

**THE MINUTES OF THE 515th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
8 July 2005**

**1515 Arch Street, Room 18025
Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair**

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
Warren Huff, Director of Urban Design, City Planning Commission
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
Sara Merriman, Special Assistant to the Director, Department of Commerce
Kathleen Murray, Special Assistant to the President of City Council
David Perri, P.E., Chief Code Official, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Denise Smyler, Esq.
Harris Steinberg, AIA
Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Jonathan E. Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Officer
Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner

Leonard Reuter, Esq., Senior Attorney, Law Department

Also

Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers
Aimee Lala, CRCG
Mary Sales
Dennis Fee
Stephen Carlino
Jonathan Walston, Brett Webber Architects
John Ciccone
Scott Yohe
Kevin Sullivan
Charles Kelly
Massimiliano Scarchilli, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects
Margaret A. Robb, Society Hill Civic Association
Lenore Millhollen, Preservation Alliance
Rachel Buurma
Andrew Tull, 609 North 17th Street
Edwin Rivera, Queen Village Neighbors Association
Leonard F. Reuter, City of Philadelphia, Law Department
Megan Delevan, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Jack Thrower, Bower Lewis Thrower Architects
Kevin Fleming, 1812 Fairmount Avenue
Louis Cicaler, DRDG, 519 Walnut Street
Joe Hamilton, 20 Belav Studio
Rachel Schade, Schade & Bolender Architects
Matthew Johnson, Center City District

Kiki Bolender, Schade & Bolender Architects
Mary Watlington, Maple Mt. Vernon Apartments
Joseph Duffy, Duffy Murphy Group
William Murphy, Duffy Murphy Group
Jeff Walter, Commerce Department
Gerry Gutierrez, Group G Architecture & Planning
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Julia Scott, Reku Design
Elizabeth Zechenter, Owner, 31 Summit Street

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 515th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:10 a.m.

Minutes of the 514th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Upon a motion made by Ms. Merriman and seconded by Mr. James, the Commission voted to approve the minutes of the 514th Stated Meeting, 10 June 2005, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 28 June 2005
Vincent Rivera, Chair

2044 Spruce Street

Owner: David Nazarian
Applicant: Rachel Schade, Schade & Bolender Architects
Date: c. 1880, perhaps G.W. and W.D. Hewitt, architects
Proposal: Demolish chimney; add elevator tower
Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval, provided that the elevator tower is reduced in height above the roofline to the absolute minimum and that the historic chimney is replicated above the roofline as part of the elevator tower.

This application proposes the demolition of a chimney and the construction of an elevator in its place on this grand late nineteenth-century mansion at the southeast corner of 21st and Spruce Streets. The chimney is highly ornamental and is visible from 21st and Cypress Streets.

In February 2005, the Commission denied an application for this address, applicant, and owner that included the demolition of the same chimney and construction of a taller elevator tower as well as the addition of a very large roof deck. The owner has decided to abandon the plans for the deck. Therefore, the elevator would now run only as high as the top floor, not the roof. Subsequently, the height of the elevator tower above the roof can be reduced significantly from the earlier design.

Mr. Farnham presented the application and noted the revised drawings. Rachel Schade, the architect, offered that a house of this size needs an elevator. Mr. Steinberg inquired if the applicant had investigated the installation of a smaller elevator. Ms. Schade responded that the elevator proposed is the smallest feasible. Mr. Sklaroff questioned the appropriateness of rebuilding the chimney on the elevator tower and concluded that the chimney should not be rebuilt. Commission members concurred.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. Huff seconded

the motion, which carried unanimously.

434 Pine Street

Owners: Craig and Janet Charlton

Applicant: Julia Scott, Reku Design

Date: c. 1978

Proposal: Construct third-floor rear addition

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the addition with an appropriate cladding material, 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 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.].

This application proposes infilling a small third-floor rear porch.

Mr. Farnham presented the revised proposal, which would face the addition in brick cladding to reflect the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the revised proposal. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

1701, 02, 04, 06, 10, 11, 13, 21, 23, 36, 38, 40 Mt. Vernon Street
602 North 17th Street

Community Realty Management, Owner

Mary Watlington, Applicant

Date: 1710: 1902; all others: c. 1859

Proposal: Paint facades, door surrounds and watertables

Architectural Committee recommendation: denial of the blue-gray colors; denial of any painting of painted or unpainted masonry details such as lintels, sills, door surrounds, and watertables; denial of the painting of the brownstone building unless an investigation reveals that the removal of the existing paint would damage the stone, in which case the building may be painted colors that match the original materials; and approval of painting the brick facades an appropriate brick red color; with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 7 [Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damages to historic materials will not be used.].

These twelve houses on this single block are painted and the owner wishes to repaint the façades, watertables, lintels, sills, and other details. The proposed colors are the present ones, light grey for the façades and dark grey for the trim. None of the paint appears in poor condition or seems to require repair. 1701 Mount Vernon, a.k.a. 602 North 17th Street, has a mural painted by the Anti-Graffiti Network (the pre-cursor to the Mural Arts Program), which features the face of the Statue of Liberty. The application does not state whether the mural will be painted over. 1710 Mount Vernon is faced in brownstone, which can be adversely affected by paint to a greater degree than brick. On 1736 and 1738 Mount Vernon, the marble watertables and door surrounds have been stripped of paint and should not be repainted.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal and noted the receipt of two letters, which offer opposition to the brick red paint color. Several Commission members expressed confusion over the content and claims of the letters.

Mary Watlington, the applicant, informed the Commission that all the buildings were previously painted and that she had no knowledge of the cost to strip paint from the facades.

Mr. Steinberg inquired about the implications of putting additional layers of paint on the facades. Ms. Spina responded that adding more layers of paint would make any subsequent removal more difficult. She also noted that the facades have been previously altered; many window openings had been infilled. Mr. James thought that the existing color should be retained. Mr. Steinberg disagreed, saying that any changes should be done to restore the building to its original integrity; therefore, the masonry details, if painted, should be stripped.

Mr. James made a motion to approve the repainting of the façades, but not the masonry details, in the submitted blue/gray color, with the staff to review details. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried with 7 votes, Mr. Sugrue and Mr. Steinberg dissented.

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

230-34 North Christopher Columbus Boulevard

Delaware River Development Group, Owner

Megan Delevan, Architect/Applicant

Date: 1985 – non-contributing to Old City Historic District

Proposal: Demolish non-contributing building; construct 30-story multi-unit building with parking

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval of the demolition and new construction, provided a Phase 1 Archeological Study is performed prior to the start of construction, pursuant to Standard 8 [Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.]; 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 Setting Guideline [Not recommended: Introducing new construction into historic districts that is visually incompatible or that destroys historic relationships within the setting.].

The proposal calls for the demolition of a two-story Post-Modern building and construction of a thirty-story residential tower. The extant building is classified as non-contributing in the Old City Historic District inventory.

The proposed building occupies almost the entire lot for the first five stories, with retail, lobby, and storage on the first floor and parking for 330 cars on the upper four floors. Floors six through thirty comprise a tower that stands on the northern half of the lot and

will house anywhere from four to nine units on each floor, with amenities on the top floor. A total of 179 units will be in the building, which will stand over 345 feet tall. All four façades of the tower will have pre-cast concrete panels punctuated by large windows and metal balconies. The penthouse floor with the amenities will have a curved glass wall, like a giant greenhouse. The lower five stories will have pre-cast concrete panels and “Bermuda shutters” in the garage openings, with the north, west and south façades otherwise remaining unarticulated. The retail spaces and lobby on the east façade will have storefront openings with double-leaf glazed doors, plate glass windows, and awnings. Concrete walls, steps, and planters hide most of the first floor from the street. The door to the main lobby will have a canopy, but the plans do not include details such as materials.

This lot and the Hertz Lot just to the north occupy the land that marks the transition from the city to the waterfront. These sites hold great archeological potential. The riverfront in 1682 reached to King Street (now Water Street), with the docks over this patch of land. By 1762, the area along the waterfront had been infilled and the docks and piers pushed further into the river. Then in the 1830s, using monies endowed by Stephen Girard, the City further expanded the waterfront and created Delaware Avenue. The piers on the eastern side of Christopher Columbus Boulevard were redeveloped in the 1920s as part of a large-scale municipal project, and the ones just north of this lot were redeveloped again in the mid-twentieth century. The 300-block of North Front Street retains the grading and scale of the development from the nineteenth century and the original eighteenth-century steps leading to the river at Wood Street remain. The lot to the north, known as the Hertz lot, the site of the Pennypot Tavern and West Shipyard, has been the subject of a major archeological study and holds the remains of four wharves and a slipway.

This site is bounded by Interstate 95 and the Benjamin Franklin Bridge at the west and south. The embankment for the highway and the bridge has separated the parcel from the rest of Old City. However, the anchorage for the bridge, which stands approximately 160 feet tall, is a strong visual feature and establishes a scale for the development of the site.

Ms. Spina described the proposal. Jack Thrower, the architect, presented the project to the Commission. He noted that, owing to the floodplain, the construction would sit five feet above Columbus Boulevard. The visitor’s parking would be located over the utility easement on the north part of the parcel. Mr. Huff asked the architect if he agreed with need for an archeological study and the applicant responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Steinberg claimed no vision or standards exist for the development of the waterfront and he believes that the waterfront should be comprehensively planned. He further argued that a shorter, less bulky building should be considered for the site, noting that the construction of large, pre-cast boxy buildings at grade level present the appearance of Miami Beach. Mr. Huff disagreed with Mr. Steinberg. He offered that the new construction complies with zoning requirements. He pointed out that the site was part of a deed restriction precipitated by the community and Planning Commission.

Carl Primavera, the attorney for the project, said that a hotel received zoning approval for this site 10 years ago; after the neighbors opposed a parking garage, the property has since been rezoned.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance asserted that development along Front Street is very important. He noted that this site is different and offered that it is very isolated. He supported the project. He noted that it has been months since he requested from the Commission an opinion on its jurisdiction over non-contributing properties and commented that he never received the clarification. Mr. Farnham interjected that Mr. Copeland believes that the Commission has full jurisdiction.

Mr. Steinberg opined that the scale of new construction should relate better to the pier structures. He asserted that the proposed building is intrusive.

Mr. Huff made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried with 6 votes. Mr. Steinberg dissented, Mr. Sugrue abstained and Mr. Sklarloff recused.

200 West Washington Square, aka 700 Walnut Street

Owner: St. James Associates

Applicant: Joe Hamilton

Date: PSFS Bank, built 1869, Addison Hutton; alterations and addition by Hutton, 1886 and 1888; alterations and addition by Furness & Evans, 1898, 1919

Proposal: Add awnings, banners, canopy, and front doors

Architectural Committee Recommendation: denial of the window awnings; approval of the canopy, provided it is redesigned to be more appropriately scaled for the historic building; approval of the rear retractable awning; approval of the doors, provided their proportions and panel and glazing configurations match the historic doors; and approval of the flags; with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]; and 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.].

This application proposes several exterior additions to the former PSFS bank building, which is being converted to a restaurant. Awnings with the restaurant's logo would be added at the 7th and Walnut Street facades. A large retractable awning would be added at the rear or south façade, where an outdoor dining area is proposed. Three flag poles are proposed along Walnut Street, in locations approximating those of historic flag poles. A barrel-arched canopy is proposed for the easternmost entrance on Walnut Street; it would extend from the building, down the steps, and to the curb. Finally, new front doors are proposed for the same entranceway; they are based on historic doors that survive on the building.

Mr. Farnham described the proposal. Commission members asked for clarification about the design of the canopy at the door. Joe Hamilton, the applicant, disclosed that the owner agrees with the Committee's recommendation. He noted that it is his intent to remake the front doors to match historic doors on the building. Mr. James inquired about ADA issues. It was noted that the ADA access is offered at the St. James Court façade.

Ms. Smyler made a motion to accept the revised proposal. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Sklaroff left the meeting and turned the gavel over to Mr. Sugrue.

2019-23 Green Street

Green Street Collaborative, Owner

Joseph Duffy and William Murphy, Applicants

Date: 1860; significantly altered in 1922 and 1959 – non-contributing

Proposal: Demolish 1-story building; construct four 3-story houses with parking

Architecture Committee Recommendation: approval subject to the windows being changed to two-over-two, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or 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.].

The Commission previously approved the demolition of the non-contributing building on this site for the construction of a multi-unit building with a single garage entrance; however, a neighboring property owner has appealed the zoning approval of the development. The owners are now returning with a new development proposal for the site. The application includes the demolition of the non-contributing remnant of the former building on the site. The new construction consists of four, three-story townhouses that face onto an interior courtyard with a garden at the rear of the property. Access to the development occurs through a single opening at the center of the property for both pedestrians and vehicles.

The Green Street façade would consist of red brick with a bracketed cornice and two large bays. Nine-over-nine windows would fenestrate the façade. The application includes two options for the access opening. The first has a large segmentally-arched opening. The other has a smaller arched opening with a paneled roll-down door flanked by two arched doors that lead to the southern townhouses.

Ms. Spina presented the application and noted that the applicant is receptive to the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Steinberg commended the proposed design. Mr. Huff concurred.

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

220 Delancey Street

Mary Sales, Owner

Brett Webber, Architect/Applicant

Date: c. 1840; façade built c. 1895; façade rebuilt 1970

Proposal: Alter former alley entrance to main entrance with steps and transom, add stone watertable

Architectural Committee recommendation: denial of the alleyway alteration, pursuant to

Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.]; and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.].

This building has a complex history. It was built about 1840. A new façade with a two-story bay and Roman brick was installed about 1895. The original marble watertable and alleyway entrance survived the 1895 alterations. During the Redevelopment Period, the late nineteenth-century façade was completely removed, including the original doorway and watertable, and the present façade was installed. However, the alleyway entrance survived. The main entrance to the property was moved to a door in the alley.

In May 1999, the owner applied to convert the alleyway entrance into the main doorway. In June 1999, the Historical Commission, after much deliberation, approved an addition in the alleyway for a larger entrance, but with a setback to preserve the appearance of the alley.

The current application proposes installing an entirely new entrance at the same level as the main entrances at neighboring houses, completely erasing any reminder of the historic alleyway opening. The new entrance would be at the opposite edge of the façade from the original, but no lost, original raised entrance. The entrance would have marble steps and lintel, four-light transom and six-panel wood door. The application also proposes adding a marble watertable.

The proposal also calls for new six-over-six wood windows, expanding several windows on the rear of the property, and altering the slope of the rear flat roof for drainage. These alterations may be approved at the staff level.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal. Mary Sales, the owner, and Jonathan Walston attended the meeting. Ms. Sales said that her family's needs are changing and the current conditions present a hardship. She informed the Commission that she has been working with an architect to develop a design that is sensitive to the streetscape.

Mr. Steinberg suggested revising the floor plans to allow for internal stairs. Ms. Sales stressed that external steps are the preferred option.

Peg Robb, speaking on behalf of the Society Hill Civic Association, offered support of the proposed alterations.

Mr. Steinberg reviewed a 1961 photograph and noted the evolution of the house. He pointed out that the current façade has been altered many times. He emphasized that most of the alley no longer exists. Mr. Huff concurred. Ms. Spina pointed out that the proposed alterations would place the door on the wrong side of the façade.

Mr. Huff made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried with 6 votes. Mr. Steinberg and Mr. James abstained.

257 South 9th Street

Brian Klazmer, Owner

Massimiliano Scarchilli, Architect/Applicant

Date: c. 1802-10

Proposal: Construct three-story rear addition

Architectural Committee recommendation: denial of Option One, but conceptual approval of Option Two, adding on to the garage and connecting to the historic rear with a minimal link that preserved its half-gable roofline, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and 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 property represents an example of a three-and-half-story, Federal Style house with a three-story rear ell that has its original half-gable roofline and a nineteenth-century two-story addition. The upper portion of the rear is visible from Schell and Latimer Streets because the garage at the back of the lot is only one story in height. The application proposes the demolition of the rear wall of the main section, as well as the entirety of the rear ell and addition, and the construction of a three-story addition. The new addition will span the entire width of the house for approximately 18 feet and then narrow to a rear wing that projects approximately 12 additional feet. The addition will stand above the cornice line of the main section by about one foot.

Ms. Spina presented the application and noted that the applicant agrees with the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Steinberg asked for details of Option Two. Kevin Sullivan, a neighbor, expressed concern about the height of the addition. It was noted that the lowest portion is sloped to the south toward his house. Mr. Huff remarked that it is a sensitive design.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to approve in concept Option Two. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

1531-33 Pine Street

1531 Pine Street Associates, LP, Owner

Gerry Gutierrez, Architect/Applicant

Date: 1865-66, Charles MacAlester, developer; 1533: mansard added, c. 1870

Proposal: Add roof deck elevator, stair penthouse, rear windows, and doors with balconies

Architectural Committee recommendation: approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and 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 property consists of two houses, one four stories and one five. The application calls for installing elevator and stair penthouses and a roof deck on the four-story building, beginning with a set back of ten feet from the cornice line. On the rear, the deck would have a solid railing, with simulated slate on the railing wall, sloped away from the cornice line as if it was part of the roofing structure rather than the railing of a roof deck. Owing to the five-story building, the visibility of these would be minimal from the west. A house to the east has a raised parapet that minimizes the visibility from the east. The roof of the mansard of 1533 Pine would be raised and windows added on the eastern wall overlooking the new roof deck. The mansard would also have simulated slate shingles.

On the rear, the property previously had a fire escape that is no longer needed. The proposal includes removing the fire escape and installing single-leaf, multi-light doors with transoms in the existing openings. Simplified metal balconies would be installed. All other openings would have six-over-six wood windows. The rear is visible from 16th Street.

The work on the front includes the rehabilitation of the two facades, including new two-over-two wood windows and double-leaf glazed and paneled wood doors.

Ms. Spina described the application. Gerry Gutierrez, the architect, concurred with the Committee's recommendation.

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

319-21 South 25th Street

Stephen Carlino, Owner

Brian Adams, Applicant

Date: c. 1840

Proposal: Construct conservatory on existing rear terrace

Architectural Committee Recommendation: approval of a simplified design without the cresting or cross gable, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or 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.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and 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 proposal calls for a second-story sunroom addition on top of a non-historic rear addition of this vernacular mid nineteenth-century house. The sunroom will attach to the historic rear of the house just above the cornice line and will have a cross gable design. It is unclear how the sunroom will meet the historic house at the cornice line. The work would be visible from Delancey Street.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal. Alistair Cornell, the contractor, and Stephen Carlino, the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Cornell said that the owner requested the cross-gable, which was simplified with the elimination of the sunburst and cresting. Mr. Carlino emphasized that the cross-gable on the second-floor will give the room height and light and more presence than a simple shed. Mr. Cornell noted that the addition is nine feet on the high end and seven feet on the low end. Mr. Sugrue stressed that the alterations are proposed for a non-historic portion of the house.

Mr. Steinberg emphasized the simple nature of the 1840s working class house, which is not compatible with the Victorian nature of the proposed cross-gabled addition. He thought that the proposed details are not appropriate for the building and suggested a simple shed addition instead.

Mr. James made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which carried with 5 votes. Ms. Merriman and Ms. Murray dissented and Mr. Huff abstained.

31 Summit Avenue

Anjani Jain, Owner

Brian Adams, Applicant

Date: c. 1865

Proposal: Construct conservatory on side of house

Architectural Committee recommendation: denial of the application owing its incompleteness.

The proposal calls for a large, pre-fabricated conservatory addition on the rear of the house, which is visible from the road. The house has a small deck in this location; therefore, no openings would be cut to access the conservatory. The conservatory is an L-shaped design, built of vinyl-clad metal and glass with a hipped roof and several skylights. The conservatory has a double-leaf door that leads out to a deck that wraps around the house, but the plans indicate that the deck will be built by the owners and is not part of this application. The foundation of the conservatory is faced in fieldstone where it will be exposed, but stucco where it falls under the proposed deck. A door opening under the conservatory appears on the plans, but the drawings do not detail the door.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal. Elizabeth Zechenter, the owner, and Peter Leeming, contractor, attended the meeting. Ms. Zechenter told the Commission that she is only replacing the rear screened porch, which has unsafe stairs, with a Victorian-styled conservatory. Mr. Leeming offered that he is only responsible for the building of the conservatory; however, he believes that the proposed deck will conform to code.

Ms. Smyler thought that the applicant should re-submit the proposal to the Architectural Committee with the plans for the proposed deck as the Committee requested. Ms. Zechenter asked if she could receive approval for the conservatory and then return for at a later date for review of the deck. Ms. Spina stressed to the Commission that the conservatory would have a door leading to the deck, making the two pieces inseparable. Mr. Perri of the Department of Licenses & Inspections said that a door that leads to nothing would not comply with the City's building code.

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

1714 Spruce Street

Paul Alexander Monaghan, Owner/Applicant

Date: c. 1855. Designated 2/8/1995, listed as Significant.

Proposal: Build rear deck, cut metal bay for door

Architectural Committee recommendation: approval of the legalization of the third and fourth-floor existing decks; approval of cutting a new door; denial of six-panel door, but approval of a flush wood door with a single-light transom, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and 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]. Denial of the second-floor deck and related alterations to the metal bay, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; and Standard 4 [Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.]

This application proposes to legalize two existing roof decks; one on the third floor above a metal bay and a second on the fourth floor. The third-floor deck is visible from Delancey Place and sits on the roof of a rear two-story addition. The fourth-floor deck sits on the back ell of the property and it is not visible from Spruce Street or Delancey Place.

The application also proposes to add a deck at the second-floor level of the rear two-story addition. This deck would be constructed of wood and roughly measure 12' by 8'. The fenestration of an existing metal bay would need to be altered to access the deck. Currently the bay has five windows with upper leaded diamond-pattern glass. The applicant proposes to reconfigure these openings to a central two-leaf door and two side windows, all of which would have upper leaded diamond glass like the existing. In addition, the applicant proposes to cut a new opening for a door on the ground floor of the same rear two-story addition. The location of the proposed door seems to have had a larger window or door at an earlier time and currently has new brick infill. The new opening would have a six-panel wood door with a tripartite transom.

Mr. Danta described the proposal. Dave Schmauk and Mr. Monaghan, the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Monaghan informed the Commission that the bay is not metal and is much deteriorated. He proposes to recreate the leaded glass pattern in the new

doors and windows. Mr. Monaghan alerted the Commission that the bay is too narrow to retain the existing number of openings and also accommodate a door. Mr. Schmauk said that the proposed doors would be similar in style and that the deck would be set back about 100 feet away from Delancey Street. He pointed out that the same condition exists on the property to the east. Mr. Schmauk emphasized that the proposed alterations would be architecturally compatible with the current structure.

Mr. Steinberg suggested modifying the three central bays and retaining the side openings. Mr. James thought that the side of the bay would be the most appropriate location for the door. Mr. Schmauck said that the side of the bay could not accommodate the door.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which carried with 7 votes. Mr. James opposed the motion.

1921 Panama Street

Bob and Linda Brockway, Owners

Julie Stephens, Applicant

Date: alterations c. 1950

Proposal: Alter front door, add shutters

Architectural Committee recommendation: approval of either Scheme 1 or 2, provided shutters are installed on all three floors, with staff to review details.

This application proposes changes to the front door of the property and the addition of shutters on the ground and second floors. The existing door opening contains two fixed panels and an operable third. The two fixed panels have a single vertical muntin and five horizontal ones. The door has a centered recessed panel. The entryway has a standing seam metal shed roof, which gives the entire ensemble a strong Japanese aesthetic.

The historic file for this property contains a 1987 photograph showing a Neo-Colonial door surround. The applicant proposes to bring back this Neo-Colonial appearance and has submitted two schemes. Both schemes retain the tripartite configuration and show a six-panel wood door. In addition, both schemes propose to eliminate three of the five existing horizontal muntins. The difference in the two proposed schemes lies in the pedimented door surround. Scheme one, proposes a larger pediment with 10" wide pilasters. Scheme two, proposes a smaller version of the same pediment with 8" wide pilasters, more in keeping with the proportions of the 1987 door surround. The neo-colonial theme would be accentuated with the addition of paneled shutters on the ground floor and louvered shutters on the second floor. The application does not propose any shutters on the third floor.

Mr. Danta explained the proposal. Linda Brockway, the owner, attended the meeting. She stressed to the Commission her preference for Option 1 and she noted that she is receptive to installing shutters on all three floors. Ms. Brockway pointed out that two single houses had been combined; however, she believes that the current condition is not in keeping with the streetscape; therefore for she is proposing a more traditional door. Ms. Merriman asserted that the differences in the two schemes are minimal.

Ms. Smyler made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried with 7 votes. Mr. Steinberg dissented.

2019 Sansom Street

John Ciccone, Owner/Applicant

Date: c. 1885., listed as contributing.

Proposal: Add roof deck and stair access

Architectural Committee recommendation: approval of the deck, provided that the staff verifies with a mock-up that it will not be visible from Sansom Street, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and 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 proposes to construct a new roof deck and stair access on the third floor of this property. The deck would measure 16' by 31' and have a set back of 16' from the front façade (Sansom Street). The stair access would be located on east side of the deck and would roughly measure 5' by 7'. The stair access would have aluminum siding for cladding material.

Mr. Danta presented the application and conveyed that he visited the site to determine the visibility of the proposed deck. He concluded that the deck is only visible from Sansom Street. He noted that the owner is willing to recess the deck to minimize visibility.

Ms. Smyler made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which carried with 7 votes. Mr. James dissented.

321 South Iseminger Street

Ray Germann, Owner/Applicant

Date: c.1830

Proposal: Legalize roof deck and stair access

Architectural Committee recommendation: approval of the legalization of the deck, provided the penthouse roof is replaced with a flat roof

This application proposes to legalize a roof deck. The roof deck sits on the main block of the house, which does not have a rear ell. The roof deck measures 15' by 15' and has a stair access penthouse with a French door, cedar siding and a gabled roof covered with shingles. The roof deck is visible from the front façade of the building on Iseminger and from Panama Street. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the deck. The owner, in order to complete the construction, added a gabled roof over the stair access. The Department issued a Stop Work Order because the owner continued to work after the issuance of the violations.

Mr. Danta explained the proposal and noted that neighbors are opposed to the deck. He made a site visit for a determination of visibility. The visit showed that the deck is highly visible. It also showed that the building has no rear ell, but only a main block.

Charles Kelly, a neighbor, informed the Commission that there are no other roof top decks on the street. He emphasized that the deck, although built seven years ago, is

very visible. Mr. Kelly stressed that neighbors object to such a highly visible structure. He noted that there is a 35-foot height limitation, but the structure is 39 feet.

Ray Germann, the owner, offered that the deck previously existed and in June 2003 he replaced the stair access. At this time he put a gable roof on the structure; however, he is willing to substitute a flat roof for the gable roof. He believes that the deck is only visible from Panama Street. It was noted that photographs demonstrate its visibility from Iseminger Street.

Rachel Buurma, a neighbor, believes the stair tower, which backs up to the courtyard and is referred to as “the outhouse in the sky,” is out of character. Additionally, she objects to the work, which was done without a permit.

Mr. Steinberg voiced his disagreement with the Architectural Committee’s recommendation owing to his belief that the existing roofline is appropriate. He suggested that the owner set back the deck to minimize visibility. Mr. James concurred with the setting back of the deck. Mr. Germann said the setting back of the deck would require its re-construction owing to the existence of a chimney.

Mr. Huff was not convinced that setting back the deck would be of any consequence. Mr. Sugrue reiterated that this owner did not construct the deck. Mr. James concluded that a compromise should be considered because the current owner did not build the deck; however, he believes that the visibility issue should be addressed. Ms. Smyler suggested that the owner redesign the stair tower. Mr. Perri pointed out that a side swinging door is required by the building code.

Mr. Huff made a motion to accept the Committee’s recommendation. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which carried with 6 votes. Mr. James and Ms. Smyer dissented.

660 Chestnut Street, Public Ledger Building

Greit-Public Ledger, LLC, Owner

Marc Morfei, Applicant

Date: 1926-27 by Horace Trumbauer, listed as Significant.

Proposal: Add banners on pilasters

Architectural Committee recommendation: approval of the two banners, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and 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 proposes to add two new banners on the Chestnut Street façade of the 1926 Public Ledger building. The banners would be located at the western most entrance on that façade and partially cover two pilasters. The building currently has similar banners to those proposed that advertise the Lights of Liberty Show. These banners were approved in 1998. The proposed banners would be hung in the same manner as the existing ones. The support would be achieved by six pulleys attached to the granite base and marble entablature. These pulleys would in turn hold metal ropes to which the banners would attach. The banners themselves would have a vertical two-tone design and read “Center City District.”

Mr. Danta described the proposal. The Commission agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which carried with 7 votes. Mr. James dissented.

609 North 17th Street

Andrew Tull, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1859; listed contributing.

PROPOSAL: Legalize roof deck and penthouse

Architectural Committee recommendation: approval of the roof deck, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and 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 proposes to legalize a small roof deck. The deck is located on the rear ell of the property. It measures 5' by 7'. A stair tower serves as access to the deck. The roof of the stair tower sheds in a slope opposite to that of the roof; therefore, it is not visible from the front of the building. The rear of the property faces a service alley and other backyards.

Mr. Danta presented the proposal. Commission members discussed the proposal and concurred with the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which carried with 7 votes. Mr. James opposed the motion.

OLD BUSINESS

1812 Fairmount Avenue

Kevin Fleming, Owner

Sabrina Soong, Architect/Applicant

Date: c.1855

Proposal: New façade, cut garage in front wall

Architectural Committee Recommendation: denial of the demolition of the façade and the addition of the garage door, but approval of the rear addition and the removal of the perma-stone from the façade, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]; and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property...].

This application proposes restoring or demolishing the front façade of this stuccoed row-house and rebuilding it with a garage opening. The brick has been covered in perma-stone; however, past projects have demonstrated that it is often possible to remove this

covering and repoint the old brick with good results.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to table the proposal for a period not to exceed sixty (60) days and to place it first on the Commission's agenda of 12 August 2005. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

THE REPORT of the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, June 2005

Mr. Farnham asked if members of the Commission had any questions about the report. They had none.

HARRY A. MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. James made a motion to approve the \$29.85 expenditure for lunches for the Architectural Committee. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

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

The meeting adjourned at 12:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes