

**THE MINUTES OF THE 459TH STATED MEETING OF THE
Philadelphia Historical Commission
8 November 2000
Commission Conference Room, 18th Floor, 1515 Arch Street
Wayne S. Spilove, Chair**

Present

Wayne S. Spilove, Chair
David Baldinger, Deputy Director, City Planning Commission
Melissa Heller Batzer, Office of City Council President, Director of Economic Development
James Cuorato, City Representative, Director of Commerce
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
Ernest Leonardo, Director of Policy and Strategic Planning, City Planning Commission
David Perri, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Michael Sklaroff, Esq.
Robert Thomas
Mjenzi K. Traylor, First Deputy Director, Department of Commerce
Dennis Ward III
Scott Wilds, Assistant Director, Office of Housing and Community Development
Caroline Wischmann
Stephanie Wolf, Ph.D.

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

Mark Zecca, Esq., Senior Attorney, City of Philadelphia Law Department

Also

Henry Nechemias
Amy Blake
Cristina Wuenschel, Becker Winston Architects
Piero Grimaldi, Grimaldi Architecture
Steve Shapiro
Karen McGovern, Rittenhouse Sports
Alan M. Kaplan, Simpson and Associates
John Van Horne, Library Company of Philadelphia
Susan Montgomery, Library Company of Philadelphia
Scott Boyles, 1737 Chestnut Street
Kevin Broad, 123 South 16th Street
C. Katsinis, 1737 Chestnut Street, Apartment #900
Morris Zimmerman, 1320 Locust St
Robert Powers, Powers and Company
James Bogle, 1830 Pine Street
William Kriebel, 1923 Manning Street
Albert D. Malmfelt, 113 Elfreths Alley
Marian DeRita, 2125 Porter Street
Alan Harris, Esq., 1500 Locust Street, #3116
Val Harris, 1500 Locust Street, #3116
Sam Silver, 2000 Addison Street

Brenda D. Frank, 113 Elfreths Alley
Gerry Gutierrez, Group G
Evan Brodie, 301 South 19th Street
Diana S. Hare, 1530 Locust Street
Janet Mason, 118 South 21st Street, Apartment #1113
Michael Isador, 1901 J.F. K. Boulevard, Apartment #2415
Bill Becker, BWA
Paul Hogan, 1837 Chestnut Street
Deborah Snyderman, 1616 Walnut Street, Apartment #1908
Edgar R. Einhorn, 207 South 20th Street
Ian Cope, 30 South 15th Street
Gerald Cope, 30 South 15th Street
Alson Alston, 2226 Green Street
Stephen Goldner, 7th and Pine Streets
Jack Weiner, 1811 Chestnut Street
Roger Friedman, 1809 Walnut Street
P. Zyats, 2228 Green Street
George Guzzie, 1512 Spruce Street
Janet Potter, The Foundation for Architecture
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association
Judith Eden, Center City Residents' Association
Noreen Timoney, Area Resident
Truman Gilbert, 2228 Green Street
Mark Deminus, Plover Systems Company
Patricia Wilson Aden, Preservation Alliance of Philadelphia
John DeWaele, 1022 Clinton Street
Albert Taus, AIA, Albert Taus and Associates Architects
Sabrina Soong, AIA, Soong Associates Incorporation Architects
Vickie M. Feldman, Panache Photos

Minutes of the 458th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Leonardo and duly seconded, the Commission approved the minutes of the 458th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held on 11 October 2000.

Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission.

Upon a motion made by Ms. Wolf and duly seconded, the Commission approved the minutes of the Special Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held 18 October 2000 with 11 votes. Mr. Sklaroff abstained

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 31 October 2000

4341 Main Street, SW corner of Grape Street

Ilyas Shah, Owner

Alan Kaplan, Esq., Applicant

DATE: c. 1905

PROPOSAL: Legalize aluminum-clad windows and shopfront alterations

Mr. Tyler advised the Commission that its review of this submission occurs pursuant to the Manayunk Ordinance, §§ PM-703.1.2 and 704.2 of the Philadelphia Code.

The Architectural Committee recommended the following:

1. *Approval of the windows as submitted;*
2. *Approval of the existing stucco on the Grape Street elevation;*
3. *Subject to painting the aluminum cornice, and*
4. *Subject to painting the varnished storefront with staff approval.*

The proposal involves legalizing the installation of aluminum clad windows in the side wall of this corner building, covering the cornice with aluminum and recladding the front storefront with varnished wood.

Allen Kaplan attended the meeting on behalf of the owner to respond to questions concerning the proposal.

Mr. Sklaroff question the circumstances of the work. Mr. Tyler responded that various owners had performed work with and without permits; owing to this, the staff cannot with certainty assign responsibility for some features to specific owners. Mr. Baron added that we lacked knowledge of the historic fenestration of the Grape Street elevation.

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

1320 Locust Street, SE corner of Juniper Street

Library Company of Philadelphia, Owner

Christina Wuenshel, Architect

DATE: 1883

PROPOSAL: Rear stair tower, HVAC on roof

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the stair tower and the HVAC unit set back towards the center of the building.

The proposal involves adding a stair tower to the rear elevation of this Furness designed house on its Latimer Street facade. The plans call for retaining the chimney, adding the tower with a glazed connection and closing windows along the piazza of the rear ell. The architect proposes a large H.V.A.C. unit for the roof.

Mr. Ward made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried with 11 votes. Ms. Wolf recused herself.

2226 Green Street

Alson Alston, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1866

PROPOSAL: Conceptual review of proposed multi-family dwelling, restructuring bay of 2224 Green Street, and encroaching upon mansard and windows of 2228 Green Street

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the conceptual proposal owing to the inclusion of the garage which violates Standards 9 and 10; however, it determined that retention of the bay at 2224 Green Street and a 3 foot setback at the third floor to accommodate the mansard windows at 2228 Green Street would be acceptable.

This proposal involves the conceptual review of a new house on the side yard of an Italianate house in Spring Garden. The Commission reviewed, though never approved, a similar proposal for this same property several years ago. In alternate one, the applicant proposes to build a condominium apartment structure that cuts off a portion of an historic bay window on the side of 2224 Green Street which the owner of that property sold with the lot. In addition, the proposal involves encroaching very closely upon the dormer windows in the mansard of 2228 Green Street. The new building will include a garage which entails cutting into the grass berm and retaining wall at the front of the lot to create a driveway to the garage. The staff recommended denial per Standard 9 and 10.

Mr. Sklaroff recused himself.

As a concerned neighbor, Mr. Sklaroff raised the question of the property's sub-division, which he believes is misrepresented. He recommended that the Commission table the proposal until the resolution of this issue.

Alson Alston, the owner, was receptive to the Committee's recommendations, and submitted a revised proposal, which eliminates the garage, and the demolition of the bay at 2224, and includes a setback from 2226. Mr. Alston reviewed documents and spoke with the Zoning, unit at Licenses and Inspections and believes that the original rejection of the sub-division has no bearing on this proposal. He also said that his massing is comparable to 2224.

The issue of the massing gave rise to much discussion. The Architectural Committee did not address the issue of massing at its meeting. Some Commission members thought this a critical issue that should be discussed in the context of the neighboring houses. Mr. Wilds questioned the depth of the new construction and the need for such depth.

Ms. Wolf believes that the conceptual approval would accept the massing and the setback with only the garage denied.

Mr. James noted that the rear of the building needs further massing review.

Truman Gilbert, owner of 2228, expressed concern about the new building's massing, which would obscure the mansard's view. He stated that a new structure comparable to his property would be acceptable.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept in concept the Committee's recommendation; however, it left unresolved for future consideration the massing of the rear of the new building. Mr. Leonardo seconded the motion which carried with 10 votes. Mr. James opposed the motion and Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

1512 Spruce Street, The Drake, SW corner of Hicks Street

David Levey, Owner

George Guzzie, Applicant

DATE: 1927

PROPOSAL: Signage

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of signage with red hued neon, the shade to be approved by the staff.

The application calls for revisiting the question of lettering on an existing c. 1950 metal marquee. The Committee and Commission previously approved brass cut out letters, which proved too innocuous. The applicant now proposes to reinstall the channel letters, but fitted with individual bulbs rather than the original neon.

The staff recommended denial. The applicant should restore the letters with neon illumination per Standard 6.

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

2118 Pine Street, SW corner of Van Pelt Street

Robert Dugan, Owner

Andrew Fielding, Applicant

DATE: c. 1865

PROPOSAL: Windows, deck and garage

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of new six over six windows with staff to review the details.

The proposal includes two permits. The first permit addresses windows. The applicant's proposal calls for changing the six over six windows in the rear of the building to two over two windows to match the front portion of the building.

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the french doors, the deck, and a wood, raised panel, painted garage door with staff to review the details. The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the outrigger decoration above the garage door.

The second permit calls for the construction of a rear deck and a new garage door. Mr. Baron explained that the applicant's proposal shows the deck extending from a rear bay with french doors to access the deck. The plans also show a horizontally slatted metal garage door topped by a wood beam that extends beyond the deck in an "outrigger" fashion.

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

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

Ellis and Peggy Wachs, Owners

Christina Carter, Architect

DATE: 1928

PROPOSAL: Windows for one condominium unit

The Architectural Committee recommended the denial of new windows and suggested repair of the existing windows with staff to review the details.

The applicant seeks to replace the windows on the south side of their apartment facing Rittenhouse Square Street for acoustic reasons. Mr. Tyler explained that the building management has decided to restore the building's existing windows and has no plans to replace

windows in the building. The staff and Committee recommended denial of the new windows and encouraged the repair and modifications of the existing windows.

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

Mr. Spilove passed the gavel to Ms. Wolf, Vice-chair.

270 South 20th Street

David and Judy Einhorn, Owners

Edgar Einhorn, Esq. Applicant

DATE: c. 1920

PROPOSAL: Café windows, replace steps

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the window and step replacement.

The application calls for the installation of café style, bi-fold windows in an existing opening on the building's front façade. In addition, the proposal includes the replacement of two slate steps in-kind.

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

1604 Locust Street

David Sura, Owner

Edward O'Reilly, Contractor

DATE: 1853

PROPOSAL: Louver in basement window

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of placing the louver behind a screen in the window and removal of the glass while retaining the muntins with the staff to review details.

The applicant seeks to install a vent on the front façade of the building behind an existing basement window. The application calls for the retention of the basement window grille and muntins. In the six light window, the plans show four lights removed and replaced with a screen that covers the louvers. Mr. Baron explained that placing the vent in the back of the building was not feasible.

Mr. Wilds questioned whether the submitted proposal is the best solution.

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

Ms. Wolf returned the gavel to Mr. Spilove, Chair.

2026 Locust Street

Harvey Robin, Owner

Neil Rosenberg, Applicant

DATE: c. 1890

PROPOSAL: Stucco mansard and cornice details facing Manning Street

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of legalizing the stucco, but recommended approving an asphalt shingle that would mimic slate.

The application calls for legalizing the repair of stucco on the rear wall and mansard of this house which faces Locust Street. The rear faces onto Manning Street; houses face Manning Street. Staff recommendation: Denial. The applicant should remove the stucco and reshingle the mansard with a slateline, another slate substitute, or real slate shingle per Standard 6.

Mr. Baron stated that the applicant thought the stucco existed previously.

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

1914 Rittenhouse Square Street

Henry McNeil, Owner

Jennifer Foster, Architect

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Shutter removal

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the removal of the vinyl shutters subject to the installation of new architecturally appropriate wood shutters within one calendar year, with staff to review and approve shutter details.

The application calls for legalizing the removal of shutters.

Staff recommendation: Approval, subject to their replacement with new historically appropriate wood shutters within one year.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried with 11 votes. Mr. Sklaroff opposed the motion.

318-324 South 7th Street, NW corner of Pine Street

H.H. Townhouses L.C.C., Owner

Susan Garfinkle, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Comment on new construction of six townhouses

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with modifications to the garage openings to give them a more carriage opening like architectural presence.

This proposal calls for review and comment on the construction of six rowhouses on a vacant parcel in the Society Hill district. The houses will have a scale similar to surrounding rowhouses but will have garage entrances in their front facades. The staff recommended that the houses should have a design with common parking at the rear and open space over the parking. Garages on the street are not compatible in design with the district.

The Commission expressed concern about the massing and the architectural features of the garage doors. Vehicular traffic to and from the garages concerned many of the area neighbors.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to adopt the Committee's comments. Mr. Leonardo seconded the motion which carried with 11 votes. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

319-321 South 3rd Street

Gregory Colton, Owner

John Douthwade, Contractor

DATE: 1788-1795

PROPOSAL: Addition of 2nd and 3rd floor on single story wing

The Architectural Committee found the application unclear and incomplete.

The application calls for constructing a three story addition that has the appearance of two 18th century rowhouses where now stands a single story modern addition to a true 18th century house. The staff said the Standards call for additions to not create a false sense of history, although they should try to sensitively contribute to the existing architecture per Standards 9 and 10.

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

2125 Porter Street

Marian DeRita, Owner

Robert Kravchak, Contractor

DATE: 1914

PROPOSAL: Remove slate, re-roof with asphalt shingles

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the installation of the proposal slate-line shingles on the rear half of the roof behind the termination of the projecting cornice and the installation of slate or a more realistic hard or rubber slate-like shingle on the forward portion of the roof.

The applicant has a slate roof and seeks to remove it and install slate line type asphalt shingles. The staff recommended denial. The front portion of the roof back to the end of the bracketed cornice should receive new slate. Behind that line he can install slate line type shingles. If a hardship exists the documentation should go through the Committee on Financial Hardship.

Marian DeRita, the owner, attended the meeting and expressed her inability to replace her roof in slate owing to its cost. She also expressed the need for this proposal to move because of water infiltration.

Richard Tyler reported that he had researched the price of recycled rubber, which is five times more and suggested that the applicant get a price for the Committee's consideration. He also recommended that the applicant's proposal be reviewed under the provision 14-2007(7)(k)(.7) of the Philadelphia Code.

Mr. Wilds stated that, owing to the existence of many slate roofs in the Girard Estate Historic District and in forthcoming districts, replacing in kind could pose a hardship to the average homeowner.

Commission members believed strongly the need to formulate a policy regarding slate roofs and urged the creation of an ad hoc committee to develop such a policy. The issue of precedent was of great concern.

Mr. Cuorato thought the applicant should receive a commitment from the Commission for a solution to her proposal.

Mr. Ward made a motion to establish a sub-committee to formulate a policy and guidelines regarding slate roofs. Mr. Leonardo seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Mr. Spilove appointed the committee with Mr. Sklaroff as chair. Mr. James made a motion to delegate authority to Mr. Tyler to render a decision on this application under the Unnecessary Hardship provision of the Ordinance in the event that the Committee does not act within one week and Ms. Batzer seconded the motion which carried with 11 votes. Mr. Cuorato opposed the motion.

1801, 1805-09, 1811-13 Walnut Street
126, 128, 130, 132 South 18th Street

Rittenhouse Club Development L.P., Owners

Jack Weiner, Applicant

DATE: 1801-03 Walnut Street, 1896-1898

1805-09 Walnut Street, c. 1923

1811-13 Walnut Street, c. 1845; combined and refacaded 1901

126-32 South 18th Street, c. 1845; 126 and 132 altered 1920s

PROPOSAL: Conceptual review for substantial demolition of five buildings and two-phase development of commercial and residential tower

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended the denial of the concept as proposed and thought the proposed setback on 18th Street insufficient in preserving the massing of the historic buildings or the historic streetscape of 18th Street. Four of the six members suggested that any future approval should rest on the retention of a much more substantial mass of the existing historic buildings.

This application seeks conceptual approval of a two phase project involving the complete retention of the Fell-Van Rensselaer Mansion and the Allison Building and the substantial demolition of five other designated historic buildings. In the first phase, plans call for the demolition of all but the façade of the Rittenhouse Club and all but the front façades and a small portion of the Sansom Street façade of the four buildings at 126-132 S. 18th Street. The architect plans to remove other visible portions of the buildings, including the side and rear facades, character defining rooflines, mansard, chimneys and dormers. In their place, the design proposes an L- shaped, eight-story retail and office structure, set back five feet from the 18th Street facades and stepped back in 16 foot intervals from the front façade of the Rittenhouse Club. In the newest plans, revised since last month's Committee meeting, a porte-cochere will enter and exit on the Sansom Street façade. Two truck loading docks will enter from Sansom Street. In the second phase, the developer plans to construct an L-shaped, 33-story tower to sit atop the commercial structure. The tower will sit back more than 60 feet from the Walnut Street façade, but it will rise approximately five feet behind the 18th Street façades and flush with the Sansom Street elevation.

The staff applauded the applicant's revision that removes the curb cut and vehicle entrance from 18th Street and retains the facades of 128 and 130 S. 18th Street. The staff recommended the denial of the concept as proposed because of the extent of the demolition and the lack of sufficient information to make a finding of hardship. The staff did not find a compelling public interest argument for the demolition. The staff also recommended that, if the applicant wishes to make a hardship argument, the Committee and the Commission direct the conduct of studies as provided in the ordinance to examine the economics of greater retention of the historic fabric and massing of the structures.

Jack Weiner, counsel for the applicant, believes the primary argument of public interest has been addressed. This is demonstrated by the preservation of the facades of the Rittenhouse Club and Fell-Van Rensselaer Mansion and the set back on the Eighteenth Street properties with the retention of their facades although previously altered. He also stated the economic benefits of the project, bringing money and jobs to the city. He reiterated the Rittenhouse Club's thirteen years of vacancy. Gerald Cope, the architect, gave an overview of the project and its impact on the neighborhood and urged that the project be considered as a whole. Robert Powers, preservation consultant, spoke and noted that a considerable amount of preservation went into this project which included the façade easements for the Rittenhouse Club and Fell-Van Rensselaer Mansion, and cited the Washington Square high rise as a precedent.

Mr. Tyler addressed public interest and the hardship issues. He stated that hardship should include the project as a whole and not only the Rittenhouse Club. He also thought the setback on Walnut Street appropriate. He thought the setback on 18th Street inappropriate, for the latter does not conform to the Standards. He suggested that a way be found to pull it back to maintain the streetscape. Mr. Weiner responded by saying that the Commission can wave the Standards. Laura Spina stated that façade easements give control and ownership to a Preservation organization; however, controls are already in place and façade easements are redundant.

Edmund Bacon spoke in support of the project and asserted that the restoration of the Rittenhouse Club façade will give the building life.

Ms. Wolf believed that the public interest would better be served with the retention of more depth to the 18th Street facades and asked that the applicant be sensitive to the Committee and Commission's concerns.

James Cuorato, Director of Commerce, encouraged development in the city and thought the revised proposal has met preservation issues and the applicant has gone out of his way to compromise in the public interest. With respect to small businesses, the Commerce Department would help with relocation. Mr. Baron explained his concern that preservation was being juxtaposed to economics. He said replacing unique ground level stores with chain stores and an upstairs mall could hurt the appeal and economics of this street. He likened 18th Street and Rittenhouse Row to streets such as Newberry Street in Boston or Madison Avenue in New York. He also thought that approval of demolition without proof of hardship would set a bad precedent.

Dianna Hare, a resident of the area, voiced her opposition to the project.

Henry Necimius, stated his opposition to the proposal, the district should mingle age and condition, the old and the new.

Vickie Feldman believed the project is not doing justice to the city and opposes the project.

Samuel Silver encouraged development in the city but said that this is not in the public interest and should be relocated elsewhere. He also said the traffic issue should be addressed.

Janet Mason spoke in support of the project and stated that the city should welcome progress.

Janet Potter, Foundation for Architecture, commented on its behalf and stated that the Foundation has no official position but is in favor of a residential city not frozen in time. She expressed her dismay that Commission members made their positions known during the course of the deliberations and before hearing the public. She also believes that designs of buildings have impact on their use.

Patricia Wilson Aden spoke on behalf of the Preservation Alliance in support of the project.

Judith Eden, Center Residents' Association, commented on the height issue, and the visual impact on the pedestrian's view.

Scott Baldri believed the project will be detrimental to Rittenhouse Square.

Mr. James made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation and approve the submission in concept as submitted. Mr. Perri seconded the motion which carried with 10 votes. Ms. Wolf abstained and Mr. Thomas opposed the motion.

319 Market Street

Daniel Katz, Owner

Janice Woodcock, Architect

DATE: 1831

PROPOSAL: Legalize side windows and install fire escape

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of a new fire escape, but denial of the legalization of the windows. It recommended the replacement of these windows with the correct wood windows.

The applicant proposes to legalize the installation of one over one aluminum windows and the installation of a rear fire-escape. The rear of the building has visibility from a public walkway. The staff recommended denial of the aluminum windows per Standard 6 and approval of the fire-escape.

The applicant requested a one month continuance in writing.

235 Chestnut Street

Frank Ragosio, Owner

Ivano D'Angella, Architect

DATE: 1856

PROPOSAL: New canopy, internally illuminated projecting signs and lighting

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of wood blade signs, a new raised sidewalk platform and façade lighting with details to be reviewed by staff. The Committee recommended approval of a modified freestanding metal and glass canopy that aligns with the transom bar but

with a shallower pitched roof that would still shed water but appear flatter and more horizontal with details to be reviewed by staff.

The application calls for the installation of a new entrance canopy on this mid-nineteenth century building's Chestnut Street façade. The applicant proposes to remove the existing fabric canopy and install a new, free standing, glass and steel canopy. The plans show a gabled canopy supported by four square steel posts with lettering on the front and sides of the canopy, illuminated by red neon strips. The applicant proposes signage on the face of the canopy and on two backlit-projecting signs at either end of the façade. Plans also include a lighting scheme for the façade of the hotel. Finally, the application request alterations to the granite platform that runs the width of the building.

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

113 Elfreths Alley

Albert Malmfelt, Owner

Gerry Guttierrez, Architect

DATE: c. 1811

PROPOSAL: Visible rear addition

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the third floor addition, second floor roof deck and a modified second story addition with a sloping parapet wall at rear that would simulate the historic form of the sloping shed roof.

The application calls for two additions to this three-story row house on Elfreth's Alley. The applicant proposes a second floor addition with an overhang above the existing one-story kitchen in the rear of the property with a deck on the roof of this addition. Plans also show a proposed third story addition over an existing two-story rear portion of the house. Partial demolition of the existing roof surfaces would be necessary for construction. Photographs from Bladen's Court and Front Street indicate that the additions would have moderate visibility.

Mr. Wilds questioned the third floor windows, and the deck, and the sloped wall to conceal the deck, because of its high visibility to an important and unique Old City Street. He also believed the visibility issue warrants a sight line study.

Gerry Gutierrez, the architect, thought visibility would be lessened by the 8 foot fence around the house and that this is in conjunction with a repair project for the owner owing to water penetration.

Mr. Baldinger made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried with 10 votes. Ms. Wolf and Mr. Wilds opposed the motion.

209 North 3rd Street

Dr. Michael Yaron, Owner

Albert Taus, Architect

DATE: c. 1825

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation, cut new windows

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of project including the enlarged rear window openings and simplified gate with details to be reviewed by staff. The Committee also recommended approval of the new side window openings provided the second register of windows is shifted east away from the existing original fanlight opening.

The plans call for the rehabilitation of this c.1825 house into apartments and a ground floor commercial space. The major alterations include cutting new windows on the mostly blank side façade and the rear façade, which has visibility from a parking lot. Other windows will receive sash to match the originals. A new gate will fence off the side courtyard. The Committee and Commission have previously approved a similar scheme.

Mr. Taus, the architect, submitted revised drawings that change the size of several of the side windows.

Mr. Ward made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation with the inclusion of the window change. Mr. Baldinger seconded the motion which carried with 11 votes. Ms. Wolf abstained.

625 North 16th Street

Peter Kura, Owner

Sabrina Soong, Architect

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation, legalize removal of rear shed

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

The application calls for a complete renovation to this three-story brick row house including new windows, repointing and a new entrance door. The applicant proposes to install wood, two over two, double hung windows on the front façade, six over six, double hung windows on the south façade and infill four windows on the rear elevation. The applicant also proposes to legalize the removal of a deteriorated shed from the visible rear of the building. Plans show a proposal to repoint and patch existing brick on the front and south facades, and a new transom to match existing and a four-panel door on the front façade. The application calls for the repair of existing marble steps, a new metal railing and new basement windows. In the gable end, the applicant proposes a new fanlight window. On the rear of the building, plans show new concrete steps, railing and four light back door, and stuccoing of the rear façade. At the roof, the architect proposes new asphalt shingles and the replacement of the cornice in wood.

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

627 North 16th Street

Peter Kura, Owner

Sabrina Soong, Architect

DATE: c. 1859

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation, legalize removal of rear shed and bay

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal as submitted with the staff to review and approve details, as well as a pointing and brick samples.

The application calls for a façade renovation to this three-story brick row house including new windows, repointing and a new entrance. The applicant proposes to install wood, two over two, double hung windows on the front façade; new wood, six over six, double hung windows on the north façade, and multiple new windows on the partially visible rear elevation. The applicant removed the deteriorated wood portions of the building and now seeks to build a new frame addition and upper floor bay. The applicant also proposes to repoint and patch existing brick on the west elevation. The plans show work on the front façade including a new transom, a new four-panel door and metal railing. Plans also propose new glass, three pane basement windows. On the rear of the building, plans have concrete steps, a new railing and a new back door, and a stucco finish.

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

2531 South Lambert Street

Joanne Castorina, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1914

PROPOSAL: Close window, install stained glass

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with a reveal and retention of the window frame with the staff to review details.

The applicant seeks to remove a window on the side of her house in the bathroom, block it most of the way up with brick and add a leaded glass window. The window location has limited visibility.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation with a reveal but the deletion of the frame. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

4200 Spruce Street, SW corner of 42nd Street

Omicron Association of Theta Xi, Owner

Greg Woodring, Applicant

DATE: c. 1902

PROPOSAL: Stair tower and ADA ramp

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with a simplified ramp detail and with staff to review details. In as much as the building has had asphalt shingles for at least twenty years, the Committee thought the use of slate-line or a similar substitute material appropriate.

The proposal involves removing a fire-escape from the east side façade of this fraternity house and building a brick stair tower on the more concealed west side. A new ramp will allow handicapped accessibility. The architect also proposes a new roof and several windows in addition. The applicant sought guidance for the future re-roofing of this building which now has asphalt shingles. Presumably slate shingles originally covered this roof.

Mr. Baron received a revised submission which included roof replacement; however, at the time of the asphalt shingle installation no permit was required. Some Commission members

recommended tabling the roofing issue, until a much needed policy is instituted in regards to slate roofs.

The architect stated that owing to the size of the roof, the budget would be greatly impacted by slate and therefore proposes a slate-line shingle replacement. The Commission thought slate-line replacement appropriate owing to its current existence, unless the applicant prefers otherwise.

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

1022 Clinton Street

John DeWaele, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1839-40

PROPOSAL: Remake Pine Street store into garage

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the submission with the doors to resemble carriage doors.

The applicant seeks to create a garage out of a one-story building at the back of this Clinton Street lot, most recently used as an antique store on Pine Street. The applicant claims that the structure was formerly a garage.

Mr. Tyler stated that in 1923 only a rear yard existed and the existence of a curb cut leads one to believe a garage did exist at some time.

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

128 Bainbridge Street

Michael Samschick, Owner

Joel Spivak, Architect

DATE: c. 1771-1792

PROPOSAL: Conceptual review, reface in brick and new construction

The Architectural Committee recommended:

- 1. Approval of the proposal in concept;*
- 2. Denial of the refacing the building in brick, and*
- 3. Approval of a siding treatment discovered in the course of a closer physical examination of the building, or in the absence of any surviving material, siding to match comparable buildings of the period in the neighborhood.*

The conceptual application involves reconstructing and adding onto a perma-stone covered frame, half gabled house. The applicant who seeks to purchase this long empty house proposes to reconstruct the face of the building in brick and construct a large addition set in the yard behind the existing house.

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

126-28 League Street

Michael Samschick, Owner

Joel Spivak, Architect

DATE c. 1806-1817

PROPOSAL: Conceptual review, partial demolition and new construction

The Architectural Committee recommended:

1. *Approval of the proposal in concept with the rear addition designed in such a manner as to convey a stronger sense of the rear slope of the historic building, and*
2. *Final approval of the project if the applicant submits satisfactory drawings of the Washington Avenue elevation before 8 November for review by the Chair of the Committee and staff.*

This conceptual application calls for rebuilding much of these Imminently Dangerous frame structures and attaching them to a new structure set behind the ridge line. The construction would demolish the rear roof slopes and dormers.

Mr. Baron presented revised drawings with the elimination of the glass block. He also stated that the applicant wishes full approval instead of conceptual approval owing to the dangerous condition of the structure.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation amended for full approval in lieu of conceptual approval. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which unanimously.

THE REPORT of the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, October 2000.

Mr. Tyler 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 of \$34.08 for Architectural Committee lunches.

Mr. Ward made a motion to approve the expenditure. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Ms Wolf made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary