect

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: New front façade

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of corrected drawings with the staff to review details.

This application calls for the demolition of a stuccoed, damaged brick façade and the reconstruction of a new brick façade using a different brick and joint profile. The drawing does

not show the windows or door correctly; however, it calls for new two-over-two windows and paneled door to match the adjacent house. The door surround will be a simplified design in cast stone and the marble will be cleaned of paint. New limestone sills and lintels will replace the marble ones where those cannot be reused.

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

57 Summit Street, corner of Prospect Street

Malcom Sheppard, Owner

Chariss McAfee, Architect

DATE: c. 1854

PROPOSAL: Cut new window and doors, side facade

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with the staff to review details.

The proposal, revised since last month, now calls for cutting a window into a double door leading out to the terrace and a window in the kitchen ell. No work is shown to wood addition.

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

Livezey Lane Fairmount Park, Livezey House, Glen Fern

City of Philadelphia, Owner

John Milner, Architect

DATE: c. 1750

PROPOSAL: Drainage/structural repairs

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with the staff to review details.

This proposal calls for site work to help drain water away from the building, including building a new retaining wall behind the building, demolition of a non-historic concrete patio, installing drains in existing walls, and restoration of windows that have received water damage.

Mr. Sugrue commented on the importance of this magnificent structure.

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

4415 Main Street, NE corner of Gay Street

Christopher Anderson, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1825

PROPOSAL: Cut new side storefront window

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with the staff to review details.

This proposal calls for cutting a storefront window into the Gay Street elevation of this corner building at the first floor.

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

1909,1913,1915,1925,1930,1931,1934,2021,2032 Mt. Vernon Street
1908,1912,1914,1916,1920,1930,1932,1934 Wallace Street
619,626,628,630,634 North 18th Street

Spring Garden Limited Housing Partners, Owners

Michael Gresko, Architect

DATE: c. 1865

PROPOSAL: Masonry coating of marble

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal as submitted, but recommended other options for the applicant to explore with staff to review and approve method.

This proposal calls for coating the marble bases, door surrounds and lintels and sills of these rowhouses with the Thorocoat system. Many of these elements were previously painted and the paint removal has not met expectations, and appears splotchy. Ms. Spina stated that the Committee denied the proposed method because it will cause on-going maintenance and the Thorocoat coating has a texture unlike the marble. The Committee proposes a light abrasive such as the JOSS or Gomage treatments.

Mr. Sklaroff inquired about the names of the principal partners in the ownership of these properties.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to deny the proposal as submitted but gave staff the authority to approve and review details of the selected method. Mr. Brown seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1614 North Street

Michael Treacy, Owner

James Treacy, Applicant

DATE: c. 1865

PROPOSAL: New garage doors

The Architectural Committee recommended denial as submitted but recommended that the applicant explore other options which retain the proportions of the historic doors.

This proposal involves removing a side swing door that was approved by the Committee and Commission as a reconstruction of an existing historic door and replacing it with a sectional roll up garage door. The applicant has concerns about security with the glazing and convenience.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal and noted that the original doors require strong horizontal bands. Mr. Wilds questioned the adjacent house's door design. Mr. Sklaroff believed that the applicant has more than cooperated and that the specifics of the door's design should be at the owner's discretion with the staff to review the details. Mr. Brown stated that since the owner is willing to replicate the original door, then he should proceed in this manner. Mr. Rivera concurred with Mr. Sklaroff and thought that the ease in operation an important aspect in the door's selection.

Patricia Freeland, of the Spring Garden Civic Association, spoke in support of the proposal.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal as submitted or a revised design based on the historic doors, whichever the owner chooses, with the staff to review details. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion which carried with 12 votes. Mr. Sugrue and Mr. Wilds dissented.

2057 Brandywine Street

Dermott McCartan, Owner

Larry Persofsky, Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Rear windows and deck

The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

The application includes new rear one-over-one windows on the three floors of the main building and a new door on the third floor leading to a deck on the roof of the two-story addition.

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

2025-29 Chestnut Street, Mid-City YWCA, Friere Charter School

Redevelopment Authority, Owner

Carl Freedman, Architect

DATE: 1923

PROPOSAL: Awning and sign on Ranstead Street façade

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the revised proposal with the staff to review details.

This building returns to the Committee and Commission with changes to the proposed awning on the rear of the building. Committee previously questioned the design of the awning and its placement below the fire balcony at the 2nd floor. The application now calls for the fabric awning to be attached to the fire balcony. A new sign, with individual aluminum letters will hang from the awning skeleton and a new banner will attach to the fire balcony.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Heller-Batzer seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1822 Delancey Street

Daniel Berger, Owner

David Traub, Architect

DATE: c.1855

PROPOSAL: Partial demolition and new addition on rear

The Architectural Committee recommended denial based on preservation of historic fabric and Standards 2, 5, and 9. Two members, Mr. Rivera and Mr. McCoubrey favored the proposal.

The applicant requested a continuance.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to grant a continuance for a period not to exceed six (6) months. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1619 Lombard Street

Ari Miller, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: Three-story rear addition

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with the staff to review details, but requested revised drawings to include a reveal and the half gabled roof.

This proposal calls for construction of a three-story addition with rear deck. The proposal also calls for restoration of the front door and transom; however the proposed panels need to be altered somewhat in proportion.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal and noted that the applicant submitted a revised proposal to reflect the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to approve the revised proposal. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1920 Waverly Street

John and Barbara Ramb, Owners

Frank Kakos, Applicant

DATE: c. 1865

PROPOSAL: New electric meter

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with the painting of the meter red

This proposal calls for the legalization of the installation of an enlarged electrical box and meter on the front of the building. Other houses on the block have small meters, as did this one. With remote reading it is now possible for the meter to be placed internally; however, the owners want it on the outside to save space.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Mr. Wilds questioned the existing meter to the right. Mr. Rivera said that utility companies have specific regulations regarding the distance between gas and electric meters. Mr. Sklaroff asked the staff to consult with the utility companies to establish their policies on meter placement, so that the Commission knows of their requirements when reviewing this type of application.

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

2220 Delancey Street

Don Bleznak, Owner

Mary Ellen Strain, Architect

DATE: c. 1877 for William Weightman

PROPOSAL: New windows and decks

The Architectural Committee recommended approval subject to the rear window/door opening not being widened and the staff to review details.

The proposal calls for new windows on the rear of the property and two roof decks. This three-story house has a two-story rear bay. The owners wish to install a deck on the roof of the bay and enlarge a third floor window into a double-leaf door leading out the deck. The application also has a roof deck on the main building, but set back from the front façade.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal and in response to the question, noted the staff recommended approval of the deck on the bay because it sits at the rear. Mr. Sugrue stated that the bay is very visible from 23rd Street. Mr. Hack believes the deck on the bay would be an intrusion while other

members of the Commission believed that the deck on the bay would change the character of the property.

Dan Bleznak, the owner, and Peter Miller, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Miller said that decks on bays exist in the area and that the deck would be the same footprint as the bay. In addition, he believes that the visibility is minimal. In response to the commission's issue of the material, he said that he is open to a metal railing in lieu of a wood railing.

Mr. Hack made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation and approve of the roof deck but deny the deck on the bay and the lengthening of the window. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

627-37 North 18th Street, NE corner North Street

Carriage House Condo Association, Owner

J. R. Goldstein, Applicant

DATE: c. 1886

PROPOSAL: New skylight

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with a sandstone color and the staff to review details.

This proposal calls for erecting a pyramidal skylight over the internal lightwell. The free-standing structure will sit on a metal raised curb. An additional air-conditioning unit and vents will also be installed on the roof; however, the many existing units and four large penthouse additions will hide most of these. The proposal also includes a new fresh air intake louver on the rear (Bouvier Street) façade, in an existing opening and painted to match the surrounding trim.

Joel Goldstein, the architect, attended the meeting and explained that the curb is solid with louvers between the mechanical equipment and that the metal elements will be a sandstone color.

Commission members questioned the visibility given the size of the building, and it was noted that visibility exists from Fairmount Avenue and 18th Street.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation with the color and details to be reviewed by staff. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1800 Walnut Street, Rittenhouse Square

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Carol Menke, Landscape architect

DATE: 1913, Paul Philippe Cret, architect

PROPOSAL: New paving

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the change from concrete to brick system, but thought that the color and uniformity should be reviewed by staff for details.

Through the center of Rittenhouse Square, the existing paving, installed in 1975, is made of tan brick pavers framed by poured concrete strips. The concrete has a large amount of aggregate, providing a contrast to the brick in color and texture. The proposal calls for removing the concrete strips and installing ironspot brick pavers in a black color.

Mr. Sklaroff inquired whether there is any concrete that can sustain the weight of heavy traffic. Mr. Menke, landscape architect for the project, stated that the depth of the strips dictate its durability. Some members believed that preservation is most important and therefore a

restoration replacing concrete with concrete, which would be more faithful to Cret's design, should be considered.

Mr. Menke said that concrete is a more historic material but in this location cannot bear the traffic in the square and the salting needed during inclement weather. He also said that this placement in such a narrow area would damage the existing tan brick pavers on the edges. In addition, the installation of new concrete would require the removal of the entire paving and starting over. Mr. Menke stated that his proposal matches Cret's design in layout; however the material has changed because concrete is unsuitable. Also the repair work must be done with a very limited budget.

Mr. Wilds inquired whether Cret's plan of walkways and pathways is compatible with the existing layout, or has through time the entire layout and design changed so much that going back to concrete would mean an actual restoration. Mr. Sklaroff said that the City and private sector should be held to the same standards in regards to preservation. Mr. Tyler concurred with Mr. Sklaroff and further stated that work on the Square should in an incremental way re-establish Cret's plan, including materials. Ms. Spina said that the Committee discussed the proposal at length, but recommended approval to a change in material only for practical reasons. Mr. Sugrue noted that in 1913 concrete's endurance could have been unknown to Cret and the 1975 intervention of the square could be considered a historically significant transformation. Commission members did have concerns about the darkness of the stone replacement between the pavers. Ms. Smyler believes that replacement in concrete should be investigated, as well as the cost to give a basis for the Commission's decision.

Mr. Menke reiterated that the installation of concrete will damage the existing brick panels and that funding plays an important part in the repair. He also noted that the Fairmount Park Commission is unable to canvas for outside funding.

Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance, said that she would gladly consult with the Center City Residents' Association and the Preservation Alliance because these organizations would like to see a restoration.

Paul Rosen, Friends of Rittenhouse Square, said that the square needs repair. Funding a full restoration would be unfeasible for the group.

Mr. James questioned the fact that the applicant has applied for repairs, and that some Commission members are proposing that the applicant perform work greater than the proposed scope.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation but appoint a sub-committee to come back with an optimal plan for restoration with the inclusion of an analysis of the cost for repair as well as restoration. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion. The motion failed with a vote of 6 to 7 with one recusal. Mr. Rivera, Mr. Sugrue, Mr. Tissian, Mr. James, Mr. Hack, Mr. Perri, and Mr. Bumb opposed the motion. Ms. Heller-Batzer recused.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried with 7 votes. Mr. Steinberg, Mr. Kilkenney, Ms. Smyler, Mr. Sklaroff, Mr. Wilds and Mr. Bumb opposed the motion. Ms. Heller-Batzer recused.

1830 Rittenhouse Square, Unit 15A, SE corner of 19th Street

Paul Rosen, Owner

Rachel Simmons Schade, Architect

DATE: 1913, Frederick Webber, architect

PROPOSAL: New windows and relocate air conditioning units

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the following:

1. *Restoration of the double-leaf door,*
2. *Rehabilitation of the double hung windows, and*
3. *Placement of the HVAC units with the staff to review all details..*

In addition the Architectural Committee recommended denial of the picture windows per Standards 2 and 5.

This proposal is for a condominium unit on the 15th floor, which wraps around the north façade and incorporates the first three bays of the east and west façades. The window pattern of the building includes bays that have Palladian windows, large double-hung windows with semi-circular transoms flanked by thin double-hung windows. Stone mullions separate all elements. For the central window on the north façade, the design has a coupled double-hung window, separated by wood mullion, flanked by double-hung windows of equal size, separated by stone mullions. The proposal calls for the rehabilitation of the 14 flanking double-hung windows and restoration of the double-leaf door leading out onto the western balcony. For the central windows in each bay, the owner wishes to remove the double-hung windows and install large picture windows. The proposal also calls for removing the central, coupled window and installing a large picture window. Finally, the proposal asks for the HVAC units to be relocated to the fire escape balcony on the east façade and a small vent on the east facade.

Paul Rosen, the owner, and Rachel Schade, the architect, attended the meeting. Ms. Schade stated that it was her belief that the center window has a wood mullion so that it could be removed to create larger windows, as demonstrated on other floors of the building. The applicant presented enlarged photographs showing the numerous floors with the proposed condition. All but one of the windows were installed without the proper permits. Mr. Rosen stated that he should not be penalized for proceeding in the appropriate manner. Furthermore he believes that his proposal does not impair the historic value of the building, which has already changed, and believes that there should be an enforcement of violations to any tenant that proceeded without a permit. Mr. Rosen also noted the casement windows on the 14th floor. Ms. Spina stated that the Commission approved those windows because of extenuating circumstances regarding questions of ownership at the time of the violation. She also noted that the central wood mullin remains despite changes in the windows.

Mr. Steinberg expressed his belief that the modifications to the windows change the intended design and he does not support the changes and the Commission is bound to look at the merits of each individual case. Mr. Sklaroff concurred with Mr. Steinberg; saying the existing conditions interrupt the rhythm and character of the building and the situation should not be compounded. Ms. Smyler cited the approval on the 14th floor and that this was not the intention of the original architect. Mr. Wilds said that the center window has a very strong impact on the character of the building. Mr. Sugrue noted this allowance will give way to future applications.

Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation, said that she opposes any further changes to the building.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted. Ms. Heller-Batzner seconded the motion which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Sugrue, Mr. Steinberg, Mr. Rivera, Mr. Sklaroff, Mr. Wilds and Mr. Perri opposed the motion.

Mr. Rosen conferred with Mr. Sklaroff and said that he would be willing to comply with the historic windows, if violations are enforced against owners that have altered the historic windows without a permit. Mr. Sklaroff then requested that the previous motion be rescinded for six months to allow Licenses and Inspections to pursue the enforcement of violations for the

restoration of the windows. Mr. Perri said that enforcement could take more than a year. Mr. Tyler reiterated that this could entail permits dating back as far as thirty years. Mr. Rosen thanked the Commission and left the meeting.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to rescind the previous motion and hold the motion for 6 months but approve all parts of the proposal except the picture window to give such time for enforcement of violations.

Mr. Wilds expressed his opposition to this motion but thought the violation enforcement appropriate. He noted that a motion cannot be held up or reversed after the applicant leaves. Mr. Hack said that enforcement has to be uniform and cited other buildings with the same existing conditions. Mr. Perri reiterated the need for increased staffing to handle such enforcement. Mr. Copeland, counsel for the Commission, stated that the reconsideration of a motion has to come from a party who voted in favor of the motion; therefore, Mr. Sklaroff cannot offer a motion to change the original decision and the decision stands.

7 Loxley Court

Don and Hilka Frankenfeld, Owners

Mary Ellen Strain, Architect

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Rear additions

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of a revised design that sets the west entry wall further back, and takes the appearance of a brick garden wall with wood gate.

This application calls for a large clapboard addition on the rear of 7 Loxley Court, which consists of two smaller houses previously combined into one residence. The footprint of the addition is wider than the historic building at the first floor, allowing that portion to be visible from the historic courtyard. The roofline of the proposed addition is a gable that rises above the historic roof.

Mary Ellen Strain, the architect, attended the meeting and stated that alterations are necessary for ADA reasons and that the addition will house the elevator. The applicant submitted revised drawings to reflect the Committee's recommendations.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to approve the revised design. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

209 Cuthbert Street, aka 51-55 Little Boys Way

Marie Ginsburg, Owner

Jerry Roller, Architect

DATE: c. 1870

PROPOSAL: New entrance, canopy and sign

The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

This proposal calls for a new metal front door, four-panel sidelight, canopy and signage on this industrial building. That bay of the building was previously substantially altered to create the entrance and now contains a flush metal door.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Heller-Batzer seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

215 Lombard Street aka 420-434 South 2nd Street

Steve Marsh, Cosi, Incorporated, Owner

Joseph Alteari, Architect

DATE: 1977, Leatherbee Associates, architects

PROPOSAL: Exhaust vent and illuminated signage

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of allowing the vent set above a new horizontal muntin with a full width canvas like awning, and the sign with punch through letters above modified with cream colored plastic on the bottom, or halo lit metal letters.

This application stems from the transition of the space from an XandO to a Cosi restaurant. The owner wishes to install a vent in the transom of one of the windows and shorten the awning to expose the vent. Also, the application includes two new plastic internally lit box signs at the corner of the building.

Mr. James made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Heller-Batzer seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

33 North 3rd Street, corner of Filbert Street

Joseph Barber, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Roof deck, HVAC, stairhouse

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal.

This application calls for a roof deck surrounding a barrel-vault skylight. The access to the deck will be through a one-story stair penthouse at the northeast corner of the roof. An existing elevator tower stands at the southeast corner. The roof deck will be set back fifteen feet from the front wall of the building and over 2-½ feet from the parapet walls at the sides. Sight-line photographs show minimal visibility from 3rd Street.

Joseph Barber, the owner, attended the meeting.

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

234 Pine Street

Harvey and Babs Snyder, Owners

David Amburn, Architect

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: Rear and side partial demolition/additions

The Architectural Committee recommended denial as submitted per Standards 2, 9 and 10, but offered the applicant suggestions for the revised design.

The applicant had applied for a rear addition last month, but following the Committee meeting, requested a continuance [Proposal #1]. This revised proposal comes to the Commission for the first time. The application now calls for the demolition of historic fabric on the first and second floors, building a new rear wall in brick projecting out several feet and new windows at the 1st and 2nd floors. Metal plates above the 2nd floor will shield the HVAC units on the roof [Proposal #2]. The applicant researched the history of the building, and the addition dates to 1935.

David Amburn, the architect, and Babs Snyder, the owner, attended the meeting. Ms. Snyder presented a list of neighbors who support the construction. She also noted that the rear 1930s addition has been significantly altered and that only a small amount of historic fabric still remains. In addition, she said that Stamper Street is a mix and that the neighbors prefer that the addition remains plain and brick be retained at the corner. Ms. Snyder and Mr. Amburn presented drawings reflecting the Committee's recommendations [Proposal #3].

Commission members expressed concern about consistency and believed the second proposal more appropriate than the revised drawings presented at the meeting, since it reflects modern changes.

Robin Schatz stated that Councilman Frank DiCicco supports the second proposal.

Bernice Hamel, speaking on behalf of the Society Hill Civic Association, stated that the Association supports the Committee's recommendation and supported the third proposal, saying that it was more in keeping with the houses on Stamper Street.

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

242 South 3rd Street

Robert Bury, Owner

Kiki Bolender, Architect

DATE:

PROPOSAL: HVAC on roof, light over the front door

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the light on the transom bar of the door and the intercom in the stone jamb, but denied the HVAC placement on the visible roof location.

This application calls for a new HVAC unit on the third floor of the highly visible rear ell of this building. Staff previously approved the unit in a non-visible location, but the contractor prefers this site. In addition, the applicant proposes a light over the front door in the transom bar and installing an intercom system, using the existing holes in the door surround.

Kiki Bolender, the architect attended the meeting and noted that the neighboring house at 240 South 3rd Street has a unit in the same proposed location. In addition, she said that the visibility would be limited to Bingham Court owing to the roof sloping in the opposite direction; however, she also proposes a shielding wall of gray shingles to mimic the existing roof to further limit visibility.

Commission members thought the proposal more appropriate without the screen wall.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. Kilkenney seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

229 Fitzwater Street

Virgil and Norma Procaccino, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1859, new façade, c. 1950

PROPOSAL: Complete demolition and new construction

The architectural Committee recommended denial of the demolition per Standards 2, 5, and 10.

The owner wishes to demolish this building as well as the garage next door (231 Fitzwater) and erect two new townhouses. 231 Fitzwater is not on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

The application for demolition makes no claim for economic hardship or public interest. The application for new construction is incomplete and lacking elevations and a new site plan.

Virgil and Norma Procaccino, the owners, attended the meeting and noted that the request for larger windows is for aesthetic reasons as well as for more light. Ms. Procaccino also said that neither she nor her husband was aware of the historic status of the property at the time of purchase. She also claimed that the integrity of this former rooming house is already deteriorated, with very little historic fabric remaining. The applicants presented a petition signed by neighbors in support of the project.

Some Commission members questioned the designation. Mr. Tissian stated that Society Hill is an area with limited garages and believes that the two proposed garages are an intrusion on the streetscape. Mr. Sklaroff said that even in keeping with the merits of preservation, there is room for new architecture and advancement in the city, therefore he believes that the applicant should be able to do something new but the scale of the new construction should be controlled. Ms. Spina cited the property at 125 Queen Street, a similar situation, in which the Commission denied demolition. Mr. Tyler believes that once a designated building is gone, the new construction should not be under the Commission's jurisdiction, but thought that this consideration should be taken up at a later date. In addition, he said that the demolition issue should be for reasons of financial hardship or public interest or the applicant's request for a rescission of the designation. Mr. Hack inquired whether the applicant could exchange the rescission of the property for the Commission's jurisdiction over the new construction. Mr. Perri thought that a case for public interest exists.

David O'Donnell, speaking on behalf of the Queen Village Neighbor's Association, expressed opposition to the demolition of the designated property but supports the demolition of the garage at 231. Mr. O'Donnell noted that some signers of the petition were not aware of the historic status of the property. He said that 124 Queen Street was in the same situation and the owner restored it to its former glory. That could be done here as well.

Robin Schatz speaking on behalf of Councilman Frank DiCicco, expressed his support of the proposal.

Some Commission members believed that the property can be rehabilitated historically and that the applicant can have a favorable design without the garage. Mr. Sugrue said that the design issue is secondary; however the rescinding of the designation or the demolition of the property is a more important issue. Ms. Smyler stated that the designation of the property should not be rescinded. Ms. Spina noted that the process for rescission is the same as for designation. Mr. Hack and other members recommended the restoration of the designated property, and the demolition and new construction on the non-designated property.

Ms. Heller-Batzner made a motion to continue the motion for a period not to exceed thirty (30) days. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion which carried with 11 votes. Mr. Hack, Mr. Harris and Mr. Perri dissented.

143 Monroe Street

Elizabeth St. John, Owner

Thomas Zimmerman, Applicant

DATE: c. 1800; brick cornice, c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Legalize removal of brickwork and installation of new copper cornice

The Architectural Committee recommended denial as submitted but approval of adding a wood cornice with the staff to review details.

This early house had a corbelled brick cornice installed in the mid-19th century. In 1980 the Commission approved the removal of the brick cornice and the restoration of the earlier wood cornice. That work never commenced. In 2001 a different contractor received a new permit for roofing without cornice work, but removed the brick cornice and installed a metal cornice that does not match the earlier approved wood cornice or the later brick one. This application calls for the legalization of the installed metal cornice.

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

1115-45 Market Street, aka 51 North 12th Street, Reading Terminal Headhouse

Pennsylvania Convention Center Authority, Owner

Paul Steinke, Applicant

DATE: 1891-93, Francis Kimball and Wilson Brothers, architects

PROPOSAL: Signage

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the replacement awnings with the Reading Terminal Market logo and six blade signs to replace icons, but denial of the eight wall signs.

This application calls for additional signage for the Reading Terminal Market, using the historic diamond-shaped logo. The proposal includes 8 new wall signs on various locations and six blade signs hanging on existing brackets. The market also wishes to replace the awnings over the four 12th Street doors, with the new awnings reading "Reading Terminal Market."

Mr. Sklaroff stated that given the nature of the building, the proposed signage is appropriate.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Brown seconded the motion which carried with 12 votes. Mr. Rivera and Mr. Sklaroff dissented.

3260 South Street, University Museum

University of Pennsylvania, Owner

Joanne Aitkin, Architect

DATE: 1897-99, Wilson Eyre, Cope & Stewardson, Frank Miles Day, architects

Addition – 1971, Mitchell Guirgola, architects

Addition – 2001, Atkin Olshin Lawson-Bell, architects

PROPOSAL: New skylights, HVAC vents, new side door and rebuild garden

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with the staff to review details.

This complex proposal involves the ground and first floor plans of the museum. The original museum buildings do not have central HVAC systems. The proposal calls for creating a mechanical room and study facilities in the basement of the building, under the present garden area. Metal-framed skylights installed in the perimeter of the garden would provide the necessary light to these spaces. The installation of these rooms will require raising the entire garden area 6 to 8 inches above the current level. A new brick wall with marble coping will run along the edge of the skylights and new plantings will stand in front of the wall.

The new garden will match closely the original Italian-inspired design and will retain the elements of the pool, side lawns and brick paving. The original brick paving will be salvaged and

restored, the marble coping will be replaced, owing to its deteriorated condition. The pool will be rebuilt; however, since the entrance at this level has become the main entrance of the building, the plans call for shortening the pool slightly.

The fresh air-intake and exhaust vents for the HVAC system will be placed in the areas between the landscaped garden and the bays of the wings level to the ground. These will be minimally visible from the garden paths.

The final item is two new doors cut into window openings below grade, one on the west elevation of the west wing and one on the east elevation of the east wing. These doors will provide the necessary egress from the basement areas. On the west elevation, the existing areaway will have to be expanded slightly to accommodate the new door.

Peter Saylor, the architect, and Michael Lane, the landscape architect attended the meeting.

Mr. Tyler noted that the University of Pennsylvania's Cultural Resources Committee has issues with some aspects of the proposal. Mr. James questioned the mechanical venting in regards to its appropriateness. Commission members thought it important to match the brick and marble.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation with staff to approve details including the brick and marble matches. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion which carried with 10 votes. Mr. Hack, Mr. Sugrue and Mr. Steinberg recused themselves. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

1428-34 Chestnut Street, aka 111 South 15th Street, Packard Building

Chest-Pac Associates, L.P., Owners

Anthony M. Ciocca, Applicant

DATE: 1922-24, Ritter & Shay, architects

PROPOSAL: New fire door on Chestnut Street

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with the staff to review details.

This proposal calls for a new fire egress on the Chestnut Street façade. Behind the historic ornate gates there is a recess of six feet to the actual front doors. The new fire door opening will be cut in the eastern concrete wall and the door itself setback approximately six inches from the face of the wall. The door will be a flush metal door painted to match the concrete. The historic gate will help screen the new door.

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

THE REPORT of the Committee on Historic Designation, 12 February 20. Thomas Sugrue, Acting Chair

Saint Simeon Church, (Mars Hill Baptist Church)

2650-52 North 9th Street, aka 900-18 Lehigh Avenue, aka 2659-61 North Hutchinson Street

Date: 1890 Parish House; 1891 Church; 1895 Rectory

Architect: Frank Rushmore Watson

Laura Spina presented the nomination. The Church of Saint Simeon, a U shaped complex of three adjoining buildings, was designed by Frank Rushmore Watson in the late 1880's. Originally built for the Saint Simeon Episcopal Church, a parish formed in 1886, the church was

dedicated in memory of Right Reverend William Bacon Stevens, the fourth Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania. Ms. Spina stated that the Church of Saint Simeon meets criteria a, c, d, e and h of Section 14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code. It has significant character, interest and value as part of the development, heritage and cultural characteristics of the City. The Church reflects the environment of an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style, namely the predominance of the Gothic style in ecclesiastical architecture, and embodies the distinguishing characteristics of that style. It is the work of Frank Watson, an architect whose work has significantly influenced the historical, architectural and cultural development of the City. Finally the Church of Saint Simeon, owing to its unique location, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community and City.

Reverend Jermaine Quick, the pastor, was in attendance to give support to the nomination.

Mr. James made a motion to place the resource on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

THE REPORT on the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, November 2001

Mr. Tyler reiterated the need for more staffing, and the undo hardship that will be imposed upon the staff with the Boyd designation in regards to a lengthy litigation. Some members offered to speak to City Council in support of additional staff. Mr. Hack and Mr. Sugrue offered the services of architecture and preservation students as interns. Mr. Tyler then asked if members of the Commission had any questions about the report. There were none.

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to approve the expenditure of \$ 36.59 for the Architectural Committee's breakfast and lunch.

Mr. Hack made a motion to approve the expenditure. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Mr. James made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary