

**THE MINUTES OF THE 437th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
13 January 1999**

**Commission Conference Room, One Parkway, 1515 Arch St., 18th Fl.
Wayne S. Spilove, Chair**

Present

Wayne S. Spilove, Chair
Duane Bumb, Deputy Director, Department of Commerce
David Brownlee, Ph.D.
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
Barbara Kaplan, Executive Director, City Planning Commission
Carol Lawrence
Shelly Merhige, Office of City Council President
David Perri, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Michael Sklaroff, Esq.
Robert Thomas
Dennis Ward III
Scott Wilds, Assistant Director for Housing, Office of Housing and Urban Development
Caroline Wischmann
Stephanie G. Wolf, Ph.D.

Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Kristin Cardi, Historic Preservation Planner
Elizabeth Harvey, Historic Preservation Planner
R. Scott Jacob, Executive Secretary
Laura Spina, Historic Preservation Planner
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Mark Zecca, Esq., Deputy City Solicitor

Also

Joshua Bernstein, Esq.
Vida Welsh
Philip Senechal
Jefferson Clark
Daniel Bosin
Cary Borish
Aliko Strakes, Preservation Alliance
Edward Palmer
P. Dhunno
Dominic Ward
Sarah Ward
Vincent Cho
George Manos
Olga Shorokhova, Manos Architects
Michael Twerski, Esq.
Steven Levinson
Toby Olson
Roland Davies
Richard Thom
Tamara Myers
Patrick Lavin, Greater Media Cable

Alan Werther, Esq.
Daniel Taylor, Bank Philadelphia
Elizabeth Schneck
William G. Schwartz, Esq.

Wayne Spilove, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 437th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 10:00 A.M.

MINUTES of the 436th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Jacob to amend the minutes of the 436th Stated Meeting to reflect the presence or absence of Commission members at the vote to approve an honorarium for an expert witness regarding the *Dream Garden* mosaic mural. He also recollected that the Commission discussed and possibly voted to assist the residents of Winona Street with the replacement of the street's historic paving materials. Commission members and staff did not remember the Commission's voting on the issue. Mr. Jacob stated that he would amend the minutes to reflect his findings from listening to the tape of the meeting.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Wilds and duly seconded, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the 436th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held on 9 December 1998, as amended, Wayne S. Spilove, Chair.

REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 29 December 1998, Robert Thomas, Chair.

1839 Spruce Street, a.k.a. 275 South 19th Street, Rittenhouse Place

Rittenhouse Place Condominium Association, Owner of building's common areas and facade
Cary Borish, Co-owner of ground-floor restaurant condominium unit/Applicant

DATE: 1924

PROPOSAL: Request for a continuance regarding the new café doors

Mr. Thomas recused himself from the discussion and the vote owing to his architectural firm's affiliation with the proposal.

Cary Borish, Co-owner of ground-floor restaurant condominium unit, requested a continuance of at least two months. Commission members agreed to grant him a continuance until the March Commission meeting. Mr. Baron noted that the applicant must make a submission for inclusion on the agenda for the 23 February Architectural Committee meeting. *Mr. Ward made a motion to grant a two-month continuance. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried with ten votes. Mr. Thomas recused himself.*

209 North 3rd Street

Richard Tucker, Owner
Richard Thom, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1825

PROPOSAL: Cut new windows in side wall; facade rehabilitation

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the proposal, with the changes to the door, windows and barge board, with staff to review and approve details.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves renovating an empty building for a ground-floor office with apartments above. This will entail installing new wood windows on the front facade and cutting new windows into the blank side facade. The ground floor of the side facade will receive a new door. Several of the new window openings lie within a non-original portion of the building. The proposal also calls for the rehabilitation, not replacement, of the existing dormer.

Mr. Thomas stated that Committee members asked the applicant to:

1. Consider locating the new door and a few of the windows in the location of existing cinder block-filled openings on the side facade.
2. Use a three light pane configuration in the half-circle window on the top floor.
3. Install a beaded barge board at the roof line.
4. retain the remaining shutter hardware.
5. revise the design of the proposed door to lend the appearance of double doors.

Mr. Baron showed the Commission revised drawings reflecting some of the Committee's recommendations. The applicant stated that he did not place windows in all of the existing cinder block-filled openings on the side facade.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to approve the proposal, with revisions proposed by the Committee. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

611 Spring Garden Street, German Society of Pennsylvania

German Society of Pennsylvania, Owner

Richard Thom, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1888

PROPOSAL: Mechanicals in side yard

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the proposal, conditioned upon the installation of a fence and a landscape screen of equal height surrounding the mechanicals, and painting the exposed ductwork to match the brick.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves installing mechanicals for a new air conditioning unit in the yard adjacent to the building as well as some external ductwork. The Architect plans to place a fence around the mechanical equipment, with a landscape screen in front of it. Mr. Thomas stated that staff asked the applicant to make the landscape screen as high as the fence, and to paint the exposed ductwork to match the brick of the building. A possible future addition would conceal the mechanicals and ductwork.

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

311 Lawrence Court

John Ditunno, Owner

Robert LaRouche, Applicant

DATE: 1971

PROPOSAL: Enclose fourth-floor front deck

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial.

Mr. Sklaroff inquired about the Commission's jurisdiction over modern buildings within the proposed Society Hill Historic District. Commission members explained that this property is listed as "contributing" to the district, and dated from the Redevelopment Period of Society Hill.

Mr. Brownlee noted that the renovation and redevelopment of Society Hill constitutes a period of significance in the nomination, and an important aspect of the evolution of twentieth century American architecture. Mr. Sklaroff asked the Commission to decline jurisdiction, and to approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. Wilds thought the proposal warranted approval owing to its age. Mr. Perri noted that this proposal also requires a zoning variance.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves altering a modern row house within the Society Hill District. The applicant proposes roofing over the fourth floor deck similar to several other houses in the development down the street. The line of the roof would fall lower than the adjacent ones because a glass roof requires a steeper pitch. Mr. Thomas stated that Committee members decided not to recommend approval of the proposal after learning that this rowhouse belongs to a "cluster" of only two rowhouses in this small development as opposed to a row of several, and because of its intact condition. Mr. Thomas suggested the applicant could use a roll-down awning instead of the permanent roofing.

Joshua Bernstein, counsel for the applicant, showed the Commission photographs of twelve other houses within the seventeen-house development that have enclosed decks in like locations. Owing to the number of neighboring houses with enclosed decks, Commission members decided to approve the proposal in a manner that addresses the design of the neighboring deck enclosures. Commission members agreed that the Architectural Committee and staff should review and approve final details for appropriateness.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the enclosure of the roof deck, with a revised design to address the design of the neighboring deck enclosures, with the Architectural Committee and staff to review and approve final details for appropriateness. Mr. Sklaroff seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Mr. Spilove turned the Chair over to Ms. Wolf. Mr. Perri left the meeting at this time.

707 Pine Street

Pia Roychowdhury, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1761

PROPOSAL: Replace pineapple feature on railing

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of replacing the pineapple feature, including the use of stock materials from a catalog, with staff to review and approve details.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves the restoration of the pineapple shaped iron feature on the railing of an historic row house. The Redevelopment Authority plans call for the replacement of this feature in the rehabilitation specifications for the building similar to the remaining pineapple feature on the neighboring rowhouse. The applicant claims to have encountered much difficulty in finding an accurate replication of the pineapple, and has received estimates of several thousand dollars to have it copied. Mr. Thomas stated that Committee members discussed several options to mitigate the expense of replacing the pineapple feature, including the use of stock materials from a catalog, with staff to review and approve details.

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

Mr. Spilove returned to the meeting and resumed the Chair.

210 Race Street

William Becker, Owner/Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Fenestration on side facade

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the proposal, conditioned upon the submission of a letter of consent from the owner of the neighboring property for the proposed changes.

Mr. Thomas explained that the applicant proposes to install new windows in the former party wall of the building, and that Committee members expressed concern that these new elements through a former party wall may precipitate problems in the future. He stated that the Committee asked the applicant to secure a letter of consent from the owner of the neighboring property for the proposed changes. Commission members inquired whether that applicant had secured the letter of consent, as specified in the Committee report. The applicant has not secured the letter. The Commission decided not to make the letter of permission a condition.

Mr. Baron showed the Commission revised drawings with alteration to the windows on the side facade. The Commission did not object to these changes.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to approve the revised proposal, without the condition of the submission of a letter of consent from the owner of the neighboring property for the proposed changes. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

634 South American Street, nw corner at Bainbridge Street

Matthew Sandler and Corliss Cavalieri, Owners

Tamara Myers, Applicant

DATE: c. 1800

PROPOSAL: Privacy fence at rear deck

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Ms. Lawrence recused herself from the discussion and the vote.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves adding a privacy screen to the top of the previously approved visible roof deck railing. The applicant will construct the screen of wood panels containing one-half inch slats. Mr. Thomas noted that the garage addition of the house, on which the deck sits, is recessed from the historic portion.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which carried with eleven votes. Ms. Lawrence recused herself.

222 Bainbridge Street, sw corner at American Street

Vida Welsh, Owner

Roland Davies, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1770

PROPOSAL: New dormer, deck and side vent

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of:

1. A rear deck, with railings that incorporate more openness such as the railing on the neighboring building at the southeast corner of Monroe and South American Streets.
2. A new dormer to resemble the rear dormer of the adjacent house and deck-access door.
3. A kitchen stove exhaust vent through the wall of the rear ell painted to match the bricks.

The proposal includes:

1. A rear deck.
2. A new dormer and door to access the deck.
3. A kitchen stove exhaust vent through the wall of the rear ell.

Commission members expressed concern over these rather dramatic changes to this eighteenth century building. Mr. Thomas explained that the Committee also objected to the largeness of the proposed dormer and aspects of the roof deck. Mr. Baron showed revised drawings for the proposal that reflect the Committee's recommendations. In response to a question from Mr. Sklaroff concerning roof decks, Mr. Tyler stated that buildings of this period often had decks on the roof. Mr. Thomas noted that the buildings suffered significant insensitive alteration already.

Ms. Merhige made a motion to approve the revised proposal. Ms. Kaplan seconded the motion which carried with ten votes. Mr. James and Mr. Sklaroff dissented.

Commission members asked for more time to review revised proposals that reflect the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Lawrence also asked for more photographs of the surrounding areas when the design of a proposal correlates with neighboring buildings.

Mr. Spilove excused himself again and turned the Chair over to Ms. Wolf.

913 Spruce Street

John and Karin Sirlin, Owners

David Amburn, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1816

PROPOSAL: Rear deck, garage modification

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval, with staff to review and approve details.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves modifying an existing garage and installing a deck on top. Mr. Thomas stated that Committee members did not object to the proposal, but did discuss issues of water drainage.

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

219-225 South 18th Street, Rittenhouse Regency

Rittenhouse Regency Affiliates, Norman Dimson, Managing Partner, Owner

Brad Shaw, Houlihan's Restaurant Group, Applicant

DATE: 1929

PROPOSAL: New shopfront and metal entrance awning

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that the applicant returns with a new storefront design based on drawings that have received approval on the rest of the building's ground-floor facade. The new café doors will have a multi-pane design with true divided lights. A new, barrel-vaulted metal awning over the door represents a departure from existing design on the building. The proposal also includes open-sided, non-illuminated canvas awnings with no lip. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee agreed that these elements complement the existing shopfronts on this building. William Schwartz, counsel for the applicant, explained that applicants wish to change the name of the restaurant from the one on the submitted plans.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, and the name change. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1535 Locust Street, ne corner at 16th Street

Bank Philadelphia, Owner

Elizabeth Schneck, Applicant

DATE: 1928

PROPOSAL: Redesign ATM location; illuminated signage

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves modifying an existing ATM installation and adding a slightly projecting sign. He stated that protective coating will keep the copper panel proposed for the ATM niche from oxidizing. Ms. Kaplan asked whether the Commission approved the existing ATM alcove. Mr. Baron stated that it predates the building's designation.

Mr. James inquired about the proposed railings. The applicant stated that the new railings will replace existing.

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

1709 Walnut Street

Green Village Food Market, Owner

George Manos, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1929

PROPOSAL: New storefront facade

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the new proposal, with the addition of the stone base next to the right-side door, and with the specifics of the photomural to return to the Architectural Committee.

Mr. Thomas explained that the architect has modified his proposal to rebuild the storefront of this Art-Deco commercial building. He stated that George Manos, architect for the proposal, asked the Committee to recommend approval of the photomural from the earlier proposal because he considers it an integral component of the new design, and that the Committee agreed to recommend approval of the photomural subject to further submission of details to the Architectural Committee for its review.

Mr. Baron showed the Commission revised drawings with the introduction of logo signage and a name change. Commission members expressed concern over approving new design elements without the benefit of Architectural Committee review. The Commission also discussed the need to review all aspects of the proposal at one time, instead of piecemeal, as with this

applicant. George Manos, architect for the proposal, stated that he has not chosen the final design for the photomural. Commission members also discussed the possibility of separating the signage and lighting aspects of the proposal from the structural elements.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to deny the proposal and send it back to the Architectural Committee to review all the aspects, including the photomural at the same time. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion. The motion did not carry.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to approve the window and door aspects of the proposal, without the signage, lighting and portion of the design with the fire door and photomural. Mr. Sklaroff seconded the motion which carried with nine votes. Ms. Merhige dissented and Mr. Wilds abstained.

1701 Delancey Street, rear of Tenth Presbyterian Church

Tenth Presbyterian Church, Owner

Matthew White, Applicant

DATE: 1905

PROPOSAL: Mechanicals in yard; new gate

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of:

- 1. Installing a transformer within an enclosed but visible yard space.*
- 2. Replacement of the current chain link fencing with an upgraded chain link or, when money becomes available, an iron fence and installation of a new brick post.*
- 3. Replacing an existing fire escape with a ladder type escape.*

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves:

1. Installing a transformer within an enclosed but visible yard space.
2. Replacement of the current chain link fencing with an black vinyl coated chain link or when money becomes available an iron fence, with a post and built to accommodate either fence.
3. Replacing an existing fire escape with a ladder type escape.

Commission members expressed concern over granting approval for future work when money becomes available. Mr. Baron stated that approval will help the church to raise funds. Commission members agreed to approve all phases of the proposal, but insisted that the iron fence, if completed, must not differ from the current proposal.

Ms. Kaplan made a motion to accept the Committee 's recommendation. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1509 Walnut Street

Avado Brands, Inc., Owner

William Palmer, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1960

PROPOSAL: Café windows; louvers in basement windows

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approve the proposal with the new louvers set back behind the existing basement grates, with staff to review and approve details.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal calls for removing the existing awnings and installing wood café doors within an existing non-original storefront opening and louvers in the

basement window openings. The applicant also seeks to install a fire department connection with an accessory bell. Mr. Thomas stated that Committee members asked the applicant to install the new louvers behind the existing basement grates. The applicant explained that the new name for the restaurant will require minor changes to the signage aspect of the proposal.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, with staff to review and approve details of the minor sign changes. Mr. Sklaroff seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Society Hill, 10 Locations: South Front and Lombard Streets, sw corner; 100-110 Spruce Street; South 2nd and Lombard Streets, sw corner; South 2nd and Spruce Streets, sw corner; South 3rd and Walnut Streets, sw corner; South 4th Street and St. James Place, se corner; South 6th and Locust Streets, se corner; South 6th and Pine Streets, se corner; South 6th and Spruce Streets, se corner; South 8th and Pine Streets, sw corner

Patrick Lavin, Greater Media Cable, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Cable boxes on sidewalks

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Denial of the proposal as submitted, the applicant to return after further study of the possibility of installing the boxes underground.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal involves installing cable boxes on the sidewalks. These boxes will supply cable service for emergency purposes for up to four hours. The proposed boxes will measure 17" by 28" wide and 36" high. Greater Media Cable has made attempts to reduce the number of boxes from ten to five. Mr. Thomas stated that Committee members agreed that the boxes have some detrimental impact on the street scape and asked the applicant to explore alternative, or possibly underground, locations, and cited the various sorts of approvals required, such as a City Council Ordinance and Streets Department approval.

Mr. Baron suggested the Commission might send the issue to the Telecommunications Committee.

Norman Tissian stated that the Society Hill Civic Association (SHCA) opposes the proposal until further study of the possibility of installing the boxes underground. He also asserted that SHCA wants to have more say regarding the locations of the cable boxes. He asked the applicant to explain the necessity for these boxes. The applicant stated that the boxes provide emergency power for several hours should the usual system fail. Alik Strakes of the Preservation Alliance read a statement in opposition to the current proposal, and stated that the Alliance would also like to see the boxes installed underground.

Commission members discussed options for less conspicuous locations, including interior installations. The applicant agreed to return to the Commission after conducting further study of alternate methods and locations of installation.

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

237-247 South 18th Street, Barclay Hotel

Barclay Condominium Association, Owner

Philip Senechal, Unit Owner

Alan Werther, Applicant

DATE: 1928

PROPOSAL: Balcony in visible side court of building

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the new proposal with the details reviewed and approved by staff, and the Commission to advise the condominium association to devise a regulatory system to relegate any future applications for similar balconies to this or like locations behind the smoke stairs within the light court, and on this building only.

Mr. Thomas explained that this application represents a modification to a former proposal to install a balcony and doors to access the balcony. That application, denied by the Committee, Commission and the Board of License and Inspection Review has reached court. The applicant now seeks a compromise to install the balcony on the west wall of the U-shaped light court adjacent to an existing fire landing.

Mr. Thomas stated that the applicant presented new drawings for the proposal to the Committee, but without dimensions. The balcony will now remain partially obscured by the existing fire balcony. Mr. Baron informed the Commission that the new dimensions are five feet by ten feet, and explained that they had to lengthen it to miss an existing window. The balcony will now only extend beyond the fire balcony by two feet. Mr. Thomas explained that the view corridor of the proposed balcony along the north side of Locust Street extends less than thirty feet wide.

Mr. Thomas explained the Committee's recommendation that, should this proposal receive approval, a regulatory system should relegate any future applications for similar balconies to this or like locations behind the fire balconies within the light court, and on this building only. Mr. Thomas noted that the applicant described current discord among the controlling members of the condominium association may precipitate difficulties in passing any regulations presently.

Mr. Tyler asked whether, in view of the simplicity of this proposal, this application warrants final approval with staff to review and approve details. He also stated that the Commission could advise the condominium association of this application and the Commission's decision. Mr. Zecca chronicled the various legal proceedings stemming from the earlier applicant and subsequent Commission denial. He asked the applicant to formally state for the record that, with today's conditioned approval, his client withdraws the appeal to the Commission's initial denial, with prejudice.

Alan Werther, counsel for the owner of the unit, stated that, with today's conditioned approval, his client withdraws the appeal to the Commission's initial denial, with prejudice.

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

127 Kenilworth Street

Dominic and Sarah Ward, Owners/Applicants

DATE: Original building - c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Rebuild house on historic site

Architectural Committee Recommendation: Approval of the proposal, with staff to review and approve detail of the window sills.

Mr. Thomas explained that this proposal comes back with a revised drawing to show the construction of a new house. The house will follow much of the design of the now demolished historic carriage house formerly standing on the site. He stated that the Committee raised no objections to the plans for the new construction. Mr. Wilds inquired about the upper levels of the

new building and the roof deck. Mr. Baron explained that the upper-levels are set back far enough to mitigate their visibility. Mr. Sklaroff asked the owners if, aside from jurisdictional questions, they are satisfied with their proposal. Mr. and Mrs. Ward affirmed their satisfaction. The Commission did not object to the new proposal.

Ms. Merhige made a motion to accept the Committee 's recommendation. Ms. Wischmann seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Dominic Ward, Owner of the property, asked whether he needs to include the faux hoist in the design of the house. Commission members agreed that the new building need not have this element of the demolished carriage house. Mr. Thomas and Mr. James thought that the applicant should retain the hoist as an integral feature of a reconstructed carriage house.

Mr. Sklaroff made a motion to allow the applicant to delete the faux hoist from the proposal. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion which carried with eleven votes. Mr. Thomas and Mr. James dissented.

Certified Local Government, Training session

Mr. Tyler asked the members of the Historical Commission to attend the monthly training sessions conducted by Commission staff. He explained that the members need to attend these meetings or other historic preservation related events in order to retain our Certified Local Government status. The Commission decided to hold the meetings every third Wednesday of the month, at 8:00 a.m., in the Commission Conference Room, 18th Floor, One Parkway, 1515 Arch Street. The meetings will begin in February.

REPORT on the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, December 1998, Richard Tyler

Mr. Tyler noted a few highlights from the staff report. He stated that the Financial Hardship Committee will meet again prior to the February Commission meeting.

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

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Scott Jacob
Executive Secretary