

**THE MINUTES OF THE 481st STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
13 September 2002 at 9:00 a.m.**

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

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
James Brown
Duane Bumb, Deputy Director, Commerce Department
James Cuorato, Director and City Representative, Commerce Department
Gary Hack, Chair, City Planning Commission
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
Denise Smyler, Esq.
Harris Steinberg, AIA
Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.
Norman Tissian
Scott Wilds, Deputy Director, Office of Housing and Community Development

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

Lawrence K. Copeland, Esq., Senior Attorney, Law Department

Also

Matthew Pasquarello, Pella Window and Door Company
Shannon Fitzpatrick
Helena Grady
Lynn Henson, neighbor 15th and Waverly, mural
Richard Ullman
Clarence Norman, Church of Christ
Willie Rupert, Jr., Church of Christ
R. Jay
Daniel Mehan, Mehan Builders
John Cluver, Voith and Mactavish Architects
Nikki Marx
Bill Greenlee, 15th ward leader
Bernice Hamel, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance
Harry J. Sher, Esq., Counsel for owner at 410 South 15th Street
Neil Sandvold, Sandvold Blando
Nan Guttermann, Vitetta Group, Ithaca Partnership
Vito Chimenti, Peirce College
Thomas Witt, Esq., Wolf Block Schorr and Solis-Cohen, LLP
Margaret Westfield, Westfield Architects

Arlene Matzkin, Friday Architects
Michael Rigolizzo, 2nd Street Investors
Hugh Zimmers, Zimmers Associates
Winchell S. Carroll, American Revolution Patriot's Fund
John McIntyre, 108 Fairmount Avenue
Brian Flaherty, Wolf Block Schorr and Solis-Cohen, LLP
William G. Schwartz, Esq., Obermayer Rebmann and Hippel, LLP
Judith Eden, 355 South 16th Street
Marc D. Brookman, Esq., Duane Morris, LLP
Torsten Kreider, 1922-28 Delancey Street
Dennis Hummel, 1922-28 Delancey Street
Randy Cotton, Preservation Alliance

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to delegate Scott Wilds the acting-chair. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Wilds, Acting-chair called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m.

Minutes of the 480th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission. Upon a motion made by Mr. Steinberg and duly seconded, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the 480th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held 9 August 2002, Duane Bumb, Acting-Chair.

ELECTION OF CHAIR

Mr. Tissian made a motion to nominate Michael Sklaroff chair of the Commission. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion which carried unanimously. Mr. Tissian also made a motion to nominate Thomas Sugrue Vice-chair. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously. Ms. Heller-Batzer, who was not present for the vote, asked that the record show her support for Mr. Sklaroff's nomination.

Mr. Sklaroff thanked the Commission members. He commented that it is a great honor and an important milestone. He hopes to fill the position with patience and wisdom.

THE REPORT of the Committee on Financial Hardship, 15 August 2002
Scott Wilds, Acting Chair

300-318 North 63rd Street, NW corner of Vine Street, Patterson Memorial Presbyterian Church

Owner: Church of Christ

Applicant: William G. Schwartz, Esq.

Architect: T.P. Chandler

Date: 1884, parish house and bell tower; 1897, sanctuary

Proposal: Complete demolition based on financial hardship

The Financial Hardship Committee recommended that the committee table its decision until after the Historical Commission's ad-hoc committee convenes, as outlined in the 13 June 2001 resolution of the Historical Commission, and has issued its findings.

This proposal involves the complete demolition of this church. A fire caused extensive damage to the sanctuary of this church a number of years ago; insurance proceeds helped the congregation rebuild it. Since then, a portion of the west wall of the parish house collapsed. Although the congregation had it repaired, this structure evinces further distress. A structural engineer has found the bell tower, located at the junction of the hall and the sanctuary, perilous. The congregation lacks the funds, an estimated \$92,000 for the tower alone and yet more for the hall,

to undertake remediation. Owing to these conditions, attempts to sell the property to another religious organization have failed; the only interest in acquiring it comes from person interested in a cleared development parcel.

Mr. Wilds explained the proposal. He noted that a site visit which consisted of Richard Tyler, Laura Spina, Suzanne Pentz, a structural engineer, John Gallery and Randy Cotton of the Preservation Alliance, Robert Yeager, Partners for Sacred Places, and the Ad-Hoc Committee members was conducted to inspect the structures to determine their existing conditions. Mr. Tyler commented that the recent Imminently Dangerous Status report by the Department of Licenses and Inspections relates only to several portions; however, he believes that structurally, some areas are repairable. The Preservation Alliance thought that the church should apply for a grant to find a re-use for the structure. Mr. Sklaroff expressed concern about safety, owing to the physical condition. He also commented that it is not with certainty that the structure can be salvaged. Commission members concurred that any consideration in this matter should happen after the Ad-Hoc Committee convenes.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to table the proposal for a period not to exceed six (6) months. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 27 August 2002
Vincent Rivera, Chair

1127 Pine Street, NW corner of Quince Street

Paul Bouikidis, Owner

Daniel Mehan, Contractor

DATE: c. 1827

PROPOSAL: New windows with applied muntins

The Architectural Committee recommended denial pursuant to Standard 6. [Deteriorated features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and where possible materials.]

This application reviewed and rejected last month by both the Committee and Commission for replacement of sash returns now as a total window replacement. The work will require the removal of the historic windows; the new design features applied muntins rather than true divided lights.

Mr. Baron explained the application. Mr. Wilds inquired about the type of muntins in the proposed windows. Mr. Baron responded that the muntins are interior and exterior with a spacer bar. Mr. Sklaroff questioned the date of the existing windows.

Dan Mehan, the contractor, and Matthew Pasquarello, both Pella window representatives, attended the meeting. Mr. Mehan stated that he proposes to replace the entire window because the sash pockets are deteriorated and paint will not adhere to the rotted trim. He also said that the muntin pattern will be replicated; however, the frame would be reduced a ¼ inch on each side. Mr. Mehan noted that the same proposed windows appear on the neighboring house.

Mr. Tissian inquired if the existing windows are repairable. Mr. Mehan responded that the current windows do not protect against the cold. He said that he proposes to replicate anything that is removed. Mr. Rivera took issue with the overall proportions of the proposed windows and noted that the plans show that the existing windows are larger. Mr. Steinberg questioned the masonry openings' size in the drawings which show a difference of seven inches; Mr. Mehan said

that the seven inches would be incorporated into the sash pockets but the exterior would be replicated with simulated dividers in the glazing. Mr. Sklaroff commented that the Pella is a good window, but it means giving up historic fabric. Mr. Baron inquired about the dormer window frames; Mr. Mehan said that a replacement window could be done with the retention of the pilasters and would replicate exactly the existing design.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Mr. Sklaroff recused himself and passed the gavel to the vice-chair, Thomas Sugrue.

724-26 Pine Street, and 721-23 Addison Street

Lisa Roberts, Owner

John Cluver, Architect

DATE: c. 1810, 726 refaced mid 20th century

PROPOSAL: Partial demolition, reconstruct façade and new construction

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the demolition and new construction on the rear of the houses facing Spruce Street as well as the new construction and alteration to Addison Street with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials to protect the integrity of the property.] They recommended denial covering the rears of the Spruce Street houses with zinc pursuant to Standard 5 [Distinctive materials and finishes that characterize a property will be preserved.]. The Committee said that the application for the work to the front of the Spruce Street houses is incomplete and welcomed Mr. Cluver's withdrawal of that portion of the application.

This proposal seen in May 2001 in concept involves combining several properties into a single house. The house facade at 724 Pine Street will be restored and that at 726 Pine Street reconstructed. The plans call for the demolition of the rear ell portions of both houses and a new rear ell built on 726 Pine Street. The brick rears of both houses will receive zinc metal cladding. On Addison Street, the applicant proposes the construction of a new one and a half story garage at 721 and the rehabilitation of the existing house/garage at 723. The main change involves reversing the door and garage opening.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Mr. Wilds questioned the visibility of the zinc on the rear of the properties.

John Cluver, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Cluver said that he and his clients now propose to keep the brick exposed.

Bernice Hamel, speaking on behalf of the Society Hill Civic Association, expressed its support of the proposal with the zinc added to the rears.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion which carried with 12 votes. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Sugrue passed the gavel back to Mr. Sklaroff.

216-220 West Washington Square, NW corner of 7th and Locust Streets

T. McGowan, Owner

Lanny Leibowitz, Applicant

DATE: c. 1911 for W.B. Saunders Publishing Company

PROPOSAL: Deck on north side

The applicant withdrew the proposal.

340-42 South 5th Street, NW corner of Pine Streets

Richard and Margaret Ullman, Owners

Nicholas Aloï, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: c. 1972

PROPOSAL: Deck railing

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of a railing with a simplified design pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired].

The application calls for a new railing on top of a brick wall surrounding the rooftop deck on this modern row house.

Mr. Baron explained the proposal and noted that it was previously thought that the parapet would hide the railings, but that it was never determined that the top of the rail will be visible.

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

Washington Square, 600 Walnut Street

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Winchell S. Carroll, Applicant

DATE: 1683, designed by Thomas Holme

PROPOSAL: Plaques

The Architectural Committee recommended denial pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]. The Committee recommended that the applicant return to the Committee after investigating alternative locations, more details about the proposed design and specific drawings of each plaque.

This application calls for installing plaques in the walkway in front of the Monument to the Unknown Soldier of the Revolution to acknowledge the organizations that contributed to the rebuilding of the Monument. The plaques made of carved granite would be imbedded flush with the slate walkway.

Winchell S. Carroll, the applicant, attended the meeting. He explained that timing is an issue, because of the turnover of the square to the National Park Service, which opposes all plaques. The plaques would give recognition to the various organizations, which were instrumental in the restoration of the park. He also said that in 1998, the National Park Service and the Fairmount Park Commission turned down his request for a plaque area in the square.

Commission members inquired if the Society Hill Civic Association supports the plaques; a letter received by the staff clearly expresses the association's opposition to the plaques. Commission members reviewed the proposed text of each plaque and concurred that the message on each plaque is closely related and could be incorporated into one plaque. It also believed that the applicant should consider a plaque that is smaller and less intrusive. Mr. Sugrue and other members expressed concern about the location. The chair of the Commission polled its members to get a consensus about the consideration of a single plaque in a location away from the tomb. The members voted 8 to 4 in favor of the consolidation and the change in location of the plaque away from the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

Bernice Hamel, Society Hill Civic Association, stated that the association opposes the plaques, but said that consideration could possibly be given for a single plaque away from the tomb.

Mr. James made a motion to table the proposal until the October meeting. Mr. Brown seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

615 Lombard Street

Shannon Fitzpatrick, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Two-story rear addition

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired], with the staff to review details.

This application calls for building a two-story rear addition to the property, which will have limited visibility from 6th Street.

Commission members concurred with the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Steinberg noted that the height of the proposed railing does not meet code; however, the Department of Licenses and Inspections would address this issue.

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

340-42 South 6th Street aka 601-03 Pine Street

Rick Jay, Owner

Neil Sandvold, Architect

DATE: 340-c. 1825; 342-vacant lot

PROPOSAL: One-story side addition

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in

such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired], with the staff to review details.

During the redevelopment period of Society Hill, the original c. 1825 residence at 340 South 6th Street was restored and the late 19th-century building at the corner (342 South 6th Street) was demolished to create a yard for 340. A brick wall surrounds the yard and has painted wood gates. This proposal is for a small (approximately 14 feet x 14 feet), one-story dining room addition at the rear of the yard. It will have brick façades, simulated divided-light wood windows and a standing-seam copper roof.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal and presented a sample of the proposed brick. The Commission agreed with the proposed application.

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

Rockland Mansion, Fairmount Park

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Arlene Matzkin, Architect

DATE: 1810

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation, new parking lot

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment] and Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.] as well as the mechanical systems guideline [Recommended: installing a completely new mechanical system if required for the new use so that it causes the least alteration possible to the building's exterior elevations.]. It also recommended approval of the parking lot, the turnaround and lighting, pursuant to the site guideline [Recommended: designing new onsite parking when required by the new use so that they are as unobtrusive as possible and assure the preservation of the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape.], with staff to review details.

This proposal is for the rehabilitation of this significant park mansion for a new use as the Psychoanalytic Center of Philadelphia. The rehabilitation includes new paneled, single-leaf doors to the side entrances, one of which will become the handicapped access for the property; a replacement wood staircase with lattice cheeks to the rear porch; new retaining walls at the side entrance; new light fixtures at the side entrances and lighting boxes in the roofs of the porches, with the fixtures to come for approval at a later time; replacing one basement window to match the existing, and stucco repair. The new mechanical system requires two vents. The proposal calls for louvers in the existing window openings in the stone foundation of the rear porch, with stone infill.

The project includes a new 31-car parking lot to the north of the building. The lot will have crushed stone paving and two driveways leading onto Mount Pleasant Drive. One path will lead to the handicapped entrance and one to the original brick walkway to the front door. The plans also include a crushed-stone turnaround directly in front of the house, which lies on an historic path.

Ms. Spina explained the project and the Commission members concurred with the Committee's recommendation.

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

231-35 North 2nd Street

PTM Group Corporation, Owner

Liz Zimmers, Applicant

PROPOSAL: New garage structure, mural

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the design as submitted for the front façade with the pilasters breaking the cornice lines and approval of option #4 for the mural with the integrated cast iron pieces, with the staff to review details. The applicants are in agreement with the recommendation.

This proposal for a six-story parking garage returns for final approval. Staff, along with Suzanne Pentz, a structural engineer, inspected the remaining cast iron pieces salvaged from 233 North 2nd Street. Only three fluted pilasters with Corinthian columns, three consoles, and twelve pieces of various sizes of the other pilasters remain. The proposal now calls for the same design for the front façade as previously seen by the Committee and Commission and four options for recognizing the earlier buildings. The first calls for a plaque describing the demolished buildings; the second, a plaque installed in a small-scale mural of the buildings; third, a full-size mural of the demolished 233 North 2nd Street, but no integration of the salvaged pieces, and the fourth is a full-sized mural incorporating the salvaged pieces.

At the site visit by staff, it was noted that the sidewalk in front of 233 North 2nd consisted of three carved granite slabs. The proposal also includes moving these slabs to the south façade. The design for the front of the building has remained the same from the previous application. The staff recommended this design when it was believed that more pieces of the salvaged cast-iron existed and could be integrated into the design. However, since so few pieces remain, the staff prefers incorporating them into the mural on the south façade.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal and noted that the rhythm of the building is not carried through, and thought that a stronger vertical orientation should exist. This proposal includes the salvaged pieces in a sidewall mural with the incorporation of the granite slabs.

William G. Schwartz, Esq., noted that the installation of the granite slabs would exist on the property of the Delaware Port Authority. Mr. James asked if in the event that the granite slabs would be disallowed, would they be retained. Mr. Schwartz responded that the slabs could be stored on the premises. Mr. Steinberg thought the proposed tracery on the front façade inappropriate.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation with the retention of the granite slabs if not incorporated into the mural. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried with 12 votes. Mr. Steinberg abstained.

100-04 Market Street, SW corner of Front and Market Streets

Michael Yaron, Owner

Richard Wesley, Architect

DATE: 1882 for George and Albert Ulrich; Colonial Revival storefront, c. 1905

PROPOSAL: New operable café windows

The Architectural Committee recommended approval as submitted, but if possible create a more vertical orientation of the café windows, with the staff to review details.

The applicant requested a one month continuance.

742-52 South Front Street, between Pemberton and Fitzwater Streets, Workman Place

Octavia Hill Association, Owner

Sara Sweeney, Architect

DATE: 7 rear court houses- 1748 by George Mifflin; 742-46 South Front Street- 1812-13 by John Workman; 748 S. Front- c. 1775; 750 S. Front- c. 1769; 752 S. Front- 1751; 101-25 Fitzwater Street- c. 1815

PROPOSAL: New gates, cardreader

The Architectural Committee recommended approval pursuant to Standards 9 [New additions will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

This application is for the installation of three security gates at the entrances leading into the rear court, with one on Pemberton Street, one on South Front Street and one on Fitzwater Street. The gates have simple metal pickets and posts. The Pemberton Street and Front Street gates will have metal disks with cutouts saying “W P 1748”. The gates will be free-standing, not attached to the buildings. There will be card readers installed to unlock the gates.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal and the Commission agreed with the Committee’s recommendation.

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

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to the vice-chair, Thomas Sugrue.

245 South 17th Street

Ithaca Partnership, Owner

Lauren Weinstock, Applicant

DATE: 1888, Frank Miles Day, architect; alterations: storefront, c. 1960; garage opening, 2001

PROPOSAL: Garage door

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

This application for a garage door returns yet again, but this time it includes the necessary information. The proposed overhead door has a triple configuration. Each vertical “panel” has a transom with applied leading above three recessed vertical panels. The bottom third of the door is solid wood with no ornamentation. The drawings also include sections of the garage door, details of the new stone surround and the wood brick mold. One new detail in this proposal is the repair of the front door, with a pane removed for an air-intake vent for the garage. This door will become fixed, with all hardware removed and a black-painted board installed behind it.

Ms. Spina presented the proposal.

Nan Gutterman, the architect, attended the meeting. Ms. Gutterman noted that the Jahn method and salvaged brick would be used for the restoration. Ms. Gutterman explained the Jahn method to the Commission. She said that she will meet with the staff at the site to determine the restoration needs. She also apprised the Commission that the applicant does not propose to clean the brick. In response to Mr. Steinberg's inquiry about the Jahn finish, Ms. Gutterman said that it would be a simulated brownstone finish. Members reiterated that the restoration should not include quoins to the masonry.

Ms. Spina discussed several options for the vent, and concluded that the top fixed pane with a black panel is the best option. Mr. Sugrue expressed his dismay at the enormous amount of removal of historic fabric. Mr. Hack commented that the property has been an eyesore for years, and this rehabilitation makes the best of a bad situation.

Mr. James made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion which carried with 11 votes. Mr. Sklaroff recused himself and Mr. Steinberg opposed the motion.

2134 St. James Street, English Village

Nikki Marks, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1923, Spencer Roberts, architect

PROPOSAL: New windows

The Committee voted to recommend approval of new six-over-six double-hung windows on the second floor to match exactly the original windows in size and detail, approval of 6-light casement windows on the third floor, but denial of the double-hung windows on the first and third floors, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials.], with staff to review details.

This application proposes the replacement of the windows on the front façade of 2134 St. James Street, a townhouse in the English Village, one of the city's most unique residential developments. It prescribes replacing the 8-light casement windows on the first floor with 4/4, true divided light, wooden windows; installing 6/6 wooden sashes to match existing and repairing or replacing the frames to match existing on the second floor; and installing 6-light wooden casement windows as evidenced by an early photograph on the third floor.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal.

Nikki Marx, the owner, attended the meeting and said that the casements cannot provide security when no one is home. She noted the variety of windows on the street.

Mr. Wilds emphasized that the only real issue to the proposal is the proposed first floor windows. Ms. Spina noted the difference in casement windows is that the glass is in one plane. Mr. Steinberg inquired if there is any alternative to double-hung windows. Mr. Baron stated that if security is an issue, the installation of interior bars is appropriate.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion which carried with 13 votes. Mr. Cuorato dissented.

108 Fairmount Avenue, SE corner of Hope Street

John McIntyre, Owner

Anthony Johnson, Applicant

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: Cut garage door in side wall

The Committee voted to recommend approval pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.], with staff to review details.

The application proposes the cutting of an opening and the installation of a garage door in the secondary, Hope Street façade of the rowhouse at 108 Fairmount Avenue. The garage would be cut in the later addition to the rowhouse that runs along Hope Street to the west of the original rear ell. The creation of the opening would require the removal of a window and door as well as some brick. Hope Street is a narrow alleyway. Presently, garages, but no houses, front on Hope Street.

Mr. Farnham explained the motion. The Commission members agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

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

2214 Brandywine Street

Fred Duling, Owner

Liz Zimmers, Applicant

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Legalize and Paint decks on rear and main building

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the decks on the first floor and rear ell, and denial of the deck on the main building pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]

This application proposes legalizing and painting three decks at 2214 Brandywine Street, one at the first floor level behind the rear ell, one at the third floor level on the rear ell, and one atop the main body of the rowhouse. The upper deck, which dwarfs the building and its neighbors, is highly visible from Spring Garden Street. In July 2002, the Historical Commission denied a marginally different proposal to legalize these three decks.

Mr. Sklaroff and some of the Commission members thought that the minor change to the proposal, the addition of paint, is not substantial enough to warrant reviewing the proposal a second time, since the Commission rejected the proposal previously. It believed that the applicant should exercise his right to an appeal at this point. Ms. Smyler inquired if enforcement procedures had begun, and Mr. Perri responded that it had not been initiated thus far. The Commission noted that the violation for the decks was issued in May and the property was purchased in June.

Ms. Smyler made a motion to dismiss any reconsideration of this proposal. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried with 12 votes. Mr. Cuorato dissented.

1903-05 Green Street

Loonstyn and Duling, Owners

Liz Zimmers, Applicant

DATE: c. 1859, refaced with Roman brick façade, c. 1895; one-story addition, c. 1935

PROPOSAL: Demolition of 1905 and partial demolition and rehabilitation of 1903, new construction of four-story building, roof decks

The applicant requested a one-month continuance.

533 North 22nd Street aka 2130 Brandywine Street

Joel Maruchek and Helena Grady, Owners/Applicants

DATE: c 1859

PROPOSAL: Rear deck

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and the Rehabilitation Building Exterior Roofs guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as ... decks and terraces ... when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.], with the railing's height not to exceed 42 inches and the staff to review details.

This application proposes constructing a rear deck, cutting an opening in an exterior brick wall, and installing a deck access door at the rowhouse at the southeast corner of N. 22nd and Brandywine Streets. The deck will be built at the second floor level behind the rear ell above the rear yard. The deck, which is set back 4' from the building line on Brandywine Street, will be highly visible. A "shadow box" fence will stand 4'5" above the deck floor. A second floor window will be removed and the hole in the brick wall enlarged to accommodate a door leading to the deck. In June 2002, the Architectural Committee recommended approval of a deck in this location, provided that the fence be simplified and its height reduced. In July 2002, the Historical Commission denied the application. The applicant was not present at the meeting to accept the Committee's compromise design. The applicant has since redesigned the deck to meet the Committee's original height recommendation.

Helena Grady, the owner, attended the meeting.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal. Mr. Steinberg inquired if the proposed deck, which fills three-fourths of the yard, will be painted or natural. Mr. Wilds thought that the application requires a new submission, which should include sections and elevations from the street.

Ms. Smyler made a motion to approve the proposal. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

410 South 15th Street, SW corner of Waverly Street

Michael Sher, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850; altered c. 1885

PROPOSAL: Legalize mural on stuccoed base of sidewall

Without a permit, the owner of the property had a mural painted on the Waverly Street façade of this building. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the mural and the owner applied to legalize the work. Both the staff and Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposal, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]. At the Commission meeting on February 8, 2002, Mr. Tissian made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation and to legalize the mural. The motion failed with a tied vote of 5 to 5. Since the Commission did not act on the permit application within 60 days as prescribed by Section 14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code, the Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a permit to legalize the mural.

Peirce College filed an appeal with the License and Inspection Review Board and on 28 May 2002, the Board remanded the issue to the Historical Commission.

The issue of the application does not include aesthetics or content, but simply if the work meets the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards*. Both staff and the Committee noted that, in the past, the Commission has approved murals only on former party walls, not on façades that have architectural features, such as this building. Although it has stucco on the first floor, this façade also has windows and ornate brickwork on all floors.

Harry Sher, attorney for the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Sher believes that the proposal should not have been remanded to the Commission owing to the timing of the appeal. He believes that Peirce's objection to the mural is purely a technicality, and that only the stucco was painted. Mr. Sher acknowledged his mistake of putting up the mural without a permit and said that laws are designed to protect the ignorant.

Thomas Witt, counsel for Peirce College, disputed that the stucco is a non-historic feature and he noted that the *Standards* do address paint in an historic district. He also believes that Standard 9 is the reason that the mural was remanded to the Commission. Mr. Witt noted that approved murals are on party walls and that this mural has no relation to the city's mural arts program. He also said that Peirce College has unwillingly spent over \$42,000 across the street, owing to the Commission's jurisdiction to protect the character of the historic district.

Mr. Cuorato, who was the acting-chair of the Commission when the Commission first heard the proposal, thought that the issue should not be belabored, and supports the mural. Mr. Sklaroff believed a major issue of the mural is owing to its being put up illegally. Mr. Wilds inquired if the artist plans to maintain the mural or if the owners if necessary will agree to either maintain or repaint the wall in a dark red stucco color. Mr. Tissian said that the mural deters graffiti. Mr. Hack stressed that 3000 murals exist in the city and there is no policy in place for their maintenance. He believes that at some point a policy should be established. He suggested that a temporary permit be issued. Mr. Perri said that presently there are no controls over the murals in the city, but non-commercial signage maintenance has been discussed. Mr. James urged the Commission to consider this proposal as legalizing the painting of a stucco wall with consideration of the paint color, which should be sympathetic to an historic building, and not as a work of art. Mr. Sugrue reiterated that he does not find the argument of graffiti compelling enough to give consideration to such an elaborate solution, which he believes will set a precedent. Mr. Hack thought that censoring an artist's expression is a slippery slope. Ms. Smyler stated that it should not be defined as art and it is more than a coat of paint.

Hugh Zimmers, an architect with a business near the mural, spoke in support of the mural. Liz Zimmers, his daughter, also spoke in support of the mural.

Lynne Henson believed that the neighborhood has character and that the mural enhances the property. She entered a letter written by her husband in support of the mural.

Mr. Sher cited a letter from Michael Lewis of Williams College that he is distressed at the removal of the mural. In addition, he presented a petition in support of the mural.

Vito Chimenti, Peirce College, clarified that the entrance of the college is diagonally across the street from which point the mural is visible.

Margaret Westfield, historic architect, spoke on behalf of Peirce College, and stated that she worked a block from the mural. She presented large photographs of the surrounding neighborhood, which show fenestrated facades with stucco to match the bricks. Mr. Cuorato thought that the negative visual impact is subjective and should not be considered as fact. Ms. Westfield believes that the mural changes the historic character of the wall because stucco painted a brick color reinforces the brick walls characteristic of the district.

Mr. James noted that, even with the mural, graffiti still exists and Mr. Chimenti concurred that graffiti is very common. Mr. Wilds asked if the stucco beneath the mural could sustain a coat of paint in the future. Mr. Steinberg cited variations in the districts, which change over time, but changed by various architects and that the red brick expresses this district. Mr. Sklaroff thought that members should consider the true issue, the color and busyness of the mural, and if it has an adverse effect on the district. Mr. Sugrue said that the intentions of the architect that designed the building should be considered. Mr. Tyler reiterated that the *Standards* regulate the painting of buildings in historic districts. Mr. Perri noted that this proposal legally is no different from the proposal on Brandywine Street. Mr. Baron cited the Commission's former precedent of not approving murals except on a party wall. Mr. Sklaroff questioned if consideration would be given for the painting of a stucco wall. Mr. Cuorato stated that the Board's decision was based on the chair's expressing his opinion prior to the official vote and believed that Mr. Sklaroff was proceeding in a similar manner. In addition, he believes that the Commission's charge is to exercise judgment in extraordinary situations, and thinks the proposal at hand is an expression of art in the surrounds of the Avenue of the Arts. At this point Mr. Sklaroff said that he would recuse himself from voting.

Judith Eden, Center City Residents' Association, believed that the mural should not be addressed as a remedy for graffiti because there are other remedies and challenges it as an effective deterrent for graffiti. She said it has become a magnet for graffiti.

Ms. Smyler suggested an annual inspection of the mural, if the inspection reveals that the mural's upkeep is being neglected, then the temporary permit could be revoked. Mr. Rivera believes that the mural is alien to the character of the district. Mr. Sklaroff concurred with Mr. Rivera. Mr. Sher suggested a polyurethane coating to protect the mural. Commission members thought the coating inappropriate, owing to its preventing the wall from breathing. Some members thought the idea of the issuance of a temporary permit credible a solution to this situation. Mr. James questioned the legality of the issuance of a conditional temporary legalization permit.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to grant a temporary permit for a period not to exceed 4 years, at that time either return the stucco to a brick red color, or review the mural proposal again for a further extension of time, with the denial of the clear coating of the mural. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion which carried with 7 votes. Mr. Rivera, Mr. James, Mr. Brown, Ms. Smyler and Mr. Sugrue opposed the motion. Mr. Sklaroff recused himself from the vote.

Duane Bumb, Deputy Director of the Commerce Department replaces Mr. Cuorato.

1922-28 Delancey Street

Dennis Hummel, Owner

Charles Evers, Architect

DATE: c. 1920 rebuild of older mews into Spanish Revival apartment building.

PROPOSAL: Cut garage door in front façade, windows

The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend denial pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; Standard 4 [Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.]; and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property]

This application involves converting an apartment building into a single-family house and cutting a garage into the front façade. The Committee and Commission have seen nearly identical applications for this building before and have denied them in 1999 and 2001. The applicant has drawn the streetscape to show the number of garages on the block as well as documenting past uses of the block and building. Many of those garages are the rears of Spruce Street addresses or are carriage houses no longer used for vehicular purposes. This building's significance rests on its later Spanish revival reconstruction as apartments and not on its earlier use or form.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal and Mr. Sklaroff asked for clarification of the appropriate *Standard* in relation to this proposal.

Marc Brookman, Esq., counsel for the owner, attended the meeting. He said that the 1999 application was a different application, as well as the 2001 application, which the Commission rejected. He said that the context of the 1900 block of Delancey Street is unusual. In addition, he disagrees that the structures are independent and believes that the application is consistent with the code requirements and the *Secretary of the Interior Standards*. It is his belief that the proposal is a good plan and it has the neighbors support. He believes that the only issues are the installation of a garage door into the facade and the concern with establishing a precedent is unfounded.

Charles Evers, the architect, holds that historically the facades were garages and stables. He said that the proposal would restore the façade of the deteriorated property and that the windows in the other openings would be restored.

Mr. Sugrue noted that the windows to be removed appear wider, but Mr. Evers said that the proposal would keep the symmetry of the buildings with the addition of additional sash. The proposal will turn an eyesore into a single-family home with the incorporation of historic characteristics into the design and with little reduction in the historic fabric. Ms. Smyler inquired if the windows would be historically replicated and if the brown door should be replicated to match the bottom. Mr. Hack believes that the proposed garage door is compatible with this very interesting block. Mr. Baron requested that the applicant submit shop drawings of the windows for approval.

Ms. Heller-Batzer made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

DISCUSSION TO FORMULATE A POLICY FOR SLATE ROOF REPLACEMENT

Mr. Tyler said that difference in the cost of slate roofs and asphalt shingles is drastic, therefore, a policy should be instituted. Mr. Wilds thought that a sub-committee should be formed to discuss

the issue and a policy formulated. Mr. Sklaroff thought that the issue should be discussed at the next Commission meeting and that the Architectural Committee should discuss and make a recommendation to the Commission.

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

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

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIA FUND

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to approve the expenditure of \$17.58, for Architectural Committee lunches.

Ms. Smyler made a motion to approve the expenditure. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Randy Cotton, Preservation Alliance, commented on the deteriorated condition of the Naval Home. Mr. Tyler said that on a recent site visit, he noted over-grown foliage and unsecured buildings, and believed that the buildings should be sealed to protect them from intruders.

Mr. Sugrue 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 11 October 2002