

**THE MINUTES OF THE 519th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
10 November 2005**

**1515 Arch Street, Room 18029
Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair**

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
James Brown, IV
Warren Huff, Deputy Director, City Planning Commission
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
Sara Merriman, Special Assistant to the Director, Department of Commerce
Kathleen Murray, Office of City Council President
David Perri, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Harris Steinberg, AIA
Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.
Norman Tissian
Scott Wilds, Deputy Commissioner, Office of Housing & Community Development

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Jonathan E. Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Officer
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner

Lawrence Copeland, Esq., Senior Attorney, City Law Department
Leonard F. Reuter, Esq., Deputy City Solicitor, City Law Department

Also

Georgyn Geetlein Fest, 800 Addison Street
David Mercuris
Mark Solden, P2 Architects
Aileen Banker, Richard Thom Architects
Richard Thom, Richard Thom Architects
Fred Berg
Jon Coleman, 818 Addison Street
Peter Rothberg, 1518 Walnut Street
Bill Melton, 1700 Delancey Street
Ken Kodinstein, P2 Architects
Amy Ngyuen, 2135 Walnut Street
David Lerman, Symphony View
William Vessal, 814 Pine Street
Hal Banker, 814 Pine Street
Vince Ricchiuti, 2534 South Lambert Street
Lydia Evans, Stuart Rosenberg Architects
Stuart Rosenberg, Stuart Rosenberg Architects
Audrey and Piers Marchant, 421 Catharine Street
Joseph Brin, Joseph Brin Architect
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Boris Cubas, Aumiller Youngquist Architects
Bill Aumiller, Aumiller Youngquist Architects

Kris Rogers, Winn Development
Chuck Lawson, Winn Development
Doug Seiler, Seiler + Drury Architects
Bill Landsburg, Jack Kellmer Company
Martin Jay Rosenblum

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 519th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:15 a.m.

THE MINUTES OF THE 518TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Mr. Sklaroff offered several corrections to the minutes.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Steinberg and seconded by Mr. Tissian, the Commission voted unanimously to approve the corrected minutes of the 518th Stated Meeting, 14 October 2005, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

Mr. Sugrue joined the meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

8-10 Letitia Street

Owner: 8 Letitia Way Associates

Applicant: Richard Thom, architect

History: c. 1860

Proposal: Legalize roof deck

Architectural Committee Recommendation: denial of the legalization of the deck in its current location, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

This application proposes the legalization of a roof deck that covers the main roof of this former-commercial building. The deck has a vinyl railing that is visible from Front Street.

Mr. Baron presented the project. Richard Thom, the architect, and Gie Liem, the owner, attended the meeting.

Mr. Thom explained that the deck existed at the time of purchase, but that the current owner had rebuilt the deck within the same footprint. The original deck was not up to code and the railing had been raised six inches during the reconstruction. Mr. Thom explained that the new deck with the new code compliant railing is not visible from Letitia Street, but is visible from Front Street. It will not be visible from Front once the building at 22 S. Front, which is currently under construction, is completed. Mr. Thom further explained that the Committee's recommendation to push the deck back was not possible owing to the existence of mechanical equipments and skylights.

Peter Rothberg of the Old City Civic Association supported the legalization of the deck.

Ms. Murray moved to legalize the deck. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 9 to 0. Mr. Sugrue abstained.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 OCTOBER 2005

Vincent Rivera, Chair

2204 Mount Vernon Street

Owner/Applicant: Andrew Kleeman

History: c. 1889 by James H. Windrim, architect, for William Kemble, President of People's Bank. Served as a carriage house for 2205 Green Street.

Project: Install simulated standing-seam roof

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval of the simulated standing-seam roof in the grey color, with the staff to review the details for the rib spacing, pursuant to Standard 6.

This application proposes to install a simulated standing seam roof on the former carriage house of the Bergdoll Mansion. The proposed product is a green rubber material, which adheres directly to the decking. The applicant proposes to remove the existing (non-original) standing seam roof and subsequent layers of roofing, but retain the original standing seam roof layer and apply the new roof on top of it. In addition, the applicant proposes attic vents, none of which would be visible from the street. The roof is partially visible from Mount Vernon Street and highly visible along 22nd Street.

Mr. Danta presented the application. Andrew Kleeman, the owner, appeared and showed a sample of the grey roofing material. He said he was now in agreement with the Committee's recommendation to install a grey roof. Mr. Wilds said that he did not object to the green.

Mr. Huff move to adopt the Committee's recommendation and approve the simulated standing-seam roof in the grey color, with the staff to review the rib spacing, 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.]. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

814 Pine Street

Owner/Applicant: William Vessal

History: c. 1860

Project: Construct garage in rear, reconstruct balcony

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval of the garage, but with a cross-buck design for the doors; approval of the proposed railing on the balcony; and approval rebuilding the rear fence, but with brownstone capping, without the balls, pursuant to Standard 9 and Standard 10.

This application proposes to construct a detached two-car garage at the rear of the property along Addison Street. Currently, there is a non-historic exposed CMU wall with a door and two non-historic piers supporting a historic iron gate. The garage would measure 23' deep by 19' wide and would be constructed of brick with a wood cornice.

The garage would have three doors, two car doors and a third pedestrian door in the middle, all of stained wood with glazed panels on the upper portion. The piers would be reconstructed using the same brick as the garage and the historic iron gates would be placed back in the new piers.

In addition, the applicant proposes to reconstruct a balcony that once existed on the property and that would extend most of the length of the rear ell. The historic iron brackets, still in place, would be used to support the new balcony. The new balcony would be made of iron with a new grate and railing decorated with cast iron rose motif medallions. The applicant has chosen the rose motif owing to the abundant use of flowers, specifically roses, used as a decorative motif throughout the property and the organic detailing of the many wrought and cast iron elements found throughout the property.

Mr. Danta presented the proposal. William Vessal, the owner, and his designer, Hal Banker, appeared to answer questions about the proposal.

Mr. Tissian asked if Addison Street is a residential street in this block. It was determined that it has residences on the south side. Mr. Sklaroff asked about the reasoning behind the changes requested by the Committee, the crossbuck doors and the deletion of the spheres on the posts. He said the design should reflect 2005. Mr. Benker said that they were in agreement with these changes requested by the Committee and had already made the changes in their revised drawings.

Georgyn Geetlein Fest, the block captain for Addison Street, spoke in opposition to the proposal. She said that nothing had ever been built in the garden of the house, that alterations to the rear of the building were illegal, and that the garage would violate covenants that were placed on the property. She also objected to the roof deck facing the rear.

Mr. Danta explained that there is no roof deck in the application and that the proposed railing was for a previously existing historic balcony facing the side yard, not the rear.

Mr. Sklaroff explained that the Historical Commission reviews based on its ordinance, but cannot enforce a covenant. He asked Mr. Perri about reviewing the garage for violations. Mr. Perri said that the Department of Licenses & Inspections would look for potential zoning violations when it reviewed the permit application.

Mr. Vessal said that the garage appears on the approved plans of 1980. There is now flagstone on the location where the old garage stood. Mr. Wilds said that the Commission should review what appears in the application including a railing for a side balcony and a garage in the location of a former garage. Mr. Sklaroff asked if the staff had looked at historical evidence regarding a former garage or carriage house on the site. Mr. Danta said that staff had not looked.

Mr. Tissian asked if the rear garden wall is historic and if there are other garages on the street. Mr. Vessal explained that the wall is cement block. A photo was shown demonstrating other garages on the block. All of the houses on the south side of Addison have garages.

Michael Coleman, a neighbor facing the property on Addison, also spoke against the

proposal. He said that the proposal calls for building the garage on the garden.

Ms. Geetlein Fest said that there were no others on that side of the street. She then revised her statement to allow that there was one garage and one parking lot on the north side. The houses on the south side have garages, but they were constructed in 1962. She explained that she has a radio show and would air this issue on her show.

She questioned the notification for the review. The staff stated that all legal notice requirements had been satisfied. The meeting agenda was sent those enrolled on the interested parties list including neighborhood organizations and individuals who had requested enrollment. The staff explained that signs are only posted on properties when significant demolition is proposed. Ms. Geetlein Fest contended that no signs had been posted for this review. The staff replied that no significant demolition was proposed.

Mr. Tissian moved that the application be tabled for a period not to exceed six months and that the staff research and document the history of the site and present its findings to the Commission. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 8 to 2. Mr. Huff and Ms. Murray opposed.

Mr. James arrived and Ms. Murray left the meeting.

210 West Washington Square, N.W. Ayer Building

Owner: Washington West Associates

Applicant: Serge Nalbantian

History: 1927-29, Ralph Bencker, architect

Project: Replace windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval of the Graham window, denial of the Traco window, and no recommendation on the Peerless window, pursuant to Standard 6.

This application proposes replacement windows for the N.W. Ayer Building. The Commission reviewed a comprehensive plan to redevelop the building at its September 2005 meeting. The applicant presents two window alternatives: a Traco window and a Graham window. The Graham alternative would replace the historic metal windows with aluminum replicas that match the originals almost exactly, except for a minimal difference of 1/8 of an inch in the muntins and 11/16 of an inch on the top rail. The bottom rail is a perfect match.

Mr. Danta presented the proposal. He explained that the applicants have submitted additional drawings for the meeting that were not been seen by the Committee. He said that they wish to have at least two choices so that they can seek competitive bids. Kenneth Kornstein of Polatnick Zacharius architects appeared to explain the windows. In response to a question by Mr. Wilds, he said that all of the windows above the first floor would be replaced at once.

Mr. Steinberg said that he thought that perhaps the most important dimension was the meeting rail, which he thought matched well on the Peerless window. He noted a discrepancy between the elevation and the sections of the Peerless. The architect Mark Solden said that the section was more accurate than the elevation.

Mr. Sugrue moved to approve both the Graham and Peerless windows. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1700 Delancey Street

Owners/Applicants: William and Eleanor Melton

History: 1895 with later alterations

Proposal: Install gate in parking area

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval of the gate and flower boxes, with the staff to review attachment details, pursuant to Standard 9 and Standard 10.

This application proposes to install a gate to secure the parking area adjacent to this property at the corner of 17th and Delancey Streets. The applicant proposes a metal gate to span from the applicant's property to the neighboring property. The applicant owns most of the space where the gate is proposed, however, there is a 3' easement between the two properties. The owner has received verbal agreement from the next door neighbor to close this area adjacent to their property. The gate's design would mimic the gate across the street and measure 11' by 8' with an arched top design. It would also include a small door on the west side, measuring 2.5' by 4'. The gate would be supported by two piers mounted in the ground, which would hold the hinges. However the final details have not been designed yet.

In addition, the application proposes to add flower boxes below the window sills of three ground-floor windows. These boxes would be made out of copper. The larger box along Delancey Street would measure 8" by 80" and two smaller boxes along 17th Street would measure 10" by 40".

Mr. Danta presented the proposal. The owner Mr. Melton represented the application.

Mr. Sklaroff and Mr. Wilds questioned why the Commission would approve flower boxes since they are not original to the house. Staff explained that the Commission has a long history of approving them.

Mr. Melton explained that his designer had modified the drawings to show a square top on the gate. Mr. Perry said that the pedestrian door in the gate would have to be enlarged if it is used as a fire exit.

Mr. Brown moved to approve the revised proposal in concept. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1010 Race Street

Owner of commercial unit: Lucky 1016-18, LP

Applicant: Sherry Young

History: 1892, Willis Hale, architect for the Heywood Chair Factory

Proposal: Legalize changes to storefront doors

Architectural Committee Recommendation: denial, pursuant to Standard 5 and Standard 9.

This application proposes to legalize alterations to a pair of storefront doors in the

commercial ground floor of this building. The symmetry of this façade is carried to its ground floor with a monumental arched central entrance and two smaller arched commercial entrances at either side. Each of the commercial entrances had the same double-leaf door and transom configuration. The tenant on the eastern commercial space altered his doors by removing the lower solid panels and replacing them with a single sheet of glass without a permit.

Mr. Sklaroff recused owing to his firm's relationship with the unit's owner, Stuart Harding.

Mr. Danta presented the proposal. No one appeared on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Wilds asked if the doors were part of the approved tax credit application. The staff stated that they were. Mr. James rejected the idea of legalizing work done without a permit. Mr. Gallery, whose organization holds an easement on the façade, was in attendance but did not wish to add a comment.

Mr. James moved to adopt the Committee's recommendation and deny the proposal. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which passed unanimously

Mr. Tissian left the meeting. Mr. Sklaroff remained out of the room; Mr. Sugrue chaired.

1519 Spruce Street

Owner: Symphony View, LP

Applicant: Robert Boyd

History: 1890

Proposal: Build roof deck on main section

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval of the proposal, pursuant to Standard 9 and Standard 10.

This application proposes a roof deck on the fourth floor of the main roof of the property. The deck would follow the shape of the elliptical rear ell and would measure 20' wide by 35' deep. It would be reached by an existing penthouse stair access. Last month, the Commission approved a second-floor rear deck and legalized new construction and alterations at the rear, but denied a fourth-floor deck for this property. The owner now proposes a revised plan that accounts for the Commission's concerns about the denied fourth-floor deck.

Mr. Danta presented the proposal. David Lerman, the owner, and Robert Boyd of the architect's office spoke on behalf of the application. Mr. Lerman explained that they had modified the application as the Commission had requested.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee recommendation to approve the deck. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed 8 to 1. Mr. James dissented.

2032 Delancey Street

Owner/Applicant: Alexander Waddell

History: c. 1870

Proposal: Build one-story addition, add roof deck on rear ell

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval with the rear wall to be made of brick, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

This application proposes constructing a one-story addition at the rear of the property. The addition will stretch the full width of the property and house a garage. Its roof will form a terrace with a double-leaf door replacing a non-historic bay as access. The addition will have stucco facing and a wood, overhead garage door. Two rear windows in the side addition, which are currently infilled with brick, will be replaced, one with a two-over-two window to match others on the façade, and the other with a one-over-one window.

On the roof of the rear ell, a stairwell penthouse already exists. The application proposes recladding the penthouse with wood clapboarding and building a small roof deck on the rear ell. The penthouse is not visible from the street and the railing for the deck probably would not be visible either.

Mr. Sklaroff returned to the meeting and assumed the chair.

Ms. Spina presented the project.

Mr. Steinberg moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal with the rear wall constructed of brick, with the 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.]. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2135 Walnut Street – 5th floor

Owner of 5th floor unit: Amy Nguyen

Applicant: Robert Boothroyd

History: 1916, Clinton & Russell, architects

Proposal: Replace windows with vinyl windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: denial of the proposal, pursuant to Standard 6.

This building currently has non-historic replacement windows in most openings. However, the Commission has been working with individual condominium owners to install the historically correct windows as shown in an older photograph in the Commission's files. A condominium owner on the 7th floor has already installed the historically correct windows on the Walnut Street façade.

This application proposes replacing the windows on the 5th floor with non-historic white vinyl one-over-one windows.

Ms. Spina presented the project. Amy Nguyen, owner, attended the meeting.

Mr. Steinberg moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the proposal. Mr. Wilds seconded.

Mr. Sugrue asked the applicant why she did not want to install the historically correct windows. Ms. Nguyen explained that she could not afford wood true-divided-light windows. Ms. Nguyen further explained that she was willing to install simulated-divided-light windows instead of the proposed vinyl.

Mr. Steinberg amended his motion to approve wood simulated-divided-light windows, with the staff to review details. Mr. Wilds, who had seconded, seconded the amended motion, which passed with a vote of 8 to 0. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

421 Catharine Street

Owners/Applicants: Audrey Jaros and Piers Marchant

History: 1832

Proposal: Build three-story rear addition – in concept

Architectural Committee Recommendation: denial of the proposal, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

This 2½ -story house, which dates to 1832, retains its original configuration, which includes a main section with a gabled roof and a small rear ell. The house has an arch-head dormer on the front and a pedimented dormer on the rear, typical of the Greek Revival period. A one-story garage sits at the rear of the property along Fulton Street, but the upper stories of the house are visible from the street.

The proposal in concept calls for adding a three-story addition at the rear of the property that would engulf the historic rear ell. The drawings show two schemes for this addition. Scheme A has the three-story addition with a flat roof. The slope of the rear gable of the main section is kicked-up to meet the addition; this would entail the demolition of the historic dormer as shown in the section drawing. However, the axonometric drawing for this scheme shows the dormer rebuilt.

Scheme B calls for a 2½-story addition. Again, the rear slope of the historic gable will be altered to accommodate more room on the third floor, but this time the slope will be changed to a gambrel profile.

The drawings also show a proposed roof deck on the one-story garage with an elevated walkway leading from the deck to a door on the second floor of the house.

The proposal does not include any elevations and only rough schematic drawings. The drawings do not provide information on materials or other details.

Ms. Spina presented the project to the Commission. Audrey and Piers Marchant, the owners, and Joseph Brin, the architect, attended the meeting.

Mr. Sugrue moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the proposal. Mr. James seconded the motion.

Mr. Sklaroff requested clarification on precedents for alterations of this magnitude. Mr. Wilds mentioned that the Commission had approved such alterations in the past when the alteration was not visible.

Ms. Marchant mentioned that Fulton Street was a single-lane alley and that cars were not allowed on it. Ms. Marchant also explained that there were historical bases for their proposal. She passed copies of Fire Insurance maps to the Commission Members showing a wooden infill in 1898 and structures facing Fulton Street. Ms. Spina clarified that an 1837 Fire Insurance survey clearly mentions the existence of a rear ell.

Mr. Sugrue voiced his concern with the treatment of the rear gable. Ms. Marchant explained that the rear dormer has to be replaced regardless of any addition owing to extensive rot. She added that the flat roof design would provide more interior space.

Mr. Sugrue withdrew his motion. Mr. Brown withdrew his second.

Ms. Spina explained that the house was currently a 2½-story structure and that the application proposed a 3½-story structure, which would alter the shape of the gable and result in the demolition of the rear roof structure.

Mr. Steinberg explained the application proposed to extend the third floor, attic level, and construct the addition from the ridge of the gable back, which would turn the back of the gable into a gambrel roof. He also pointed out that neither scheme would preserve the existing dormer. Others pointed out that the designs proposed defied the laws of physics; they would be impossible to build. As depicted in the unusual perspective, the proposed dormer would extend above the ridge line.

Mr. Baron mentioned that because the yard is so large, the Architectural Committee concluded that an expansion could be accomplished without much demolition to the main house.

Commission members thought that the applicant should develop a more accurate and detailed drawing including a section through the property that would clarify the extents of existing and proposed fabric.

Mr. Steinberg moved to approve in concept the addition of a third floor to infill the rear ell. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 9 to 0. Ms. Merriman abstained because of her friendship with the applicants.

Mr. Sugrue left the meeting.

2534 South Lambert Street

Owners/Applicants: Vincent and Lisa Ricchiuti

History: 1912, James and John Windrim, architects

Proposal: Replace hairpin fence with brick wall and gate; install concrete deck; pave garden

Architectural Committee Recommendation: denial of the proposal, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

This corner property retains its original wrought-iron hairpin fence. A few months ago, a car traveling along Shunk Street struck the fence, damaging a portion of it. The owners now wish to remove the hairpin fence and install a brick wall with a wrought-iron gate at the parking pad. The brick wall will be similar to the one at the neighboring property. The application also proposes extending the porch with a concrete deck with a wrought-iron railing. Except for two small corners, the entire garden area of the house will be paved in concrete. Most of the garden has been paved already for a parking pad that existed prior to designation.

Ms. Spina presented the project. Vince Ricchiuti, the owner, attended the meeting.

Mr. Ricchiuti mentioned that he had not received a copy of the letter from the Girard Estate Area Residents. Mr. Sklaroff stated that civic associations should send copies of position letters to owners.

Mr. Ricchiuti stated that he needed to construct a retaining wall owing to the difference in elevation between his and the neighboring property. He also noted that he was trying to conform to the historic character of the property by using exposed aggregate mortar and brick. He noted that he was not opposed to the use of the hairpin fence, but that he was opposed to its exclusive use.

Mr. Steinberg asked if there had been a retaining wall previously. Mr. Ricchiuti noted that there was a retaining wall that had been destroyed in the accident. Mr. Ricchiuti mentioned that his property had been burglarized and that a more solid fence would provide greater security.

Mr. Sklaroff explained that the proposal employed the hairpin fence as a decorative element and not as functional object, as it had been originally.

Mr. James moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the proposal, 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.]; 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.]. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Steinberg left the meeting.

33 South 2nd Street and 18-22 Letitia Street

Owner: Sam Bradstreet

Applicant: Doug Seiler, architect

History: 33 South 2nd: c. 1905 (front portion), c. 1850 (rear portion)
18-22 Letitia: c. 1855

Proposal: Rehabilitate first floors with structural repairs of upper floors – in concept

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval in concept provided:

1. the stone pilasters and cornice are not repainted once the paint is removed;
2. the spandrel under the storefront window of 33 N. 2nd has two panels and all of the spandrels under the windows have a center vertical bead to appear as if they are doors;
3. the storefront windows have casement windows that match the door configurations;
4. the doors in 18-22 Letitia Street have equal-sized panes of glass;
5. the proposed granite stoops under the windows are removed;
6. the louvers in the storefront transom are deleted and the vent is rerouted to the roof, and
7. all of the decorative cast-iron window hoods on 18 and 20 Letitia Street remain;

pursuant to Standard 2.

This application in concept proposes the rehabilitation of only the first floors of the rear of 33 South 2nd Street and the front of 18-22 Letitia Street. The rear façade of 33 South 2nd Street has a Greek Revival storefront with stone pilasters and cornice. The upper floors have segmentally-arched stone lintels and stone sills. Most of the windows have been infilled with brick and the storefront windows and doors have been replaced with flush metal doors or brick infill.

On 18-22 Letitia Street, the first floor has ornate cast-iron pilasters and cornice and cast-iron lintels. Almost all of the windows on 18 and 20 Letitia have ornate scrolled cast-iron detailing above the lintels. The first-floor openings have been infilled with brick and contemporary storefronts including pent eaves.

The proposal calls for removing the infill at all of the first-floor openings and restoring the windows and doors. On 33 South 2nd Street, the historic configuration of doors flanking a storefront window will be restored. The outer bays will have double-leaf, half-glazed doors with panels below. The central bay will have a single, plate-glass window with a wood, three-paneled spandrel below a new granite sill. A new concrete stoop will be placed at this bay. Originally, this bay would have had flush grates leading to the basement area, and the spandrel below would have been double-leaf doors leading to the basement. All three bays will have three-light transoms that match the transom that now exists in the middle bay. The proposal also calls for removing the paint from the stone pilasters and cornice and then repainting the stone.

For the Letitia Street properties, the plan also stipulates retaining the historic door-window-door configuration. Here, too, the doors will be of a double-leaf design and the storefront windows will be large, plate-glass. The storefront windows will have a two-panel design to better replicate the historic basement door configuration. All of the

window bays will get new granite stoops instead of the historic, flush basement access panels. All of the bays will have two-light transoms, but the southernmost bay will have louvers for ventilation instead of glass. The cast-iron pilasters and cornice will be refurbished and the one missing corbel will be replicated.

The permit application states that the upper floors will be stabilized, but no details have been included. It should be noted that the proposed plans do not show many of the decorative cast-iron window hoods that now exist.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Douglas Seiler, the architect, attended the meeting.

Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Brown seconded it.

Mr. Seiler stated that he was in agreement with the six points of the Committee's recommendation. However, he noted that there is an existing restaurant on the ground floor that vents its kitchen through the roof and that the proposed louver would be used for intake not for exhaust. He said they would study the possibility of omitting the louver, but it may not be possible. Ms. Merriman mentioned that it would be appropriate to grant conceptual approval since all these details would be discussed later.

Mr. Wilds and Mr. Brown amended their motion to read approval in concept, provided:

- 1. the stone pilasters and cornice are not repainted once the paint is removed;*
- 2. the spandrel under the storefront window of 33 N. 2nd has two panels and all of the spandrels under the windows have a center vertical bead to appear as if they are doors;*
- 3. the storefront windows have casement windows that match the door configurations;*
- 4. the doors in 18-22 Letitia Street have equal-sized panes of glass;*
- 5. the proposed granite stoops under the windows are removed;*
- 6. the louvers in the storefront transom are considered during the final review, and*
- 7. all of the decorative cast-iron window hoods on 18 and 20 Letitia Street remain; 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].*

The motion passed unanimously.

45 North 3rd Street

Owner: Bedrock Old City Partners

Applicant: Lydia Evans, architect

History: c. 1854 with later nineteenth century rear addition

Proposal: Rehabilitate front façade, cut new windows and doors, add roof deck and lightwell

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6, Standard 9 and Standard 10.

The nineteenth-century building at 45 N. 3rd Street is joined at the rear to other structures that have frontage on American and Cuthbert Streets and Little Boys Way.

The applicant plans to convert this large industrial space into residential units.

On Third Street, the marble façade will be restored with the removal of later windows and doors and the installation of new wood windows and doors based on original designs as demonstrated by photographs, insurance surveys, and the Baxter's panoramas.

On the south side, facing Cuthbert Street, the plans show the replacement of the steel industrial sash with thin profile aluminum windows to approximate the configuration of the existing historic windows. A garage and pedestrian door opening will be converted to the main entrance and a window. An additional door will be cut to allow access to the trash room.

On the east façade facing American Street, the first floor now features a door on the right side and a garage door to its left. The plans show a proposal to reverse these elements and convert the garage into a large window to an internal garden that would give open space and light to a lower-level unit.

On Little Boys Way, plans call for adding windows and a door.

At roof level, the applicant is showing two decks. A light well with large glass window would be cut into a south facing wall about in the center of the structures. A series of new windows would also be cut into the south facing wall adjacent to the light court.

Mr. Baron presented the application. Stuart Rosenberg and Lydia Evans, the architects, were present.

Mr. Brown moved to approve the proposal, with the staff to review details. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

4624-42 Walnut Street

Owner: Winn Development

Applicant: Kristina Rogers

History: 1913, Frederick Michaelsen, architect

Proposal: Replace doors and some windows, install metal paneling in storefronts, replace railings

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval of a modified plan that included all aspects of the plans as submitted except retaining the existing wood doors and glazed storefronts windows, modifying the existing wood doors with security glass and new security bolts, altering the store front windows behind existing glass and within existing frame, with the possibility of allowing transoms to be made operable at the discretion of the applicant, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

This application involves renovations to a large multi-building apartment complex. The plans show the construction of steel picket fencing at the rear and on first-floor porches as well as new railings on several porches to match the existing railings. Aluminum windows were installed throughout the building during a 1980s renovation. Several matching replacement windows will be installed where the earlier replacement windows have broken. The building masonry will be repaired where needed. On the first floor several storefront windows will be altered to augment privacy by installing a base of

either insulated metal panels or opaque glass on the bottom portion where there is currently a large sheet of glass. The applicants also propose to install security cameras, new buzzer intercom systems, and new doors. The new doors will sit within hollow metal frames, which will reduce the existing openings.

Mr. Baron described the application. Kris Rogers and Chuck Lawson of Winn Development, the developers for the project, said that they received new funding from the Office of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to perform the upgrades to the properties. Mr. Wilds noted the importance of the buildings and how they anchor the neighborhood. He mentioned that since the project is receiving federal monies, it will need to undergo a Section 106 review as well.

Mr. Steinberg moved to approve the revised proposal, provided the existing wood doors are retained and modified only with security glass and new security bolts, and provided the existing glazed storefronts are retained and modified only behind the existing glass and within the existing frames, with the 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.]; 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 Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.]. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

314 South Iseminger Street

Owner: Sonja Neilson

Applicant: John Sheridan, contractor

History: c. 1830

Proposal: Legalize demolition of rear ell, build new two-story rear ell with deck

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval of the proposal as submitted, pursuant to Standard 6 and Standard 9.

This application seeks to legalize the demolition of a brick rear ell and construction a two-story structure with third-floor deck in its place. The rear is not visible from a public right of way. Last month, the applicant applied to rebuild the rear in wood with a stucco finish with vinyl windows. The Commission denied this application. The applicant has now submitted photographs and a letter from an engineer describing the poor condition of the rear ell. The applicant now proposes to construct the ell in brick with wood windows.

Mr. Baron described the application. John Sheridan, the contractor for the project, reiterated that the proposal does not prove visible from a public right-of-way.

Mr. Brown moved to approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

327 South 17th Street

Owner: 327 Condo Associates

Applicant: Fred Berg

History: c. 1860

Proposal: Build rear addition

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval of Alternative One with the height of the mansard lowered by 1.5 to 2 feet, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

The Architectural Committee first reviewed a proposal for this property at its 27 September 2005 meeting, but the applicant then postponed the review by the Commission to allow the Committee to review a revised deck proposal. The applicants propose a mansard-roofed rear addition and deck on an addition to the rear ell. There are many mansards in the area on Chadwick Street including a mansard-roofed addition approved by the Commission for the house next door. The applicant now proposes two schemes to modify the deck discussed at September's Committee meeting. Alternate One shows a narrower deck, set back from the Chadwick Street façade. Alternate Two shows the deck built in to the addition and covered by the mansard roof. Both of these schemes were discussed by the Committee as possible solutions at its September meeting.

In addition, the applicant proposes to reconstruct the original railing on the front stoop, reopen several windows at the rear and cut two windows in the side façade of the garage.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Fred Berg noted that he submitted revised plans that demonstrated the Committee's request for a lower roofline.

Mr. Steinberg moved to approve Alternative One with the height of the mansard lowered by 1.5 to 2 feet, with the staff to review details. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2500 South Colorado Street

Owner: Carmen Marrone

Applicant: Vincent Novello

History: 1908, James and John Windrim, architects

Proposal: Replace visible side windows with vinyl windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: denial of the vinyl windows, pursuant to Standard 6.

This application proposes the installation of four, six-over-one, vinyl windows on the visible side and rear of this corner building. The muntins will not be true divided light and the windows will have no putty slope.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal. He noted a letter submitted by the Girard Estate Area Residents' Association (GEAR) in support of the application.

Ms. Merriman moved to approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. Huff seconded the motion.

Mr. Sklaroff recalled that the Commission's policy has been to require property owners to install historically accurate windows, regardless of the design and materials of the existing windows. The staff concurred. Mr. Baron reiterated that this policy allows properties to be slowly restored over time, even if a property was altered prior to designation. Mr. Wilds argued that the Commission should discern between the front and side windows, owing to the fact that this property is one-half of a twin. Mr. Steinberg noted that the Commission must weigh the balance between preservation and the changes that have happened to a property over time. Ms. Spina said that if an owner has a property that had changes prior to designation, that owner should be held to the same requirements as one who has a property with original fabric. Otherwise, the Commission starts to set two different standards for property owners and penalizes those who purchase properties that have not had alterations.

Ms. Merriman's motion failed with a tie vote. Messrs. Brown, Perri, Sklaroff and Steinberg dissented.

Mr. Brown made a motion to table the proposal until the Commission received more information. Mr. Steinberg seconded motion, which also failed with a vote of four to four. Messrs. Huff, James, and Wilds and Ms. Merriman dissented.

Mr. Sklaroff noted that since the Commission was not able to take any action, the Department of Licenses & Inspections may issue a permit for the work after sixty days. He noted that the decision did not set a precedent because both motions had failed. He asked the staff to write a one-page summary of the Commission's policy on windows. Mr. Huff acknowledged that he has been consistent in his own personal interpretation of extant non-historic material prior to designation.

717 Chestnut Street, Integrity Trust Bank

Owner: Del Frisco's of Philadelphia, equitable owner

Applicant: Bill Aumiller, architect

History: 1923, Paul Cret, architect

Proposal: Restore masonry base, cut new door, add ramp and canopy – in concept

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval in concept of the proposal, but with smaller light fixtures, pursuant to Standard 7, Standard 9 and Standard 10.

This application, in concept, proposes to rehabilitate and alter the front façade of this former bank building on Chestnut Street. At its October 2005 meeting, the Commission reviewed and denied a similar application and suggested that the applicant submit a revised application with additional information and updated designs for the canopy and handicap access. The building was designed by renowned Philadelphia architect Paul Philip Cret in 1923. The ground floor of the building underwent alterations sometime after World War II with the addition of a new store front that protrudes from the historic façade. The applicant proposes to remove this post-war alteration and re-establish the original plane of the façade. In addition the applicant proposes to open a secondary entrance with an A.D.A accessible ramp on the eastern bay of the front façade. This door would be a two-leaf design with transom to match the existing western door. The middle bay would be opened with a fixed insulated glass window. The existing door in the western bay would be replaced with new doors that would match the current. The applicant proposes a new internally illuminated canopy to be placed over this western main entrance. The three ornately crafted bronze windows in between each pilaster

would be cleaned and restored, but a new insulated glass and muntin system would be placed behind the decorative grills. The rest of the application proposes restoration and cleaning of the stone façade, bronze elements, and new fixtures for façade illumination

Mr. Danta presented the proposal. The architects William Aumiller and Boris Cubas represented the project.

Mr. Wilds asked if the proposal could not be approved as a final application. Mr. Reuter explained that the Commission's practice of changing in concept applications into final has a times resulted in confusion during appeals. Mr. Sklaroff noted that the lights would need a full review at a later point. Mr. Gallery spoke in favor of reviewing the application for final approval.

Mr. James voiced a concern about the ADA entrance not having its own canopy. Mr. Cubas explained that the overhang of the building would shield the entrance.

Mr. Wilds moved to grant final approval to the revised proposal without the lights, which must be reviewed at a later date. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which carried with a vote of 8 to 1. Mr. James dissented.

THE REPORT OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE HISTORICAL COMMISSION STAFF, OCTOBER 2005

Mr. Farnham presented the report and asked if the Commissioners had any questions or comments. They had none.

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Steinberg moved to approve the \$ 22.35 expenditure for lunches for the Architectural Committee. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Upon a motion made by Mr. James and seconded by Mr. Huff, the meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Jonathan E. Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Officer
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner