

**THE MINUTES OF THE 476th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
12 April 2002 at 9:00 a.m.**

**Commission Conference Room 18th Floor, 1515 Arch Street
James Cuorato, Acting-Chair**

Present

James Cuorato, Director, Commerce Department, Acting Chair
James Brown, IV
Melissa Heller-Batzer, Director of Economic Development, Office of City Council President
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
David Perri, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Vincent Rivera, AIA
Michael Sklaroff, Esquire
Harris Steinberg, AIA
Norman Tissian
Scott Wilds, Deputy Director, Office of Housing and Community Development

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

Lawrence K. Copeland, Senior Attorney, Law Department

Also

Mary Rita D'Allesandro, Mayor's Office
Kalyan Som, 2051 Walnut Street
David W. O'Donnell, 203 Christian Street
Judith McDowel, Queen Village Association
Michael Samschick, 114 Chestnut Street
Christine and Clifford Mumm, 220 Washington Square
Richard Sprague, Esq., Sprague and Sprague
Geoffrey R. Johnson, Esq., Sprague and Sprague
Anna Reyes, 106 Kenilworth Street
Brian W. Zobel, Architect
Davis Smith
C. Goldfarb, Court Reporter
Marcy BonDurant
Craig Klofach, UJMN Associates
Kevin Clark
Herbert Lewis, UJMN Associates
Mark Ueland, UJMN Associates
Mary Ellen Strain, Towers & Miller Associates
Robert Sutton
Leslie Smallwood
William Kane, Kane Woodworking, 218 South 20th Street
Scott Ritchie, Otto Design Group
John Ciccone, John Ciccone Architects
Alan Karpo, Second Street Wholesale

Mary Anne Hunter, Fairhill Burial Ground
Manuel Delgado, Spring Garden Community Development Corporation
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
George Soto
Anna Reyes
Anthony Ciocca, ToryPete Management
Jerry Roller, J.K. Roller Architects
David Schmidt, J.K. Roller Architects
Lene Copeland, Michael Shannon Designs
Frank Mallas
Lee Drukker, William Penn House
Lilly Drukker, William Penn House
J. P. O'Brien, William Penn House
Jean K. Wolf, Preservationist Consultant
David S. Traub, AIA, 1822 Delancey Street
Daniel Berger, owner, 1822 Delancey Street
Ira Kauderer, Esq., Preservation Alliance
Virgil Procaccino, 229 Fitzwater Street
Norma Procaccino, 229 Fitzwater Street
Richard M. Cole, AIA, 229 Fitzwater Street
Sunnie B. Freeman, 1919 Chestnut Street, #717
Robin Schatz, Room 332, City Hall
Christopher Hiester, 222 St. Marks Square
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance
Christian Busch, The Sullivan Company
Tybie Moskinsky, 1919 Chestnut Street, #2719
Milton and Elenor Laden, 1919 Chestnut Street, #1407
Anne Castelli, 1919 Chestnut Street
John Solether, 229 Fitzwater Street

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to designate James Cuorato the acting-chair for the meeting. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

James Cuorato, Acting Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m.

RECOGNITION OF WAYNE SPILOVE

Mr. Cuorato commended Mr. Spilove for his tenure in office as Chair of the Historical Commission and read a citation from Mayor John F. Street. Mr. Sklaroff presented Mr. Spilove with a plaque on behalf of the Historical Commission. Mr. Spilove extended his thanks to the Commission and staff.

Minutes of the 475th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission. Upon a motion made by Mr. Tissian and duly seconded, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the 475th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held on 8 March 2002, Duane Bumb, Acting Chair, with the correction of Harris Steinberg's name.

THE REPORT of the Committee on Financial Hardship, 20 March 2002
Scott Wilds, Acting Chair

2901 Germantown Avenue, Fairhill Burial Ground

Fairhill Burial Ground Corporation, Owner
Craig Klofach, Architect
Replacement of cemetery fence

The proposal involves replacing the damaged fence along Germantown Avenue with a new simplified fence as installed along Indiana Avenue and using any salvagable pieces to restore the fence along 9th and Cambria Streets. The herringbone brick sidewalk will be restored along 9th Street and a portion of Cambria Street, with concrete along the remainder.

Mr. Wilds explained the proposal and presented the recommendation of the Committee on Financial Hardship.

Craig Klofach, the architect, attended the meeting to answer questions as needed.

The Commission members thought the proposal merited financial hardship consideration.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to approve the scheme A proposal, owing to a determination of financial hardship. Mr. Perri seconded the motion which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Sklaroff abstained from the vote.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 26 March 2002
Vincent Rivera, Chair.

106 Kenilworth Street

George Soto, Owner
Joel Spivak, Architect
DATE: c. 1740

PROPOSAL: Rear addition and deck

The Architectural Committee recommended denial as submitted but the approval of a revised design with the new third story roof on the southern most section of the building revised with a sloped roof, removal of the transom windows and the remaining windows adjusted to the scale of those on the rest of the building, which shall be reviewed by the staff prior to the Commission meeting.

This proposal involves alterations to the visible rear of this early rowhouse. The proposal involves raising and changing the shape of the original three-story rear ell, adding a deck and stair- house. The plans also show adding another story over the two-story southern most section of the building. This piece will cantilever out over the side yard of the building and hide the whole rear of the historic house.

George Soto and Anna Reyes, the owners, as well as David Schmidt and Brian Zobel, architects for the project, attended the meeting. Ms. Reyes stressed the need for additional space and said that her property is the only one with an ell. She also noted the limited visibility of the addition along Monroe Street. She said that retaining the sloping roofline would require raising the party wall between the two houses to at least ten feet, which will hide the dormer window. Ms. Reyes passed around photographs showing existing conditions in the neighborhood, and said that her proposed addition maintains the character of the building. Mr. Zobel emphasized that the alterations will not impact the front façade.

Mr. Steinberg asked for clarification of the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Sklaroff inquired about the date of the rear ell and thought that the material of the new addition should clearly distinguish the new from the old. Mr. Rivera believes that by allowing the original

ell to be raised three feet, the eave height of the new addition will be maintained. Mr. Wilds noted that a metal railing on the roof deck will lessen its impact.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal as submitted. Ms. Heller-Batzer seconded the motion which carried with 7 votes. Mr. Rivera and Mr. Steinberg opposed the motion.

116-18 Chestnut Street

116-18 Chestnut Street, LP, Owners

Joel Spivak, Architect

DATE: v. 1857, façade c. 1905

PROPOSAL: New windows and door on rear, close rear openings and cut new side windows, roof top stair enclosure and HVAC, new rear stair

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal including the following:

1. *Stuccoeing the rear from the second floor down in a brick color;*
2. *Rooftop stair house;*
3. *Placement of the HVAC;*
4. *Moving the rear door to align with the upper floor windows, and*
5. *Approval of the new windows on the side of the building.*

This proposal involves alterations to this commercial structure, adding windows on the stuccoed side party wall, a new stairhouse and AC units on the roof and closing and replacing windows on the rear façade and adding a stair, door and stucco.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal and the Commission concurred with the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

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

319-21 South 3rd Street

Lisa Colton, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1788, Addition c. 1968

PROPOSAL: 2nd story addition

The Architectural Committee recommended conceptual approval of scheme A but requested proposed rear elevations, site plans and photographs of the existing conditions of the rear façade.

Unlike the previous proposals for adding to this structure, this proposal maintains much more of the existing structure by adding a floor on top of the existing c. 1968 house addition. The architect has presented three proposals. Alternate A involves raising the roof, reversing the slope and building up the side wall in masonry with stucco as a continuation of the existing side wall. Alternate B shows the front window clerestory brought around the side and a new flat roofline projecting back from that point with standing-seam-metal siding covering the new wall. Alternate C retains the outline of the current roofline, but adds a roof that slopes downward from the existing front wall sheathed in the standing-seam-metal. The new side roof wall sits inboard of the existing side wall and chimney.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. No one was present to represent the applicant.

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

320 Walnut Street

Archdiocese of Philadelphia, Owner

Mark Ueland, Architect

DATE: c. 1930

PROPOSAL: New windows, penthouse, rear additions and front doorway

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with the following:

- 1. Approval of the side window mullion pattern;*
- 2. Approval of the penthouse addition;*
- 3. Approval of the railing attached to the inside of the parapet, in place of further raising the parapet;*
- 4. Approval of stairhouse with the air conditioning unit on the top;*
- 5. Approval of the infill of the atrium;*
- 6. Approval of the banner placement, and*
- 7. Approval of the door with modifications and the staff to review all details.*

Two Committee members favored the proposal. Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Pentz recused themselves from the vote. It was noted that the replacement windows lack any detail and that the windows will need to return for a separate review.

The proposal returns to the Committee after a delay of six months during which the applicant has worked with the community, the congregation of Old St. Joseph's Church, and the National Park Service to modify the design. On the front façade, the architects have changed the doorway with the removal of the canopy and a new multi-pane side sliding door design. The plans still show a banner above the door. On the roof, the architect has modified the penthouse design with hipped roofs and raising the parapet wall with a stuccoed masonry extension. The windows of the side and rear facades will now retain their historic three-over-three pattern. The rear façade now features a larger stair tower with the HVAC cooling tower placed on top.

In attendance to represent the project were Mark Ueland, the architect, Herbert Lewis and Brother Joseph Willard. Mr. Ueland noted that he is in agreement with the recommendation of the Architectural Committee.

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

420 South Camac Street

Marcy BonDurant, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Visible rear addition

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal as submitted with the staff to review details.

This proposal involves adding a three-story addition to the rear of this half-gabled rowhouse. The third floor portion of the addition has limited visibility from Lombard Street.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal and the Commission agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

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

323 Cypress Street, NW corner St. Peters Way

Adam and Emily Martidez, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1890

PROPOSAL: 3rd floor addition and roof deck

The Architectural Committee recommended denial per Standards 9 and 10.

This proposal involves two schemes to add a floor and a deck on top of this carriage house. Scheme A involves a box-like addition with a deck and trellis at the front of the building. Scheme B shows a stuccoed gable roofed addition with cross gable dormers. This proposal shows a deck at front and rear with a painted metal railing. A former application for a roof top addition received a denial as well, based on the massing and scale which overwhelms the existing house. The roofline of this house has great visibility owing to its location on a corner and the fact that it sits across the street from a park.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. The Commission asked if anyone in attendance represented the project; there was no one.

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

223 Delancey Street

Steven Grasse, Owner

Scott Ritchie, Architect

DATE: Front façade c. 1966, rear addition c. 1890

PROPOSAL: Cut new rear windows, replace roof deck

The Architectural Committee recommended approval as submitted.

This proposal involves rebuilding an existing roof deck and cutting some rear façade windows down into double-leaf doors, adding balconies and transom windows. This work has some visibility from American Street.

Scott Ritchie attended the meeting to answer questions and explain the proposal.

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

220 West Washington Square, NW corner of Locust Street

Clifford Mumm, Owner

Jennifer Bonaccorsi, Architect

DATE: 1911

PROPOSAL: Penthouse addition

The Architectural Committee recommended approval as submitted with a change in the fanlight transom element to a rectangular element and the fence with a squared top. Mr. D'Alessandro recused himself.

This proposal involves a penthouse for the roof of the building. The penthouse meets the criteria for setbacks from the south and east facades as well as the height limits established by the former

conceptual approval. The penthouse has multiple windows with arched top fanlights.

Jerry Roller, architect, attended the meeting to represent the proposal.

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

220 West Washington Square, NW corner of Locust Street

220 West Washington Square Condominium Association, Owner

Alan Hartell, Applicant

DATE: 1911

PROPOSAL: New wood windows

The Architectural Committee recommended approval as submitted using wood, on both facades, and the retention of one of the original metal windows for documentation.

This proposal calls for the replacement of all the windows in the building including the wood sash on the Washington Square side of the building and the metal sash of the Locust Street side of the building. The applicant proposes a new wood sash with a muntin that is wider than those on the east façade and narrower than those on the south side. The applicant shows both narrow applied muntins and wide true-divided-light muntins as options. In both cases the putty slope lacks the depth of the existing windows.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal and responded to Mr. Sklaroff's inquiry about the staff's recommendation. Mr. Baron said that the first floor Locust Street façade had been changed, and the new windows should replicate the original. He noted that the *Standards* emphasize repairs when possible and prefers that the original material be kept if possible. Mr. Wilds stated that if the originals can be repaired then they should be kept. Mr. Tissian questioned the heaviness of the windows.

Clifford Mumm, the owner, and John Ciccone, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Ciccone said that the operation of the windows as they exist is very difficult. He also noted that they will now replicate the two different sized muntins on the two facades, and that the proposed screen inset will only be at the lower sash. The existing frames will be retained and only the sash will be replaced. Mr. Mumm said that the building was previously a printing factory and the existing windows are not suitable for residential use.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation with the retention of one of the original metal windows on the first floor. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Sklaroff opposed the motion and Mr. Harris abstained from voting.

233 South Quince Street, SE corner of Latimer Street

Mary and Kenneth Panciera, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1830, modified c. 1867

PROPOSAL: Legalize changes to deck, change in paint color

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the legalization of the deck's design subject to the denial of a color other than the approved green or light cream.

This proposal involves modifications to a rear highly visible deck. Although this deck was approved last year, it was constructed differently than approved with a different rail and flower boxes. At that time the Commission approved a scheme to paint it either cream or green to match the existing trim. The applicant would now like to stain the wood a redwood color.

Commission members took issue with the applicant's disregard of the approved plans in the construction of the deck. Therefore, they thought that the legalization as well as the color issue should be rejected. Neither the applicant nor a representative was present at the meeting.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation and deny the proposal. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried with 6 votes. Mr. Rivera, Ms. Heller-Batzer, Mr. Wilds and Mr. Cuorato opposed the motion.

919 Clinton Street

Howard Lander and Kevin Clark, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1836

PROPOSAL: Demolish rear addition and add new rear bay

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with the staff to review details.

This proposal involves removing a late 19th century rear addition that faces onto an alley and installing a rear bay onto the original rear ell in its place. The insurance survey indicates that a bay existed previously in that location. The Department of Licenses and Inspections declared the chimney on the rear extension Imminently Dangerous.

Commission members concurred with the demolition and new construction because the proposed alterations are a restoration.

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

810 Locust Street, Musical Fund Hall

Musical Fund Hall, Owner

Paula Legere, Applicant

DATE: 1824, modified by William Strickland, Napoleon LeBrun and 1891 Addison Hutton, site of first Republican presidential convention.

PROPOSAL: Bird repellent

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the Nixalite as submitted but gave the applicant recommendations for other options.

This proposal attempts bird control with the installation of Nixalite on the ledges and column capitals on the front façade of the building.

Commission members agreed with the Committee that netting options, which have less visibility, should be investigated by the applicant.

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

124 Market Street

Sue-Jan L.L.C., Owner

Keith Hobbs, Applicant

DATE: c. 1830 altered c. 1900

PROPOSAL: New windows and storefront

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the side entrance as proposed with a sidelight and the continuation of the transom all the way across, but the removal of the secondary

transom and installation of a taller door in the center bay to mimic the height of the new proposed door. All details shall be reviewed by the staff.

This proposal involves adding a door to the front façade to reach living spaces upstairs. The existing storefront has a central entrance. The applicant proposes a second entrance in the left bay as a single-leaf door with a sidelight.

Lance Kraemer attended the meeting to represent the proposal. The applicant submitted revised drawings, which reflect the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to approve the revised submission. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

102 North 2nd Street

Alan Karpo, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Handicap ramp and railing

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with the staff to review details.

The applicant proposes to install a handicap ramp and railing to run nearly 18 feet along the front façade of his and his neighbor's storefronts. He has secured his neighbor's permission to build the ramp.

Alan Karpo, the owner, attended the meeting and said that the proposed ramp does not minimize the sidewalk because it will not project any further than the steps. He also proposes a railing that will match the existing railing.

Mr. Wilds said that the proposed ramp would greatly impact the neighboring building; however, the owner of the adjacent property gave written approval for the ramp. Mr. Wilds thought that a simple railing is more appropriate. Mr. Perri stressed the importance of a six-foot clearance on the sidewalk. Members questioned the turning radius and thought the scale of two-thirds ramp could be reduced.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation with a simplified railing having the pickets perpendicular to the street and the ramp as narrow as possible. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1912-14 Brandywine Street

Elizabeth Osborne, Owner

Lene Copeland, Architect

DATE: c. 1910

PROPOSAL: Replace garage doors, new exterior lighting

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of option #1 door design and option #1 of the exterior light design and approval of the person door subject to the retention of the original door on the site, with the staff to review details.

This proposal appears before the Committee again with a revised garage door design modified to appear more like the historic doors it would replace. The design also calls for a new door and light design.

Elizabeth Osborne, the owner, and Lene Copeland, the architect, attended the meeting and presented revised drawings to reflect the Committee's recommendations.

Some members discussed the door's design but option #1 was considered the most appropriate.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation and to approve the revised design. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

237 South 18th Street, NE corner of Rittenhouse Square Street, The Barclay

Barclay Condominium Owner's Association, Owners

Christian A. Busch, Architect

DATE: 1928, J.E.R. Carpenter, Architect

PROPOSAL: Cooling tower on roof and streetscape alterations

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of a revised design of the cooling tower's screening using a light material with details such as the horizontal band and applied arch design, expanding the flat panel to extend to the catwalk and divisions in the lower panels to lessen the wind load. They also recommended approval of the streetscape alterations with the planters not attaching to the building.

The proposal involves the installation of a cooling tower on the roof of the Barclay in place of the Classical water tower that formerly existed in that location, which a former owner removed without a permit. The Commission gave conceptual approval to such a scheme with the new cooling tower to be screened with a design appropriate to the architecture of the building. Mr. Busch has returned with three schemes, one of which leaves the units unscreened, another design wraps a simple scrim around the top portion of the units, and the third covers the base structure of the units. In addition, the applicant proposes streetscape alterations with paving, bollards, planters and railings.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal and noted that this roof location is the only place that will support the cooling tower. Commission members questioned whether bollards or planters ever existed on this building and believed that further investigation is needed.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to approve the cooling tower on the roof with a screen to reflect the band and arch details, with the staff to review details, but denial of the streetscape alterations pending more information. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

2029 Cherry Street

Robert Sutton, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Legalize painting the façade, new front door and transom

The Architectural Committee recommended legalization of the paint and transom subject to the door replacement and gave the applicant the option of removing or retaining the shutters.

This proposal calls for the legalization of painting the building façade and replacing the front door and transom. The house was painted previously. The replacement door is a metal, six-panel door with the two upper panels glazed. The vinyl transom has a single light.

Robert Sutton, the owner, attended the meeting and presented photographs of doors on neighboring houses. The applicant believed that in replacing his door, he replicated the proportions of the neighboring doors, and he painted the house to match the existing color.

Mr. Rivera noted that there are different proportions in wood and metal doors. Some members inquired if painting the door is a possibility but believed that the applicant had replaced the door and painted the façade in good faith.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation and approve the legalization. Ms. Heller-Batzer seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

222 St. Marks Square

Christopher and Kathryn Hiester, Owners/Applicants

DATE: 1877-80, George W. and William D. Hewitt

PROPOSAL: Legalize storm doors

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the project as submitted.

The application calls for the legalization of storm doors on the front façade. The double-leaf doors are fully glazed but have metal frames and the bottom rail does not match the height of the original door.

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

1615-17 Spruce Street

Jon Hollander, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Roof deck, painting façade

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the project as submitted.

This proposal calls for a roof deck on the rear ell of the building. It proves slightly visible from 16th Street. Also, the owner wishes to repaint the front façade in colors that match the existing, cream with olive green trim.

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

2220 Delancey Street

Dan Bleznak, Owner

Mary Ellen Strain, Architect

DATE: c. 1877 for William Weightman

PROPOSAL: New rear door and railing

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the project with staff to review details.

The Commission denied the previously proposed deck on the rear bay of this building. The owner is now proposing cutting the window down to a door, installing a double-leaf multi-paned door and a balconette of painted metal pickets.

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

1428-30 Locust Street, aka 235 South 15th Street, Vida Building

Philadelphia Management Company, Owner

Patrick Dewey, Applicant

DATE: 1915

PROPOSAL: New signs

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the project as submitted and suggested that the applicant work with staff on a revised design which could have neon letters..

This proposal calls for the removal of the neon signs at the corner of the building and replacing them with internally-lit plastic box signs. The same applicant installed signs of individual halo-lit metal letters at another location. That signage would be more appropriate for this Beaux-Arts building.

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

2215 Delancey Street

Sophia Demas and Frank Mallas, Owners/Applicants

DATE: 1879

PROPOSAL: New windows

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposed windows with the staff to review details. The Committee voted to recommend approval of the replacement of the two over two windows at rear with tilt pack sash kits with jamb liners

The proposal calls for new sash in a box frame to be installed within the existing frames. This will cut down the glazing by approximately 2 inches on each window.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal and noted that since the Committee meeting it has been determined that the rear has minimal visibility from a public right-of-way. She explained that the Commission has approved new sash without a box frame, known as tilt-packs, the tilt-pack has vinyl jamb liners, and its installation would require the removal of the exterior brick mold or the interior trim.

Frank Mallas, the owner, and Neil Steiner, Marvin Window representative, attended the meeting. Mr. Mallas said that the windows are over three-foot wide and in addition, he would like to get rid of the existing storm windows. He also noted that two floors have interior shutters, which present a problem in the use of the tilt-pack window, and that the proposed windows do not have a visible jamb liner. Mr. Steiner presented a sample of the proposed window and said that the proposed window will have a full screen.

Ms. Spina cited the window guideline because the proposed window does not convey the same visual appearance with the two-inch differential. Mr. Brown questioned the possibility of restoring the existing windows. Mr. Baron said that Marvin Windows make a sash kit which has been approved by the Commission on many occasions. Mr. Harris believed the jamb liner a greater intrusion than the storms. Mr. Rivera thought the proposed windows have less of an impact. Mr. Wilds inquired about the difference in the dimensions and the removal of historic fabric. Mr. Brown suggested that the staff do a site visit to determine the window's size, mullions and the depth of the brick mold.

Jean Wolf stated that she has used a window comparable to the proposed window and owing to the size of the window, the lost of glazing will have minimal visibility and she supports the proposed window.

Mr. James made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted with staff to review the details. Mr. Harris seconded the motion which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Brown opposed the motion while Mr. Sklaroff abstained from the vote.

2051 Walnut Street, NE corner of 21st Street

Nature's Gallery Florist, Incorporated, Owner

Kalyan Som, Architect

DATE: c. 1855-60

PROPOSAL: New storefront

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the squared off-centered storefront.

This application calls for removing the existing storefront and replacing it with a new metal and glass storefront. The existing façade, though non-historic fabric, has a symmetrical design with a central door flanked by two plate-glass windows. The proposed storefront calls for a door to the west and a single plate-glass window to the east.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal. Mr. Steinberg inquired if the granite base would be affected as a result of the storefront alterations.

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

218 South 20th Street

NWJ Management, Owner

John Coffen, Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: New cornice

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal as submitted.

This building suffered a serious fire, which destroyed the roof and cornice. This proposal is for the installation of a pierced wood cornice. Some evidence remains that the house originally had a Neo-Grec pierced, slanted cornice, rather than the typical bracketed cornice found on most Italianate buildings. The actual pattern of piercing is unknown and the proposal copies a cornice found on another building in the neighborhood.

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

1428-34 Chestnut Street, SE corner of 15th Street, Packard Building

Chest-Pac Associates, LP, Owners

Anthony Ciocca, Applicant

DATE: 1922-24, Ritter & Shay, architects

PROPOSAL: Cut new rear door

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal as submitted but with metal-framed doors.

The developer for this building wishes to install an entrance on the Sansom Street façade of this building. The proposal involves cutting a door under an existing window and installing a frameless-glass double-leaf door. The proposal also includes two new lights flanking the door and a bronze plaque for signage.

Ms. Heller-Batzer made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. James opposed the motion.

1909,1913,1915,1925,1930,1931,1934,2021, Mt. Vernon Street
1908,1912,1914,1916,1920,1930,1932,1934 2032 Wallace Street
619,626,628,630,634 North 18th Street

Spring Garden Limited Housing Partners, Owners

Manuel Delgado, Applicant

DATE: c. 1865

PROPOSAL: Masonry coating of marble

The Architectural Committee recommended that each property be taken individually based on Mr. Baron's field assessment and that the staff should review a sample of paint before proceeding with the recommended process.

This proposal, for a coating, using the Thoro-coat system, on the marble door surrounds, lintels and sills, returns to the committee for further discussion. At the previous meeting, the Committee recommended denial, and instead, recommended treating the marble with a light abrasive treatment, such as Gomage or JOSS. The Commission agreed and denied the proposal as submitted.

Manuel Delgado, the applicant, attended the meeting. He inquired if the previous approval of the metal door on 2029 Cherry Street was based on similar conditions in the row or economic hardship. He believed that his issue of paint is parallel to that situation; however, the Commission thought that this application differed because it concerned original historic fabric. In any case the proposed compromise allows for the painting of the trim on a majority of the properties. Mr. Scott reiterated that this proposal involves federal money and required a separate review under federal guidelines.

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

One East Penn Square, aka 1-21 North Juniper Street, NE corner of Market Street

Granite Penn Square L.L.C., Owner

F. Neale Quenzel, Architect

DATE: 1930, Ritter and Shay Architects

PROPOSAL: Alter transom above main entrance for canopy hangers

The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

This application calls for a revision of the support system for a previously approved canopy on the Juniper Street façade of this building. The proposal involves removing two panes of glass in the window above the door so that the cables can be attached to the support structure of the building. The other alternative would be to penetrate the ornate terra cotta on the sides of the window.

Mr. Harris commented that the attachments are respectful to the building citing the INA building in which cuts were made through the stone moldings.

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

OLD BUSINESS

1822 Delancey Street

Daniel Berger, Owner
David Traub, Architect
DATE: c. 1855
PROPOSAL: Partial demolition and new addition on rear

The Architectural Committee recommended denial based on preservation of historic fabric and Standards 2, 5, and 9. Two members, Mr. Rivera and Mr. McCoubrey favored the proposal.

The proposal calls for the removal of an original three-story rear ell and the construction of a two-story rear addition that has a garage at the lower level, a large kitchen on the first floor and a small room on the second floor leading to a new roof terrace with a pergola.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal and noted that library research referenced the rear ell as early as 1887.

Carl Primerva, Esq., attorney for the project, stated that, with the retention of the facades, the proposal complies with Standards 2, 5, and 9 of the *Secretary of the Interior Standards*. Jean Wolf speaking as a preservationist said that the rear addition has been significantly altered. She gave specifics of the varying dates and materials denoting the many alterations. David Berger, the owner, said that he believes his proposed addition respects the neighboring house.

Mr. Sklaroff commented that what is being given up is a 1887 ell which is predominantly intact on the upper floors and it is an important historical feature owing to its being part of the history of an extraordinary building. Mr. Steinberg noted that Wilson Eyre designed the neighboring house.

Ms. Heller-Batzer made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

229 Fitzwater Street

Virgil and Norma Procaccino, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c. 1859, new façade, c. 1950

PROPOSAL: Complete demolition and new construction

The architectural Committee recommended denial of the demolition per Standards 2, 5, and 10.

The owner wishes to demolish this building as well as the garage next door (231 Fitzwater) and erect two new townhouses. 231 Fitzwater is not on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal. Mr. Tyler commented that his site visit determined that there is no remaining interior plaster on the front wall and clearly, a later brick exists. He believes that the building was listed in error, and today, it would not be designated individually. Commission members inquired if this building would be contributing, staff responded in the affirmative. Mr. Tyler noted that the sidewall and rear is original; however, the new construction at 231 will render the sidewall a party wall, and also that the streetscape is a highly mixed context. Mr. James inquired if the new design could encompass the retention of the roofline, so that it is sympathetic to the neighboring houses. Mr. Tissian said that he strongly opposes garage doors taking up a major portion of the front façades. Mr. Steinberg said that he agreed with Mr. Tissian and reiterated Mr. Hack's recommendation that 229 should be restored and that 231, which is not designated, could be demolished and a new design constructed which will maintain the rhythm of the street. Mr. Sklaroff believed that three options are available for this proposal, the recommendation of the Architectural Committee, rescind the designation or referral to the

Committee on Financial Hardship. Mr. Wilds commented that the proposed cornice line is significantly higher than the adjacent property.

Virgil and Norma Procaccino, the owners, attended the meeting. Mr. Procaccino stated that he and his family propose to live in one property, while the other would be sold. He emphasized the importance of parking spaces and believed his proposal an improvement to the neighborhood. He agreed to do a revised design, which would be more sympathetic to the cornice line of the adjacent property. He presented to the Commission a petition signed by more than 200 neighbors in support of the proposal.

Commission members emphasized that if the property's designation is rescinded, then the Commission would not have control over the new design. However, if the Commission approved the demolition, it will review, for approval the design of the new building.

Judy McDowell and David O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighborhood Association, speaking on its behalf said that the proposal should be referred to the Committee of Historic Designation to rescind the designation.

John Solether said the properties as they exist are an eyesore and nuisance and supports the applicant's proposal.

Kathy Conway believes that the property does not have historic significance and supports the proposal.

Rick Hanson spoke in support of the proposal.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to refer the proposal to the Committee on Historic Designation to rescind the designation. Mr. Brown seconded the motion.

The previous motion was a satisfactory solution for the Community because it will follow the process.

Mr. James stated that going to the Committee on Historic Designation should be the applicant's decision. Mr. Sklaroff withdrew his motion, to allow the applicant to make a decision on how he wished to proceed. Commission members reiterated that if the demolition is approved, then the new design would be subject to review by the Committee and Commission for assurance that the new design is sympathetic to the streetscape. Mr. Tissian strongly expressed his belief that the Commission has a responsibility to the quality of life in the city, not to let the automobile and garage doors take over the city. Mr. Tyler questioned the applicants about their understanding the conditions of the demolition approval, the applicant accepted the conditions.

Mr. James made a motion to approve the demolition, subject to the review of the new design by the Committee and Commission. Ms. Heller-Batzer seconded the motion which carried with 6 votes. Mr. Sklaroff, Mr. Steinberg, Mr. Brown and Mr. Tissian opposed the motion.

NEW BUSINESS

Ebenezer Don Carlos Bassett Historic Marker Re-dedication

John Brown, IV

Mr. Brown asked that Commission members attend a ceremony for the re-dedication and re-installing of an historic marker honoring an African-American, who lived in an area of North Philadelphia. Mr. Cuorato asked that Mr. Brown distribute the information about date, time of the ceremony to the staff, who would be then forward it to the Commission members.

THE REPORT on the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, March 2002

Mr. Tyler then asked if members of the Commission had any questions about the report. There were none.

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to approve the expenditure for the Architectural Committee's lunch. Mr. Tyler said that the receipt was misplaced and the funds could be approved at a later date.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Richard Sprague, Esq., asked that the record reflect his objection to the Executive Session.

THE REPORT of the Committee on Historic Designation, 21 March 2002

Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D., Acting-Chair

1908-10 Chestnut Street, aka 1911-23 Sansom Street, The Boyd Theater

Ms. Spina gave an illustrated presentation of the nomination to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places of the Boyd Theater. The nomination stated that the Boyd Theater, presently known as the United Artists Sam Eric Theater, is a unique and fine example of an Art Deco "motion picture palace" in Center City Philadelphia and is the finest remaining movie theatre of the architecture firm of Hoffman and Henon. It has significant character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage and cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth or Nation. It is characterized by a distinctive architectural style, Art Deco, and embodies elements of that style. The Boyd Theater is the work of architects whose work has significantly influenced the historical, architectural, economic, social and cultural development of the City, Commonwealth or Nation. The Theater contains elements of design that represent a significant innovation or singular physical characteristics, and the theater represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community and City. Finally, the nomination stated that the Boyd Theater exemplifies the cultural, economic, social and historical heritage of the community. This theater is the last remaining example of a "motion picture palace" in Philadelphia.

Ms. Spina concluded that the Boyd Theatre meets criteria a, c, d, e, f, and j of Section 14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code for designation.

Ira Kauderer, Preservation Alliance, said that there are additional grounds to be considered for designation and was prepared to submit a revised nomination. John Gallery, also of the Preservation Alliance, said that the theater met the criteria for designation as well as additional reasons; therefore, the motion not to designate the Boyd Theater should be rejected.

Of the many people who attended the meeting to speak to the nomination of the Boyd Theater, there was a mix of convictions about the designation. Rubin Axelrod, Tybie Moshinsky and James O'Brien spoke against the designation, while Mrs. O'Brien, wife to James O'Brien, along

with Jean Dichter supported the designation. Hershel Baron who was present at the previous designation attempt for the theater, also supported the designation. Milton Laden expressed concern about the development of the property, if the theater is demolished.

Richard Sprague, Esq., counsel for the Boyd, expressed his appreciation for the motion to reject the nomination, but said that he believed the designation process is objectionable.

Mr. Wilds said that the interior is the prominent feature of this theater; however the Commission's decision is based on the exterior features. Mr. Steinberg disagreed with Mr. Wilds and said that the urban design is worthy of designation and Mr. Rivera also agreed with Mr. Steinberg. Mr. Cuorato commented that the Commission is very familiar with this property and any decision made will not be taken lightly.

Ms. Heller-Batzer made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation and to reject the nomination of the Boyd Theater. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried with 7 votes. Mr. Rivera and Mr. Steinberg opposed the motion. Mr. Sklaroff recused himself from the vote.

Mr. James made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 1:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary