

**THE MINUTES OF THE 489TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
9 May 2003**

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

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
James Brown, IV
Duane Bumb, Deputy Director, Department of Commerce
Gary Hack, Chair, City Planning Commission
Warren Huff, City Planning Commission
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
Kathleen Murray, Council President Verna's Office
David Perri, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Vincent Rivera, AIA
Denise Smyler, Esq.
Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.
Norman Tissian
Scott Wilds, Deputy Director, Office of Housing and Community Development

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

Mary Schmidt, Esq., Law Department
Daniel Shah, Esq., Law Department

Also

Heather Ascher, 2137 St. James Place
David Urffer, J.K. Roller Architects
David Schmidt, J.K. Roller Architects
Vito Chimenti, Peirce College
Doug Seiler, STD Architects
Francis Gallagher, 1801 Porter Street
Elsie Faulcone, 2141 St. James Place
Andrew J. Krouk, 1420 Locust Street
Nicole Pellegrini, Office of Charles King
Leonard J. Cicotello, 149 South Hancock Street
William Maffucci, 1600 Market Street
Michael Ascher, 2137 St. James Place
Tim Woolford, 516 Queen Street
Ed Robinson, 516 Queen Street
Nikki Marx, 2134 St. James Place
William Caton, 241-43 Chestnut Street, Unicorn Holdings
Bernard Nearey, Esq., 2200 St. James Place
Marion Ruth Rogel, 2127 St. James Place

Mark Gallini, 311 South Chadwick Street
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Andrea Hemmann, 311 South Chadwick Street
Dianne Chambless, 929 Clinton Street
Julie Stoiber, 400 North Broad Street
Steve Lazin, 507 North 21st Street
Robin Schatz, Councilman Frank DiCicco's Office
Stephen Wu, 524 Delancey Street
Joe Serratore, DSA Architects
Ivano D'Angella, DSA Architects
Lenore Millhollen, Preservation Alliance/Center City Residents' Association
Penelope Benith, Cecil Baker Associates, 1601 Locust Street
Shawn Evans, AIA, Old City Civic Association
Roberto Pupo, 35 Strawberry Street

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 489th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:03 a.m.

Minutes of the 488th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Upon a motion made by Mr. Wilds and seconded by Mr. Rivera, the Commission voted to approve the minutes of the 488th Stated Meeting, 11 April 2003, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 29 April 2003
Vincent Rivera, Chair

524 Delancey Street

Patricia Dowden, Owner

Stephen Wu, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1805

PROPOSAL: Reconstruct 3rd floor

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron presented the application. The applicant seeks to reconstruct the third floor of this row house, which was lost at some point in the past. The continuity of brickwork makes it clear that this house was built with 526 Delancey Street, its neighbor to the west, which retains its upper floors.

The Commission agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

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

128 South 18th Street

William Munz, Owner

Perri Milou, Applicant

DATE: c.1835; storefront, early to mid-20th century
PROPOSAL: Storefront alterations

The applicant withdrew the proposal.

1420 Pine Street

Peirce College, Owner

Vito Cimenti, Applicant

DATE: 1897, George C. Mason, Jr., architect

PROPOSAL: Security camera

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval subject to the new placement and painting the installation brick red, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal. The proposal involves installing a security camera in a plastic dome to police the area in front of the home of the college president, which stands directly across Waverly Street.

Commission members concurred with the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

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

2201 Spruce Street

Andrew Krouk, Owner

David Schmidt, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1835, storefront c. 1900

PROPOSAL: Façade renovations, HVAC, vents

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval with the addition of wood panels below and between the storefront windows, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal. The applicant seeks to restore the storefront and stucco walls, block up a door in a brick and stucco portion of the building, and add roof vents, a skylight and HVAC equipment.

Andrew Krouk, the owner, and David Schmidt and David Urffer, the architects, attended the meeting. Since the Architectural Committee meeting, the applicant revised his proposal to reflect the Committee's recommendations.

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

2127 St. James Street

Marion Rogel, Owner

Bernard Nearey, Applicant

DATE: 1923, Spencer Roberts, architect

PROPOSAL: Legalize lattice, pergola and planter

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the lattice by a vote of 3 to 1 and unanimously voted to recommend denial of the pergola and planting box. They recommended approval of a planting area with a bluestone curb built out to the extent shown in the designation photograph of 3 May 1995, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

The proposal involves the legalization of several garden structures including a pergola, lattice, and planter that encroach onto the walkway in the front of this house in the English Village. Mr. Baron explained the application and noted that the street is a bluestone walkway with planting areas.

Mr. Wilds remarked that he made a site visit prior to the meeting to gain a better insight into the proposed application. Mr. Sklaroff inquired about the planter's encroachment on the common area. Mr. Rivera commented that the Committee discussed at length private property versus public area. It believed that there are varying degrees of encroachment and that the trellis, pergola and planter extend past the area intended for green foliage and into the courtyard, which is common to the residents. Mr. Tissian asked if the attached lattice is damaging the masonry.

Marion Rogel, the owner, Alvin Holm, an architect, and Bernard Nearey, Esq., attended the meeting. Mr. Nearey presented photographs to show the aesthetic effect of the lattice work and pergola on this English Village property. Mr. Sugrue asked about the pergola's attachment to the house. Mr. Holm responded that it is bolted to the house and has four nautilus or curved ends, with vertical wood columns and beams across the rafters. The planter box is not attached to the house, but it sits on the bluestone paving. In response to Mr. Sugrue's query about the existence of other planters in this village, Mr. Nearey responded that others exist, some removable and some permanent. Ms. Rogel pointed out that the trellis has existed for about seven years, the pergola for five years and the planter about one year. Mr. Nearey argued that English Village is a private courtyard and not a public street, therefore the exercise of jurisdiction should be of a limited nature.

Mr. Sklaroff questioned whether jurisdiction arises because of the historic district. Mr. Tyler remarked that these properties were individually designated and also that the bluestone walkway is designated as a part of the Historic Street Paving District. Mr. Nearey disagrees with the street paving designation since he believes that it is not considered a street. Mr. Tissian asked about repairs to the street, and it was noted that individual homeowners do the repairs. Commission members had issue with the attachment, the placement of the pergola and the planter box and their affect on the historic fabric.

Mr. Holm argued that the roses, vines and latticework are consistent with the style of English Village. He believed that this is an issue of horticulture and not preservation. Mr. Sugrue disagreed, he said that similar architectural styles do not have pergolas and trellises for roses. He believed that the same goal could be accomplished with a less intrusive method, even a freestanding removable trellis. Mr. Holm opined that the fastening of the latticework and pergola to the brick has not damaged the historic fabric, because the brick can be repaired and that the planter can be removed. Ms. Rogel believed that her alterations beautify the courtyard.

Nikki Marx, resident of 2134 St. James Street, commented that her primary concern is the planter's extension into the common area.

Michael and Heather Ascher presented a petition signed by neighbors in support of the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Their principal concern is the planter box because if

everyone built out, then it would hamper the walkway area. Ms. Ascher pointed out that other planters exist, but not of this magnitude.

Mr. Wilds complimented the garden; however, he believed that the additional elements are intrusive on the historic structure. He thought the curved ends on the pergola are too dramatic. Mr. Sugrue concurred. Mr. James remarked that alterations are not in the public right-away and do not impact the public. He also noted that it is not the Commission's charge to resolve issues between neighbors. Mr. Sklaroff remarked that the courtyard is very important, and believes that neighbors should be given consideration. Mr. Sklaroff asked for a consensus of the material for the planter. Most of the Commission members thought that the planter's edging should be bluestone. Mr. Wilds offered a compromise to the applicant.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to legalize the following:

- 1. The lattice work on the south wall, except the easternmost piece, and*
- 2. The pergola with the shortening of the rafters so that the curved ends do not project beyond the entrance vestibule.*

Mr. Wilds made a motion to deny legalization of the following:

- 1. The extension of the planter, and it voted that the planter must be pulled back to the edge of the bluestone with the curbing in bluestone, and*
- 2. The lattice work on the western façade of the vestibule, as well as the easternmost piece on the south façade.*

With the staff to review details. Ms. Murray seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Rivera, Mr. Bumb and Mr. Sklaroff abstained from the vote.

4700 States Drive, Ohio House

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Arlene Matzkin, Architect/Applicant

DATE: built to represent State of Ohio at 1876 Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition

PROPOSAL: Fence, lighting

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

The proposal involves adding parking, fencing, and gates around the building as well as lighting for the parking and for the house itself.

Commission members concurred with the Committee's recommendation.

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

1223 Pine Street

Katie Recker, Owner

Arlene Matzkin, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1825

PROPOSAL: Reinstall historic door and steps

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with either marble or cast stone steps, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

This application proposes restoring an historic door, doorway, and steps that were removed and infilled without a permit at some point in the 1990s. A violation for the unapproved infill was issued in February 1997. In April 1997, the Commission denied an application by a previous owner to legalize the infill. In December 1997, the Commission denied an application by the current owner to legalize the infill. At that time, the Commission did approve the installation of a false door at the infill. This work was never undertaken. At different times during the discussions of this infill, the original door has been reported to be behind the brick and in the basement.

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

1719-21 Walnut Street

Two Nuts, L.P., Owner

Charles King, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1719: 2003; 1721: c. 1900

PROPOSAL: New door on 1719, new awnings on 1719 and 1721

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the door; signage, provided that the plaque is anchor-mounted; and the awnings with open sides, provided that they are not mounted to the stone façades, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. This application proposes a new double-leaf door at 1719 Walnut and signage and awnings at 1719 and 1721. In February 2002, the Commission approved substantial demolition and new construction at these two properties. The building at 1721 dates to c. 1900; the building at 1719 is entirely new construction, but echoes the historic façade that once stood in its place.

At 1719, a glazed double-leaf Neo-Colonial door would be installed in place of the fully glazed double leaf door approved by the Commission when it reviewed the new facade. Awnings would be installed over the 1st-story door at 1719 and over all 2nd and 3rd-story windows on the front facades of 1719 and 1721. The awnings would be steeply pitched and would include neither cheeks nor aprons. They would be mounted directly into the historic limestone façade at 1719. Signage would consist of a plaque beside the door at 1719, a vinyl transom sign above the door at 1719, a decal on the 1721 storefront window, and etched film on the 1721 storefront transom. Additionally, the Talbots logo would appear on the two window awnings and the doorway awning as well as hanging signs on the doorway awning frame.

Commission members concurred with the recommendation of the Committee.

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

311 South Chadwick Street

Mark Gallini and Andrea Hemmann, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1845; addition by architect Frank Weise, 1991

PROPOSAL: Expand rooftop addition and deck – in concept

The Architectural Committee recommended final approval as proposed.

Mr. Farnham described the application for approval in concept. The owner proposes extending an addition on the roof of a carriage house at 311 S. Chadwick Street. The Commission approved the original addition in April 1991. Owing to a parking lot running along Pine Street from Chadwick to S. 17th Streets, the carriage house and any rooftop additions are highly visible from the south and west. During the review of the application for the original addition, the Committee and Commission discussed the visibility of the addition, which they sought to reduce, and compromised with the applicant. The addition currently proposed would be much more visible than the original addition.

The current proposal is based upon the Committee's review of a similar proposal at its February 2003 meeting. At that meeting, the Committee recommended approval in concept of the proposed addition provided that its west façade was redesigned to be less conspicuous and that the deck and a more transparent railing were set back to the plane of the west façade of the proposed addition. The new design of the west façade is less conspicuous; however, the railing has not been set back to the line of the west façade of the addition. In the new design, the railing stands between the addition's west façade and the main façade of the carriage house.

Mr. James inquired about the size of the addition at the roof level and it was determined that it would encompass an area of one-half to one-third of the roof level. Mr. Rivera noted that the railing would be pulled back to be in line with the extension of the current roof.

Mr. Bumb made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried with 11 votes. Mr. James dissented.

2433 Pine Street

Robin Kohles and Sam Garst, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1875

PROPOSAL: Demolish 2-story rear addition, add new 2nd floor bay with deck

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval as proposed, pursuant to Standard 9 and Restoration Standard 7.

This application proposes demolishing a rear 2-story stucco projection and adding a patio, 2nd-story bay window, and 3rd-story deck. It is very likely that the existing rear projection to be demolished consists of an original 2nd-story bay with a 1st-story infill addition.

The application proposes several additions and alterations. At the 1st-story level where the projection would be removed, a tripartite aluminum-clad window and an aluminum-clad single-leaf door with transom and concrete steps would be installed. The new bay at the 2nd story would be clad with painted wood or metal and fenestrated with aluminum-clad windows. The deck atop the new bay would include a painted steel railing. The portions of the rear façade revealed by the demolition would be covered in stucco. At the rear, a wood and CMU wall would be demolished and a new wood fence with a gate and brick patio paving would be added.

At its March 1998 meeting, the Commission approved a similar proposal to demolish the 1st-story of the rear addition, leaving only the 2nd-story portion as a projecting bay. At that time, the Commission also approved the demolition of the wall and the construction of the wood fence. Although approved, the work was not undertaken.

Commission members concurred that the proposed alterations are appropriate.

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

1801 Porter Street

Francis Gallagher, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1907, James and John Windrim, architects

PROPOSAL: Demolish fence for parking pad

The Architectural Committee voted three to one to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the site guideline. Mr. Rivera dissented.

The owner wishes to remove the metal hairpin fence on the side elevation and install a parking pad. Francis Gallagher, the owner, said that a curb cut existed years ago, prior to the re-paving of the street. In response to a Commission member's query about the yard's location, he said that this is a corner property, and that the yard extends to both the side and the rear of the property.

Mr. Tissian expressed concern with the setting of a precedent, since this would be the first parking pad on the block. Ms. Smyler inquired about Roseberry Street and Ms. Spina noted that the fronts of the houses face the street. Mr. Sklaroff pointed out that the allowance of the proposal would imply curb cuts along with other needed alterations for the creation of a parking pad.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Brown seconded the motion which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Bumb, Mr. Wilds and Ms. Murray dissented.

1516 Pine Street

Joseph Ciminera, Jr., Owner

Joe Serratore, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1849, Thomas U. Walter, architect

PROPOSAL: Roof deck with skylight, stairtower extension, rear alterations

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend final approval of the entire project, with a metal railing on the HVAC platform.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. This application for final approval proposes several alterations to this brownstone house. The vast majority of the alterations were given conceptual approval at the Commission's January 2003 meeting. Those alterations include the stair tower, decks, skylights, balconies, carport with deck and bridge, and covered walkway with vestibule. The only aspect of this application not given conceptual approval is a HVAC platform with screening wall on the roof of the rear ell.

The Commission members agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

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

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue, Vice-Chair.

226 South 16th Street aka 1601 Locust Street, University Club

Allan Domb, Owner

Gordon Fluke, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1929, Grant Simon, architect

PROPOSAL: Cut new windows and door in penthouse

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the 20th-story window alterations as proposed. For the 21st-story alterations, they voted to recommend approval of the new door opening on the south façade as proposed, but denial of the window enlargement and modillion removal on the east, west and north façade, pursuant to Standards 5 and 10. The Committee voted to recommend denial of the vent, as proposed for the 19th story, west façade, pursuant to Standard 10.

Mr. Farnham presented the application. Several applications related to the conversion from offices to residences of the high-rise building, now called the Lanesborough, at 16th and Locust Streets have already been reviewed by the Commission. This application for further alterations to the penthouse level proposes cutting a 1'-2" x 2'-2" hole for a future vent in the west façade at the 19th story and covering it with a painted metal panel; changing one 18-light fixed window to a 6/6 double hung-window with 6-light transom on each of three facades, the north, east, and west, at the 20th story; and altering four windows and related modillions, one on each façade, at the 21st story. On the south façade of the 21st story, a 3-light window and three stone modillions in a row of five would be removed, the opening enlarged, and a French terrace-access door installed. On the north, east, and west façades of the 21st story, 3-light windows and three stone modillions in rows of five would be removed, the openings enlarged, and 6/6 double-hung windows installed.

Mr. Wilds inquired if it is possible to vent upward on the interior instead of the visible skin of the building. Mr. James expressed concern with the possibility of continuing proposals forthcoming on this building.

Penelope Benith, the architect, opined that she believed that the upper floor alterations are near completion; however, she is unclear as to the progress of the lower floors. Ms. Benith noted that the proposed vent is a requirement in conjunction with the heat and hot water. The enlargements of the windows are needed because the windows as they currently exist, are inappropriate as bedroom windows. She did conclude that she is open to pursue other options. Ms. Smyler and other Commission members agreed that a solution could be reached that would allow the modillions to be undisturbed. Commission members concurred that the applicant should seek other options for venting.

Mr. Bumb made a motion to approve the enlargement of the windows on the 21st-story, without disturbance to the modillions, approve the 20th story window alterations as proposed and approve the new door on the south façade of the 21st floor as proposed, with the staff to review details and denial of the new vent. Mr. Hack seconded the motion which carried with 10 votes. Mr. James dissented and Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

1901 Vine Street, Free Library of Philadelphia, Main Branch

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Sandra Horrocks, Applicant

DATE: 1912-1927, Horace Trumbauer, architect

PROPOSAL: Signage

The application has been withdrawn.

Mr. Sugrue passed the gavel back to Mr. Sklaroff

516 Queen Street

Timothy Woolford, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1810; addition c. 1890

PROPOSAL: New roof deck, façade alterations

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the shutters, cellar bulkhead and cellar window grate with staff to review details. The Committee voted to recommend approval of a roof deck, no wider than the rear ell, set back in line with the rear of the roof access bulkhead with staff to review details and an HVAC condenser location mock-up.

The proposal involves adding shutters, a cellar bulkhead and a cellar window grate and a roof deck to this three- story row house. The roof deck will sit largely on the front portion of the roof although a rear ell exists. The deck will have high visibility from the sides because the neighboring houses have only two stories. The roof deck would be acceptable if pushed back to the area of the rear ell.

The applicant submitted a revised proposal, which pulls the deck inward on the sides, so that it will predominantly be situated on the rear-ell.

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

Bladen's Court aka 117-19R Elfreth's Alley aka 138-40 N. Front Street

Charles Datner, Architect/Applicant

PROPOSAL: Addition to north wall

The applicant withdrew the application.

241-43 Chestnut Street

Carol Caton, Owner

Doug Seiler, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 241: c. 1857, Stephen Button, architect; 243: c. 1897, Wilson Eyre, architect

PROPOSAL: Additions, façade alterations

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the fire escape expansions and 6-story rear addition at 241 Chestnut as well as the basement access at 243, with staff to review details. The Committee voted to recommend denial of the addition at the rear of 243 as proposed, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal and noted that the Commission at a previous meeting denied the fire escapes. This application proposes several alterations and additions to two buildings at 241 and 243 Chestnut Street. They include a 6-story rear addition at 241 Chestnut; the conversion of four front-façade windows into fire escape doors and extension of the 3rd to 6th-story fire

escape balconies from 239 Chestnut to 241; a 2-story addition at the rear of 243 along S. 3rd Street; and a basement accessway with railing at 243 along S. 3rd Street. A similar proposal for these properties was reviewed by the Commission in April 2003. The Commission approved in concept the rear additions and basement access, but denied the window conversion and fire escape extension as well as a dormer on 243, which is not included in this application.

Doug Seiler, the architect, and Bill Caton, the owner attended the meeting. Mr. Seiler said that the previous application included extending the fire escapes and a new dormer. Mr. Caton said that the current application has removed the dormer, which he believes is a significant change to the application.

Mr. James inquired if the design of the fire escapes had changed and Mr. Seiler responded in the negative. Mr. James also asked the reason for the denial of the fire escapes. The Commission concluded that they had a visual impact on the appearance of the building. Mr. Wilds reiterated that the applicant maintains that an interior means of egress will compromise the interior space. Mr. Sklaroff emphasized the importance of not setting a precedent, since fire escapes never existed on this building. Mr. James believes that a reasonable re-use of the building at some point would probably require fire escapes. Mr. Wilds said that architecturally, the proposed alterations are an enhancement to the property. Mr. Perri said that new fire escapes on a building are illegal and the current escapes are too short to accommodate 241 without the proposed extensions.

Mr. Seiler informed the Commission that as a compromise for the fire escapes, the applicant is willing to restore the windows of 239 to match 241. Commission members asked Mr. Caton to provide written authorization from the owner of 239 with a statement of the proposed alterations.

Mr. Sklaroff asked that the minutes reflect his disapproval of the Committee's handling of this matter. Ms. Smyler concurred.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, subject to the receipt of written authorization from owner of 239, with the inclusion of a statement of the proposed alteration, with the staff to review details. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried with 11 votes. Mr. Sklaroff dissented.

35 South Strawberry Street

Roberto Pupo, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1910

PROPOSAL: Storefront alterations

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposal, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. This application calls for infill at the storefront for security reasons. Presently, the two doors appear in a recess and the single-paned storefront window stands at the building line. The proposal calls for leaving the transom area recessed, but installing a new wall at the building line, creating a vestibule. The new wall will have a single-leaf door and multi-light transom and sidelight. The storefront window will be changed to a one-over-one double-hung window. When the Commission approved the storefront, the owner was to ensure that both doors had half-glazing with panels below.

Roberto Pupo, the owner, said that his desire is to attain security, and that he is willing to modify his submission to conform to the Commission's regulations. Ms. Smyler made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation; however, upon further discussion the motion was amended. Mr. Wilds pointed out that the existing 1st floor condition is not original to the 1910s building. Mr. Sklaroff and members thought that the applicant could withdraw his application as submitted, and keep the existing storefront, but install a simple metal gate in the front.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve a simple metal gate in the front of the existing storefront, with the staff to review details. Mr. Brown seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

149 South Hancock Street

Front Street Development Associates, Owner

Joseph Pacitti, Applicant

DATE: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: Complete demolition, construction of 11-story building

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9 and 10. Since the proposal includes a financial hardship application, the Committee recommended sending the application to the Financial Hardship Committee.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal. The developer for the northern parcel of the land between Front and Hancock Streets wishes to demolish the last remaining historic building and erect an 11-story building with a penthouse. The application is based on financial hardship.

The new construction occupies the entire lot at the first four floors and has a set back at the south façade on the upper floors and a small penthouse. Commercial space is proposed for the first floor along Front and Sansom Streets, parking on floors two through four, and office space on floors five through eleven. The loading/service area will be located on Hancock Street. However, the ground occupied by the historic Bouvier building, which will be demolished, will simply be open space leading to the loading dock.

The plans do not include details, such as materials or window types.

Mr. Bumb opined that a design review does not require a hardship review as well. Mr. Brown concurred. Mr. Wilds explained that in 1987, this building was about to be demolished and the Redevelopment Authority (RDA) saved the building by purchasing it. Mr. Sklaroff stressed the importance of focusing on the merits of the building.

Leonard Ciccotello, the architect, said that the re-use of this building is not practical to the current proposal. Nicholas Scafidi, counsel for the RDA, said that developers believe that the historical context is lost in this area. He also said that the revitalization of this property, which is in poor condition and of no interest to the public, would be a frivolous effort.

Mr. Sugrue expressed concern with the loss of a significant building for the creation of a loading dock and service area. Mr. Sklaroff noted the letter from the Department of the Interior, which states that it has concerns about the loss of the historic building, the impact the demolition would have on Welcome Park, and the scale of the proposed new development.

Mr. Sklaroff emphasized that it is important that all issues are weighed and that a case for public interested has not been presented. He questioned the impact of the footprint of the Bouvier

House; it was noted that it is a small part in comparison with this very large development. Mr. Wilds remarked that revitalization efforts over the past 15 years have been difficult, which speaks for itself. Ms. Smyler gave a strong argument for demolition in the public interest, which she believed was demonstrated, since this property has not been developed. Mr. Bumb agreed that public interest has been demonstrated. Mr. Tyler disagreed that the case can meet the criteria of public interest. He cited the demolition of the fire station for the expansion of the Convention Center as an example of valid public interest, not this project for a private developer. Mr. Sugrue agreed and said that he is not persuaded that the building should be demolished and suggested that the developer incorporate the building into his design. Mr. Ciccotello pointed out that the Bookbinder's development and its need for a service area limits the possibilities for the location of the service area.

Mr. Scafidi opined that options do exist since the developer has not purchased the property and that a design could incorporate the Bouvier building. Ms. Spina said that on the south side of Moravian Street, a proposed development of eight townhouses will be built along Walnut Street. She also said that the building is structurally sound. Mr. Baron thought that alternate uses should be explored. Mr. James commented that the re-use issue has been addressed by the RDA, with a history of unsuccessful developments for the property. Mr. Tissian asked the architect to research the possibility of incorporating this structure into its design. Mr. James remarked that he believed that there are other avenues that are not present today. Mr. Ciccotello said that other options have been pursued. Commission members discussed the public interest issue at length, and most of the members concurred that it is necessary to follow the procedure set forth by City Council. Some members also believed that the proposal articulated to the Architectural Committee was not in the public interest and that the Commission should not make a hasty decision. Ms. Smyler urged the Commission to allow the project to move forward, based on public interest.

Shawn Evans, Old City Civic Association, said that the developer had made no attempt to contact the civic association and explained about the moratorium on demolition in Old City. He also pointed out that the developer has not purchased the property, questioning the basis of hardship. He requested that the matter be tabled until a later date.

There was a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation but it failed with a tied vote.

Ms. Smyler made a motion to approve the demolition, based on public interest, subject to funding in place and acquisition of building permits. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion which failed with a tied vote. Mr. Hack, Mr. Rivera, Mr. Brown, Mr. Tissian, Mr. Sugrue and Mr. Sklaroff dissented.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to table the proposal for a period not to exceed six (6) months and refer the application to the Committee on Financial Hardship. Ms. Murray seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

512-14 South 3rd Street

Gargoyles Ltd., Owner

Anthony Bracali, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 512: 1858 as a firehouse, attributed to Stephen Button, architect; 514: c. 1940

PROPOSAL: Cut new windows, roof decks

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, 10, and the roofing guideline.

This application is for the conversion of two buildings at the southern boundary of the Society Hill Historic District. The building at 512 has brick infill in the second floor windows. The application calls for new aluminum-clad, multi-light casement windows in the upper floors. However, the proportions of the transoms and windows differ from those existing in the 3rd floor. Also, window openings in the rear will have new windows. On 514, the proposal stipulates widening the openings on the upper stories and installing new, aluminum-clad, casement windows. New window openings will also be cut on the rear of the property. Both buildings will have roof decks, each set back approximately 30 feet from the front and rear façades.

The Commission concurred with the Committee's recommendation.

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

327 Race Street

Pat Karasidis, Owner

Charles Datner, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Basement access with railing

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 2. The Committee suggested that the applicant redesign the entrance to fit into the existing sidewalk opening.

This application calls for a new basement areaway and door. The work would remove a granite step original to the storefront and extend four feet out onto the sidewalk. The below-grade, single-leaf door would include the area of the present bulkhead opening, but would extend beyond it. The new concrete stairs would cut across two-thirds of the storefront and would be surrounded by a galvanized pipe railing.

The Commission agreed with the Committee's recommendation that the proposed entranceway should be redesigned.

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

1226-32 Walnut Street aka 225-35 South 13th Street, St. James Hotel

Royal Bank, Owner

Jeffrey Bossert, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1901-04, Horace Trumbauer, architect

PROPOSAL: Relocate door, replace entrance for ADA, new awnings

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal provided that the awnings mount below and do not cover the transom bars; the plaques are anchor-mounted, not epoxy-mounted; a single-leaf door with sidelights is substituted for the currently proposed double-leaf door in the easternmost bay; and that the surround is preserved in the westernmost bay, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9, 10 and the storefront guideline.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. This proposal differs from the one seen by the Committee last month and includes several parts. First, the bank proposes to remove the curved awnings and

install new shed awnings at the transom bars of the windows. Second, the owner wishes to switch the entrance from the westernmost bay to the one next to it. The removal of the entrance will include demolition of the doors and decorative wood surround. The new entry will have a metal system colored to match the stone. The packet includes an image from c. 1930 that shows an entry in a different location than the ones being changed and the two westernmost bays as windows. The new entry will also have a sloped sidewalk to meet ADA requirements. Third, the proposal no longer includes an ATM machine at the street, but a new entry in the easternmost bay leading to a lobby machine as requested by the Committee. However, the new entry will include the demolition of the decorative wood surround and the installation of aluminum double-leaf doors. Fourth, new wall plaques for signage, but the proposal does not include details of material or attachment.

Mr. James expressed his opposition to the plaques, which he believed should be eliminated and Mr. Sugrue concurred. Mr. James suggested that signage be put on the glass.

Jeffrey Bossert, the architect, noted that the proposed awnings with signage would replace the existing awnings and said that the size of the plaques are two-feet by three-feet. Some members believed that the plaques should be smaller in size. Mr. Bossert said that the plaques of acrylic or a painted metal could be reduced by half.

After further discussion, some Commission members thought that the proposed awnings should be installed below the transom bar, with signage on every other awning. It also thought that the number of plaques should be limited to three: one on the 13th Street façade and two on the Walnut Street façade.

Mr. Tissian made a motion accept the Committee's recommendation with the amendment of the location of the proposed awnings and signage only on every other awning. It also recommended limiting the number of plaques to three: one on 13th Street and two on Walnut Street. Ms. Murray seconded the motion which carried with 10 votes. Mr. Bumb and Mr. Wilds dissented.

929 Clinton Street

Alan Goldstein and Dianne Chambless, Owners

Alexander Rice, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1840; ½ floor removed, n.d.

PROPOSAL: 5th-story addition with dormer, façade alterations – in concept

The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept of the addition of a 5th floor with the roofline to be determined pending the outcome of sight-line studies, pursuant to Standard 9 Approval of the sidewalk, windows, door, and shutters, with staff to review details including shop drawings, pursuant to Standard 6. Denial of the gas lantern, pursuant to Standard 3.

Ms. Spina presented the application. This application for approval in concept proposes the restoration of the top ½ story of this building, which was lost many years ago in a fire. The addition will have a gambrel roof with a central dormer window. The cornice will replicate the cornice at 927 Clinton and the dormer will have a pedimented shape with clapboard cheeks. At the rear of the addition, doors will lead out to a rooftop deck. The deck will sit on an extended piazza that will house a new elevator. The existing three-story rear ell will not change.

On the front façade, the application includes new 6/6 true-divided light windows, six-panel wood door and shutters on all floors, but details are not included. Also the owner wishes to install a herringbone brick sidewalk and a gas lantern over the front door.

Commission members asked Dianne Chambless, the owner, to provide site line studies from the front of the street.

Mr. James made a motion to approve the proposal in concept, but deny the gas lantern. Ms. Murray seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

2100-10 Fairmount Avenue

Donato Spaventa, Owner

Angela Vendetti, Applicant

DATE: 1922

PROPOSAL: Cut new storefront windows and door, awnings, handicap ramp

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the entranceway design is improved, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9, the window guideline and the entrance guideline.

This application returns for final approval. The applicant has incorporated suggestions by the made by the Committee at their previous review. The proposal calls for new coupled, casement windows on the 21st Street façade and two, tripled casements on the Fairmount Avenue façade. A third opening on the Fairmount Avenue façade will have a single-leaf, metal door with sidelights and a single casement window. The windows will be made of metal and have a horizontal muntin to reflect the double-hung windows on the upper floors. The proposal also includes new concrete steps and ramp with simple aluminum picket railings. Canvas-like awnings will be installed in each opening.

Commission members thought the proposed alterations appropriate and concurred with the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to give final approval to the proposal, with the improved entrance design, and staff to review details. Ms. Murray seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

507 North 21st Street

Carol Kaminski, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: New steps and garden wall

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend either the proposal as submitted or a brown stucco wall, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

This Spring Garden Historic District house, with its twin at 505 North 21st, is a rare example of the Italianate Villa style that reads as a single mansion. The twin at 505 retains its historic brownstone wall with wrought-iron fencing, but the wall at 507 was demolished at some point. The non-historic existing steps at 507 are brick and concrete. The application for 507 calls for a new grey, simulated-stone retaining wall along the 21st Street façade and partially along Brandywine Street, with a return back toward the building that will terminate at the porch. The

wall will have simulated-stone coping, four-foot newel posts, and steps at the front and side of the house. The height of the wall will match that of the stone portion of the wall at 505.

Mr. Hack inquired about the owner's preference of stone. Commission members thought a CMU wall with scored stucco also appropriate.

Steve Lazin, the owner, commented that the neighborhood is a mixed context of walls. He noted his preference for a gray stone wall that will match the neighboring wall in height.

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

THE REPORT of the Historical Commission Staff, April 2003, Richard Tyler

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

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to approve the expenditure of \$ 250.00 to Keast and Hood for a structural report for 300-18 North 63rd Street. In addition, Mr. Tyler requested the return of the remainder of the \$16,000.00 grant from the Philadelphia Intervention Fund sponsored by Preservation Pennsylvania. Mr. Sklaroff polled the members and the overall consensus was that the grant money should be retained in the Batten Fund in the event of a future need.

Mr. James made a motion to approve the Batten Fund expenditure of \$250.00. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

NEW POLICY under Pennsylvania's Amended "Right to Know" Law
Lawrence Copeland, Esq., Law Department

In the absence of Mr. Copeland, Mr. Tyler explained the changes made to the policy, including new costs.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the policy. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission members about pursuing an appeal in Court of Common Pleas regarding the demolition of 228-30 Arch Street. Commission members concurred that an appeal should be sought.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to seek an appeal. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Mr. James made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary

As corrected 6/17/03