

**THE MINUTES OF THE 484th
STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
13 December 2002 at 9:00 a.m.**

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

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
Duane Bumb, Deputy Director, Commerce Department
Gary Hack, Chair, Philadelphia Planning Commission
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
Thomas Kilkenny
David Perri, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.
Norman Tissian

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
Eileen Quigley, Esq., Assistant City Solicitor, Law Department

Also

Aaron S. Weiner, Aaron S. Weiner Construction Company
Samuel Weiner, Dov Properties, LP, 204 Christian Street
Chris Klem, Systra Consulting
Katherine Frey, Ford Farewell Mills & Gatsch Architects
David O'Donnell, Queen Village Neighbors Association
Adam Laver, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers, LLP
Stephen Giannascoli, Triad Realty
Stephen Zwick, Ztecture PC
Dean Pailas, Operation manager Jack's Firehouse Restaurant
Scott Menkle, MCW Enterprises
Afia McKinley, owner, 69 East Logan Street
Stephen Verner, Cecil Baker and Associates
Penny Benith, Cecil Baker and Associates
Cecil Baker, Cecil Baker and Associates
Albert Taus, Albert Taus and Associates
Allan Domb, 226 South 16th Street
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance
Michael Hauptman, Brawer and Hauptman Architects
Theresa Stuhlman, Fairmount Park Commission

Executive Session

Prior to the start of the Commission meeting, Commission members held an executive session to discuss pending litigation.

Mr. Sklaroff, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:25 a.m.

Minutes of the 483rd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission. Mr. Sugrue added two corrections to the minutes in the matter of the designation of 109-131 North 2nd Street. Upon a motion made by Mr. Hack, the Commission unanimously approved, as corrected, the minutes of the 483rd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held 8 November 2002, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 26 November 2002

204 Christian Street

Aaron Weiner, Owner

Albert Taus, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1805

PROPOSAL: Rear deck, windows and doors

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 property and its environment would be unimpaired], with staff to review details.

This proposal involves alterations to the rear of a wood house. This house, which has suffered neglect and inappropriate alteration to the extent that Licenses and Inspections declared it dangerous, has recently sold to a new owner who wishes to restore the structure. The staff has signed a permit for most of the work to the front of the house. The applicant wishes to install a deck on the rear ell and some new windows and doors, on the south facing elevations.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. The Commission agreed with the recommendation of its Committee.

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

.

69 East Logan Street

Afia McKinley, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Rear addition, cutting new windows and door of carriage house

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with true divided light wood windows all around, a wood door and on the south elevation, the windows should be sized vertically to fit between the battens. On the rear addition, the windows may be wood clad in aluminum. They also recommended approval of a stucco covering for the addition if the applicant so chooses. These recommendations follow 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] all with staff to review details.

The proposal involves rehabilitation of a rear carriage house. The façade facing the road will receive new windows. An addition will extend off the rear façade.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal and pointed out that on the plans the square windows on the front façade, should have a more vertical orientation fitting between battens. Afia McKinley, the owner, attended the meeting and agreed to redesign the front façade windows to the vertical orientation.

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

1216 Spruce Street, SE corner of Camac Street

George Anni, Owner

Clayborn Cann, Applicant

DATE: c. 1821, altered 1840

PROPOSAL: New café windows, exhaust vent, rear decks, doors and fence

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal as submitted, with the legalization of the decks, with the 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, features, size, scale, proportion and massing to protect the property and its environment] and the mechanical systems guideline.] as submitted, with the legalization of the decks, with the staff to review details.

The proposal involves legalizing the building of two decks and an exhaust duct on this house and corner store. In addition, the applicant wishes to modify the storefront to feature operable café windows and wood bulkhead panels. H.V.A.C. units, installed on the roof with out a permit would be placed on the rear decks.

Mr. Baron explained the project and presented photographs, which show that roof decks existed previously on this property. Mr. Baron said that one of the roof decks was replaced owing to its deterioration; however, a cease work order has been issued for this property. Commission members asked for clarification of whether a deck existed because the plans note the rebuilding of rotted deck. The Commission asked that the revised application include time lines of construction to establish the condition of the property prior to alteration. Mr. Sklaroff emphasized the issue of legalizing roof decks and recommended that the proposal be tabled for a period not to exceed six (6) months.

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

2130-32 Fairmount Avenue and 655-59 North 22nd Street

Jack McDavid, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1904

PROPOSAL: Legalize demolition of brick wall, construction of new wall and new brick patio

The Architectural recommended approval of the demolition and construction of a new fence in wood at the rear of the 22nd Street properties and a new front wall along Fairmount Avenue either in metal or brick of equal height 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, proportion, and massing to protect 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 property and its environment would be unimpaired.] with the

staff to review details.

The proposal involves legalizing the demolition of a garden wall along the backs of houses facing 22nd Street, and demolishing a wall facing Fairmount Avenue. The applicant proposes building a new wall either out of brick or metal that would extend along the street and a wood fence in the yard areas of the rowhouses along 22nd Street, also owned by the same applicant. The new fence/wall would enclose a new brick patio area alongside the restaurant.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Mr. Sklaroff inquired if the demolished fence was historic; it was not.

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

128 South 19th Street, NW corner of Moravian Street

Jul Roe, Owner

Avram Hornik, Applicant

DATE: c. 1865, altered 1921 by Herman Wetherell

PROPOSAL: New storefront window with café windows, reopen window and door openings
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, proportion, and massing to protect 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 property and its environment would be unimpaired.]. All with staff to review details.

The proposal involves installing a restaurant in the first floor of this former deli. The side windows will be reopened and glazed with small pane sash to match the existing. The storefront will be rebuilt to incorporate café windows.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal. The Commission concurred with the Committee's recommendation.

Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents' Association/Preservation Alliance, noted that prior to the meeting, that she had numerous calls, expressing opposition to the proposal. Absent attendance by any of these persons, she declined to declare a position.

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

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

227 South 6th Street, Lippincott Building

MCW Enterprises, Owner

Stephen Verner, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1900, William Pritchett, architect

PROPOSAL: Handicap ramp, creation of interior courtyard, new mechanical chimneys
The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, including the ramp

with a 6 or 7 inch rise for the new landing, the courtyard, the mechanical rooms at roof without catwalks and the changes to the 6th Street elevation.

This project returns to the Committee and Commission with some revisions. Previously, the applicant wanted to lower the door on 6th Street to grade to meet accessibility requirements. Now, the proposal calls for leaving the door as is and adding a granite ramp with a metal picket railing. The railing will balance the new railing for the approved basement egress on the northern part of the façade.

The second part of the application is for a new interior courtyard at the northern section of the building. To meet light and air codes for units, the owner wishes to install a courtyard. The building's north façade will not change, but a portion of it will become an exterior wall on both sides. The courtyard is 25 feet in width and eight feet deep. The wall will receive structural stiffeners on the interior face and windows will be weatherproofed.

The third part of the proposal calls for three large elevator machinery rooms on the roof. They will sit at the northern end of the building, but will be visible. The rooms will be sheathed in standing-seam metal in the same color as the roof and other mechanical chimneys. Catwalks would connect the rooms.

In addition, fenestration and roof details of the penthouse differ from the previously approved application.

Ms. Spina explained the proposal. Mr. Sugrue inquired if the catwalks have visibility. Ms. Spina responded that visibility exists from St. James Street and noted that the applicants prefer the catwalks. In the discussion of the ladder, Mr. Perri said that he thought that the code does not require a ladder. However, Stephen Verner, the architect, explained that an examiner at the Department of Licenses and Inspections said that one ladder for Fire Department roof access is required. Mr. Perri deferred to the information given by the examiner.

Mr. Hack made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion which carried with 7 votes. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

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

Allan Domb, Owner

Gordon Fluke, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1929, Grant Simon, architect

PROPOSAL: Windows, doors, HVAC vents and penthouse

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the simulated-divided-light wood windows for the upper floors provided the profiles, details and dimensions match the original with staff to review details. The majority of the Committee voted to recommend restoration or replication of the lower floor windows (below the 3rd floor) with true-divided-light wood windows with staff to review details. The Committee split 2-2 on the proposed new glass entrance on 16th Street. They recommended approval of the north and east door modifications and the new louvers on the north façade. The Committee voted to recommend conceptual approval for the partial removal of sections of the stone parapet wall at the 18th floor (30" above floor) reinstalling the coping and the addition of a simple railing at those locations. The Committee voted to recommend approval of the penthouse addition with more vertical fenestration on the east and west elevations and staff to review details. They recommended denial of the exterior fireplaces and split 2-2 on the horizontal wooden pergola.

This application has several parts. The Committee and Commission previously approved

changing several window openings and creating new windows in the building. The owner wishes to install new metal-clad wood windows with simulated divided lights in all of the openings. The muntin pattern and brick mold would replicate the historic windows, but the applicant must supply shop drawings to verify this.

The Committee and Commission approved, in concept, changing the entrance on 16th Street. The proposal returns with details of the new door. The entrance will have a stainless steel panel with a large, single-light storefront window on one side and a single-leaf, frame-less glass door on the other, and a stainless steel transom bar and single-light transom above. The current service door on the 16th Street façade will get new flush metal doors and frame, painted to match the surrounding stone. The application also calls for a new door on the St. James Street (north) façade of the building. This door will have a metal panel with a double-leaf door on one side and a single-leaf door on the other, with a vent in the transom area.

For the mechanical systems, the proposal includes installing a large vent on the St. James Street façade at each floor. Each vent will be four feet, four inches tall and six feet wide. The owner proposes to paint them to match the surrounding stone.

The 18th floor has a setback with a high parapet wall. Now that the building will have a residential use, the owner wishes to cut parts of the parapet wall to offer a view out of the windows. The proposal calls for cutting the stone parapet in several sections and installing a glass railing.

Lastly, the application includes a two-story penthouse addition. The Committee and Commission approved a one-story penthouse for a previous developer. This proposal calls for a stucco addition with large, one-over-one double-hung windows. The first floor of the penthouse will have a setback of five feet from the roof of the 18th floor on the south façade. The second-floor will have a setback of four feet from the roof of the first floor on the south facade, but will have a pergola and two outdoor fireplaces.

Ms. Spina presented the application. Mr. Baron pointed out that the current door on 16th Street has a framework and a smaller scale in the division of glass, which is more in keeping with the rest of the building. In addition, he said that the pergola would have visibility and it is important that the building keeps its formality.

Cecil Baker, the architect, said that he does not have a problem with the frame around the door or the elimination of fireplaces and the pergola. He remarked that the aluminum clad is the preferred window owing to its durability and that scaffolding would be required to paint the wood windows. The proposed windows would match the profile of the existing exactly. Allan Domb, the owner, noted that Pella does not make true divided-light windows. Mr. Baker believed that the wood true divided-light might be an issue for Pella manufacturers.

Mr. Sugrue inquired if the aluminum-clad windows would appear different. Mr. Hack concurred that long-term maintenance is an issue, and concurred with the applicant about aluminum-clad for the upper floors. Mr. Tyler reiterated that the details of the proposed windows would match the wood profile exactly. Mr. James emphasized the importance of not setting a precedent. He also stressed that the Commission should apply the same consideration to private homeowners as that of large property owners. Mr. Sugrue said that there is a significant cornice line at the 4th floor, and that the average townhouse in the city does not exceed four stories; therefore, the fifth floor should be the point at which the aluminum-clad windows should be considered. Mr. Hack disagreed, and said that the average view of a pedestrian is not more than thirty feet.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to approve the Architectural Committee's recommendation but with

true-divided-light wood windows on the first two floors, wood simulated-divided-light windows on the third and fourth floors and aluminum-clad windows with simulated-divided-light on the fifth floor and above, all to match existing wood profile; new 16th Street door with small panes and framing; new service door on 16th Street; new entrance on north façade; and vents on north façade, with the staff to review details. Conceptual approval of the removal of portions of the parapet to 30 inches, keeping the stone caps with the installation of a simple railing. Denial of the fireplaces and pergola. Mr. Hack seconded the motion which carried with 5 votes. Mr. Perri and Mr. Hack dissented. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

2232 Locust Street, SE corner of 23rd Street

Locust 23 Associates, Owner
Michael Sher, Applicant
DATE: 1907, C. Hoffman
PROPOSAL: Legalize rear fence

The applicant withdrew the proposal.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

2110 Chancellor Street aka 223 South Van Pelt Street

Ara Chalian, Owner
Michael Hauptman, Architect/Applicant
DATE: c. 1867
PROPOSAL: Rooftop addition with deck in concept
With a vote of two to one, the Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal in concept with the inclusion of the air conditioning units, provided that they are not visible. Ms Pentz opposed the recommendation.

This application for approval in concept proposes the construction of a 1-story addition atop a 2-story carriage house at 2110 Chancellor Street. It also proposes the maintenance of the historical facades including masonry cleaning and painting of trim and doors.

An earlier version of this project was considered at the 24 September 2002 Architectural Committee meeting. Only two Committee members were present. Mr. Rivera recommended approval; Ms. Pentz recommended denial. After the Committee meeting, the applicant requested a one-month continuance. During the interim, he presented the design to the Zoning Committee of the Center City Residents' Association. The Zoning Committee voted not to oppose the zoning for the project provided that the applicant change the contrasting metal panels on the Chancellor Street façade of the addition from the brick color to the color of the other metal pieces. A letter stating this position is included in the application.

At the 8 November 2002 Commission meeting, after the one-month continuance, the applicant presented an updated design to the Commission. The new design accounts for some of the Committee's comments, but not the request of the Center City Residents' Association. The three major changes to the design since the earlier review are:

- Elimination of the skylight above the stairs;
- Elimination of the deck extension; and
- Reduction of the height of the addition.

At its 8 November 2002 meeting, the Commission remanded the updated design back to the

Committee for review.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal, which is in concept. Michael Hauptman, the architect, attended the meeting.

Mr. Sugrue said that he has reservations approving such a significant change to the building. Mr. Sklaroff commented that it is well designed.

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

City Hall, Broad and Market Streets

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Peter Gaffer, Applicant

DATE: 1871-1901, John McArthur Jr. with T.U. Walter

PROPOSAL: Headhouse for sidewalk elevator lift on east side of City Hall

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the bollards as proposed, but denial of the elevator housing design as submitted. It recommended that the applicants revise the design to include the modifications discussed.

Mr. Farnham presented the project and informed the Commission that the elevator lift portion of the proposal has been withdrawn. The applicants propose to refurbish the existing elevator lift. Approval of the bollards is the only remaining element of this proposal.

Commission members thought that the bollards should mimic the existing ones around City Hall.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to approve the bollards. Mr. Hack seconded the motion which carried with 7 votes. Mr. James abstained.

4231 North Concourse Drive, Memorial Hall

City of Philadelphia, Owner

Robert Jones, Applicant

DATE: 1876, Herman Schwarzmenn

PROPOSAL: Roofing, coping and gutter system

The Architectural Committee recommended approval 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.].

This submission proposes the repair and replacement of roofing and drainage systems, installation of a waterproofing and drainage system between the interior and exterior domes, and the repair and replacement of several ornamental details at Memorial Hall in Fairmount Park. It includes:

- re-roofing around the exterior dome
- repointing and installing lead joint covers at the north elevation coping
- cleaning the interior dome
- installing a waterproofing and drainage system above the interior dome
- replacing the copper cove sheet metal above the gutter to match existing
- replacing two damaged ornamental shields
- replacing seven 1975 foam replicas of ornamental garlands to match originals

- repairing the sheet metal rising walls
- repairing the dome gutter
- re-roofing over the north office space

The applicant provided no details regarding the replacement of the two damaged ornamental shields and scant details regarding the replacement of the seven 1975 foam replicas of the ornamental garlands. The possibility of restoring, rather than replacing, the shields should be explored. Details of the restoration and/or replacement of the ornamental features should be submitted for review.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal. Theresa Stuhlman, Fairmount Park Commission, said that this is a million-dollar project to eliminate water infiltration between the two dome systems.

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

OLD BUSINESS

309-11 South Street

Axelrod Giannascoli Realty Group, Owner

Adam E. Laver, Esq., Applicant

DATE: c. 1895

PROPOSAL: Legalize windows

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of this application pursuant to Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.]; 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 [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.].

This application proposes to legalize the 1/1 PVC windows installed without a permit on the second and third floors of the building at 309-311 South Street. Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the illegal windows on 20 May 2002. It was also noted that an illegal roll-down gate and sign hangs over the storefront. On 10 April 1999 the Commission unanimously voted to deny a proposal for such a gate and sign. The applicant should also come before the Commission to legalize the storefront modifications.

Carl Primavera, counsel for the applicant argued that the information presented is misleading and intimates that the applicant knowingly proceeded with work absent a permit. Stephen Giannascoli, the owner, said that the windows were very deteriorated and that he asked a contractor to replace them; however, he had no knowledge that a permit was needed until the receipt of the violation. He also noted that the tenant installed the roll-down gate and signage, without his knowledge. Mr. Primavera argued that owing to the context of the street, the proposed windows are appropriate. In addition, the replaced windows were not original.

Mr. Baron said that typically vinyl windows do not have a putty slope. Mr. Sklaroff stressed that the replacement windows should be the historically correct windows.

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

motion which carried with 6 votes. Mr. Tissian dissented. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

THE REPORT of the Activities of the Historical Commission staff, November 2002.
Mr. Tyler asked if members of the Commission had any questions about the report. There were none. Mr. Tyler remarked that his predecessor Grant Simon designed the University Club.

Mr. Tyler gave a special mention of Margaret Tinkcom, who passed away last week. As the Commission's first historian, Ms. Tinkcom helped establish the structure of the office and oversaw much of the research now in the Commissions files.

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

The meeting adjourned at 10:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary

Corrected 1/10/03