

**THE MINUTES OF THE 502nd MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

11 June 2004

City Council Caucus Room, 4th Floor, City Hall

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair

Warren Huff, City Planning Commission

Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property

Nathaniel Parks, Commerce Department

David Perri, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections

Vincent Rivera, AIA

Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.

Norman Tissian

Scott Wilds, Deputy Director for Policy and Planning, Office of Housing Community Development

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist

Jonathan Farnham, Historic Preservation Planner

Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary

Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner

Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Lawrence Copeland, Esq., Senior Attorney, Law Department

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

Also

Michael Mattioni, Esq., 413 South 3rd Street

James W. Pearson, Jr., Esq., 1612-1618 Locust Street

Charles Bode, Philadelphia Trolley Coalition

Mark D. Sanders, President, Philadelphia Street Railway Historical Society

Robert H. Machler, Deltran

Harvey Clark, 2212 Wallace Street

Irvin J. Borowsky, Chairman, National Liberty Museum

Robert Hawk, National Liberty Museum

Sandra Kelly, National Liberty Museum

Anthony J. Citino, 1725 West Porter Street

Charles McGloughlin, Metcalfe Architect and Design

Marvin Gerstein, Temple University

Michael Silver, owner, 413 South 3rd Street

Greg Tribb, Wachovia Bank

Kevin Manion, Wachovia Bank

Dan Griffith, Wachovia Bank

Lew M. Halas, Tantala Associates, 911-17 Clinton Street

Hyman Myers, Vitetta Group

James Campbell, Campbell Thomas and Company, 5218 Germantown Avenue

Pete Thomas, Elwyn, Incorporated, 5218 Germantown Avenue

Leonard Reuter, City of Philadelphia Law Department
Rick Cole, Richard M. Cole and Associates
Julia Haus, Richard M. Cole and Associates
Patricia Perlstein, 2031 Walnut Street
John and James Kolea, 110-12 South Front Street
Richard DeMarco, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg and Ellers LLP
Laurie Phillips, 237 South 18th Street
Joanne Phillips, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews and Ingersoll
Lynn Blahausch, 1601 Locust Street
Jerry Roller, J.K. Roller Architects
Tony Forte, Esq., Saul Ewing, for Temple University
Stephen Anderson, Zimmers Associates Architects
Carl Primavera, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg and Ellers LLP
Oleh L. Janusz, Janusz Woodwork and Construction
Spence Kass, Kass and Associates
Dianne Chambless, 929 Clinton Street
Alan Goldstein, 929 Clinton Street
Gersil N. Kay, Building Conservation International
Robert Powers, Powers and Company
James P. Leonard, 1812-1818 Locust Street
Matthew McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews and Ingersoll
Cathy Harris, Mural Arts Program, 25 South Van Pelt Street
Jane Golden, Mural Arts Program, 25 South Van Pelt Street
Paz Gutierrez, Mural Arts Program, 25 South Van Pelt Street
Donald Gensler, Mural Arts Program, 25 South Van Pelt Street
Jay Eisner, 1939 Pine Street
Janice Woodcock, Woodcock Design, 1939 Pine Street
Steven Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association

502nd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 502nd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:10 a.m.

Minutes of the 501st Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Upon a motion made by Mr. Huff and seconded by Mr. Rivera, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the 501st Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, as corrected, held 14 May 2004, Thomas Sugrue, Vice-Chair.

OLD BUSINESS

413 South 3rd Street

Michael Silver, Owner

Richard Cole, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Cut new windows in south façade

The Architectural Committee voted two to one to recommend denial of the proposal, pursuant to Standard

2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; and Standard 3 [Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.].

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission, which proposes cutting four new window openings and installing 6-over-6, wood, true-divided-light windows in the south façade of this rowhouse at the northeast corner of 3rd and Stamper Streets. The south façade faces Stamper Street. The south, brick façade is unfenestrated (except the half-round attic window) and entirely original.

Michael Mattioni, counsel for the owner, and Michael Silver, the owner, attended the meeting. Mr. Mattioni said that the three proposed windows are part of a major renovation and that all salvaged bricks would be stored on the site. Mr. Silver urged the Commission to give consideration to the alterations, since he believes that the lower window will deter vandalism. He noted that the neighbors as well as the Society Hill Civic Association support the proposed alterations.

Mr. Wilds strongly asserted the significance of the historic wall and he declared his opposition to the proposed alterations. Mr. Rivera disagreed; he said that the wall would not be adversely affected by the windows. Mr. Huff remarked that the windows would animate the street. Mr. Sklaroff advocated a balance of preservation and livability.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to deny the proposal. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which failed with a vote of 3 to 6. Mr. Rivera, Mr. Huff, Mr. Perri, Mr. James, Mr. Parks, and Mr. Sklaroff opposed the motion.

Mr. Huff made a motion to approve the revised proposal. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried with 6 votes. Mr. Wilds, Mr. Sugrue, and Mr. Tissian opposed the motion.

915 Clinton Street

Coles House, LLC, Owner

Albert Tantala, Engineer/Applicant

DATE: 1835-1843

PROPOSAL: Legalize roof deck

Mr. Farnham presented this application, which proposes the legalization of a roof deck constructed without the Commission's approval or a building permit. At its February 2003 meeting, the Commission approved numerous changes to this property for its conversion to condominiums including the addition of nine decks. This deck was not reviewed or approved as part of that application.

The deck is situated on the main block of the rowhouse, not on the rear ell. It is located on the rear slope of the gable roof, but extends above the peak of the roof, even without a railing. It stands on concrete footings that were cut into the building's side wall, damaging the historic brick. Also, changes including the addition of a window have been made without approvals to a projection on the roof that is labeled "existing stairs" on the plans. The application does not address this change or other contemplated changes necessary to convert the projection to a stair tower. The deck is highly visible from Cypress Street and, with the addition of the requisite railing, may be visible from Clinton and S. 10th Streets.

Inspired by this illegal deck, architect J.K. Roller submitted an application to the Commission in late 2003 for a similar deck and stair tower at 919 Clinton Street, two doors to the west. At its November 2003 meeting, the Commission denied that proposal pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

Mr. Sklaroff expressed grave concern about work being done without a permit as well as work that exceed the permit. He also expressed concern about permits when the community is not aware of the proposed alterations.

Carl Primavera, counsel for the owner, said that the deck is part of the most expensive unit and will render the unit more marketable. The unit has no other outdoor space.

Mr. Wilds asserted that if the lack of a deck with this unit would result in an economic hardship then the proposal should be referred to the Committee on Financial Hardship. Mr. Sugrue cited previous denials of decks and noted that the deck in question is a most egregious case, especially with the damage to historic fabric.

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance, offered his opposition to the deck, saying that the deck is a gross violation of the *Standards*. If the Commission approved the legalization of the deck, then *Standards* would have been abandoned.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to deny the legalization of the deck. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 25 May 2004
Vincent Rivera, Chair

114 Elfreth's Alley

Edward H. Watson, Jr., Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1751 and 1762 by Thomas Patterson, house carpenter, significant in district

PROPOSAL: Demolish 1-story rear addition, erect 2-story rear addition with deck

The applicant withdrew the application.

110-112 S. Front Street, NW corner of Ionic Street

John Kolea, Beaumont Corporation, Owner

Jonathan Broh, Applicant

DATE: c. 1835; 1994, all but the stone storefront demolished; 1997, stone columns and entablature dismantled

PROPOSAL: 15-story residential tower with parking

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property]. Any new construction on the site should reuse the historic materials as required by the Commission in 1997.

Ms. Spina presented the application to the Commission. The Historical Commission designated the

property in May 1974. The building suffered a fire in 1993; following the fire, the Department of Licenses & Inspections declared the upper two stories Imminently Dangerous. The owner then applied to the Commission for approval of its complete demolition. In January 1994, after much deliberation, the Commission approved the demolition of the upper four stories, with the Department of Licenses & Inspections (L&I) to inspect the integrity of the rest of the building. At the time, all but the stone columns and entablature were demolished.

In 1997, the owner returned to the Commission for permission to dismantle the remaining pieces of the building and clear the lot. The Commission approved the dismantling of the stone pieces with several conditions: the pieces were to be housed in a new structure for protection from the elements; they were to be re-erected in any new construction on the property when the property was redeveloped; and these conditions were to be inserted into the property's deed so that any future owner would be aware of the requirement.

In December 2003, the present owner, the Beaumont Corporation, applied for and received a foundation permit for the property. It was given without the Historical Commission's approval. When L&I realized that the permit was issued in error on 4 May 2004, the Department revoked the permit. The application before the Commission is for a building permit for the property.

The application calls for a 15-story high-rise residential building with parking on the first floor. The pedestrian entrance would be on the Front Street façade with a recessed, double-leaf, fully-glazed door. Two vehicular entrances would be situated on the Ionic Street and would lead to the parking garage (the floor plan shown on A1.1 does not correlate with the elevation on A2.1). The garage entrances would have open, metal, roll-down gates. The first four stories would be faced with brick and a cast-stone cornice; the upper floors would be faced with a stucco-panel system. All of the floors would include banks of fixed windows atop awning windows at the southeast corner of the building. At the center of the eastern and western façades and on the southern façade, the building would have recessed balconies with metal railings. The top of the building would have an askew, two-story penthouse with a roof deck at the southeast corner.

The building would stand along Ionic Street, which is a part of the Historic Street Paving Thematic District. The proposal calls for retaining the historic granite block and resetting them for new street grading; however, it is unclear where and for what purpose the re-grading is required.

Ms. Spina presented the Architectural Committee's recommendation, which was denial pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Rivera inquired about the height of the building as well as the nature of its use. Ms. Spina explained that the building would be 15 stories tall with parking on the first story and residential units above.

Mr. Sklaroff listed the significant issues. First, he noted saving the surviving historic fabric is one issue; this fabric should have been, but perhaps was not, addressed in the deed. Mr. Primavera confirmed that the Commission's earlier provision was not inserted into the deed. Second, a foundation permit was granted by L&I without the Commission's review. Mr. Primavera interrupted the Chair to explain that the developer underwent a two-year review process with the City Planning Commission, the Zoning Board of Adjustment, the Department of Licenses & Inspections, and other agencies. He added that it is a \$10 million project with a personal guarantee.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Perri a series of questions. He asked if and how the property was listed on the Register. Mr. Perri answered that it was. Mr. Wilds reminded the Commission that it had reviewed applications related to this property in the past. Mr. Perri postulated that perhaps the plans examiner at the Department had keyed in the wrong address while checking to see if the property was listed on the Register. When that incorrect address was not flagged as historic, the examiner approved the permit without Commission review. The foundation permit was revoked about five or six months after it was issued. Work was begun before the permit was revoked. Mr. Sklaroff asked if the applicant had continued with construction after the revocation of the foundation permit. Mr. Perri answered that he had. Mr. Sklaroff asked if the applicant had built above the foundation level without a building permit. Mr. Perri answered that he had.

Mr. Wilds noted that the marble that was stored on the site might have prompted the owner to investigate the circumstances surrounding the origin of the material. Ms. Spina noted that the Commission's notice letter for the district was sent to the seller, not the current owner. She added that the seller's disclosure form should have stated that the property was listed on the Register. Mr. Sklaroff asked whether the Commission's jurisdiction was "review-and-comment" only or full review for approval. Mr. Copeland explained that the Commission has "full-review" jurisdiction because a building stood on the property at the time of the original designation. Mr. Sugrue asserted that the site was not vacant because the historic material was stored there. Mr. Sklaroff noted that the Commission has full jurisdiction over the site. Mr. Tyler agreed.

Mr. Perri clarified that the permit that was issued and revoked was a foundation permit only. The code clearly states that an owner works at his own risk with a foundation permit. The issuance of a foundation permit does not establish vested rights to the building or related permits. Mr. Sklaroff acknowledged that the work had exceeded the foundation permit. Mr. Copeland stated that the vested rights doctrine cannot be applied in this context because the revoked permit was for the foundations and not the building.

Mr. Primavera explained that construction was stopped at the fourth floor.

Mr. Tissian asserted that the height of the building is inappropriate for the community. Mr. Tissian also noted that the National Park Service opposes the height of the building.

Mr. Primavera offered to "explain what really happened" to the Commission. He began by stating that the Old City Historic District had not yet been created at the start of their permitting process in September 2002; Commission members had noted earlier that the property was designated individually in 1974. He explained that the Planning Commission, the Streets Department, and L&I reviewed the project. L&I issued a zoning refusal. The developer submitted plans to the Zoning Board of Adjustment as well as the Old City Civic Association. The Zoning Board approved the variance for the project. He recalled that there was no opposition from the Old City Civic Association including Richard Thom. He remarked that the developers are suburbanites and this is their first foray into the city. In January 2003, a zoning permit was issued. A foundation permit was issued; later, a revised foundation permit was issued. The developers then entered into contracts and began pre-sales. He claimed that for two years they pursued permits without a mention that the site was designated as historic. He also stated that Mr. Thom had notified the developers that there was "some junk material," meaning the historic marble, on the site. He added that Mr. Thom recommended that they not use the "junk." Mr. Primavera concluded that he would like to avoid "a catastrophe of lawsuits and litigation." He also claimed that Mr. Voight of L&I stated that the reason the property was never flagged as historic was that it was listed by the City under the wrong address. The "Historic" Commission, he declared, "surfaced" two years after the development process

started. It would be a “calamity”; it would be “ruinous,” “harmful,” and “prejudicial” to stop this project. He asked the Commission members to look at themselves and ask “What madness is it” to enforce the Commission’s jurisdiction in this case? He handed out a list of the consequences if the Commission attempted to “interfere with” or “impede” the project. He asked the Commission to “stop the madness.”

Mr. James asked why the developer did not inquire at the Commission’s offices to determine if the site had been designated. Mr. Primavera answered that there was no district when the project commenced. Mr. Wilds countered that the site has been designated since 1974; citing the district designation date and not the individual designation date obscures the facts.

Mr. Primavera then asserted that L&I should have directed the application to the Historical Commission for its review. He stated that his client would have happily entered into the Commission’s review process had he known to do so. Mr. Primavera concluded that it was unjust to require his client to enter into Commission’s process at this late point, “years hence.” Mr. Perri clarified that the applicant would not have been notified of the designation as historic years ago, but only should have been notified recently when he applied for the foundation permit. He added that there are no triggers built into the process to direct an application to the Historical Commission upon application to L&I’s zoning counter, the Planning Commission, or other City agencies. He noted that this allows for approval processes to proceed in parallel, which is quicker than a serial process. Mr. Primavera asserted that systemic problems exist within the City’s overall approval process. Mr. Sklaroff cautioned Mr. Primavera to limit his discussion the topic under consideration. Mr. Primavera pressed forward with his condemnation of the overall process, which he claims fails to alert developers of historic designations in a timely manner.

Mr. James asked if the developer received notice about the designation of the Old City Historic District. Mr. Primavera stated that he could not answer the question. Mr. Sklaroff asked him when the current owner closed on the property. He answered that the closing took place in August 2002 and the deed was recorded in September 2002. Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Primavera to confirm that the developers are not based in Philadelphia. He confirmed that they are from out-of-town; he added that their advisors, J.K. Roller and Klehr Harrison, are Philadelphia-based. Mr. Sklaroff continued to develop a timeline. He confirmed that the developers applied for a foundation permit in December 2003. He added that the notice of the Commission’s consideration of the district was mailed in July 2003. Ms. Spina remarked that the list of owners in the proposed district was compiled by the Board of Revision of Taxes (BRT) in May 2003. She explained that BRT had not yet updated its database with the current owner as of May 2003. She stated that the district notice was mailed to the previous owner, not the current owner. Mr. Sklaroff asked if notice was made in any other way. Ms. Spina explained that posters announcing the district consideration were placed on every block and notice was placed in a newspaper of general circulation.

Mr. Sugrue pointed out the failure of the Commission to send the notice letter to new owner and L&I’s failure to flag the address on the permit application as one listed on the Register. Mr. Perri agreed that an error was made when the plans examiner checked the address.

Mr. Sklaroff continued with his clarification of the timeline of events. He acknowledged that a foundation permit was issued, that the foundation work began, and that the permit was revoked. He asked Mr. Primavera why the developer continued to erect the building after the foundation permit had been revoked. Mr. Primavera replied that the architect had submitted a set of plans to L&I for a preliminary code review in May 2003 and that only the Historical Commission was blocking the issuance of the permit. Mr. Sklaroff asked that Mr. Primavera answer his question: Why did you work on the foundation after the foundation permit was revoked and why did you build above the foundation when you had no

building permit whatsoever? Mr. Roller explained that the adjacent building at 108 S. Front Street was damaged during the foundation excavation. Mr. Roller asserted that the best way to prevent further damage to the adjacent building was to continue to build without a permit. He stated that this illegal work was done “in concert” with the local building inspector and the City. He concluded that continuing to build was the best means of “preserving” the adjacent historic building. Mr. Sklaroff asked for a clarification of the term “in concert.” He asked if a permit had been issued. Mr. Roller answered that the building inspector “knew what we were doing.” Mr. Sklaroff replied that the inspector may have known, but that he had no control via a permit over the work. Mr. Roller conceded that the work was done with “the knowledge but not the approval” of the City. Mr. Primavera asserted that the contractor continued to erect the building without a permit because consultant Robert Powers had assured the developer that the Commission had only “45-day review-and-comment” jurisdiction or no jurisdiction at all owing to the developer’s “vested rights.” Mr. Wilds countered that the developer was aware of the Commission’s jurisdiction after the foundation permit was revoked. Mr. Primavera then stated that the development team was appearing before the Commission in “a cooperative effort to ask for your help.” He stated that he did not concede to the Commission’s jurisdiction. He stated that “there is no jurisdiction.” He continued, contending that “at best, you ever had, under any stretch, would be review-and-comment.” Mr. Primavera again insisted that the permitting process is fundamentally flawed. Mr. Sklaroff suggested that the Commission not be diverted at the moment by questions outside the review of the present case.

Mr. Sugrue summarized his understanding of the case: first, L&I failed to flag the address as historic when processing the foundation permit application; second, the Historical Commission failed to notify the current owner of the consideration and designation of the Old City Historic District; third, the previous owner failed to revise the deed to reflect the Commission’s restrictions. Mr. Sugrue stated that the applicant has sought permits for two years “in good faith.” He added that the applicant would have been before the Commission two or three years ago if the process worked correctly. He suggested that the Commission focus its discussion on the incorporation of the historic fabric as required in 1994.

Mr. Parks asked the applicant if he had met with the civic association. Mr. Roller answered that the developer had met with the Old City Civic Association.

Mr. Sugrue moved to legalize the foundation permit and approve the building permit, provided that the applicant present a plan to the Architectural Committee to incorporate the historic material into the new building. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion.

Mr. James asked if others deemed a 15-story building appropriate for this Old City site. He asserted that it would not be appropriate. Mr. Sugrue contended that the time has past for a discussion of this project on its merits. He noted that the project already rises to five stories. He claimed that it should have been reviewed two years ago. Others noted that the developer would have been notified first in December 2003, not two years ago, if the system had functioned properly. Mr. James countered that the construction was undertaken without a permit and that the Commission has the right and responsibility to review the project. Mr. Rivera stated that he is comfortable with the size and scale of the building as proposed. Mr. Tissian stated that he feels very strongly that 15 stories is inappropriate for the location, but he sees no way to “go backwards” and correct the errors that have been made. He stated that he would vote to approve the motion, but added that there is something “morally” wrong with the circumstances the Commission finds itself confronting.

Mr. Parks asserted that the Commission has no jurisdiction in this case because the district had not yet been created two years ago, when the developer began his permitting process. Mr. Wilds corrected Mr.

Parks; he stated that the site has been listed on the Register since 1974.

Mr. Sklaroff directed the discussion to the question of the potential reuse of the historic materials. He suggested that no one would benefit from the retrofitting of the historic materials to a completed design. Mr. Wilds concurred. He stated that it is not reasonable at this time. Perhaps a piece of the materials could be displayed in the lobby.

Mr. Sugrue agreed with Mr. Sklaroff and Mr. Wilds and amended his motion, removing the provision that the historic materials be reused. The second agreed with the amendment.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that he supports a denial of the application. He asserted that the development team, Mr. Powers, Mr. Roller, and Mr. Primavera, are extremely knowledgeable about preservation in Philadelphia. He stated that it would very difficult to believe that these experts were not aware of the designation of this site. He contended that they neglected their responsibility to consult with the Commission. He also stated that he does not believe that the four stories needed to be built to save the neighboring building. He added that he does not believe Mr. Primavera's claim that the Old City Civic Association supported the project. He continued that the scale of Front Street is an important historic resource, which would be negatively impacted by this building. He concluded that an approval of this project would send a message to developers that the Commission could be ignored.

Mr. Parks asked if the current owner knew at the time of purchase whether the property was designated as historic. Mr. Primavera answered no, he did not. He added that the entire development team as well as the Old City Civic Association and L&I were all astonished to learn a few weeks ago that the site had been designated as historic.

Mr. Sklaroff declared that the Commission should have provided a better mechanism to ensure that its earlier ruling on this property was enforced.

Mr. Tyler stated that he was perplexed by the fact that none of the experts involved in the project had inquired about the property's status with the Commission.

Mr. Parks again noted that the historic district was not in place when the developer filed his zoning application. Other Commission members again reminded him that the property has been listed on the register since 1974, making the date of the creation of the district irrelevant.

Mr. Perri asked Mr. Roller when he submitted the application for the final building permit. Mr. Roller stated that he applied for it before the foundation was revoked. Mr. Primavera again suggested that the City's processes be reformed. Mr. Huff asked Mr. Primavera what the Planning Commission's recommendation on this proposal had been. Mr. Primavera replied that he did not know what its recommendation had been.

Mr. Sklaroff restated Mr. Sugrue's motion, seconded by Mr. Rivera, to legalize the foundation permit and approve the building permit for the proposed 15-story building as well as the changes to Ionic Street. The motion passed by a vote of 5 to 2, with two abstentions. Mr. James and Mr. Wilds opposed. Mr. Tissian and Mr. Perri abstained.

321 Chestnut Street

National Liberty Museum, Owner

Irvin Borowsky, Applicant

DATE: 1901, Hewitt Bros., architects; 3rd floor added, c. 1910

PROPOSAL: Legalize signs and lights, add signs, bench

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.], Standard 7 [Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.], Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.] and Signage Guideline [Not Recommended: Using inappropriately scaled signs and logos or other types of signs that obscure, damage, or destroy remaining character defining features of the historic building.].

The owner, without a permit or Historical Commission approval, installed three signs in the front window openings, the flagpole on the corner and seven lights into the cornices of the building. The Liberty Museum now wishes to legalize the signs and lights. The museum is also applying for additional signage: a banner on the front, four signs along Orianna Street and one on the rear of the building overlooking Franklin Court. Other than location, the application does not include details of the signage. The proposal also calls for a bench at the foot of the staircase on Chestnut Street.

In February 2000, the Historical Commission denied a signage application that included banners on the columns and a sign in a single bay on Orianna Street, stating that the signage overwhelmed the building. At that time the Commission suggested to the museum that it reopen some of the former windows along Orianna Street for the visibility that the museum was seeking.

Ms. Spina presented the application and noted that prior to the Commission meeting, the applicant removed the illegal signs and flagpole, although the patching of the stone that was penetrated with the installation of the flagpole and lights remains unclear. Mr. Sklaroff suggested that the applicant return to the Architectural Committee with a new proposal, which would include details regarding the patching of the stone. The Commission concluded that since the applicant withdrew his application for legalization, then there is no action for the Commission to undertake and the motion made by Mr. Wilds was withdrawn.

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

103-107 Church Street

Zagara Management, Owner

Stephen Anderson, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1848 for Estate of Stephen Girard; alterations, 1930-31 by John Windrim, architect

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitation and additions for residential conversion

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

The Committee and Commission previously approved a large addition to these three buildings in Old City with several setbacks at the roofline. Previously, the fenestration in the additions was symmetrical and related to the historic buildings.

Since the Commission reviewed the proposal, another developer has purchased the properties and redesigned the interior spaces. The rooftop addition has been reduced in size. However, the new developer wishes to maximize the light and views by enlarging the windows considerably. The new windows are still wood, true-divided light. The front façade is minimally visible from Front Street, but the north façade is visible from Cuthbert Street.

Also, the proposal now calls for cutting 13 new, double-hung windows on the east façade. A new, flush metal door is also proposed as a second means of egress.

Ms. Spina presented the application.

Joanne Phillips, Esq., and Stephen Anderson, the architect, attended the meeting. Ms. Phillips explained that the revised proposal reduces the height of the additions but changes the window configuration. The proposal also includes the installation of thirteen new windows on the east wall that will have limited visibility from Church Street.

Commission members agreed with the changes.

Mr. Rivera made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

1725 West Porter Street

Anthony J. Citino, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1906, James & John Windrim, architects

PROPOSAL: Erect carport and shed, install gates

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the carport, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.] Approval of the gate and fence, pursuant to Standard 9 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 owner wishes to install a carport with shed for storage. The structure would have a flat, asphalt roof, T1-11 sides and white trim. The whole structure would measure eighteen feet by fifteen feet and have a shed to one side. The chain-link fence would be replaced with a wrought-iron one.

Ms. Spina presented this application, which also calls for legalizing a metal gate that the owner installed on the front façade between his house and the neighbor's at 1723 Porter Street.

Anthony Citino, the owner, disclosed his wishes for a low-level carport and shed with a flat roof, which he claims would retain the openness of the area. He commented that the existing shed is not compatible for Girard Estate.

Mr. Wilds inquired if the opening in the gate could accommodate a car. Mr. Tissian remarked that there have been other denials for carports in Girard Estate. Mr. Sklaroff said that the proposed carport is inconsistent with the character of Girard Estate and that it is important to keep the yards open. The applicant inquired if a temporary tent could be erected and Mr. Wilds responded that the tent would be inappropriate if it is left up on a continuous basis.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried with a 6 to 3 vote. Mr. Wilds, Mr. James and Mr. Huff opposed the motion.

826 South Front Street

Wandz Costanzo, Owner

Oleh Janusz, Contractor

DATE: 1817; storefront added, c. 1885

PROPOSAL: Replace storefront, add shutters, alter dormer, add lighting

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 4 [Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.] and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.]

Ms. Spina explained this application in which the Commission approved alterations to the storefront in 1974, but they were not built according to plan. T1-11 siding and inappropriate windows were installed instead of the approved materials. The proposal calls for removing the siding and installing wood panels that would replicate the look of the historic transoms. Wood panels would also be installed below the existing windows. New single-leaf, four-panel doors will be installed in each opening and the marble stairs repaired and reset. The owner also wishes to install two-panel wood shutters on the upper floors, replace the light, install metal railings, remove the brick infill at the second doorway, and remove the tar paper at the dormer. Although not a true restoration of the historic storefront, the work will undo many of the unsympathetic changes that have happened to the building over the years.

The Commission agreed with the proposed alterations.

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

5218 Germantown Avenue

Elwyn Incorporated, Owner

James C. Campbell, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1795

PROPOSAL: Replace roof, gutters, repair cast iron porch

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal, including the ridge vents and soffit vents on the condition that they and the hanging gutters are painted to match the cornice, with staff to review details, subject to a determination of need, pursuant to Standard 4 [Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.].

Ms. Spina explained this application. The house originally had cedar shake roofing, but it was replaced with a standing-seam metal roof almost a century ago. The proposal calls for replacing the metal roof

with a new standing-seam aluminum roof. On all façades but the front, the pole gutters would be replaced with hanging aluminum gutters. This would obscure the decorative ogee cornices. The work also includes lightning rods.

Peter Thomas and architect James Campbell attended the meeting.

Mr. Wilds thought that since this 1795 house originally had a cedar shake roof, such a roof should be considered. It was disclosed that along with the 19th century additions, there has been a metal roof for over 100 years, which has achieved its own significance.

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

929 Clinton Street

Alan Goldstein, Owner

Alexander Rice, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1840; roof destroyed by fire, mid-20th c.

PROPOSAL: Construct addition, add rear balconies

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

The Commission previously approved major renovations to this property, including the rebuilding of the gable roof. At the rear, the gable roof led out to a rear deck that was built on an extended elevator tower. Now the application calls for building an addition off of the gable roof and infilling the historic piazza even more to extend the roof deck another five feet.

The second part of the application calls for new decks on the rear façade of the rear ell. The one on the third floor spans the width of the rear ell and extends five feet; the one on the second floor extends the full depth of the lot. Although on the rear, all of these alterations are highly visible from 10th Street.

Commission members expressed concern that they would be revisited with additional deck alterations to this property.

Alan Goldstein and Dianne Chambless, the owners, attended the meeting. Mr. Goldstein explained that the proposed alterations have evolved from the omission of the deck on the original application. He noted that visibility only exists from 10th Street and that the top unit will be for them.

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

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

1800-1818 Park Avenue

Temple University, Owner

Hyman Myers, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1872, David A. Woelpper, builder

PROPOSAL: Significant demolition, reconstruction of mansards

The Architectural Committee recommended final approval of the demolition including the mansards, replication of the mansards, roofing of the mansards with a slate substitute matching the shape and color of the original slate, and infilling the basement windows provided the historic basement window grates are replicated in a durable material, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; Standard 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.]; and 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 application seeks final approval of demolition, stabilization, and some restoration at 1800-1818 Park Mall. The overall project includes the rehabilitation of 1800 Park Avenue; substantial demolition at 1802-1818 Park Avenue; the retention of the historic facades of 1802-1818 Park Avenue; and the construction of a 5-story building set back behind front facades of 1802-1818 Park Avenue. At its meeting on 13 February 2004, the Commission found that the adaptive reuse of the historic buildings would constitute a financial hardship and approved in concept the demolition of the rears of 1802-1818, but not the mansards, and the new construction provided the design was improved.

The current application seeks final approval of the demolition of the rears of 1802-1818 Park Mall (Phase 1). A façade stabilization plan has been submitted with the demolition plans. The design for the new building to be constructed behind the historic facades has not been completed.

The current application also seeks final approval of the demolition of the mansards with dormers and their reconstruction to match originals. The new mansard structure would be constructed in steel; the dormers would be recreated to match the surviving originals; the mansards and dormers would be roofed with a slate substitute. The Commission's earlier finding of financial hardship and in-concept approval of the demolition and new construction did not include the demolition of the mansards and dormers. The applicant claims that further investigation has revealed that it is infeasible to preserve the mansards, which are extremely deteriorated. The applicant requests that the staff review the details of the mansard reconstruction.

The current application also includes a series of staff-level review items such as replications of historic doors and windows.

One aspect of this portion of the application, the basement window infill, requires Committee and Commission review. Mr. Tyler informed the applicant that he would approve the basement window and grille replacement proposal if the applicant installed windows between the grilles and infill. The applicant wishes instead to install grilles and infill without windows.

Tony Forte, counsel for Temple University, and Hyman Myers, the architect, attended the meeting. Mr. Myers stated that the mansards with dormers would be reconstructed to match the historic roofs and that all of the basement windows grates would be replaced with replicas. He reported on a site visit with the

Commission staff at which it was determined that the replication of the basement windows between the grates and infill windows would not be necessary. The applicant offered to work with the staff to select an appropriate color for the basement window infill.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

327 Race Street

Aris Kartoutsdis, Owner

Charles Datner, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830

PROPOSAL: Legalize basement steps and doorway

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, owing to inconsistencies in the plans.

This application proposes the modification and legalization of a basement entrance added to the building at 327 Race Street. The entrance was added without a building permit or Commission approval, despite the Commission's denial of a proposal for a basement entrance in May 2003. On 5 September 2003, members of the Commission's staff happened upon a contractor completing the basement entrance work. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a violation on 23 September 2003. A subsequent investigation revealed that the work was not undertaken defiantly, but because of a misunderstanding resulting from a language barrier.

The Greek Revival building was constructed about 1830 as a residence. Before the Civil War, probably in the 1840s, a 3-bay storefront with doors in the outer bays was added to the building. This storefront, which is documented in a 1908 photograph, included bulkhead doors below the window in the center bay. The old storefront was replaced with a new storefront about 1920. The new storefront, which survived intact until September 2003, included industrial windows over brick spandrels in the two west bays and doors in the east bay. It did not include basement access. The current application proposes to legalize an inaccurate replication of the 1840s basement doors in the 1920s storefront.

The May 2003 application proposed an open stairway to the basement that would have run parallel to the front façade. The Commission denied that application because it would have required the removal of an historic stone step. The current application proposes an open stairway running perpendicular to the front façade into the center bay of the storefront. According to the application, a brick spandrel in the center bay would be removed and paneled doors added in its place. Matching wood panels would be added in place of the brick spandrel in the west bay. Although not shown, metal pipe railings flanking the opening would be added. The drawing is inconsistent. In section, the top of the basement door approximately aligns with the sidewalk level. In elevation, the door or doors rise about two feet above the sidewalk, filling the spandrel below the window. The proposed plan will not work and should be revised.

Commission members concluded that the alterations to this property are inappropriate.

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

123 S. Broad Street

Owner: Wachovia Bank

Applicant: Dan G. Griffith, Wachovia Bank

History: 1928, Simon & Simon

Project: In concept – canopies and lighting

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval in concept of the canopies, provided they are limited in width to the arched openings and reduced in scale; approval in concept of the banners on Sansom and Walnut Streets, provided they are limited to one per façade, positioned near the corner, and scaled to the nearby windows; approval in concept of the lighting; and denial of the additional flag poles; 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 for review in concept proposes canopies, signage, and lighting for the bank building at 123 S. Broad Street. Architect Grant Simon, a former chair of the Historical Commission, and his brother designed the grand building in 1925. The proposed additions are not compatible with the grand, dignified, classical building. Most significant, the canopies would obscure the important sculptural metalwork above the three Broad Street entranceways. Also, the proposed canopies extend beyond the arched openings, breaking the verticality of the soaring spaces.

Greg Tribbe said that it is the intention of the bank to increase its street presence. He noted the increased competitiveness in the banking industry. He added that the design of the canopy was guided by similar designs.

Mr. Tissian deemed the proposed alterations to this very significant building excessive. Mr. James concurred. Mr. Wilds objected to the obscuring of significant historic elements. He contended that a more conservative design would be more appropriate. Mr. Huff stated that the Planning Commission must review the façade. Mr. Sklaroff countered that the proposed alterations are exciting and that the historic fabric is not being destroyed. Most Commission members agreed that the applicant should seek a more subtle design that is sensitive to the architecture.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Parks seconded the motion, which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Sklaroff dissented.

1 S. Broad Street

Owner: Wachovia Bank

Applicant: Dan G. Griffith, Wachovia Bank

History: bell, 1926, Gillett & Johnstone Foundry; belfry, 1931, John Windrim, architect

Project: In concept - alterations to belfry

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval in concept of the lettering at the base of the belfry, provided structural information is submitted as part of the final review; approval in concept of the lighting of the belfry; and denial of the spiral sculpture called the "crown"; 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 for review in concept proposes signage and lighting for the bell and belfry at the building at 1 S. Broad Street. The signage would consist of a very large steel spiral sculpture with LED lights wrapping the belfry and a very large internally illuminated Wachovia sign at the base of the belfry. Blue and green lights would illuminate the bell and belfry.

The bell was installed in 1926 on the Wanamaker Department Store at 13th and Market Streets. It was moved in 1931 to a higher location at the new Wanamaker's Men's Store and Office Tower, the building at 1 S. Broad Street now known as the PNB Building. Architect John Windrim designed the building including the belfry, which was planned specifically to house the 15-ton Wanamaker Bell.

The Historical Commission designated the John Wanamaker Memorial Founder's Bell as an object in June 2000; it did not nor has it subsequently designated the entire building. Therefore, the Commission must consider both jurisdictional and design questions.

The Ordinance defines "Object" as "A material thing of functional, aesthetic, cultural, historic or scientific value that may be, by nature or design, movable yet related to a specific setting or environment." The proposed signage and lighting would significantly alter the setting or environment of the bell.

Commission members concluded that the PNB sign is not historically significant and can therefore be removed. Mr. Wilds as well as other members deemed the sculptural signage at the top inappropriate. Mr. Sugrue concurred. He said that the sculpture would obscure the bell tower and that the bank could accomplish its goal with a lighting design. Mr. Tissian disagreed. He asserted that the spiral would not be visible in the daytime; however, its visibility at night would reflect the ambience of the Avenue of the Arts. Mr. Sklaroff spoke in favor of the proposal, which he contended would be an enhancement to the skyline.

Mr. Tissian made a motion for final approval of the proposal, with the staff to review structural details. Mr. Parks seconded the motion, which carried with a vote of 5 to 4. Mr. Rivera, Mr. Huff, Mr. Wilds, and Mr. Sugrue opposed the motion.

630 Pine Street, aka 629 Addison Street

Owner: John Grossi

Applicant: John Sabatini, architect

History: c. 1840; new façade c. 1910

Project: Alter front façade, demolish original rear ell and build rear addition; erect new row house on Addison Street

For the historic building at 630 Pine Street, the Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the front façade alterations, but approval of the rear demolition and new construction, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.]; Standard 3 [Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as

adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.]; Standard 4 [Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.]; and 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.]. It suggested that the applicant restore the front façade based on the Commission's 1950s photograph and surviving physical evidence.

For the new construction at 629 Addison Street, the Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval in concept of the massing, height, opening rhythm, and garage, but denial of the details of the new construction, 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 alterations and new construction at 630 Pine Street, a property that extends from Pine Street south to Addison Street. The owner has received zoning approval to subdivide the lot into two lots, one facing Pine, the other facing Addison. The lot has not yet been subdivided, but will be soon. For the Pine Street property, the applicant proposes alterations to the front façade and the demolition and construction of an addition at the rear. This building was constructed about 1840; a new Colonial Revival front façade was added about 1910. The applicant also proposes an entirely new house at the rear of the lot, facing Addison Street.

For the front façade of the historic building, the applicant proposes a denticulated wood cornice, but not the historic cornice. Most significantly, the proposed cornice ignores the extant, large, decorative, brick corbels at the party walls. The historic Colonial Revival cornice, which stood on the corbels, could be replicated from a photograph in the Commission's collection. The applicant also proposes to rebuild the door surround with engaged columns. The original door surround, much of which has survived, could be replicated as well. Note that a ghost of the pediment section of the 1910 door surround can be seen on the façade; the extant, smaller pediment is a later addition. Finally, the applicant proposes paneled shutters for the second and third-story windows. This 1910 Colonial Revival building did not have shutters. The proposed one-over-one windows and roofing are appropriate. In general, the applicant proposes to remake this 1910 façade as a falsely historic 1780 façade. The documentary and physical evidence exists to restore this facade to its historic 1910 state. The 1910 façade, with its bold cornice and door surround, was a harmonious and coherent composition.

At the rear of the historic building, the applicant proposes to demolish an historic, 2-story ell and construct a smaller, 2-story rear addition. A small deck would be added atop the addition. The rear ell appears to be entirely original; it maintains its original half-gable roofline. The rear of this building is currently visible from Waverly Street across a vacant lot. The applicant is applying to build a house on Addison Street as part of this application. The new house would completely block the view of the rear of 630 Pine Street.

At the rear, facing Addison Street, the application proposes a new house with garage. The façade would be ornamented in the Colonial Revival style. It would be an admixture or mélange of Colonial features gathered arbitrarily from surrounding historic buildings and combined in a random manner.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission and reported that the applicant had revised the designs for the front facades of the two buildings to comply with the Committee's recommendations. He noted that the applicant now proposes to restore the front façade of the historic building on Pine Street to its original, historic, 1910 appearance.

John Sabatini, the architect, attended the meeting and noted that the revised proposal includes carriage style doors on the new building at the rear.

Steve Weixler, the Society Hill Civic Association, acknowledged the applicant's cooperativeness, and he asserted the Association's support of the revised proposal.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the revised proposal with the restoration of the front façade of 630 Pine Street, with the staff to review details. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

1601 Locust Street aka 226 South 16th Street

Owner: Alan Domb

Applicant: Lynn Blahusch, C.B. Development Services, Inc.

History: 1929, Grant Simon, architect

Project: Legalize canopy

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the legalization, 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 the legalization of a large metal canopy on the University Club building at 1601 Locust Street. It was erected without the Commission's approval or a building permit. The canopy is appropriate for this building.

Lynn Blahusch, the applicant, acknowledged that a mistake had been made with the permitting. She stated that one architectural firm had received the Commission's approval in concept to install the canopy. When a second firm was retained to design the canopy, it mistakenly believed that all of the permits had already been issued.

Commission members concluded that the canopy is appropriate for the building.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to legalize the canopy. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

2031 Walnut Street

Owner: Blac Holding Co.

Applicant: Patricia Perlstein

History: c. 1860

Project: Erect 1-story rear addition

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposal, provided dark green webbing is inserted in the chain-link fence, 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 a 1-story addition and fencing at the rear of 2031 Walnut Street. The addition would be faced with brick and would include a flush metal door as well as a basement access. Although the application is not explicit, the fencing appears to be of the cyclone or chain-link type.

Commission members deemed the addition with the fence appropriate.

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

1514 Waverly Street

Owner: Eleanor Zimmers

Applicant: Liz Zimmers

History: c. 1880

Project: Demolish 1-story stair tower, erect rooftop addition, re-open infilled windows

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval in concept of a 3rd-story addition, provided the Waverly Street façade is not impacted, but denial of the proposal as submitted.

The applicant withdrew the proposal.

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

1612-1618 Locust Street

TC & KY Associates, Incorporated, Owners

Ceebraid-Signal Corporation, Applicant

DATE: Locust Club, built c.1960, Non-contributing

1618 Locust Street, built c. 1850, attributed to John Notman

PROPOSAL: Demolish 1612-1616 Locust Street, erect 8-story residential building, and rehab 1618 Locust Street

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval with staff to review details, provided the trellis and roof deck at the front of 1618 Locust Street are pulled back from the front façade so as not to be visible from Locust Street, with staff to verify the lack of visibility at the site, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]; and Standard 10 [New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

The Architectural Committee reviewed an application to redevelop the properties at 1612-1618 Locust

Street at its February 2004 meeting. After the Committee and community registered its disapproval of the plan by Bower Lewis Thrower, the applicant withdrew the proposal, and hired the architectural firm of Agoos Lovera. Agoos Lovera has prepared a design that stipulates the demolition of the Non-contributing structure at 1612-1616 as well as a 1960 addition that wraps around the rear of 1618 Locust Street. The Significant brownstone house at 1618 Locust would be retained and restored on the exterior. The plans call for an 8-story residential building to be constructed on the site of the Locust Club. The new building will have multiple set backs from Locust Street as well as from the west side above the 6th Floor to honor the scale of Locust Street and minimize shadows on St. Marks Church. The building will be clad in yellow and pink Casota stone like that on the Art Museum and will include balconies as well as an entrance on the west end of the facade. On Latimer Street, the building will include a courtyard and a vehicular entrance to basement parking with a brick wall running along the sidewalk line. At its May 2004 meeting, the Commission approved in concept the Agoos Lovera plan. It now returns for a final review.

Joanne Phillips, counsel for the applicant, James Rowe, Robert Powers, and Jason Schlesinger attended the meeting. Ms. Phillips gave an overview of the project stating that code requirements meet the *Standards*. She pointed out that the revised design addresses the concerns of the neighbors and interested parties. Ms. Phillips acknowledged the applicant's agreement with the Architectural Committee's recommendation. She also noted that she has met with the Center City Residents' Association.

Carl Primavera, Esq. who is representing St. Mark's Church, expressed the church's concern about the impact of the height of the new construction on the church.

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance, supports the project. He believes that the developer has done all the right things; working within the zoning limits and the great appreciation for the streetscape.

James Leonard, 1610 Locust Street, said that he met with the architects, to discuss his concerns about the process; however, he supports the design, since it will not diminish other properties on the block. Mr. Leonard noted that the applicant will provide engineering studies, with respect to neighboring properties.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to give final approval to the project. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried with 8 votes. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

1509 Pine Street

Sam Ryan, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: Legalize door and transom

The Architectural Committee recommended denial 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 application calls for legalization of a door and transom that were installed and do not match the proportions of the drawing that was approved. The contractor said he made an assumption that the door was a seven foot door and noted that on the drawing which was approved. He did not, however, measure,

follow the instructions of the architect's drawing to match the neighbor, or follow the dimensions of the transom, or even the proportions of the door as shown on his own drawing.

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

25 South Van Pelt Street

Archdiocese of Philadelphia, Owner

Cathy Harris, Applicant

DATE: 1894; addition 1939 L. Magaziner for Evening Home and Library Association

PROPOSAL: Mural

The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal, which calls for painting a mural on two walls of the building, the north and somewhat on the east wall. These are finished brick walls that were never party walls. A metal mesh screen will also be attached at the lower part of the north west corner of the building.

Mr. James suggested that the Commission withhold any decision until after the formulation of a policy recommendation by the Ad Hoc Committee on Murals.

Cathy Harris, Donald Gensler and Paz Gutierrez of the Mural Arts Program attended the meeting. Ms. Harris asked that the Commission hear the merits of the application. Ms. Gensler disclosed that the wall has always been covered and obscured. He noted that as far back as 1909 the wall was obscured by a horse stable and then a blind factory. The space now contains HVAC equipment and fire escapes. Ms. Gutierrez agreed with the concerns of the Commission; however, in this particular circumstance, the wall is currently a residual space. She believes that the insertion of the screen will allow a majority of the bricks to remain exposed; and asked that an exception be made by the Commission.

Mr. Wilds commented that if an exception is made, then this would set a precedent for other murals on brick walls. Mr. Rivera said that the Committee's decision was guided by the architectural treatment of the wall, as well as the message that the mural would convey.

In response to the motion to table the proposal, Ms. Harris stressed that owing to private dollars, the course of action should be expeditiously pursued.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to deny the application. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which failed with a vote of 3 to 6. Mr. Sugrue, Mr. James, Mr. Parks, Mr. Huff and Mr. Perri and Mr. Sklaroff opposed the motion.

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

236 South 20th Street

Susan Ryszka and Stephen Hulme, Owners

Susan Brandt, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Erect 3rd-story addition, brick parapet wall, two roof decks, trellis
The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the addition, pergola and deck with a panelized system with a skirt, with the staff to review details, but denial of the stair, upper deck and masonry wall.

Mr. Baron presented this proposal, which calls for alterations to this highly visible rear façade of a property. The rear ell has visibility from Locust, Woodstock, St. James and Chancellor Streets. The proposal calls for constructing a rear addition, two decks, pergola, winding stair and brick wall at 236 S. 20th Street. The deck, which sits on the rear ell, would be much more solid than most decks for it will be constructed with masonry units.

Barry Ginder, the architect, attended the meeting and noted that the proposal was revised to reflect the Committee's recommendation with a panelized system. In response to Mr. Sklaroff's query about the deck's location, Mr. Ginder said that seven feet of the deck is on the rear ell and setback from the chimney.

Mr. Wilds remarked that the trellis is a very visible element. Mr. Ginder cited a property at 21st and Spruce, which has a similar trellis.

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

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

1939 Pine Street

Jay Eisner, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1960 contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District

PROPOSAL: Infill openings, alter windows

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of alternate A with masonry infill but approval of alternate B with the glazed lower panel, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Baron explained proposal A, which calls for closing down the masonry openings on the 2nd and 3rd floors, removing the sliding doors and installing asymmetrical casement windows.

Janice Woodcock, the architect, Jay Eisner, the owner, and Joanne Phillips, counsel for the owner, attended the meeting. Ms. Phillips said that the property is contributing to the district and that the proposed alterations would not be detrimental to the district. She informed the Commission that the owners wish the alterations for security and that the masonry wall would provide easier maintenance. Ms. Woodcock said that with regards to retaining the balcony, a faux balcony would not be useable.

Mr. Tyler said that since this building is classified as contributing in size and scale, it should be treated with the same level of scrutiny as an 1850s building. Mr. Huff believes that with an appropriate material and contemporary design the proposed alterations would be in the best interest of the homeowners. He also stressed the importance of consistency and cited the proposal on South 3rd Street as an example. Mr. Rivera said that the balcony creates a decorative motif and suggested operable windows with panels below, which would retain the openings. Ms. Woodcock said that maintaining the lower panels would be problematic. Mr. James suggested a compromise of Scheme A on the first level and Scheme B on the upper levels. Mr. Baron remarked that this building creates verticality to the row of houses.

Mr. James made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation for the approval of scheme B. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which failed with a vote of 2 to 6. Mr. Sugrue, Mr. Tissian, Mr. Huff, Mr. Wilds, Mr. Perri, Mr. Parks. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the proposal as submitted with scheme A. Mr. Parks seconded the motion, which carried with a vote of 6 to 2. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

411 South Carlisle Street

Pearl Kimberg, Owner

Richard D. Holst, Applicant

DATE: c. 1835

PROPOSAL: Legalize door

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Baron presented this proposal that requests legalization of a flush door with applied moldings installed without a permit. The designation pictures of the building and historic photos show that the original door would have had five horizontal panels.

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

2123 Brandywine Street

Bob Heim and Eileen Kennedy

Andrew Lengel, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: 1-story rear addition

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Baron presented this proposal, which calls for a one and a half story rear addition on top of an existing one story addition. The rear of the house faces a street that contains only rears of properties. The adjacent structures are all modified and stuccoed. The rear has very limited visibility from 22nd Street.

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

6118 Ardleigh Street

Bill McMichael-Reaume, Owner

Charles McGloughlin, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1850 as carriage house/barn for Cope House

PROPOSAL: 2-story addition

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal with the setback of the addition on both sides to allow for the retention of the brackets, with the staff to review details. Ms. Pentz abstained.

Mr. Baron explained this application, which calls for building a two-story addition on the north façade of this barn structure now renovated as a house. The new piece will be constructed with board and batten siding to mimic a nearby shed and an early one story addition on the east side of this structure.

Charles McGloughlin, the architect, attended the meeting. In response to the Commission's query about the addition's location, Mr. McGloughlin said that the addition would be constructed in the rear.

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

2212 Wallace Street

Harvey Clark and Anna Marie Vardaro, Owners

Harvey Clark, Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

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

Mr. Baron explained this proposal, which seeks to legalize work to the exterior of this rowhouse. The work includes removal of paint, cutting wide mortar joints, installation of hard Portland cement mortar, rebuilding a cornice using incorrect brackets that do not match the historic cornice and installation of a new front door that does not match the historic four panel door.

Harvey Clark, the owner, and Ken Jacoby, the contractor, attended the meeting. Mr. Clark said that the work was done by two different contractors, which resulted in miscommunication about the securing of permits. He said that neighbors have signed a petition in support of the alterations to the property. Mr. Clark argued that there is no consistency to cornices on the block.

Mr. Wilds asked for clarification of the communication between the applicant and the staff. He said that even though the previous door was non-historic, the most serious issue is that the work proceeded without a permit. Mr. Wilds commented that the cornice brackets should be replicated to match the neighboring cornice. Commission members offered to allow the applicant to retain the door, but install the correct cornice. Mr. Clark was not receptive to the Commission's compromise.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to legalize the door and brick work, subject to installing the correct cornice, with the staff to review details. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which carried with 7 votes. Mr. Parks dissented and Mr. Tissian abstained.

THE REPORT on the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, May 2004

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

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to approve the expenditure of \$36.05 for the Architectural Committee lunches.

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

Mr. Sklaroff appointed a committee to meet and establish a mural policy. The committee would consist of Mr. Perri, Mr. James, Mr. Tissian and Mr. Rivera.

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

The meeting adjourned 1:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary

As corrected 7/19/04