

**THE MINUTES OF THE 508th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
10 December 2004
One Parkway, 1515 Arch Street, 18th Floor
Conference Room 18025
Michael Sklaroff, Esquire, Chair**

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
Warren Huff, City Planning Commission
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
Sara Merriman, Department of Commerce
Kathleen Murray, Assistant to the President of City Council
David Perri, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Vincent Rivera, AIA
Denise Smyler, Esq.
Harris Steinberg, AIA
Thomas Sugrue, Ph. D.
Norman Tissian
Scott Wilds, Deputy Director, Office of Housing and Community Development

Lawrence Copeland, Esq., Law Department
Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department

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

Also

Timothy Calligan, Chestnut Hill Academy
William Leonard, 250 South 18th Street
Amy Rivera, 213 Catharine Street
Edwin Rivera, 213 Catharine Street
Charles McLaughlin, 1230 Pine Street
Gardner Kahoe, Kirkbride Center
Jerry Roller, J.K. Roller Architects
Arlene Matzkin, Friday Architects
Ross Wilson, Parkway Corporation
Susan Ryan, Martin Jay Rosenblum Associates
James Wiesenhutter, Unkefer Brothers
Veronica Cox-Emanuel, ACE American Insurance Company
Victor J. Perla, ACE American Insurance Company
Craig Deutsch, Harmon Deutsch Architects
Fred Kaulbach, Kling
Francesca Oliveira, Kling
Virgil Procaccino, Christian Street Partners
Ray Brogdon, Soong Associates, 1015 Cherry Street
Peggy Conver, Chestnut Hill Academy

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
 Christopher Restak, Esq., 4643 Hazel Avenue
 Rob Flaynik, 2012 Spring Garden Street
 Amy Johnston, Mural Arts Program
 Jason Sieminski, Drinker Biddle and Reath
 Charles Loomis, Loomis McAfee Architects
 Joseph Byre, CNO, 257 North 2nd Street
 Steve Labov, CNO, 257 North 2nd Street
 Martin Jay Rosenblum, 615 North Broad Street
 Paul Irwin, 218 Carpenter Street
 Julie O'Brien, 317 South 20th Street
 David Keene, Capital Sign Company
 David Knapton, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
 Henry Lieberman, Applebee's
 Stephanie Haney, 4643 Hazel Avenue
 Thomas Witt, Esq., Wolf Block Schorr and Solis-Cohen, LLP
 Mark Washington, Mark Ulrick Engineers, Incorporated
 Leonard F. Reuter, Law Department
 Michael Del Rossi, Jr. Grayboyes Commercial Windows
 Devin Aronstam
 Ronald Patterson, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers LLP
 J. Robert Hillier, FAIA

507th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 508th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:15 a.m.

Minutes of the 507th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Upon a motion made by Mr. Tissian and seconded by Mr. James, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the 507th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held 12 November 2004, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

Ad Hoc Committee on Murals

David Perri, Chair

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to table the discussion until the 14 January 2005 meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission. Mr. Huff seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

The Report of the Committee on Historic Designation

4865 Market Street, a.k.a. 111 North 49th Street, Pennsylvania Hospital for the Insane, Kirkbride Center

Kirkbride Realty Corporation, Owner

Date: 1854-59, Samuel Sloan, architect, with Dr. Thomas Story Kirkbride; addition, 1929; service buildings, c. 1920; hospital building, 1959

At the October 2004 Historical Commission meeting, Mr. Wilds made a motion to table the designation for a period not to exceed six (6) months to allow a sub-committee of the

Committee on Historic Designation to visit the site with representatives of the staff, owner, and nominator and to recommend bounds and other conditions of the Commission's jurisdiction over the buildings, site, and appurtenances at 4865 Market Street. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

On 25 October, during the interval between the October and November meetings of the Commission, the sub-committee and staff met at the site with the owner as directed by the Commission. The sub-committee prepared a boundary recommendation. At the November Commission meeting, however, the owner posed further questions. The Commission again deferred taking an action and directed the staff to consult with the owner.

Mr. Sklaroff inquired if staff had met with the owner. Ms. Spina responded that she made several calls and sent written notification to the owner, but received no response.

Gardner Kahoe, corporate counsel for CoreCare, Incorporated, the owner of Kirkbrides, asked that the Commission postpone a designation vote for one month to allow him to review the information acquired as a result of the site visit by the Committee and staff.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to continue the nomination for a period not to exceed one month. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

The Report of the Architectural Committee, 30 November 2004

500 Willow Grove Avenue, Chestnut Hill Academy

Chestnut Hill Academy, Owner

Eric Rahe, Architect/Applicant

DATE: Wissahickon Inn: 1882-84, Hewitt Brothers, architects, and William Mackie, builder; Commons Building: 1905, Frank Miles Day, architect; Gymnasium, Frank Miles Day; Kline Science Building: c. 1950, Hatfield, Martin & White, architects; Kingsley Gymnasium: addition 1956 and 1959, Hatfield, Martin & White, architects; Squash courts: Voith & Mactavish

PROPOSAL: Demolish building, construct two buildings and parking lot – in concept
The Committee recommended tabling this submission pending the receipt of more information.

Peggy Conner of Chestnut Hill Academy informed the Commission that she was prepared to submit new information for the proposal.

Mr. Sklaroff emphasized that the Architectural Committee should review the new information; therefore the applicant should return to the Committee. Mr. Wilds thought it important that as part of the new information, the applicant clarify the basis for the demolition.

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

213 Catharine Street

Edwin Rivera, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c.1810

PROPOSAL: Cut garage door

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.].

Ms. Spina presented this application. The owners wish to install a garage at the rear of the property by carving out a space in the rear ell. The work has started without a permit or Historical Commission approval. The owner has inserted a steel I-beam below the second floor and has removed approximately four feet of the first floor to accommodate a car in the rear yard. The new rear wall of the first floor has two one-over-one wood windows. A large, stuccoed pillar supports the steel I-beam, which may remain exposed. The existing metal, picket gate will remain. On the east façade, a former window has been cut down to a single-leaf door.

The proposal also includes legalizing the installation of wood, one-over-one wood windows in several existing openings on the north and east elevations of the rear ell. Although the rear ell may not date to 1810, it is 19th century fabric and the windows should be six-over-six.

Amy and Edwin Rivera, the owners, attended the meeting. Mr. Rivera believes that the rear ell is 1930s, is not original to the property, and thus does not entail the removal of historic fabric. He offered to work within the guidelines with the staff and Committee.

Mr. Sklaroff stressed to the applicant that a denial does preclude his return to the Committee.

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

218 Carpenter Street

Paul Irwin, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1858

PROPOSAL: Construct rear, two-story addition

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the addition and deck, but with a single-leaf door and six-over-six window at the 3rd floor rear, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and Standard 10 [New additions and related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

The proposal calls for a two-story rear addition with a third-story deck on this corner property. The addition will have a stucco finish to match the existing side wall. The three windows and door that now exist on the rear wall will be moved to the new rear wall of the addition. At the third floor, the historic rear wall will be removed to create a wall of sliding-glass doors, flanked by sidelights, leading to the deck.

Ms. Spina presented that proposal and noted that the applicant submitted a revised proposal to reflect the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to approve the revised submission. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

615 North Broad Street, Rodeph Shalom

Congregation Rodeph Shalom, Owner

James Weisenhutter, Applicant

DATE: 1926-28, Simon and Simon, architects

PROPOSAL: Add stair tower, cut new entrances

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval as submitted, with the staff to review details.

Ms. Spina explained this application, which includes cutting two side entrances, one on the north façade and one on the south façade, as well as a new stair tower at the rear of the building. The north entrance will be cut in the center bay and will have a double-leaf steel door with perforated metal panels.

The south entrance, which faces a parking lot, will also be cut in the center bay. These doors will be double-leaf and fully glazed. This entrance will have a curved, prefabricated glazed and metal canopy, with glazed walls, that extends six feet. The entrance will also have a concrete ramp, with a plain metal pipe railing. A new gate in the metal picket fence will lead from the parking lot to the synagogue, with metal plates creating a circle, and contemporary lighting fixtures with globes and metal detailing.

The stair tower will be added to the east façade and will extend the full three stories. Faced with stucco on all façades, the addition will have a single-leaf flush door on the south façade leading to concrete stairs with a metal mesh railing. The south façade may also have a series of vertical windows.

The Commission concurred with the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

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

1520 Green Street

Courtyard Associates, Owners

Matthew Wilcox, Applicant

DATE: 1861-65 by Stephen Button, architect

PROPOSAL: Remove stained glass windows, replace windows, install HVAC equipment and skylights

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised proposal, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 2 [The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.], Standard 4 [Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.], 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 Roofs Guideline. [Recommended: Installing mechanical and service equipment on the roof such as air-conditioning when required for the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

This application includes several parts. First, staff has already approved the permit application to restore the stained glass windows on the front façade. The last remaining stained glass window sits in the middle bay on the east face. This window, designed by Nicolo D'Ascenzo, is the only window in the church that has religious themes. The owner wishes to remove the window and donate it to St. Joseph's University. The University is collecting stained glass windows for a future exhibition of stained glass in Philadelphia.

Second, except for the extant stained-glass windows, all of the other windows in the upper sanctuary are missing. The proposal calls for installing new, wood windows that are based on the muntin patterns of the lower floor. The proposal also includes new windows in the bell tower and oculus. All of the other windows will match their original configuration.

Third, the application proposes twenty skylights in the roof of the building. The roof has a very shallow pitch and the skylights have short curbs; they probably will not be visible from the street.

Lastly, the proposal calls for eighteen new condenser units for air-conditioners on the roof of the rear portion of the church. These will not be visible from the street.

Ms. Spina presented the application and noted that the applicant has chosen to retain the D'Ascenzo window in its current location.

Matthew Wilcox, the architect, pointed out that the 9 windows in the upper sanctuary would be recreated with the remaining materials. He clarified that the replication would receive clear glazing and not the stained glass as reported.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to approve the revised submission, with staff to review details. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion which carried with 10 votes. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

Ms. Murray arrived for the meeting.

2131 Green Street

Martin Brigham and Harriet Rubenstein, Owners

Arlene Matzkin, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1861

PROPOSAL: Construct garage with deck at rear

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.].

Ms. Spina presented this proposal, which includes the construction of a one-story garage addition at the rear. The addition will have a stucco finish and a wood roll-up garage door. The roof of the addition will have a deck with a pergola with access through a new single-leaf, multi-light wood door cut down from a window at the second floor. The rear of this house faces Clay Street, which has only garages.

Arlene Matzkin, the architect, representing the proposal offered no comment.

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

2012 Spring Garden Street

Chesterfield Twenty, LLP, Owner

John Hubert, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1875; brownstone detailing added, c. 1890; black glass front added c. 1930

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitate building, add stairtower and roof decks

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the removal of the glass panels on the front, the decks on the first and second floors at the rear, and the decks on the roof, with staff to determine the location of the railing at the front with a mock-up, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property.] and Roofs Guideline [Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as decks and terraces when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.].

Ms. Spina explained this application, which includes façade rehabilitation and decks on both the roof and off the rear bay. The façade rehabilitation will include removing the smoked glass installed on the front façade in the 1930s. The details of the façade restoration, including new windows, will be worked out with staff.

The new deck for the roof of the building would be set back fifteen feet from the front cornice and accessed by a new stair penthouse located at the westernmost edge of the house. The penthouse will be sheathed in mahogany siding.

On the rear, the proposal calls for decks off of the first, second and third floors. The three-story metal bay already has a deck on the roof that existed at the time of designation. The second and third story decks will be accessed by doors cut in the metal bays, but no details have been provided.

Mr. Steinberg thought that the glass and lettering on the front façade, which is a fine example of the vernacular of the 30s, should be retained. He believes that the sign is an evolution of the street. Mr. Wilds cited 1902 Sansom Street, which is a similar concept in the restoration efforts. Mr. Sklaroff asked for clarification of the roof decks since visibility does exist.

Rob Flaynik offered that modifications have been made to the rear decks with a mock-up for a determination of visibility. He pointed out that the rear of this property backs up to the Korman Suites' parking garage, which will lessen visibility. Mr. Flaynik said that the railing for the roof deck would be seen from Spring Garden Street, but he intends to minimize the visibility of the deck. He added that he wants to be sensitive to the neighborhood and is willing to comply with the Commission guidelines. He disclosed that the owner of the property does not wish to retain the sign.

Ms. Spina stressed the denial owing to the policy of rear ell roof decks. She said that the cutting of the metal bay on the 2nd and 3rd floors would constitute the removal of historic fabric. Mr. Wilds questioned the consideration of approval of a visible roof deck on the main roof, even though it is set back. Mr. Rivera pointed out that the railing is really a low masonry wall of cement board paneling. Mr. Sklaroff commented that from the rear elevation, the contour of the building changes with the substantial construction on the top; he also expressed concern about visibility.

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance, expressed concern that a new policy was being created with regards to decks.

Mr. Sklaroff cited Hyman Myers and said that historically buildings do not have four facades but five including the roof. He also mentioned that Mr. Tyler has observed that historically, decks existed on rear ells. Mr. James opined that the only issue with this application is the deck on the main roof. Mr. Wilds concurred and recommended that the front roof deck be eliminated. Mr. Sugrue believes this is a sensible solution, but thought more consideration should be given to the wall as a railing.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation, but with the elimination of the deck on the main roof. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

633 North 16th Street

Graduate Developers, Owners

Clayborn Cann, Applicant

PROPOSAL: Build residence on vacant lot – review and comment

The Architectural Committee voted to table the proposal in order for the architect to redesign the house to be more in keeping with the neighboring houses.

Ms. Spina described the proposed house for the vacant lot. The house will have a brick façade, one-over-one windows, multi-light doors on each floor with metal balconies running the full width, and a garage at the first floor with a roll-down paneled door.

The Historical Commission has 45 days for review and comment.

Allan Rubin, Spring Garden Civic Association, stressed that this is an unusual block of semi-detached houses with breezeways. He noted that the proposed house with a two-car garage would occupy the entire open lot.

Mr. Tissian asked if other garages exist on this block. Mr. Rubin responded in the negative. Mr. Huff offered a suggestion of a two-deep garage with a single opening. Mr. Steinberg questioned the curb cut with regards to a historic district. Mr. Sklaroff remarked about the importance of maintaining the streetscape. Mr. Wilds commented on the overall design which is overwhelming in scale and height. In noting that the neighboring house's cornice wraps around, Mr. Wilds thought that the applicant should redesign the house to be consistent in height and massing and window configuration to replicate its twin. Mr. Steinberg concurred. Commission members discussed the proposed curb cut, which disturbs the streetscape at length and concluded that the issue of the curb cut would be voted upon separately.

Mr. James stressed that a simple denial is appropriate for a review and comment. The Commission concluded that the applicant should redesign the building to be more compatible with the streetscape with the elimination of the garage. Mr. Perri thought that since the work is new construction, this would limit the Commission's control over the curb cut.

Mr. James made a motion to deny the application as submitted. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion which carried with 11 votes. Mr. Wilds opposed the motion.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to deny the curb cut. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which failed with a 6 to 6 vote. Mr. Perri, Mr. James, Mr. Huff, Ms. Merriam, Ms. Murray and Mr. Wilds opposed the motion.

Ms. Smyler excused herself from the meeting.

4100 Main Street

AAC of Manayunk Association, Owner

Jack Kanagic, Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Legalize sign and lighting

The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend 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.].

Ms. Spina explained that without a permit or Historical Commission approval, the owner installed a sign and lighting over the front door. The lighting includes a metal conduit that cuts across the second-floor window and two spot-lights to illuminate the sign. The sign covers the brick jack arch over the door.

Mr. Wilds asked about the Committee's objection to the signage. Ms. Spina informed the Commission that the signage obscures the decorative jack arch. Mr. Sklaroff emphasized the importance of not locating the conduit in the center of the window.

Mr. James made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion which carried with 10 votes. Ms. Murray dissented.

1230 Pine Street

David Callan, Owner

Charles McLaughlin, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1830, storefront c. 1975

PROPOSAL: Demolish storefront and restore residential front, alter chimneys, demolish rear wall and roof, build 3-story addition

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the rear addition as proposed, approval of the front façade restoration and approval of a one-story rear addition with basement excavation and a second-floor deck with a single-leaf, multi-light door, all with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and Standard 10 [New additions and related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.].

Mr. Baron explained this proposal, which calls for the demolition of the visible and original rear façade, roof and dormer of this Federal/Greek Revival Style house. The rear would receive a new three story addition in its place. On the front façade, the applicant proposes the demolition of a recent storefront treatment and its replacement with a restored residential front. The details of that design have not yet been accurately worked out and this does not represent a restoration. Mr. Baron noted that the one story rear addition was demolished last week without a building permit.

Mr. Steinberg asked for clarification of the storefront restoration. Mr. McLaughlin, the architect, responded to Mr. Steinberg's query. Mr. McLaughlin informed the Commission that the demolition was performed by the contractor, the company of Crompton and Seitz. Mr. Wilds asked about the time line of the demolition, it was determined that the demolition occurred between the Committee and Commission meetings.

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

2124-2126 Wallace Street

Jonathan Wilson, Owner

Charles Loomis, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855, altered

PROPOSAL: Alter window openings, install cornice, repair brick, replace garage doors
The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the carriage, garage and hayloft doors with staff to review details and denial of the cornice, brick wall and second floor window alterations pursuant to 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 elements from other historic

properties, will not be undertaken.], 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 described this proposal. This former carriage house had undergone alteration before designation, including the removal of its cornice, the raising of the height of the top floor ceiling, and a creation of a brick parapet on the front façade. This application calls for reinstalling a cornice in a new location at the top of the parapet and rebuilding the brick wall in that area. The applicants propose raising the height of the windows at the second floor and making them four over four rather than two over two. The carriage house, garage and hayloft doors would be replaced.

Jonathan Wilson and Charles Loomis attended the meeting. Mr. Loomis clarified that the building is situated behind the parapet. He informed the Commission that the masonry in the window area is falling and cracking. Mr. Loomis asked the Commission if the portion of the wall above the cornice could be penetrated.

Mr. Wilds thought that the new design should mimic the existing with regards to the height. He also suggested the option of leaving the windows but replacing the cornice. Mr. Sklaroff noted that the raising of the building and proposed scale is at issue. He commented on the appropriateness of the design because carriage houses tend to be different.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried with 7 votes. Ms. Merriman, Mr. Steinberg, Mr. Tissian and Mr. Sklaroff dissented.

613 North 18th Street

Steven Westbrook, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Demolish and rebuild front façade and rear ells, add decks

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the submission, with larger windows in the side façade of the rear ell, the areas of façade reconstruction noted on the drawings and staff to review details, 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.].

Mr. Baron presented this proposal, which was seen last month as a substantial demolition. It returns as a revised proposal to legalize the demolition of the rear ell. It calls for rebuilding the front façade using the existing brick and building a new cornice, doorway and windows to match the originals. The details provided for the windows, however, are incorrect. Unfortunately, it does not call for saving the first and second floor of the façade or the doorway as had been recommended by the Committee. It also gives no details of the doors, door surround or windows to be replaced. The revised

plans now show the rear bays to be reinstalled to their original size and covered in cedar.

No one was in attendance to represent the application. Commission members agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

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

436 Walnut Street

ACE-INA Insurance, Owner

Michael Del Rossi Jr., Applicant

DATE: 1915, addition 1972

PROPOSAL: Replace windows

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

Mr. Baron presented this proposal, which calls for replacing the windows in both the new and older portions of this office building. In the old section of the building, a former owner replaced the historic wood sash in aluminum and capped the window frames with aluminum prior to designation. The applicants have researched the original design with an historic photograph, surviving sidelights in the upper floor and the historic frames under the capping to help create a new aluminum window.

Vic Perla, Michael DelRossi and Veronica Cox-Emanuel attended the meeting.

The Commission concurred with the Committee's recommendation.

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

436 Walnut Street

ACE-INA Insurance, Owner

Robert Thompson, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1915, addition 1972

PROPOSAL: Demolish penthouse, install HVAC equipment and screening

The Architectural Committee recommended approval subject to staff review of a mock-up for a determination of the appropriate color.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal, which calls for the demolition of a utilitarian penthouse and the installation of two large cooling towers. The units will be hidden with brick red colored screens.

Vic Perla, Veronica Cox-Emanuel, Fred Kaulbach, Francesca Oliveira, and Mark Washington attended the meeting.

Commission members agreed with the Committee's recommendation.

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

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

5500 Wissahickon Avenue, Alden Park: The Kenilworth

Eastview Realty Associates, Owner

Sonny Victoria, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1925, Edwin Rorke, architect

PROPOSAL: Replace roof with asphalt shingles

The Committee voted to recommend denial of the asphalt and the submission of a terra cotta estimate with a life-cycle cost assessment for consideration by the Committee at a future date. It also expressed a willingness to consider the metal simulated tile.

The applicant requested a thirty-day continuance which was granted.

215 South 15th Street

Felchen 15, LP, Owner

David Keene, Applicant

DATE: 5th District Police Station, built 1870/1898 Charles Supplee, architect

PROPOSAL: Add illuminated signage and awnings

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the signage and awnings with the flat wall sign reduced in width and with staff to review details and to work with the applicant to mitigate any damage under the existing wall sign, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]

Mr. Baron introduced this application for signage, which returns to the Committee with some changes. The application now calls for shed type awnings in canvas-like fabric on the west and north facades. The main flat wall sign will be replaced with a smaller sign flanked by two sets of neon letters on armatures. The large corner sign returns with modification only to its sign faces. The applicant looked into reattaching the sign with a less fabric hiding the quoins of the building corner; however, it was found that this would force the applicant to make a new zoning application and the existing sign would no longer be "grandfathered".

Mr. Steinberg requested that the original Bookbinder's sign be saved. Members discussed possible organizations with a possible interest in the sign such as Len Davidson's Philadelphia Sign Museum.

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

1700-1706 Rittenhouse Square Street

Parkway Corporation, Owner

Thomas Witt, Esq., Applicant

DATE: new building on vacant ground and on site of rowhouse approved for demolition

PROPOSAL: Erect 33-story residential building

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend the approval of the submission.

Mr. Baron introduced this proposal, which involves the construction of a 33-story residential tower on a vacant lot and the site of a row-house that the Commission has approved for demolition.

David Ertz, architect, and Thomas Witt, Esq., attended the meeting.

Mr. Steinberg expressed mixed emotions about the project. He offered concern about the massing and the absence of a door on the 17th Street façade. Mr. Wilds concurred with Mr. Steinberg and questioned the reason for this decision. Mr. Ertz said that the primary entrance would be located on Rittenhouse Square Street, because the ownership, guided by charm of Rittenhouse Square, thought it a better address. He added that South 17th Street has a more commercial than residential, appearance. Mr. Rivera thought that the window on the South 17th Street façade should have a residential scale; and that the window should have less height. Mr. Ertz replied that the window's height responds to neighboring buildings.

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance, said that he supports the Architectural Committee's recommendation. He commended the developer and architect for their responsiveness in addressing diverse concerns. Mr. Gallery disagreed with Mr. Tyler about the Commission's jurisdiction over the lot of the demolished building, since the building had been re-classified as non-contributing. He said that he had never received a response to his request for a legal clarification of the extent of the Commission's jurisdiction over a property following an approved demolition. Mr. Copeland said that he disagreed with Mr. Gallery; he explained that, although he had a copy of Mr. Gallery's letter, the Law Department prepares opinions on at the request of an agency.

Mr. Sugrue asked Mr. Copeland to prepare a letter to the Commission members on the 45 day review and comment rule and the applicable standard for a vacant property following a legal demolition.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Murray seconded the motion which carried unanimously. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

2010-2012 Chancellor Street

Acorn Property Development I, LLC, Owner

Arlene Matzkin, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1885

PROPOSAL: Revise approved façade design

The Committee recommended approval of the rebuilding in brick of the St. James Street wall but with the third floor addition set back four inches (4") and with greater verticality in the second floor windows, with staff to review details. The Committee recommended denial of the use of leaded glass. It made these recommendations pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.] and Standard 10 [New additions and 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.

Mr. Baron explained the application, which is very similar to the one seen by the Committee and Commission several months ago. At that time the project was approved with the doors to be revised at the front in consultation with the staff, the third floor addition to be approved at the rear subject to a setback, and the retention of the existing openings on the second floor on St. James Street. The Commission agreed to allow the applicant to stucco the rear wall of 2010 Chancellor Street. The applicant who agreed to these conditions before now returns to the Committee without revising the front doors, with no setback on the third floor and without the retention of the second floor openings. They now seek to rebuild the rear wall in brick rather than to cover it with stucco. The staff does not object to rebuilding the wall in matching brick, but thinks that the applicant should meet the other requirements already stipulated by the Commission in its review.

Mr. Wilds asked for clarification of the proposal.

Arlene Matzkin, the architect, said that her client now proposes to demolish both brick walls owing to structural issues. In response to a condition imposed by the Zoning Board of Adjustment, the wall will be rebuilt in brick instead of stucco. The application seeks to modify the existing openings, to reportion the three openings, and to setback the third floor addition 4 inches. She noted that the owner is willing to concede on the installation of leaded glass.

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

1646 Waverly Street aka 415 South 17th Street

Andrew Eisenstein, Owner

Alicia Whitt Ali, Applicant

DATE: c. 1840, remodeled c. 1970

PROPOSAL: Install garage doors to existing opening

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended denial because of an incomplete application.

The applicant withdrew the proposal.

226 South 4th Street

J. Rice and M. Forman, Owners

Martin Jay Tackett, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1804; significantly altered c. 1900 and in 1966

PROPOSAL: Construct rear addition, deck and garden wall, rehabilitate façade, add rear dormer and HVAC equipment

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal with a vertical reveal on the west-facing wall separating the old and new construction, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.]. Ms. Pentz abstained.

Mr. Farnham explained this application, which proposes the construction of a rear addition, rear dormer, patio, and garden wall as well as some rehabilitation of the façade. The impressive rowhouse was built about 1804, substantially altered about 1900 when it was converted to commercial use, and then rehabilitated, but not restored in 1966. It is listed as contributing to the Society Hill Historic District.

The lot lines will be adjusted, adding a large plot of land to the property at the rear of 228 S. 4th Street, the neighboring parcel to the south. A two-story stucco addition is proposed for the newly-acquired land. The unusual addition would include wood doors, wood shutters, and a large wood screen, but no conventional windows. No explanation for the addition's odd configuration has been provided.

A patio enclosed by a garden wall would be added at the rear. New French doors would be installed in an existing opening at the patio.

A wide dormer would be added to the rear slope of the main block roof. It would have a stucco finish and a metal roof. The roof of the building is not original and the roofline does not approximate the historic roofline. The non-historic roof was added as part of the 1966 rehabilitation.

Jay Tackett, the architect, and Ronald Patterson, counsel for the owner, attended the meeting.

Commission members concurred with the Committee's recommendation.

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

257-259 N. 2nd Street

257-259 Development, LLC, owner

Carl Primavera, applicant

History: vacant lot at the time of the designation of the Old City Historic District

Project: Erect 6-story residential building on vacant lot – review and comment

The Committee commented that the building, especially its first floor, should be redesigned to fit its context better.

This application proposes the construction of a large residential building on a vacant lot

at 257-259 N. 2nd Street, south of Vine Street. The Commission's jurisdiction is limited to 45 days of review and comment. Construction began in October 2004 without any Commission review. The Department of Licenses & Inspections had issued a building permit without referral to the Commission. After numerous complaints from neighbors about the construction, the Commission staff inquired at the Department about the permitting for the project. When the Department realized that it had issued a permit without referral to the Commission, it suspended the permit and forwarded the application to the Commission.

The 6-story building would stand on piers, with an open first story dedicated to parking and five upper stories occupied by residences. The deep building would stretch from N. 2nd Street east to the service road that runs along the I-95 corridor. It would be faced with metal and glass on the street elevations and Dryvit on the sides. It would include small balconies.

Mr. Farnham explained the application. Mr. Steinberg expressed concern about the parking at the first level of the entire structure. Additionally, he suggested that the entrance be shifted. Mr. Steinberg took exception to the proposed materials.

Jay Tackett, the architect, attended the meeting. In response to Mr. Steinberg's concern about the parking, he pointed out that a proposed garden wall would lessen the visibility of the parking area. Mr. Tackett said that he would take the suggestion of shifting the entrance under advisement.

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance; commented on the design with respect to the parking on the entire footprint of the first floor and offered support for the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

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

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

219-229 S. 18th Street, Rittenhouse Regency

Rittenhouse Regency Affiliates, owner

Lubert-Adler Management, Inc., applicant

History: Built 1925, Zantzinger, Borie & Medary, architects

Major alterations 1957, Cronheim & Weger, architects

Project: Construct 5-story addition, alter façade – in concept

The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended approval in concept of the following:

1. the restoration of all 1927 as-built historic fabric including the storefronts, main entrances, and arched window openings at floors 2 to 5;
2. the two-story corner additions and the four-story rooftop addition, provided the two-story additions are clad in a material distinct from the historic brick and provided the façade details are restudied to avoid replicating historic details, especially the recessed arches at the windows;
3. the new facing and openings in the upper corner facades, provided the façade details are restudied to avoid replicating historic details, especially the recessed arches at the windows;

4. inconspicuous pergolas;
5. the addition of window openings in the corner bays at floors 3 to 9;
6. the alterations to the windows in the center bays at floors 7 to 15 provided the details, especially the balconies, are restudied.

This in-concept application proposes extensive alterations and additions to the former Penn Athletic Club building on Rittenhouse Square at the northeast corner of 18th and Locust Streets. The building was designed by the important Zantzinger, Borie & Medary firm. It was converted from the Penn Athletic Club to an Army Corps of Engineers office building in 1957. During the unsympathetic conversion, several important decorative features were removed and many new features, including windows, introduced. The application proposes:

1. Restoration of the storefronts
2. Restoration of the main entrances
3. Restoration of the arched window openings at floors 2 to 5
4. Addition of window openings in the corner bays at floors 3 to 9
5. Alterations to windows in the center bays at floors 7 to 15
6. Two-story additions at both corner sections on 18th Street
7. Four-story rooftop addition at center bays on 18th Street
8. Alterations to window configurations and openings throughout the building

Essentially, this application proposes to reconstruct this building in a manner predicated on the original, yet unrealized, paper-only design. It does not propose to restore it to any point in its bricks-and-mortar history. Included in the application package is a rendering of the elegant, unrealized 1924 design by Zantzinger, Borie & Medary for a 12-story building with subtle detailing including balconies, pergolas, and inset columns of arched windows. The structure erected by 1927 was rather clumsy when compared to the refined 1924 design. It was five stories taller and devoid of much of the gracious detailing of the earlier design. The building was debased by the 1957 alterations and later modifications. This application proposes not the return to the 1927 as-built building or even the 1924 as-designed building, but instead to create a new, larger building based on the 1924 design.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal.

David Marshall and Robert Hillier attended the meeting. Mr. Hillier acknowledged his acceptance of the Architectural Committee's recommendation and revised the proposal to reflect the recommendation. Mr. Marshall said that the two-story addition constructed of a different material would be set back. He asserted that the brick would be retained with new openings and terra cotta on the top portion to match the existing.

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance, said that this is an extraordinary project and he noted that the most significant issues were addressed at the Architectural Committee.

Mr. Rivera made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Murray seconded the motion which carried unanimously. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

109 Elfreth's Alley

A. Caren and S. Cronin, owners

Gerry Gutierrez, applicant/architect

History: 1811 for Ephraim Haines, cabinet maker, Significant in Old City Historic District

Project: Erect 3-story addition – in concept

The applicant withdrew the proposal.

250 S. 18th Street

Mark Rogers, owner

Jennifer Bonaccorsi, J.K. Roller Architects, applicant/architect

History: Built 1923, McIlvaine & Roberts, architects

Project: Replace awning with bronze canopy, replace wood doors with bronze, add bollards

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend the following, with staff to review details:

1. approval of the canopy, provided that it is mounted above the pediment and provided that it is detailed to fit cleanly within the historic doorway;
2. approval of a single-leaf door with sidelights based on the historic doorway, but denial of the proposed door with infill panels;
3. and approval of the bollards, provided that they are located closer to the building and provided that the chains are deleted from the plan;

pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.]; and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.].

This application for the large residential building at the southwest corner of S. 18th Street and Rittenhouse Square proposes the replacement of a canvas barrel-arched awning with a bronze canopy, the replacement of glazed wood double-leaf doors with a single-leaf bronze door and infill, and the addition of bollards with chains.

Remnants of struts on the building testify that a canopy once hung above the doorway. A Commission photograph taken from a great distance shows a canopy or awning hanging from the struts. According to a representative of the condominium council, this canopy was not original, but was added in the 1970s. An ornate stone pediment hangs above the doorway. The relationship of the proposed canopy to the pediment is unclear. One drawing depicts it intersecting the building at the pediment; another depicts it mounted above the pediment.

Mr. Farnham explained the proposal and noted that the applicant has revised the submission, which deletes the bollards and chains. Additionally, the design of the canopy has been revised. Mr. Sklaroff expressed his dismay over the bollard approval. Mr. Steinberg inquired about the canopy attachment.

Jerry Roller, the architect, and William Leonard, President of the Condominium Council,

attended the meeting. Mr. Roller noted that the canopy would not require illumination and that it mimics the architectural design of the door surround. He informed the Commission that the door would not receive sidelights and that the taxi light would be retained.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to approve the revised proposal as submitted. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

261-263 S. 22nd Street

200 Christian Street Partners, owners

Craig Deutsch, applicant/architect

History: 261 S. 22nd Street, c. 1875

263 S. 22nd Street, 1957

Project: Demolish and rebuild facades, erect additions with decks

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend the following, with staff to review details:

1. the deletion of the recessed entrances and the relocation of the doors to the sidewalk line
2. the reduction of the width of each penthouse by three feet
3. the addition of glazing to the penthouses
4. a 2-light over 2-panel historic wood door at 261 S. 22nd Street
5. a simplified single-light transom over the entrance door at 261 S. 22nd Street
6. two simplified single-light transoms over the garage door at 261 S. 22nd Street
7. a simplified three-light transom over the entrance door at 263 S. 22nd Street
8. two simplified three-light transoms over the garage door at 263 S. 22nd Street
9. the replacement of the lower limestone band with brick courses at 263 S. 22nd Street
10. the deletion of the upper limestone band at 263 S. 22nd Street
11. solid 42'-tall wood railings on the decks, provided that they are not visible

This application proposes design details for two townhouses at 261 and 263 S. 22nd Street. The application is part of a larger project that the Commission and its Committee have reviewed several times. The overall project entails the partial demolition of a large L-shaped building and the construction of three residential buildings with garages and decks in its place. At the north, the property extends from 22nd Street to Van Pelt Street and includes the 261 S. 22nd and 262 S. Van Pelt facades. At the south, the property extends east about 120 feet from the 263 S. 22nd façade. The site is listed as three buildings in the Rittenhouse-Filter Historic District inventory; all three are classified as Contributing.

At its 12 November 2004 meeting, the Commission approved several segments of the overall project. At that time, it voted to approve the proposal for the building at 262 S. Van Pelt Street, with staff to review details, provided the penthouse is reduced in size to the minimum necessary to accommodate an elevator and stair only and provided that the profile of the new building does not exceed that of the building at 264 S. Van Pelt Street; to approve garages in all three new townhouses, and to approve the demolition and third-story addition at the 22nd Street townhouses, but to deny the details of the two townhouses. This application proposes details for the townhouses at 261 and 263 S. 22nd Street. The details specified in the current plans are identical to those reviewed and denied by the Commission at its 12 November 2004 meeting.

Mr. Farnham presented this application, which the Commission has seen on several occasions. Mr. Sklaroff commented that the Commission takes issue with the return of an application that has no change in the alterations proposed and has been denied.

Craig Deutsch, the applicant, acknowledged his acceptance of the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Tissian asked if it were possible to locate the garage in the rear, owing to the large rear yard. Mr. Steinberg commented on the difference in the design of the garage doors.

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

317-319 S. 20th Street

Blake Christoph, owner

Blake Ingram, applicant

History: Rowhouse and carriage house joined and carriage door infilled, c. 1925

Project: Cut garage doorway from window, add door

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to approve the reopening of the doorway and the installation of an historically appropriate, carriage house door that appears to be segmentally-arched, but denial of the proposed door and infill, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.].

This application proposes work to the Delancey Street facade of the large building at 317-319 S. 20th Street. It proposes the removal of a large segmentally-arched window, the enlarging of the opening for a garage entrance, and the installation of a garage door. A carriage house door once stood where the new door is proposed. The original carriage door opening was infilled and window installed about 1925, when the carriage house was joined to the rowhouse to the west.

The proposed garage door with plywood infill would not replicate the carriage house door that once stood at this location. The design of the door should be improved to replicate the historic carriage house door.

Commission members concluded that the applicant could work with staff for an appropriate door design.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Murray seconded the motion which carried with 10 votes. Mr. Tissian dissented.

2330 Pine Street

Michael and Jennifer Friel, owners

James Crowell, applicant

History: Built nineteenth century; significantly altered by Charles E. Broudy, c. 1960

Project: Replace windows and doors

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial.

The applicant withdrew the proposal.

1015 Cherry Street

Chinese American Buddhist Association, owner

Sabrina Soong, applicant/architect

History: Built c. 1830

Project: Demolish and install storefront, construct 1-story rear addition

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the rear addition as proposed and approval of the front façade addition provided it is redesigned to preserve in place as much historic fabric as possible, with staff to review details.

This application proposes alterations at the first-floor front façade and the construction of a small rear addition for the Fo Chow Temple of the Chinese American Buddhist Association. The building is a Greek Revival rowhouse erected in the 1830s. In the mid twentieth century, the first-floor front windows were replaced with a large storefront window. The remainder of the façade including the arched entranceway, watertable, and steps are unaltered. The application proposes demolishing the entirety of the first-floor front façade including the Greek Revival doorway, marble steps, and marble watertable and replacing it with a projecting entranceway consisting of a recessed central doorway, fixed windows, steps with decorative railings, and a yellow tile roof. At the rear, a small addition would be constructed beneath a second-story bay.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal and noted that the applicant has revised the proposal to reflect the Committee's recommendation.

Ray Brogdon, architect, attended the meeting.

Mr. Sklaroff expressed concern about the yellow clay tile on the roof of the building. He inquired if it is a cultural statement or an expression of the Buddhist religion. Mr. Wilds pointed out that the building has undergone many alterations, rendering the storefront non-historic. He concluded that under these circumstances, the proposed alterations are appropriate. Mr. Sugrue thought that the proposed alterations should prevail in the portion already altered, since there is no justification for the removal of historic fabric. Mr. Sklaroff cautioned against setting a precedent based on cultural preferences. He suggested that the congregation send a letter clarifying if the design reflects cultural or religious values. Mr. Steinberg remarked that he believes this subject needs more consideration.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the revised submission. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion which carried with 8 votes. Mr. James, Mr. Sugrue and Mr. Sklaroff dissented.

THE REPORT of the Committee on Financial Hardship, 19 November 2004.

Michael Sklaroff, Chair

4643 Hazel Avenue

Mr. Sklaroff summarized the minutes of the Financial Hardship Committee meeting. Mr.

Wilds emphasized that the applicant repaid her father thus demonstrating that the asset is mortgageable.

Stephanie Haney, the owner, and Christopher Restak, Esq., attended the meeting. Mr. Restak said that his client would accept the Committee's decision as long as it is based on fact. He argued against the statement that the primary reason for the purchase of the property was as investment. He said that Mr. Haney, a retired builder, bought the property with 3 to 5 pages of violations outstanding. Mr. Restak clearly believes that Ms. Haney is a candidate for financial hardship. He said that the architect is working with the staff to develop an historically appropriate design.

Much of the work was performed without permits and beyond the scope of an initial permit. At that time there were two owners, the applicant and her father. Since then, Ms. Haney repaid her father \$300,000 and is now the sole owner. Mr. Sklaroff concluded that work on an historic building comes with responsibilities and that a case made for financial hardship can only be demonstrated when the financial information of both owners is submitted. Mr. Baron informed the Commission that there are still many issues remaining such as the cornice, windows and porch designs.

Ms. Murray made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Huff and Mr. Steinberg dissented.

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

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

Mr. Huff commended the staff on excellent job in the completion of the Old City Historical District's manual.

Mr. Steinberg commented affirmatively on the recent ruling in which a judge overturned the Board of License and Inspection's affirmation of the Commission's approval of the demolition of the properties in the 1900 block of Sansom Street for the Parking Authority's development. Mr. Wilds disagreed and said that the judge's decision was troubling.

Ms. Spina noted the loss of the appeal for 1725 Porter Street at the Board of License and Inspection Review. She believes that the decision was influenced by the approvals of the roll-down gate at 1825 Porter Street and the two-story addition at 1723 Porter Street. Ms. Spina said that neighbors in the area were disturbed about the invasion of garden space as a result of these alterations. Mr. Sklaroff commented that community groups that support designations should be a part of the decision making process. Ms. Murray suggested that all proposed alterations receive posting. Mr. Reuter suggested monthly agendas be published in neighborhood papers. Mr. Tyler advised the Commission that many individuals and community organizations, including Girard Estate's, receive the agendas of all meetings of the Commission and its committees.

Mr. Huff said that there is an issue of curb cuts and garages in Queen Village. The

Planning Commission believes that the garages should be located in the rear and that today's market requires garages. The Department of Licenses and Inspections and the Planning Commission's jurisdiction does not extend to streets and sidewalks; an historic district's boundaries, however, do include streets and curbs.

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to approve the expenditure of \$31.61 for the Architectural Committee lunches.

Ms. Murray made a motion to approve the expenditure. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

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

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary

As corrected 1/18/05