

**THE MINUTES OF THE 494th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
10 October 2003**

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

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
Duane Bumb, Deputy Director, Department of Commerce
Warren Huff, City Planner V, City Planning Commission
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
David Perri, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Robert Previdi, Director of Communications, Office of City Council President
Denise Smyler, Esq.
Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.
Norman Tissian
Scott Wilds, Deputy Director, Office of Housing and Community Development

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

Lawrence Copeland, Senior Attorney, Law Department

Also

Alan Heilman
Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association
Matthew Rieko, Smith Kolo Incorporated
Joel Spivak
James Straw, Kise Straw and Kolodner Architects
Philip Scott, Kise Straw and Kolodner Architects
Ray Diebel, Northstar Advisors, Please Touch Museum
David R. Curry, Germantown Cricket Club
Chip Dunahugh, Old City Civic Board, River's Edge Civic Officer
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Linda G. Carroll-Pitts, Free Library of Philadelphia
John Scorsone, River's Edge Neighborhood Association
Jonathan Broh, J.K. Roller Architects
Dave R. Kinapton, PCPC
Cal Man, CM and Associates
Rick Snyderman, 303 Cherry Street
C. M. Stein, Old City resident
Warren Muller, 309 Cherry Street
Jon Hollander, 1621 Spruce Street
Mitch Partovi, Free Library of Philadelphia
Nancey Goldenberg, Center City District
Robert J. Hotes, DPK &A Architects
Alfred Borden, The Lighting Practice

Julie Panassow, The Lighting Practice

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 494th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:10 a.m.

Minutes of the 493rd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Upon a motion made by Mr. Wilds and seconded by Mr. James, the Commission voted to approve the minutes of the 493rd Stated Meeting, 12 September 2003, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Upon a motion made by Mr. Wilds and seconded by Mr. James, the Commission voted to approve the minutes, as corrected, of the Special Meeting, 23 September 2003, Thomas Sugrue, Vice-Chair.

THE REPORT of the Committee on Historic Designation, 10 and 24 September 2003

Thomas Sugrue, Chair

Mr. Sklaroff remarked that owing to the late receipt of the packets, he was not fully prepared for discussion of this matter. He inquired about the substance of the designation meetings. Mr. Sugrue informed the Commission that expansion of the boundaries was the primary issue. Mr. Wilds expressed concern about the notification requirements to owners, with regard to the expansion. Mr. Farnham informed the Commission that the expansion would only encompass a portion of a property, which is already included in the proposed historic district. Therefore, the owner has already received notification. The portion to be included is the approach to the bridge, which was previously eliminated. Mr. Sugrue remarked that the two meetings, which discussed boundaries and the classification of the buildings with the exception of the Delaware bridge, were well attended.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to amend the agenda, with the placement of the report of the Committee on Historic designation until after the Architectural Committee report. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 30 September 2003

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair

Memorial Hall

City of Philadelphia, Owner

James Straw of Kise, Architect/Applicant:

DATE: 1876 for the Centennial Exhibition by architect Hermann Schwartzmann

PROPOSAL: Conceptual review of façade alterations and an addition

The Architectural Committee recommends approval in concept of the following: the main-façade doors and windows stipulated in Revised Scheme C, i.e. the replicated 1876 bronze and iron doors and new windows based on the 1921 configuration, but without the infill; the restoration of the corner pavilion windows to their 1876 appearance; the location, size, connection, and overall appearance but not the exterior details of the carousel addition; the removal of non-historic stairs, doors, and ramps and the restoration of associated areas; the two emergency exits near grade on the west façade; the redesigned drop-off lots flanking the main entrance, provided the paving matches the central walkway; the school bus drop-off road and main parking lot; and the restoration of the plaza between the branches of the Concourse. The Committee recommends that

further study be undertaken and alternative plans be submitted before decisions are rendered on the regrading for sidewalks up to the main entrance and the closing of the north branch of the Concourse.

This application for review in concept proposes several façade alterations as well as an addition to Memorial Hall. The most significant aspects of this proposal include new windows and doors for the corner pavilions and main or south façade, and the construction of an addition for a carousel on the east façade.

SOUTH ARCADE WINDOWS

The ten openings, five in each arcade, between the central entrance and corner pavilions in the main or south elevation (drawings Sk e1) would be reglazed. Originally, the arcade openings were open not glazed. The arcades were glazed in 1921 and the extant steel windows date to 1921. At that time, concrete infill was added to reduce the size of the window openings. The pane configuration of the 1921 windows was based on the configuration of the original windows in the north or rear façade.

The applicant has submitted three schemes for the reglazing of the arcades. In Scheme A, the 1921 windows and concrete infill would be removed and large frameless glass panels would be installed. The large glass panels would ostensibly replicate the open arcades of the pre-1921 building. In Scheme B, the 1921 windows would be replaced with identical windows. The concrete infill would be preserved. In Scheme C, the concrete infill would be removed and the 1921 windows would be replaced with windows of the same configuration.

Federal tax credits will be sought for this project. The State Historic Preservation Office contends that any window scheme other than Scheme B would jeopardize the tax credit application. The SHPO references Standard 4 and asserts that the 1921 windows and concrete infill have achieved their own historic significance.

CENTRAL ENTRANCE DOORS

Originally, bronze doors stood in the central entrance openings in the south façade. When the building was open, the doors were pulled back out of sight, giving the front façade an open appearance. In 1885, after the Centennial Exhibition, the bronze doors were replaced with wood panels and paneled wood doors. In 1921, when the arcade openings were glazed, fenestration was added to the upper panels. The 1885 wood doors and panels with the 1921 glazing are extant.

The applicant has submitted four schemes for the three central entrance openings (drawings Sk e1). In Scheme A, the wood panels and doors would be removed and large frameless glass panels and doors installed. The large glass panels and doors would ostensibly replicate the openness of the pre-1921 building. In Scheme B, the wood doors would be replaced with frameless glass panels and doors; the upper, fenestrated wood panels would be retained. In Scheme C, the wood panels and doors would be replaced with wood folding doors replicating the appearance of the wood panels and doors; a system of frameless glass panels and doors would be installed behind the folding doors. When the museum is open, the doors would be pulled back out of sight, giving the front façade an open appearance. In Revised Scheme C, the wood panels and doors would be replaced with a replication of the 1876 bronze and iron doors; a system of frameless glass panels and doors would be installed behind the bronze doors. When the museum is open, the doors would be pulled back out of sight, giving the front façade an open appearance.

The SHPO contends that the 1885 wood panels and doors with their 1921 alterations have

achieved their own historic significance as defined by Standard 4 and therefore must be retained.

CORNER PAVILION WINDOWS

The eight tall windows in the four corner pavilions, which date to the renovation undertaken in the 1950s and 1960s, would be removed and replaced with new windows replicating the 1876 windows.

The SHPO contends that the extant corner windows are not significant and therefore may be replaced.

CAROUSEL ADDITION

A large addition would be constructed at the east façade (drawings Sk c2 and Sk c3). Lawn and a driveway currently occupies the addition site. The addition would house an antique carousel at the 1st-story level and service facilities below grade. It would be constructed of steel and glass and connect to Memorial Hall below the decorative belt courses and frieze running across the central section of the east façade. Three historic blind arches in the east façade would be opened, allowing circulation from Memorial Hall. A garage opening would be added below grade in the east façade; it would be shrouded by the addition. Two doorways would be added at grade to the east façade, but would be obscured by the addition. An access road would run north from the addition to the Kelly Pool parking lot. A cooling tower screened by a fence would be located at the northeast corner of the addition.

ASSORTED ALTERATIONS

On the south façade (drawings Sk e1) in the eastern arcade, a non-historic stairway and doors would be removed and the façade and balustrade restored. On the east facade (drawings Sk e2), a non-historic stairway and doors would be removed and the façade restored. On the north facade (drawings Sk e3), a non-historic ramp and three non-historic doors would be removed and the façade restored. On the west facade (drawings Sk e4), two non-historic stairways and doors would be removed and the façade restored. Two emergency exits would be added at grade. Several skylights would be restored.

ALTERATIONS TO THE GROUNDS

Several alterations would be made to the grounds (drawing LSK-1). A school bus drop-off road would be added to the north. A large parking lot would be added to the west. At the south, the north branch of the Concourse would be closed to traffic and the plaza between the branches of the Concourse restored. Drop-off lots flanking the main entrance would be constructed. The land on either side of the main entrance steps would be regraded, allowing sidewalks to be built up to the main entrance and obviating the need for ramps. This change in grade is not represented on the south elevation drawing (drawing Sk e1), but will undoubtedly alter the appearance of the building on the landscape.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal at length. Mr. Wilds inquired if the proposed schemes meet the requirements; however, none of the schemes meet the door's requirements. Mr. Sklaroff asked if the significance of the carousel relates to the Centennial and if the housing over the carousel were all new construction. In response to Mr. Sugrue's query about the attachment, James Straw, the architect, said that it would be attached below the decorative beltcourse with the only disruption to the historic fabric being the removal of the infill around the arches. Mr. Straw disclosed that the mechanical equipment would be enclosed in the lower level with the carousel above it. He said that revised grounds alterations require the closing of the North branch concourse to accommodate buses and parking. He pointed out that the proposed change in grade

will eliminate the need for a ramp. Mr. Straw noted that a consultant has been hired to study the closing of the North branch of the Concourse.

Mr. Sugrue expressed concern about the fundamental appearance of the concourse with the closing of the north concourse and the grading of the sidewalk. Mr. Sklaroff remarked that he believes that Memorial Hall is the most important building in the city, and that the grading issue is very important. Mr. Wilds also had concerns about the South Arcade's windows and doors.

Mr. Straw said that the State and Federal Agencies have not seen the revised design; however, he has researched the history and evolution of this building and he is seeking guidance from the Commission on details of the design. Mr. Straw informed the Commission that he has begun developing a grading study and that the major problematic issues arise with the addition. Mr. Huff thought scheme C conceptually appropriate with modifications. Mr. Straw agreed with the Commission's consideration for conceptual approval and noted that if the State and Federal agencies do not approve of scheme C, then the project would require an additional review by the Commission. He said that the windows and door designs have not been reviewed by the State and Federal agencies because the research was done after the meeting, but will meet with these agencies in near future.

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance, disclosed that he is chairing the advisory committee for the Please Touch Museum. He expressed his support of the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Gallery said that the east side is the preferable location for the addition because earlier studies showed that the north façade would extend the addition into Fairmount Park.

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

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

Philadelphia Museum of Art

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Richard Tustin, Capital Programs Office, Applicant

DATE: 1919-28, Horace Trumbauer, Clarence Zantzinger & Charles Borie, architects

PROPOSAL: Lighting and security cameras

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal as submitted.

This application is for new lighting fixtures and security cameras around the museum. The present light fixtures, approved by the Commission and installed in 1998, are copies of the lights that historically stood around the museum and Logan Circle. The proposal calls for replacing many of the fixtures with new ones that have lights and security cameras, as well as adding poles with just security cameras. The cameras have plastic housing and sit on arms attached to the poles. The proposed poles have the same detailing as the existing light fixtures, but with an extra neck to hold the armature for the camera. The proposed cameras will measure 10 inches by 13 inches (not counting the armatures) and have housing the same color as the poles.

The Commission concurred with the Committee's recommendation.

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

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

1901 Vine Street, Free Library of Philadelphia

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Sandra Horrocks, Applicant

DATE: 1912-27, Horace Trumbauer, architect

PROPOSAL: Two illuminated signs

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the signs, on the condition that the posts have a smaller diameter and bollard caps and the facing is changed to a color that matches the stone of the building, with staff to review details.

The library returns with a revised signage application. The proposal calls for two signs, one at the corner of 20th and Vine Streets and the other at 19th & Vine Streets. Both will have lexan-faced metal signs with painted aluminum tube supports. The facing of the signs will be white with blue and lettering, surrounding a three-line LED screen. The eastern sign will be approximately 8-½ feet tall and equally wide. It will sit at the steps that lead down to the eastern side. The western sign stands approximately 12 feet tall, equally wide, and will be placed between the western steps and the building itself.

Ms. Spina presented the application and noted the possibility of a flat bollard cap retaining water.

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

1007-13 Chestnut Street, Victory Building Annex

Philadelphia Management Company, Owner

Jonathan Broh, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1901, Roos & Booraem, architects

PROPOSAL: Rear facade alterations

The Committee voted to recommend approval of restoring the cast-iron piers, glass in the transoms, metal panels in the storefront openings and below, and paneled or flush metal doors, all with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

The rear elevation of this building has suffered many unkind alterations. The bays between the cast-iron columns have concrete infill and metal doors, and the transoms are currently open. The application calls for retaining the infill and applying fresh stucco. The flush, metal doors would be replaced with the same.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal. Mr. Wilds pointed out that the rear of the building stands on an alley like street. Mr. Huff commented that the rear of the building does not fall within the controls of the Planning Commission, but he supports the Committee's decision.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the alterations. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

411 Manheim Street aka 5140 Morris Street, Germantown Cricket Club

Germantown Cricket Club, Owner

David Curry, Applicant

DATE: 1890-91, McKim, Mead & White, architects; 1902-07, wings added, McKim, Mead & White, architects

PROPOSAL: Legalize step alterations

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the step relocation and commemorative plaque, with staff to review details.

The limestone steps leading to the porch had worn considerably, so the club asked a contractor to replace them with a new set. Staff approved legalizing the step replacement since they matched the originals. However, the club did not want to dispose of the original steps and the mason moved them to the side of the porch. So now the steps lead to nowhere because the original railing blocks entrance to the porch. The club would like to erect a sign that commemorates the original steps.

Ms. Spina presented the application. Mr. Sklaroff disclosed that he is a member of the club. Mr. Copeland advised Mr. Sklaroff that his membership does not establish a need for his recusal of this proposal. The Commission agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Huff seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

6901 Germantown Avenue

Dennis McCarthy, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c.1798; c. 1860, front porch added

PROPOSAL: Legalize side porch enclosure and rear shed

Mr. Tissian made a motion to approve the thirty (30) day continuance. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

224 Market Street

Scott Stein, Owner/Applicant

DATE: built c. 1920

PROPOSAL: Storefront alterations

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the thirty (30) day continuance. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

301-303 Cherry Street

Rick Snyderman, owner

Joel Spivak, Applicant/Designer

DATE: c. 1860, attributed to architect Steven Button

PROPOSAL: Legalize penthouse, approve roof deck and rear window

The Architectural Committee concurred with the staff recommendation and unanimously voted to recommend approval of the rear window, but denial of the rooftop additions, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

This application proposes the completion of the construction of a penthouse and deck on the roof of the building at 301-303 Cherry Street. It also proposes the replacement of a window at the rear façade. The penthouse construction was begun without a permit. The partially completed penthouse is visible from N. 3rd and Cherry Streets. The window is not visible from any public right-of-way.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal and noted the receipt of several letters in support of the project. Mr. Sklaroff inquired about consequences for licensed contractors who do work without permits. Mr. Perri responded that the licensed contractors could be taken to court, have their license suspended and possibly be fined, but that the owner is responsible for any work done on his property. Mr. Bumb inquired about the course of action by the Commission if this project had come before it.

Richard Snyderman, the owner, said that the proposed structure is a part of the residence. He acknowledged confusion of the permit issue and presented photographs, which he believed would give the Commission a different sense of the proposed construction. He said that the existing clear story portion of the house was in a deteriorated state and that the new addition would incorporate the clear story. Mr. Snyderman said that permits were acquired in March after the Board of Building Standard's approval and that the contractor believed that all permits were in place. He noted that the clear story would be raised 5 feet and that the structure would be set back 34 feet to minimize visibility. Mr. Snyderman believes that stuccoeing of the penthouse will allow it blend with the existing structure. He noted that he has a strong interest in preservation and a commitment to Old City. Mr. Wilds inquired if the existing footprint would be enlarged. Mr. Snyderman responded that the depth at the rear would increase, with only the north side expanded. Joel Spivak, the architect, said that the stair enclosure next to the clear story is not visible from the street. He pointed out that the roof pitch is higher in the front thereby requiring additional height to the rear. Mr. Wilds remarked that a design, which would lower the height, could be accomplished. Mr. Snyderman said that the proposed structure would give access to the roof. Mr. Sugrue questioned its enormous size. Mr. Perri commented that a zoning permit and a building permit are two different processes. Mr. Huff questioned the demolition of historic fabric, which was done without a permit.

Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association, said that regardless of the size and the permit issue, in speaking on behalf of Old City residents who go through the proper processes, the project should be rejected.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Bumb dissented and Mr. Tissian abstained.

45 N. 2nd Street

Joe Fratto, owner

Jeffrey Peezick, applicant

DATE: 1852 by architect John Riddell; cast iron by Tiffany & Bottom Eagle Ironworks

PROPOSAL: Legalize roof deck

The applicant withdrew the application.

1721 Wallace Street

Fred Duling, owner
Frank Mallas, Friday Architects, applicant
DATE: vacant lot at time of designation
PROPOSAL: 45-day review-and-comment on new construction
The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended approval.

This application proposes the construction of an infill building on a vacant lot in the Spring Garden Historic District. The lot was vacant at the time of designation; therefore, the Commission jurisdiction consists solely of review-and-comment for a 45-day period. The application proposes to construct a new rowhouse with three apartments. The front façade would be compatible with the adjoining rowhouses. A stairtower and two decks with 5-foot wood fences, including one on the main section of the building, would be placed on the roof of the building.

Commission members concurred with the Committee's recommendation.

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

2027-2029 Mt. Vernon Street

Victor Keen and Jeanne Ruddy, owners
Alan Heilman, contractor, applicant
DATE: c. 1875

PROPOSAL: Rooftop addition and deck
The Architectural Committee recommends approval of the rooftop addition and roof deck, provided that the addition does not extend to the west wall of the main block of the building, but is limited to the width of the rear ell, and provided that the addition and deck is not visible from Mt. Vernon Street.

Mr. Farnham presented this application, which proposes the addition of a sun room and roof deck at the 4th-story level of the rowhouse at 2027-2029 Mt. Vernon Street. The west façade of this property is visible owing to the garden at 2029 Mt. Vernon Street.

The Historical Commission approved several alterations at the rear of this property in 1975. The sun room would replace a non-historic clerestory added at that time. The sun room would open onto a roof deck on the main block of the row house. The drawings are inadequate and contradictory and the application may be deemed incomplete.

Alan Heilman, the contractor, explained that 4 feet would be added to the height of the center structure, which would include an elevator. He noted that a brick wall would hide the deck. Mr. Wilds inquired about the location of the railing and if the deck would be set back from the front to minimize visibility. Ms. Spina noted that decks on the main body of the building are routinely denied, with the exception of the approval of 2005 Brandywine Street and 2063 Brandywine Street approval after an appeal. Commission members discussed the possibility of putting doors on the rear of the clear story, with the deck on the rear ell.

Mr. Bumb made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Huff seconded the motion which failed with a 2 to 7 vote. Mr. Sklaroff, Mr. Tissian, Mr. James, Mr. Wilds, Mr. Perri, Mr. Sugrue, Mr. Previdi dissented. Ms. Smyler abstained.

Mr. James made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried with 7 votes. Mr. Huff and Mr. Bumb dissented. Ms. Smyler abstained.

2001 Spring Garden Street

Greater Canaan Church of God, owner

Edward Hickerson, T-Mobile, applicant

DATE: 1863-1865, originally the Spring Garden Methodist Church

PROPOSAL: Install telecommunications equipment

The Architectural Committee concurred with the staff recommendation and voted unanimously to recommend approval, provided that the installation of the cable chase does not damage the stone façade, that the cable chase is painted to match the stone facade, that the fence is simplified to a flat, not stockade, fence, and that the fiberglass shutter panels match the original wood shutter panels, with staff to review details including shop drawings of the fiberglass shutters, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

Mr. Farnham explained this application, which proposes the installation of telecommunications equipment in the church building. The church is listed as "significant" in the inventory of the Spring Garden Historic District. Antennas would be installed in the steeple, out of sight. Eight arched openings in the steeple are currently boarded with plywood and tarpaper. The boarding would be removed and fiberglass louver panels simulating the original wood louver panels would be installed. Three equipment cabinets screened by a 6-foot wood stockade fence would be installed in the alley along the western side of the building. A cable chase or waveguide would be installed on the west façade and would be painted to match the façade. The fence and cable chase would be visible down the alley from Spring Garden Street. A meter and cabinet would be mounted on the north wall of the church. They would be visible down an alley from 20th Street. Details of the connection of the waveguide to the stone façade and of the cable entry into the building have not been, but should be, provided.

Mr. James asked if the cable tray on the side could be done internally. Mr. Scott inquired if it were possible to put everything on the interior. Mr. Sugrue remarked that he has seen many churches' historic fabric disrupted by exterior chases; however, he believes that the proposed location is a creative solution.

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

1601 Mt. Vernon Street

Miguel Santiago, Owner

George Acevedo, Applicant

DATE: c. 1850, Home of Robert Purvis

PROPOSAL: New storefront alterations, side and 3-story rear addition

The applicant withdrew the proposal.

1621 Spruce Street

1621 Real Estate Investors, Incorporated, Owner

Jon B. Hollander, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: New windows, two wood roof decks, and one rear metal balcony

The Architectural Committee recommended approval subject a structural analysis, pursuant to Standard 9.

The application involves the installation of decks on the rear of this row-house apartment structure. The decks will have some visibility from Latimer Street through the garden of the Daughters of the Revolution building. Several windows will need to be cut down to form door entries onto the decks. The first floor deck will cantilever out and wrap the north west corner of the building. The applicant also seeks the legalization of vinyl windows installed on the north façade and rear ell.

Mr. James questioned the approval of vinyl windows. It was noted that the windows are situated 200 feet into the lot and have minimal visibility.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. James dissented.

329 South 17th Street

Mark Travis, Owner

Kris Kolo, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1865, rear ell altered c. 1890

PROPOSAL: 4th floor addition on rear ell with roof deck, demolish rear garage, new garden wall with roll-down gate

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron presented the application, which calls for constructing a one-story addition on top of the three-story rear ell. He noted that rear consists on a number of garages. The addition will serve as a family room for the three-bedroom owners unit. This addition has high visibility because of a parking lot that exists to the south of the building. The addition does not connect to the mansard of the main block of the building because the units do not connect and the mansard will be restored. A rear brick wall will be demolished and rebuilt to accommodate parking.

Mr. Huff commented that this is an extraordinary street and the revitalization of the building will enhance the street.

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

57-63 N. 3rd Street

Cambridge Real Estate Associates, owner

Daniel Magno, Wesley Architects, applicant

History: 63 N. 3rd Street built in 1852 by architect John Riddell

Project: Legalize sidewalk areaway

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the legalization.

This application proposes the legalization of an areaway cut into the Arch Street sidewalk along the important building at 63 N. 3rd Street. The building along with others to the south recently underwent an extensive, meticulous restoration. The sidewalk consists of very large granite slabs extending from the building's edge to the curb line. The slabs were installed when the building

was constructed and they cover basement vaults beneath the sidewalk.

Owing to an inadequate 2-phase electrical distribution network in Old City, the electric company requires the installation of transformers to convert to 3-phase in large-scale redevelopment projects. The owner had planned to install the required transformers through an existing areaway, but PECO was unable to accommodate that plan. Instead, PECO required that a new areaway be constructed. Without Commission approval, a contractor cut a 4-foot by 6-foot hole that extends across two of the significant granite slabs. A metal grate now covers the hole.

Mr. Sklaroff asked if PECO is required to obtain a permit. Mr. Perri responded that PECO does not obtain its permits through the normal processes. Mr. Sklaroff thought that PECO should receive a letter, which informs it that the Historical Commission has jurisdiction over demolition of pavements in an historic district. Mr. Farnham noted that the applicant would be faced with the same situation with the rehabilitation of the neighboring building. Mr. Previti thought that PECO should be given maps of the historic districts and a list of the Thematic Historic Street Districts as well as meeting with staff to discuss similar issues, as how to proceed. Commission members concurred that the real issue is how to save more sidewalks. Daniel Magno, the applicant, said that additional power is needed with the existence of aerial cabling in the area. Commission members inquired about who did the actual cutting and it was noted that a contractor from PECO did the actual cutting.

Richard Thom pointed out the vaults for the transformer exists under the sidewalk and that Old City has more than any part of the city.

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

208 Spruce Street

Carl Massara, Owner

Robert Boyd, Applicant

DATE: 1758, façade c.1870

PROPOSAL: Legalize skylight, new rear balcony

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the balcony, but denial of the skylight and the wall in its present condition. It recommended that the applicant rebuild the wall to its present height, provided the original flashing, which is now embedded in the wall is removed, and a stucco finish is added to both sides, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron presented the application, which involves legalizing a skylight and adding a balcony on a modern rear addition.

Carl Massara, the owner, said that the rafters need replacing after the fire, which necessitated the need for raising the wall. An engineer's report by Robert Rosen substantiates the need. Commission members questioned the flashing embedded in the wall. Mr. Scott clarified that the rear wall of the house should not receive stucco.

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

1300 Market Street, 1319-25 Market Street, 21 North Juniper Street

1300 Market Street, Philadelphia Center Realty, Owner

1319-25 Market Street, G. Holdings Corporation, Owner

21 North Juniper Street, CNL Hospitality, Owner

Robert Hotes, Architect/Applicant

DATE: Wanamaker Building, built 1902-10, architect Daniel Burnham

1319-25 Market Street, One East Penn Square, Market Street National Bank, built 1930, architect, Ritter and Shay

21 North Juniper Street, City Hall Annex, built 1927, architect, Philip Johnson

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, subject to the applicant working with the staff for adjustment of brightness, placement, and other details 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 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].

This proposal calls for lighting City Hall by installing large banks of lights on a number of landmark buildings including, Wanamakers, One East Penn Square and City Hall Annex. These lights will be highly visible, will create glare for pedestrians and will cast the other landmark buildings into shadow.

Mr. Sklaroff asked about the applicant for the project. Nancey Goldberg, Center City District, said that she is representing 9 property owners. Mr. Wilds inquired if the overall appearance of City Hall would change and expressed concern the theory of lighting City Hall from other buildings. Mr. Perri noted that the Department of Licenses and Inspections would only regulate the lighting fixtures, not the lighting itself. Mr. Tissian asked if the owners of the proposed buildings have agreed to pay for the electric usage. Ms. Goldberg responded that the owners have agreed to pay for the usage and maintenance. She has also contacted other building owners who would benefit from the lighting. Ms. Goldberg pointed out that presently two municipal buildings already have lights. Mr. Sklaroff thought that guidance should be given for the attachment of the lighting to designated buildings. Mr. James thought that specific details for the lighting should be submitted and that the approval should be conceptual until the funding is in place. Mr. Sugrue questioned the impact of the lighting on the historically designated buildings, and if the fixtures are visible.

Alfred Borden, The Lighting Practice, said that the Center City District is acting as an agent for the buildings. Robert Hotes, the architect, said he was hoping for approval with the staff to review details. He informed the Commission that the proposed lighting would be downward on the sculptures with a set back.

Mr. Sklaroff left the meeting and turned the gavel over to Mr. Sugrue. Mr. Wilds inquired if the city authorized negotiations with the building owners. Mr. James responded that he had no knowledge of the project and believed that a site line study should be done. He noted that a mock-up was done in collaboration with the previous light scheme. Mr. Tissian stressed the need for more details. Mr. Sugrue thought it important to know the location of the fixtures, as well as details about the light fixture itself. Ms. Smyler suggested that the applicant submit information about how the proposed lighting will interact with the current lighting. Mr. Huff thought it important to know how visible will the lights be in the daytime and how much of the detail of City Hall would be lost with the lighting. Additionally, that written authorization be given from the owners of the proposed buildings. Commission members concurred that it is important that

details which will establish the impact of the lighting on the other buildings as well as its effect on City Hall.

Mr. Previdi made a motion to approve the lighting in concept. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

THE REPORT of the Committee on Historic Designation, 10 and 24 September 2003
Thomas Sugrue, Chair

Ms. Spina gave an illustrated presentation detailing buildings streets and other sites integral to the proposed historic district. Mr. Farnham elaborated on the surrounding buildings and sites, which would establish the boundaries for the district. Mr. Wilds noted that there was a lengthy discussion about the inclusion of the piers and the long-term effect of having jurisdiction over them. Mr. Sugrue said that there was a lot of discussion about the inclusion of I-95 serving as a hard boundary as part of Old City's connection to the river. Mr. Huff believes that there is a stronger case for the piers' inclusion rather than I-95. In response to Mr. Tissian's query about 4th and 5th Market to Arch Streets, Ms. Spina said that Penn Mutual Building and other non-contributing buildings were taken out since they have no significance to the district. Additionally, the area south of Ionic Street, which has no remaining historic buildings was also eliminated. Mr. Wilds said that consideration should be given to the bridge approach, which is Paul Cret's original plan and an essential portion of the design reflective of the Kite and Key.

Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association, believes that the revised boundaries are more appropriate and has conceded to the inclusion of Penn's Landing. He offered to work with the Planning Commission to help protect the view corridor.

Chip Donahue, River's Edge Civic Association, remarked that 9 intact cast iron storefronts remain near Front and Vine.

Commission members concluded that the scheduled meeting on 22 October 2003 could better resolve issues regarding the designation and its boundaries.

CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMENT ON NATIONAL REGISTER

146-150 North 13th Street, Walter M. Steppacher and Brother Shirt Factory

Mr. Farnham said that the Walter M. Steppacher and Brother Shirt Factory at 146-50 North 13th Street is eligible for the National Register under Criteria A and C, but notes that the building stands within the Convention Center expansion zone.

Commission members discussed the possibility of the Convention Center expansion, and Ms. Smyler thought that if the Commission takes a no comment approach, then in the unlikely expansion, the Commission would not be held in prejudice and the Commission withdrew its motion.

THE REPORT of the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, September 2003

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

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Farnham asked the Commission to approve an expenditure of \$ 24.29 for Architectural Committee lunches.

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

Mr. Wilds made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Previdi seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary

As corrected 11/20/03