

**THE MINUTES OF THE 520th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
9 December 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

Vincent Rivera, AIA

Harris Steinberg, AIA

Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.

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

William Gural, Streets Department

J. Henderson, 116 Kenilworth Street

Jung Ahn, 112 Market Street

Harold Lichtman, GLP Architects

Edward Bell, EBA

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Elizabeth Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Arlene Matzkin, Friday Architects

Charles Capaldi, B Five Studio

Alan Metcalfe, Metcalfe Architecture

J. Tackett, Tackett & Co.

A. Fritch, Tackett & Co.

Dominic Ward, D&M Development Group

Catherine Franklin, Penn-Knox Neighborhood Association

Stephen J. Maffei, Landmark Design

Anthony Tartaglia, Danforth Builders

Wali Zaman, Pennoni Associates

Elizabeth Amisson, A.D. Marble & Co.

Harry Laspee, Pennoni Associates

Charles Rudalavage, Ewing Cole

Stephen Higgins, 1915 Green Street

Brett Feldman, Klehr Harrison

Ursinio Nunez, 1700 Diamond Street
Richard Donaghy, 130 Queen Street

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 520th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:15 a.m.

THE MINUTES OF THE 519TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Upon a motion made by Mr. Sugrue and seconded by Mr. Steinberg, the Commission voted unanimously to approve the corrected minutes of the 519th Stated Meeting, 10 November 2005, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 29 NOVEMBER 2005
Vincent Rivera, Chair

5200-5400 blocks of Germantown Avenue

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Owner

Larry Link, PennDOT, Applicant

Replace granite block paving in tracks with concrete

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval of the removal of the granite block from the center area surrounding the rails and the installation of un-tinted, un-patterned concrete to match the concrete approved in the earlier application for Germantown Avenue.

This application proposes to reconstruct these blocks of Germantown Avenue, a street in the Historic Street Paving Thematic District. The street currently has granite block from curb to curb and two sets of tracks for the Route 23 Trolley line, which occasionally runs. The reconstruction will consist of relaying the granite block on the sides of the cartway, but installing concrete in the area along the tracks. The concrete will be colored and stamped to simulate the granite block. New 7-inch T-rails will be laid to keep the trolley line continuous. The project also includes new lighting, sidewalks and other street improvements; however, these alterations fall outside of the Commission's jurisdiction since the Street Paving Thematic District pertained to the cartways of the streets only.

The Historical Commission reviewed the reconstruction of the 3700-4000 blocks of Germantown Avenue in 2000. At that time the Commission created an Ad-hoc Committee to explore the possibility of reusing the granite block within the track area. At that time, the Committee agreed that the use of the new T-rail precluded the use of granite block. The Committee also discussed the treatment of the concrete in the track area. It was agreed that raw concrete proved to be the most maintenance-free and consistent along Germantown Avenue. The Commission, when it adopted the Committee's recommendations at the time, specifically said that the decision would not set a precedent for Germantown Avenue, but that it would review alterations on the Avenue on a case-by-case basis in the event that new technologies allowed for the tracks to be integrated with the granite block.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal to the Commission. The applicant was represented

by Elizabeth Amisson of A.D. Marble Environmental Consultants and Harry Laspee and Wali Zamon of Pennoni Associates.

Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the removal of the granite block from the center area surrounding the rails and the installation of un-tinted, un-patterned concrete to match the concrete approved in the earlier application for Germantown Avenue. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion.

Mr. Wilds noted that he had been a member of the ad-hoc Germantown Avenue committee. He stated that the tinted, stamped concrete between the tracks would not provide a satisfactory solution because it would be hard to maintain.

Mr. Laspee provided a brief overview of the project. Mr. Sklaroff asked him why the new rail is inconsistent with the historic block. Mr. Laspee explained that the old girder rail is 9 inches deep. The new T-rail is 6-5/8 inches deep. The new rail does not provide enough space between the ties, which are set on a concrete base, and the top of the rail for the historic block. The block would rise above the surface of the rail if used with the new T-rail. Mr. Steinberg translated Mr. Laspee's explanation onto lay terms. Mr. Wilds concluded that the new track structure prevented the relaying of the historic block. Mr. Sklaroff suggested that the historic block be removed only in the vicinity of the track. Mr. Laspee explained that they were proposing a 19-foot strip of concrete at the center of the avenue. About 8½ feet of historic block would remain on either side of the 19-foot band.

Catherine Franklin introduced herself to the Commission. She is a member of the Transportation Committee of the Historic Northwest Coalition. She stated that SEPTA's claim that it cannot replace the girder rail is untrue. She noted that transit authorities are reusing girder rail throughout the country. She also noted that European countries are using the girder rail. She asserted that SEPTA should reinstall the granite block using available technologies.

Mr. Sklaroff asked about the age of the block of Germantown Avenue. Ms. Amisson stated that the granite block was originally laid about 1874 after the City assumed ownership of Germantown Avenue, which had been a toll road. Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Laspee if his claim that the block could not be re-laid was predicated on physics or economics. Mr. Laspee responded that the block could not physically be re-laid. Several Commissioners disagreed and stated that it was a matter of money, not physics. Mr. Laspee insisted that SEPTA informed him that the granite block is not compatible with the T-rail track. Mr. Sklaroff indicated that he would like a comprehensive answer to the question of physics or money.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that his organization supports the Architectural Committee's recommendation, but he noted that he also agrees with many points made by Ms. Franklin. He asserted that the block can be saved and asked the applicants and the Commission to consider other options.

Mr. Wilds asked if the proposed work would take place between two sections of the avenue where similar work has already taken place. Mr. Laspee responded affirmatively, stating that the block around the tracks has been replaced with concrete to the north and south of this area. Ms. Franklin remarked that the area in question is very important from an historical perspective. Many significant buildings stand on this stretch of Germantown

Avenue.

Mr. Sugrue stated that SEPTA's apparent failure to consider other rail types that might be compatible with the block was a fundamental issue. Mr. Laspee stated that he would appear before the Commission next couple months with another application. He indicated that he would be willing to defer a decision on this application until that time. He acknowledged that SEPTA recently paved over granite block and tracks with asphalt on a section of the avenue in Mt. Airy because of a significant safety problem.

Mr. James inquired into the identity of the agency responsible for the current application and for work on Germantown Avenue generally. He stated that he wanted to know which agency, SEPTA or PennDOT, was ultimately responsible. He also asked Mr. Laspee why he could not reuse the old rail. In response to the many important questions posed by Mr. James, several Commissioners stated that they needed more information before making a decision. They also stated that representatives of SEPTA and PennDOT should appear before the Commission to answer questions. Mr. Sklaroff also encouraged them to meet with the community. He asserted that the Commission needed to understand precisely the assumptions that led to the current proposal before it could act on it. Mr. Steinberg asked for more technical details related to the track system. Mr. Sklaroff asked the staff and Law Department to determine and document the ownership and maintenance responsibilities for the avenue. Others asked that the staff and Law Department also clarify the Commission's jurisdiction over the state highway.

Messrs. Wilds and Steinberg withdrew their original motion. Mr. Wilds moved to table the application for a period not to exceed six months. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 7 to 0. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

700 block of Sansom Street, 600 block of Fulton Street, 5300 block of Hedge Street

City of Philadelphia, Owner

William Gural, Streets Department, Applicant

Replace brick paving with imprinted resin paving

Architectural Committee Recommendation: denial, 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].

The Streets Department proposes to replace the historic vitrified brick paving on the three streets with a resin paving material that will be colored and stamped to look like the existing brick pattern. The Department will salvage the historic bricks and stockpile them to use in the patching and repair of the remaining brick streets as needed. The Department says the cost of this type of paving proves much cheaper (about half) than reconstructing the streets using the historic brick.

The resin composite material is color-integrated and laid in 5/8-inch-thick layer over a bituminous binder course. The material is hot when laid and then quickly imprinted with the desired pattern. A range of colors can be created for the material, and a red match would mimic the vitrified brick. An example of this material exists in the crosswalk at the intersection of Walnut and 15th Streets.

Only 41 blocks in the entire city have the red brick paving as the primary paving material

(several blocks of Erie Avenue have brick paving between trolley tracks). Most are concentrated in Manayunk, Germantown and Center City. At the time of designation, Sansom and Fulton had high integrity and Hedge moderate integrity. The Streets Department applied to the Historical Commission in 1999 to remove the brick in Hedge Street and pave it with asphalt. The Historical Commission denied the application.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal to the Commission. William Gural of the Streets Department represented the application. Mr. Gural explained the proposals. He noted that the Streets Department does not have the funds to maintain every historic street. He would like to salvage the brick from these streets and use it on other historic streets.

Mr. Gallery of the Preservation Alliance opposed the proposal. He stated that the City has not engaged in any comprehensive planning for historic streets. He asserted that a more systematic evaluation is necessary. He noted that the paving at Jewelers' Row is a distinctive historic element.

Mr. Baron remarked that during the review of the nomination for the Street Paving District, some streets were rejected owing to low integrity. He recommended that historic street paving materials should be salvaged from those streets, which are not designated, not from designated streets.

Heather Winnett, a resident of the 600-block of Fulton, recounted the history of her defense of her historic block of paving. She stated that the Streets Department should repair the asphalt patches to the block, not remove the historic street paving. She reported that her neighbors are opposed to removing the brick.

Mr. Sklaroff noted that governmental agencies are trustees of historic resources under the Pennsylvania Constitution.

Commissioners discussed the problem of repeated patching of holes and trenches dug for electrical, gas, water, and sewer repair. Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission does not currently review minor work proposals for historic streets. The Streets Department allows contractors to patch with asphalt and then the Department routinely reinstalls historic paving materials. He noted that historic paving materials such as bricks and blocks are often lost or stolen. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the current system is unacceptable and asked the staff to work with the Streets Department to establish a better procedure for safeguarding historic streets. Several Commissioners asserted that historic paving materials should be protected and reinstalled immediately.

Mr. Sugrue moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and deny the proposal, 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.]. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2320 Madison Square

Danforth Builders and Developers, Owner

Stephen Maffei, Architect/Applicant

New construction – plenary review

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval in concept, pursuant to Standards 9

and 10.

The applicant proposes to construct a two-story brick house on the vacant lot that will fill the missing gap in this otherwise intact historic row. The design replicates the historic fenestration pattern of a central, arched entrance with two windows on the first floor and three windows on the upper floor. The contemporary nature of the construction shows in the proposed details: the patterning of the door and the two-over-one windows. The proposed denticulated cornice replicates the historic ones on the block.

On the rear, the house has a contemporary design with a recessed section at the first floor with a patio. A roof deck is proposed at the rear section of the roof, with access through a central roof hatch.

The drawings specify neither materials for the windows and door nor details of the roof deck.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect Steven Maffei of Landmark Design and developer Anthony Tartaglia of Danforth Builders represented the project.

Mr. Wilds expressed his concern about the proposed deck. He stated that the longtime residents of the block have been through “thin and thick” and that it would not be fair to them to approve a deck on this building after they worked diligently to preserve the neighborhood during leaner years. Mr. Maffei noted that the deck would be set back from the front façade. Mr. Wilds asserted that people and objects on the deck would be visible even if the deck itself was not. Mr. Tartaglia countered that people are temporary and mobile and would not detract from the appearance of the building. Mr. Sugrue noted his opposition to a deck. Mr. Steinberg pointed out that many of the buildings on the block have mansards. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the mansards are nineteenth, not twenty-first, century additions. He commented that the block is very remarkable. Ms. Spina displayed photographs of the block taken at the time of designation. She explained that no buildings on the side of the block in question have rooftop additions; every building is two stories in height. Mr. Sklaroff noted that, on one hand, a rooftop deck would not be visible, but, on the other, it would set a precedent for roof-top additions on the block. Mr. Perri informed the applicant that the building code does not allow hatches. Therefore, he would either need to seek a variance for the hatch or erect a stair tower, which would be visible.

Mr. Wilds moved to approve the proposal in concept without the roof deck and hatch, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment]; and 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. Steinberg seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 5 to 3. Ms. Merriman and Messrs. Perri and Steinberg dissented.

3428 Sansom Street

Judy Wicks, Owner
Arlene Matzkin, Architect/Applicant
Build two-story addition on rear
Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval in concept

This application proposes a two-story addition on the rear of this Second Empire rowhouse. The Moravian Street façades of these houses sit at a lower grade than the fronts, exposing the basement level. The rears of many houses in the row have been altered with terraces and additions at this lower level. Almost all of these additions have large amounts of glazing, giving them a very open, airy quality. Moravian Street has become a heavily utilized pedestrian area, with outdoor seating for neighboring restaurants.

This house has an intact rear ell; a glass-enclosed stair tower had been added at the rear of the main section. The proposal calls for adding a two-story addition at the basement and first floors. The addition would sit under the bay on the rear ell. The portion that sits in front of the stair tower would have a gate at the street level and a double-casement on the floor above with a pedimented roofline that breaks into the second floor. The section in front of the rear ell would have three fixed-light windows at the basement level and two double-hung windows at the first floor. The drawings do not include material annotations and other details.

Ms. Spina presented the project to the Commission. Arlene Matzkin, the architect, represented the application.

Ms. Merriman and Mr. Wilds asked how these changes are related to the front changes recently reviewed by the Commission. Ms. Matzkin answered that they were and that the owner would not undertake the front changes if she could buy the neighboring building, which currently houses a Bucks County Coffee shop. Ms. Matzkin added that she hoped the owner would never excavate at the front as proposed; she stated that it would be very expensive.

Mr. Sklaroff asked if Ms. Matzkin was proposing to fill the open space at the rear. She answered that she was, but that similar spaces had already been filled with additions at the rears of nearby buildings.

Mr. Sugrue moved to approve the proposal in concept. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 6 to 2. Messrs. Sklaroff and James dissented.

Mr. Rivera arrived to join the Commission. Mr. Sklaroff excused himself and left the meeting.

1230 Pine Street

David Callan, Owner
Alan Metcalfe, Architect/Applicant
Revised proposal to legalize windows and skylights
Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval of the proposal, conditional upon the installation of wood true-divided-light sash in the existing Marvin window frames on the front and a new wood door and window at the rear to fit within the height of the

historic openings, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

The Commission reviewed and approved plans for this rehabilitation at a previous meeting; however, the contractor did not follow the approved plans in several ways. This application seeks to legalize that work and modify certain other aspects of the previously approved plans.

On the front façade, the applicant planned to retain the windows and frames at the second floor and construct new matching frames on the reconstructed first floor and add true-divided-light sash in all four windows. Instead the contractor demolished the window frames, pulling out the shutter hardware and original brick with them. The new windows which have been installed, have applied muntins and an overly wide frame. The removed brick was replaced. In exchange for the legalization of the windows, the applicant will reset them to the correct position in the openings and install a clamshell brick mold and shutter hardware. At the doorway, the applicant found that the steel beams that hold up the façade above the storefront require the reconstruction of the façade somewhat differently than formerly approved. Specifically, the transom must be located further forward in the brick opening and the door way must be located ten inches to the right of the original opening.

The applicant had intended to retain the existing roof and dormer, but ended up reroofing with weathered wood-colored asphalt shingles. The dormers were damaged in the process; they will be reconstructed to match the original designs. On the visible rear slope of the roof, the applicant added two skylights and a series of vent pipes.

On the rear façade, the applicant had proposed French doors at the first floor, but now proposes a slider. At the second floor, the original plans showed retaining the original window and installing a multi-pane wood door in the second window opening by cutting the opening down. Instead, the contractor bought a single-pane door that does not fill the height of the opening. The rear window was removed and the opening cut downward. The applicant now proposes to retain the window and door, infilling the top of the original openings with brick.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Alan Metcalfe attended the meeting to represent the proposal.

Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal, conditional upon the installation of wood true-divided-light sash in the existing Marvin window frames on the front and a new wood door and window at the rear to fit within the height of the historic openings, 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 distinctive features, 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. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 7 to 1. Mr. James dissented.

2047-49 Walnut Street

Sholom Hockman, Owner

Allison Fritch, Architect/Applicant

Alter façade, add roof decks, install garages

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

This application proposes the restoration of the front facades of two row houses including rebuilding the first floor, watertable, and window openings at 2049 and restoring windows and window hoods at all openings. Decks and garages will be added at the rears of the buildings facing Moravian Street. A bay to match that at 2047 Walnut Street will be added to the rear of 2049.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Allison Fritch and Jay Tackett, the architects, represented the proposal.

Mr. Steinberg asked about the unusual transom at 2049 Walnut. Mr. Baron explained that the storefront area was altered in the early twentieth century. A tall stoop was removed, the floor level lowered, and a doorway and arched window with balcony added. He also noted that the applicant explored restoring the doorway area to its original appearance, but determined that it would not be possible, in part because the SEPTA bus stop enclosure stands where the historic steps once stood.

Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal, 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 distinctive features, 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 work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportions, and massing, to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; 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. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

112 Queen Street

Von Hee Properties, LLC, Owner

Edward Bell, Architect/Applicant

Add three-story rear addition

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

This application proposes alterations to the rear of a property. Last month, the Commission reviewed and approved façade alterations for the property. Because the house sits one house in from the corner of Queen and Howard Streets, the back is highly visible. The owner proposes to demolish the entire rear brick wall to make a ten-foot-five inch-deep addition at the first and second floors and a three-foot addition at the third floor. A deck would then be added to the third floor as well.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Edward Bell, the architect, represented the proposal.

Mr. Steinberg moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal as submitted, 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 proportions, 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. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

116 Kenilworth Street

Josephine Henderson, Owner/Applicant

Remove and reinstall Perma-brick front

Architectural Committee Recommendation: denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

This house was faced in scored brick-like stucco before designation. The owner claims that the house is suffering from water infiltration because the stucco is failing. She proposes to have Garden State Brick Face cover the building with an additional layer of brick-like stucco.

The addition of a layer of stucco on this façade will not solve the water problem and will probably exacerbate it. The most likely source of the water infiltration is a faulty roof, gutter, or downspout. Or, perhaps, it is the result of the trapping of moisture by the stucco. The existing stucco should be removed and the brickwork below assessed. Judging from the protruding belt courses, the building probably retains its original eighteenth-century brick façade, which should be exposed if its condition warrants.

Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Josephine Henderson, the owner, attended the meeting.

Mr. Wilds asked if the proposal included the removal of the existing layer of stucco and the addition of a new layer or the addition of the new directly over the old. Mr. Baron replied that the new stucco would be placed directly over the old.

Ms. Henderson explained that her family has owned the property for 65 years. She claimed that the brick was already in an irreparable state when the stucco was first applied many years ago. She also stated that her contractor has informed her that the brick cannot be repaired. She has had the gutters and roof inspected; the inspections revealed no problems.

Mr. Baron explained that he has worked on numerous cases in which the stucco has been removed and the underlying brick repaired. He suggested that a small section of the stucco be removed for an inspection of the brick. He also noted that old stucco should always be removed before new stucco is applied.

Mr. Rivera stated that putting new stucco over old to fix a water infiltration problem is like putting a bandage on a bandage. He recommended further inspection to determine the source of the water infiltration. He stated that the new stucco would not solve the problem. Ms. Henderson stated that her contractor has assured her that it would. Mr. Wilds pointed out that the Garden State salesman is not an unbiased observer. Mr. Rivera added that he believes that water is running behind the stucco because of improper flashing at the windows.

Ms. Henderson asked who would pay for the restoration of her façade. Mr. Sugrue stated that reputable contractors would estimate the job with the hope of getting the business. He also noted that the Commission has a Financial Hardship Committee which would review the case if Ms. Henderson makes a hardship claim. Mr. Wilds concurred and stated that the applicant should work with the staff to restore the façade or make an application to the Hardship Committee. Ms. Henderson reported that Garden State is holding her \$2,500 deposit. Mr. Perri explained to the applicant that her contract with Garden State should identify the party responsible for obtaining the building permit. If it is Garden State, then the company should refund her deposit if it is unable to obtain the permit. Ms. Henderson explained that it is her responsibility to obtain the permit. Mr. Steinberg commended the applicant for seeking a permit and suggested that the contractor should refund her deposit if a permit is not obtained. Mr. James suggested that the staff meet on site with the owner and a Garden State representative to resolve the open preservation issues. Mr. Rivera offered to attend the meeting.

Mr. James moved to table the application for a period not to exceed six months. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

112 Market Street

Jung Wha Ahn, Owner

Harold Lichtman, Architect/Applicant

Add three stories, rebuild façade

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval in concept, provided that the height of the front parapet is reduced to 42 inches and that the height of the penthouse is reduced to 11.5 feet or less and provided that the structural deficiencies are corrected; pursuant to Standard 9.

In July and August 2005, the Architectural Committee and the Commission reviewed earlier versions of this application. The first was withdrawn before reaching the Commission; the second was denied without prejudice because the applicant was not

present at the Commission meeting to accept the compromise proposed by the Committee. The current proposal retains aspects of the two earlier proposals while endeavoring to incorporate suggestions offered by the staff, Committee, and Commission during the earlier reviews.

The extant building is two stories in height. It was originally four stories tall, but was cut down, probably about 1910. The brick at the second-story front façade and the third-story stone window sills survive from the original nineteenth-century building, but nothing else on the exterior is original. The important metal cornice added in 1910, which completed the new two-story building, has been lost. The second-story window openings have been enlarged and the second-story sills are non-historic. The extant storefront, which is in poor condition, was installed in 1988.

The application proposes demolishing the storefront and second-story brick façade, rebuilding the lost third and fourth stories, adding a penthouse, and constructing a cast-stone storefront and brick façade. The penthouse would be set back 15 feet from the front façade and clad in cast stone. A roof deck would be located between the front façade and penthouse and would be hidden behind a tall front parapet. The rear of the building is completely hidden from any public view.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Owner Jung Ahn and architect Harold Lichtman represented the application. Mr. Lichtman stated that he and his client concurred with the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Steinberg moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal in concept, provided that the height of the front parapet is reduced to 42 inches and that the height of the penthouse is reduced to 11.5 feet or less and provided that the structural deficiencies are corrected, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

100 Market Street

ESK Ventures, Owner

Allison Fritch, Architect/Applicant

Add handicap ramp

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval, provided the ramp is paved with brick or granite and faced with marble or granite (a thick veneer, not a thin tile) and provided that the historic marble step is preserved in place, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

This application proposes to construct a new concrete handicap access ramp along the Market Street façade of this Queen Anne commercial building. The ramp would lead to an existing historic opening and the railings would attach to a historic wood storefront. The ramp would seal an existing flush basement opening. The ramp would have a simple metal handrail. The historic doors would remain and the upper panels, currently boarded up with plywood, would be re-glazed.

Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Allison Fritch of Jay Tackett & Co. represented the project at the meeting. She stated that she and her client agreed with the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Steinberg asked for a clarification on the materials and the preservation of the step. Mr. Danta explained that the City had improved the east end of Market Street recently. He stated that the Committee thought that the materials of the ramp should be of the quality of the materials of the original building and the recent improvements to Market Street. Concrete was not appropriate in this setting. He also explained that the Committee asked that the historic marble step be preserved in place with a felt separator sheet to protect it from the concrete foundation for the ramp.

Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal, provided the ramp is paved with brick or granite and faced with marble or granite (a thick veneer, not a thin tile) and provided that the historic marble step is preserved in place, with the staff to review 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 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.].

1915 Green Street

Constantine Tsikos, Owner

Stephen Higgins, Contractor/Applicant

Legalize stucco on rear of building

Architectural Committee Recommendation: legalization of the stucco at the rear, provided it is repaired and completed as outlined in the Architectural Committee minutes, with the staff to review a detailed specification of the remedial work before it begins and to inspect it in the field once it is complete

This application proposes to legalize work done without a permit on the rear of this property, which is not visible from the public way. The applicant stuccoed the entirety of the rear in a rough stucco finish. The stucco covers the entire rear wall including the barge board and leaves no drip edge, making this rear elevation extremely vulnerable to water penetration and damage.

Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. He reported that the members of the Architectural Committee had agreed that the stucco would not solve the water infiltration problems and would, in fact, exacerbate them. He explained that the Committee recommended that, owing to the invisibility of the rear from the public right-of-way, the stucco could be left in place but repaired. Removing it might further damage the wall. The Committee suggested that a competent contractor complete the stucco project. He or she should cut the stucco below the bargeboard, remove the old bargeboard, stucco the wall to the roofline, install a new bargeboard, and appropriately flash the bargeboard into the roof. The Committee also suggested that equivalent measures be taken at the window sills, where the new stucco will also encourage water

infiltration.

Stephen Higgins, the contractor, represented the application. He explained that he had applied a rough stucco because it shed water better than smooth stucco. He disagreed with the Committee's assessment of the problematic stucco and asked for an explanation. Mr. Farnham elaborated on the Committee's recommendation and then advised Mr. Higgins to work with Mr. Danta on the details. The Commission agreed with the Committee's assessment of the stucco.

Mr. Steinberg moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and legalize the stucco at the rear, provided it is repaired and completed as prescribed by the Architectural Committee, with the staff to review a detailed specification of the remedial work before it begins and to inspect it in the field once it is complete. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2000 Benjamin Franklin Parkway, Franklin Institute

Franklin Institute, Owner

Charles Rudalovage, Architect/Applicant

Install HVAC on front roof

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval, provided the removed stone grills are stored on site, with the staff to review paint colors in both sun and shade.

This application proposes new HVAC equipment on the flat roof over the main entrance to the museum facing Logan Circle. This area currently has two smaller units, which are not visible. The proposed location is also located directly adjacent of the main mechanical room. The proposed unit would be a 6' tall by 24.5' long and would be painted to match the Indiana Limestone of museum's facades. This unit would be a heat recovery unit, which would collect heated exhaust air and funnel it back into the heated air supply. The applicant proposes to run the duct work that would connect this unit to the rest of the mechanical system through two lower panels of a Diocletian window. Neither the duct work nor the lower panels of this window would be visible. The applicant has submitted a site line study. This study shows that the unit would not be visible from the park in front of the museum or the middle of Logan Circle, but would be visible from the Franklin Parkway along the side of the Four Seasons Hotel. The visibility of the unit from the Roman Catholic Cathedral is blocked by the trees of the Four Sister Cities Park.

Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Charles Rudalovage of Ewing Cole represented the project.

Mr. Steinberg moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal, provided the removed stone grills are stored on site, with the staff to review paint colors in both sun and shade. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

413 South 19th Street

Ellen Steiner, Owner

Joseph Morrison, Architect/Applicant

Add roof decks on visible rear ell

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

This application proposes to construct two roof decks on the rear of this corner property. The rear is visible from 19th and Addison Street. One roof deck would be located on the roof of the rear ell and would measure 10' by 20'. A rear window would be altered into a door to allow access to the deck. The second roof deck would be located over an existing one-story garage that fills the backyard area. This deck would measure 9' by 10'. Both decks would have painted wood planters, of a clapboard design, along the Addison Street façade. The rest of the deck would be finished with wood posts railings.

Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architect Charles Capaldi represented the application. Mr. Wilds asked about the siding. Mr. Capaldi explained that it would be painted clapboard. Mr. Wilds inquired about the proposed color. Mr. Capaldi replied that it would be the same blue that the garage is currently painted.

Mr. Steinberg moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; 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.]; and the Roofs Guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as ... decks and terraces ... when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.]. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

32-34 North Front Street

Domenic Ward, Owner/Applicant

Install railing at cellar entrances

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

This application proposes to install galvanized steel railings at two locations on the Front Street façade of this building. The proposed locations are basement entrances. The railings would extend three feet eight inches out onto the sidewalk. The railings would attach at the three locations. Two posts would be imbedded within the historic granite steps surround. The handrail would attach to the granite Doric pilasters.

Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Domenic Ward, the developer, represented the application. He concurred with the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Steinberg moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal, with the staff to review 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 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. James seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1700 Diamond Street

Ursinio Nunez, Owner/Applicant

Add handicap ramp, install storefront window and side window and door

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval of the ramp (without pickets if code compliant, but with pickets if required), pursuant to the Accessibility Guideline; and approval of a fully-glazed wood door with transom at the top of the ramp, with the staff to review details, but denial of the proposed aluminum door and windows, pursuant to Standard 6.

This application proposes the addition of an ADA ramp on the side façade along 17th Street and the installation of aluminum windows at the front and an aluminum door at the side. The historic rowhouse building will be converted to a laundromat. No openings would be altered, but two historic wood window systems would be removed and replaced with aluminum units that do not replicate the historic dimensions or profiles. Although the drawing states that a new front door and transom would be installed, the owner has clarified that the existing door and transom would be retained, but the non-historic siding over them would be removed.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Ursinio Nunez represented the application. He stated that he agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the ramp (without pickets if code compliant, but with pickets if required), pursuant to the Accessibility Guideline [Recommended: Providing barrier-free access that promotes independence for the disabled person to the highest degree practicable, while preserving significant historic features.]; and approve a fully-glazed wood door with transom at the top of the ramp, with the staff to review details, but deny the proposed aluminum door and windows, 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. Steinberg seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

130 Queen Street

Richard Donaghy, Owner

Glenn Werner, Architect/Applicant

Add two rear decks

Architectural Committee Recommendation: denial owing to the outstanding permitting issue

This application proposes the addition of two rear decks on this corner building. The lower deck would be located on the small rear ell. The double-leaf French door that would lead to the proposed deck is extant. The upper deck would stand above the proposed lower deck. The railing for the upper deck would stand at about the same height as the roofline of the main block of the building. It would be accessed by a ladder from the lower deck. Both decks would be highly visible from the public right-of-way. The upper deck would be visible from Queen Street.

The rear of this building underwent significant alterations in the very recent past. The rear ell originally had a half gambrel roof. The gambrel was an especially unique and significant example of historic architecture. Few, if any, survive in the city. The gambrel was removed and the third story of the rear ell was expanded. Furthermore, windows, French doors, and a balcony were added at the rear. The roofline of a small side shed addition at the rear was also raised. A photograph dated 3 May 2004 shows the work to the shed addition underway. The Commission has no record that any proposal for these rear alterations was ever reviewed or approved. Furthermore, the Department of Licenses & Inspections has no record that it issued a building permit for the rear alterations. The current owners purchased the building recently, since the completion of the work at the rear.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Owner Richard Donaghy represented the application. He stated that Vivian Gulliam owned the building at the time of the alterations. Chris Pisano, an expediter, oversaw the alterations. He explained that he was considering legal action against the previous owner. He asked that the Commission legalize the irreversible changes made prior to his ownership and approve the proposed decks.

Mr. Wilds stated that the Commission should consider the rear alterations to be an existing condition. He asserted that this owner should not be held responsible for them.

Mr. Steinberg asked for clarifications on the design of the upper deck. He asked how one might access the deck. Mr. Donaghy explained that his architect had proposed that a ladder be used to access the crow's nest or upper deck. Ms. Merriman noted her support for the upper deck, which she claimed would be an amenity. Others stated that they could not review the upper deck without additional information. Mr. Perri stated that the plans were not sufficient for a building code review. He reported that the proposed ladder would not meet the building code. Mr. Steinberg concurred and stated that the upper deck should be better defined before the Commission undertakes a review.

Ms. Merriman asked Mr. Copeland to comment on the implications on any foreseeable lawsuit if the Commission legalized the rear alterations. Mr. Wilds seconded Ms. Merriman's questions and asked if a legalization would jeopardize potential legal claims against the former owner, expediter, or contractor. Mr. Copeland did not provide an opinion, but offered to explore the issue. Mr. Sugrue suggested that, without legal

advice, the Commission table the matter to allow for the gathering of more information. The owner stated that he would accept a tabling. The Commission requested that the Law Department prepare an opinion on the matter.

Mr. Steinberg moved to table the application for a period not to exceed six months. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

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, with brownstone capping and without the decorative globes, pursuant to Standards 9 and 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 application to the Commission. William Vessal, the developer, represented the application. He reported that he agrees with the Architectural Committee recommendation. Mr. Danta noted that the applicant had prepared revised drawings that comply with the Committee's recommendation. He then presented a very thorough history of the lot at 814 Pine; his history demonstrated conclusively that a stable or garage building had stood at the rear of the lot from the mid nineteenth century to the mid twentieth century. He noted that the claim made by the neighbor at the previous meeting that no garage had ever stood on the site was incorrect. All Commission members agreed that there was historic precedent for a garage and that a garage would be appropriate at the proposed location. Mr. Vessal asked the Commission to send a recommendation on the design of the garage directly to the Zoning Board of Adjustment, which will review the project. The Commission explained that it could not recommend an action to the Board, but added that it would make its preferences clear in the minute for the review.

Mr. Wilds stated that the garage should be located at the edge of the sidewalk, not set back into the yard from the sidewalk. He cited several historical and practical reasons for requiring the garage at the sidewalk line. The rest of the Commissioners agreed and asserted that it was important to maintain the street plane, with all buildings and walls set at the edge of the sidewalk. Some noted that setting the garage back into the yard would encroach on the historic garden in the side yard. Others noted that trash would collect and, perhaps, muggers hide in the alcove if the garage was set back. They emphatically rejected the notion of a setback. They also emphatically rejected the notion of a driveway from Pine Street to a rear garage. They noted the importance of the 800-block of Pine, with its grand buildings and Pennsylvania Hospital, and asserted that a curb cut on Pine would not be acceptable under any circumstances.

Mr. Wilds moved to approve the garage, provided it is situated at the sidewalk line, not set back, with a cross-buck design for the doors; approve the proposed railing on the balcony; and approve rebuilding the rear fence with brownstone capping and without the decorative globes, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; and 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. Steinberg seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

237 South 18th Street, Barclay Hotel

Barclay Condominium Association, owner

Allan Domb, applicant

History: 1928, J.E.R. Carpenter, architect

Compromise proposal for appeal before BLIR

Litigation Committee Recommendation: approval

This proposal offers a compromise for a case now pending before the Board of License & Inspection Review. According to the Philadelphia Historical Commission's litigation counsel, Leonard Reuter of the Law Department, compromises proposed to settle cases before the Board must be reviewed for approval by the Commission at public meetings. The case involves mechanical equipment illegally installed on the east façade of the Barclay at 237 S. 18th Street on Rittenhouse Square.

In the spring of 2004, contractors adding large fuel tanks in the basement of the building installed several vents and a large metal box containing overfill alarms to the east façade of the Barclay along Bouvier Street, also known as Mozart Place. Preceding the commencement of work, on 3 March 2004, the Commission staff approved a permit application for the interior portion of the project, but not the exterior. The interior-only permit application stated "Interior non-structural alterations" and was stamped "No Changes to Exterior" by the Commission staff. In addition, all exterior work was crossed out with large Xs on the Commission-approved plans used to obtain the interior-only permit. On 11 March 2004, the Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a building permit for "Interior non-structural alts." at the basement level. Nonetheless, the exterior

work deleted from the plans was undertaken. The vents and alarm box are highly visible from the public right-of-way.

The Commission staff requested that the Department issue a violation for the illegal exterior work. On 14 June 2004, a representative of the owner submitted an application to the Commission to legalize the alterations. On 9 July 2004, the Commission reviewed the legalization application and denied it. Four days later, on 13 July 2004, the owner's representative submitted a revised legalization application stipulating that the large cylindrical vent tube would be replaced by a flatter vent installed closer to the building. On 13 August 2004, the Commission reviewed the revised legalization application and denied it. On 2 September 2004, the owner appealed the Commission's denial to the Board of License & Inspection Review. The Board met on 18 January 2005 and continued the hearing to allow for an exploration of alternative designs.

Subsequent to the continuance, on 16 February 2005, Richard Tyler, Randal Baron, and Jon Farnham of the Commission staff visited the site with the engineers who designed and installed the fuel tank system. That site visit and a subsequent analysis by the owner revealed that rerouting the pipes and vents to a location out of the public's view was not feasible owing to the building's configuration and foundations and the complex ownership of the basement. Also, it appeared that the Board was likely to find in favor of the appellant, overturn the Commission's denial, and legalize the equipment as installed. Therefore staff sought ways to mitigate the impact of the existing equipment. To achieve this goal, the owner proposes the legalization of the existing equipment with the following modifications:

1. The extant "gooseneck" exhaust vent and associated brackets would be removed and the flatter vent proposed in the Pennoni Associates drawing dated July 1, 2004 would be installed with smaller, less obtrusive brackets, with the Philadelphia Historical Commission staff to review the new brackets for approval.
2. All components above grade including the overfill alarm box, fill and vent lines, and exhaust duct would be repainted to match the stone façade of the building, with the Philadelphia Historical Commission staff to review paint color samples for approval.
3. All stone damaged during the installation of the overfill alarm box, fill and vent lines, and exhaust duct would be repaired, with the Philadelphia Historical Commission staff to review the repair method and samples for approval.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal to the Commission. Attorney Brett Feldman represented the proposal.

Mr. James moved to accept the compromise proposal and legalize the equipment, provided the enumerated modifications are completed. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE HISTORICAL COMMISSION STAFF, NOVEMBER 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 \$39.78 expenditure for lunches for the Architectural Committee. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

MANAYUNK ORDINANCE DISCUSSION

Lawrence Copeland of the Law Department presented a proposed resolution to the Commission. With it, he hoped to clarify the Commission's interpretation of an ambiguous section of the local ordinance that defines the review process for submissions for sites in the Manayunk historic district. The proposed resolution reads:

The Philadelphia Historical Commission authorizes its staff to review all permit applications for properties within the Manayunk historic district established under Section PM-703.0 of the Philadelphia Code and regulated under Section PM-704.0 of the Philadelphia Code. The authority granted by this resolution shall not apply to those properties that the Philadelphia Historic Commission has also designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places under Section 14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code.

Several Commission members noted that only one member of the public was in attendance. They suggested that the Commission postpone the discussion to a subsequent meeting to allow for greater public participation. They suggested including the issue on the next agenda and informing Councilman Nutter and all other potentially interested parties.

Brett Feldman introduced himself to the Commission and explained that he represented the developers of 3 Rector Street in Manayunk. He noted that he would like to participate in a discussion of the Commission's jurisdiction in Manayunk.

Upon a motion made by Mr. James and seconded by Mr. Wilds, the meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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