

**THE MINUTES OF THE 572<sup>ND</sup> STATED MEETING OF THE  
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**9 APRIL 2010  
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET  
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

**PRESENT**

Sam Sherman, Chairman  
Leslie Benoliel  
Richardson Dilworth III  
Susan O. W. Jaffe  
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President  
John Mattioni, Esq.  
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department  
Robert Murray, Department of Public Property  
Daniel Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections  
David Schaaf, Philadelphia City Planning Commission  
Robert Thomas

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director  
Randal Baron, Preservation Planner III  
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician

Leonard Reuter, Assistant City Solicitor

**ALSO PRESENT**

Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
Julia Frayman  
Gedalia Vinokurov, Gedalia Group, Inc.  
Cynthia Philo, Old City District  
Elise Vider

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. Commissioners Benoliel, Dilworth, Jaffe, Leonard, Mattioni, Merriman, Murray, Quinn, Schaaf, and Thomas joined him.

**MINUTES OF THE 571<sup>ST</sup> STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**ACTION:** Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the minutes of the 571<sup>st</sup> Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 12 March 2010. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **121 S. 19<sup>TH</sup> STREET**

Owner: 19<sup>th</sup> & Sansom Corp

Applicant: Francis Twardy

History: c. 1885, Significant in the Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Install rear fire escape.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of a fire escape redesigned to remain within the footprint of the rear ell; and approval of the fire escape as submitted, provided that additional study shows that it cannot be redesigned to remain within the bounds of the rear ell; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to install a fire escape at the rear of this corner property. The applicant claims that the fire escape is required for compliance with the fire code. The fire escape would be constructed on the small rear ell of the building and would extend beyond it to the east. The east end of the fire escape would be supported by thin steel columns that would be 1-½ stories tall. The fire escape would be plainly visible from Sansom Street. The staff does not oppose the addition of a fire escape, but suggests a design that is more compatible with the historic building and district.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the application to the Historical Commission. No one represented the application.

The Commissioners asked why the applicant was not present and if he had communicated with the staff. Mr. Danta stated that the applicant had not contacted him since the Architectural Committee meeting.

Mr. Thomas suggested that the Commission approve a rear fire escape between the second and third floors, provided that it is contained within the footprint of the rear ell. If such an escape cannot be designed, then the applicant may submit a new application for the Commission's review. Mr. Mattioni contended that the application should be denied outright because the applicant failed to appear and present his case.

**ACTION:** Mr. Thomas moved to deny the application as submitted, but to approve a rear fire escape between the second and third floors, provided that the fire escape is contained within the footprint of the rear ell, with the staff to review details Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **149 S. HANCOCK STREET**

Owner: Redevelopment Authority of Philadelphia

Applicant: Igor Frayman

History: c. 1825 for Michael Bouvier, master furniture maker

Individually designated, 2/6/1975; Significant in Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Renovate shell for residence, install garage in front facade, construct rooftop addition

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, and 10 and the Roofs Guidelines.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to renovate a vacant c. 1825 commercial structure for a residence. The south façade as well as the upper floors of the front or west façade would be

restored. The cast-iron storefront at the front façade would be removed and a garage installed in its place. New windows would be cut into the north and east facades, which are former party walls. A large deck and penthouse without any setbacks from the facades would be constructed on the roof.

Several potential redevelopers have proposed the demolition of this building, which is in a deteriorated condition and stands in an otherwise vacant area. The Redevelopment Authority of Philadelphia purchased the property in 1988 to promote its preservation and rehabilitation.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Prospective property owner Julie Frayman and architect Gedalia Vinokurov represented the application.

Mr. Baron presented the revised design to the Commission and noted that it complied with every one of the suggestions offered by the Architectural Committee. The cast iron storefront would be retained, not removed for the garage. The deck would be set back of 15 feet from the Hancock Street façade and the three feet from the south façade. The deck railing would be lighter and transparent. The window openings in the party walls would be punched and vertically oriented. He also noted that the staff would work with the applicant to refine the details, for example the door design for the south facade. Mr. Vinokurov agreed with Mr. Baron, stating that he would refine the details once his client took title to the building and he could undertake a proper survey of it. He promised to restore the building.

Ms. Merriman commended the efforts of the prospective owner and her architect. Mr. Schaaf echoed Ms. Merriman. He asked Mr. Vinokurov if he could connect the scoring on the north and east walls to give them a more unified appearance. Mr. Vinokurov stated that he could and would. Mr. Baron commended the project as well.

Cynthia Philo of the Old City District asked the applicants when they planned to begin work. Mr. Vinokurov stated that his clients would begin work as soon as they could close on the property and obtain the requisite permits. Ms. Benoliel asked Ms. Frayman if she was purchasing the building from the Redevelopment Authority. Ms. Frayman responded in the affirmative.

**ACTION:** Mr. Thomas moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 9 April 2010, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Schaaf moved to adjourn at 9:28 a.m. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

#### **STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES**

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 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

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 7: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damages to historic materials will not be used.

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.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights 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.