

**THE MINUTES OF THE 455TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
12 JULY 2000**

**Commission Conference Room 18th Floor, 1515 Arch Street
Wayne S. Spilove, Chair**

Present

Wayne S. Spilove, Chair
David Baldinger, Deputy Director, City Planning Commission
David Brownlee, Ph.D.
Maxine Griffith, Executive Director, City Planning Commission
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
Shelly Merhige, Office of City Council President
David Perri, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Dennis Ward III
Scott Wilds, Assistant Director, Office of Housing and Community Development
Caroline Wischmann
Stephanie G. Wolf, Ph.D.

Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Julie Dunn, Historic Preservation Planner
Diane M. Hughes, Executive Secretary
Laura Spina, Historic Preservation Planner
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation

Mark Zecca, Esq., Senior Attorney, City of Philadelphia Law Department

Also

Christopher Scalone, Christopher Scalone Architects
Kevin McDowell, Executive Director, Academy of Vocal Arts
Douglas Seiler, Seiler Architects/Academy of Vocal Arts
Lance Kraemer, Lance R. Kraemer Associates Architects
Janet DeLong Hart, Greenwood Cemetery
Richard Waldron, American Swedish Historical Museum
Richard Russell, University of Pennsylvania
Michael D. Swiszc, University of Pennsylvania
John Aikman, John Aikman Architect
Anthony Weber, Weber and Company Architects
Elisa Ung, *Philadelphia Inquirer*
Pete Fiorentino, Office of the President of City Council
Jody Della Barba, Girard Estates/FDR Park
Fred Weir, Anderson Consulting
Marita Osbourne, Amerimar Wanamaker Management
John Bosio, Hillier Group Architects
Elizabeth Pokempner, Law Department Intern
Leonard Williams, Northwood
Lynette Notte, Northwood
Walter Mellbourne, Northwood Neighbor
Robin Mellbourne, Northwood Neighbor

John Buffington, Northwood Neighbor
Joyce N. Halley, Northwood Neighbor
Gloria Boyd, Northwood Civic Association
Peter Miller, Towers and Miller Architects
Christopher Mallios, 423 Vine Street
Tom Dougherty, Fairmount Park Commission
Theresa Stuhlman, Fairmount Park Commission
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents Association/Preservation Alliance
Albert Taus, Albert Taus and Associates Architects
Shep Wainwright, Xando Cosi Incorporation
Glenn Krotick, 1707 Pine Street
Richard Stange, Architect, 1701 Spruce Street
Mark Bojanowski, Owner, 1701 Spruce Street
Carolyn Wahrenberger, 535 Delancey Street
Judith Eden, Center City Residents Association

Wayne S. Spilove, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 455th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:10 A.M. Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to welcome Julianne Dunn to The Philadelphia Historical Commission staff. Mr. Tyler also announced that a lighting mock-up at Eastern State Penitentiary will take place on 18 July 2000 at 8:45 p.m.

MINUTES of the 454th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission.

Upon a motion made by Ms. Merhige and duly seconded, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the 454th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission held on 14 June 2000, Wayne S. Spilove, Chair.

THE REPORT of the Committee on Historic Designation,

The Meeting of 19 May 2000

930 Adams Avenue, Greenwood Cemetery

Greenwood Knights of Pythias Cemetery Company, Owner

At its last meeting, the Commission tabled this nomination owing to the pending loss of a quorum. It did, however, vote to incorporate a memorandum of understanding clarifying the Commission's jurisdiction into the nomination.

Mr. Tyler asked if counsel or other spokesperson for the owner wished to present for comments before going forward. Ms. Janet DeLong Hart identified herself as the representative of the owner.

Ms. Spina expressed concern over the jurisdiction over the future clearing of the untended section now overgrown with trees and brush. The Commission did not resolve this issue at its last meeting. Mr. Wilds stated that his recollection of the interpretation of routine maintenance, as discussed at the last meeting, was that it does not require Commission approval. Some Commission members believed that a distinction exists between routine maintenance and the removal of trees and landscaping. Commission members further stated that this should be a one-time occurrence. Thereafter maintenance of the grounds should not disturb the graves and

monuments. In view of this, the memorandum of understanding should clarify the changing of landscape that impacts on the character of the property.

Mr. Tyler said that the Commission has a nomination before it which at some date the Commission must act on. He also stated that he recognizes the complexity of the pending transaction and the issues before the Zoning Board of Adjustment. He spoke with counsel for the present owner concerning the Zoning Board's action, and suggested that she seek a continuance today if the Zoning Board did not yet rule. Mr. Tyler has no objection to a continuance owing to the property's being under the Commission's jurisdiction. Therefore, if the Zoning Board denies the variances, this would afford counsel the opportunity to present a fuller case. Absent any submission challenging the nomination or a formal request for a continuance, Mr. Tyler recommended going forward with the nomination.

Ms. Hart read a letter on behalf of her father, the present owner and manager of the cemetery. She urged the partial designation of the property until after a new owner takes title to it. She also stated that the present buyer does not contest the designation. Ms. Hart then formally requested a continuance.

Mr. Wilds moved that the Commission continue its consideration of the nomination for one month. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion.

Mr. Brownlee observed that the Commission has Greenwood Cemetery under consideration as an historic site and that opportunity to present additional information constitutes a legitimate reason for a postponement. However, without a proffer of additional information, the Commission will in due course vote on the information at hand and it is unlikely that this will be continued any further while waiting the completion of the sale. Ms. Hart stated that even if the Zoning Board grants the application for a variance, an opponent has thirty days in which to file an appeal, leaving the status of the several issues unchanged next month. Mr. Brownlee then withdrew his second of the motion for a continuance.

Ms. Wolf stated that the material cannot wait on the question of ownership. If additional documentation of the historic background of the cemetery is not submitted before the next Commission meeting, the Commission should proceed with the nomination. The issue of timing for the submission was raised. Mr. Wilds said that the applicant may present additional information at the Commission meeting itself.

Gloria Boyd, Northwood Civic Association, expressed her concern that if the Commission does not receive the additional information challenging the nomination until its next meeting, she will not have time to prepare a refutation.

Mr. Wilds repeated his motion to grant a continuance until the next Commission meeting when a vote will be taken. Ms. Wolf seconded the motion which carried with 5 votes in favor and 4 votes in opposition.

The Meeting of 30 June 2000

League Island, now Franklin Delano Roosevelt Park, Historic District
Fairmount Park Commission, Owner

The Committee on Historic Designation suggested several revisions to the nomination by the staff.

The Commission continued its consideration of this nomination for one month

1316 Walnut Street, University Club

Mid-City Camera Exchange, Owner

At its meeting of 14 June 2000, the Commission tabled this nomination pending a site visit by Committee and staff.

Ms. Spina made an illustrated presentation of the nomination. She noted that original documentation for the building exists and that the upper floors retain their architectural integrity, as does the rear elevation on Chancellor Street. This building, erected in 1887, possesses significance as a rare surviving early work of Wilson Eyre, Jr., as a fine example of Eyre's interpretation of Venetian Gothic Revival architecture, and as the first clubhouse of the newly formed University Club, an organization whose membership included many of Philadelphia's social and professional elite. The building meets criteria a, d and e of the Historic Preservation Ordinance as prescribed at Section 14-2007(5) of the Historic Preservation Ordinance.

Mr. Ward made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation to designate the University Club. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

THE REPORT of the Committee on Financial Hardship, 7 July 2000

216 Market Street

Mirmor Corporation, Owner

Canepino, Inc., Tenant

DATE: c. 1860

The Committee on Financial Hardship reports to the Commission that the applicant has not demonstrated a financial hardship and observes that the applicant can make a claim before the Commission that Section (7)(k)(.7), not Section (7)(f), of the Ordinance applies in this instance.

The Committee met on 7 July 2000 to resume the recessed meeting of 14 January 2000.

On 10 November 1999, the Commission voted to reject the recommendation made by the Architectural Committee on 26 October 1999 to approve an application to alter the storefront at 216 Market Street. The work began without a permit and the Department of Licenses and Inspection issued a violation. The owner and tenant filed an application for relief under the financial hardship provision of the Ordinance. The Committee on Financial Hardship met on 14 January 2000 and found that the applicants had submitted incomplete and inadequate documentation to support a hardship claim. The Committee recessed its meeting pending the receipt of a full application. On 2 May 2000, Canepino, Inc., the tenant, appealed to the Board of License and Inspection Review which heard the case on 20 June 2000, despite the expiration of the thirty-day period for filing an appeal. The Board remanded the case to the Commission for its Committee on Financial Hardship to resume and complete its deliberations.

For the staff, Mr. Tyler presented the matter to the Committee on 7 July and offered its

assessment that the current submission did not fully comply with the provisions of the Ordinance and the Rules and Regulations for a showing of financial hardship and that the evidence presented did not meet the test of financial hardship.

Ronald Patterson, counsel for the Canepino, Inc., stated that his client sought relief under Section 14-2007(7)(k)(.7) which does not require an affidavit or the demonstration of financial hardship stipulated at (7)(f). Mr. Tyler responded that (7)(k)(.7) was designed to provide relief from the literal enforcement of the Ordinance to low- and moderate-income persons, that the Commission's Rules and Regulations prescribed the procedure for a (7)(k)(.7) submission, and that he thought it not applicable in the present instance.

The Committee adopted the motion made by Mr. Wilds and seconded by Mr. Baldinger that the applicant had not demonstrated a financial hardship under the Ordinance with two votes in favor of the motion and one abstention.

Mr. Spilove stated that this case posed a unique circumstance. Here a tenant, not an owner, has applied for relief, and the owner has not cooperated in making a submission to the Committee. Moreover, only the ground floor tenant space, not the entire building, forms the subject of the appeal. Mr. Wilds added that the Committee offered the possibility of a compromise design solution which the applicant rejected.

Members of the Commission discussed various aspects of this application. Mr. Brownlee asked if a tenant incurs any responsibility in applying for a building permit. Mr. Perri responded that an owner bears the responsibility for an application, but that a tenant may act on behalf of an owner. He noted that for zoning permits, a tenant applicant must have a letter of authorization from the owner. Ms. Wolf stated that the Commission must maintain a standard for hardship reviews.

Mr. Patterson illustrated the difference between the demolished storefront and the one proposed by his client. The latter will yield significantly more restaurant seating space than the former and avoid a hardship for his clients. He also stated that this design conforms to the spirit of the code, for the proposed façade will respond to similar ones in the neighborhood, not mimic the previous one.

During the ensuing discussion, Ms. Wischmann asked if the demolished storefront had formed a part of the original fabric of the building. Mr. Tyler replied that it was not, but that it followed the configuration of the original design and had achieved its own significance as a part of the building. Mr. Baron said that successful areas often contain a variety of storefronts and uses. He cited a new one with a central recessed entrance just to the east of 216 Market Street; recesses are far from unique. Ms. Wolf cautioned against approving after the fact demolitions that occurred without permits. Mr. Tyler added that the Commission had just received drawings for the complete rehabilitation of 216 and 218 Market Street, except for the ground floor of 216; this suggests that the property as a whole does not lack viability.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to reject the application for a modified storefront based on financial hardship. Ms. Griffith seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

THE REPORT of the Architectural Committee, 27 June 2000, Robert Thomas, Chair

328-330 Delancey Street, 329 Pine Street

Joseph Ottaviano, Jr., Owner
Christopher Scalone, Architect
DATE: c. 1950

PROPOSAL: Demolish two non-contributing houses, conceptual review to build a new house
The Architectural Committee recommended the approval of the demolition and the conceptual approval of the design for the new house. Committee members suggested that the panes of glass in the windows have a vertical orientation. Two members favored approval with no conditions, and four expressed serious reservations about the battered chimney.

This application calls for approval for the demolition of two non-contributing structures and conceptual approval for the construction of a large house already seen in preliminary form. The Committee on Historic Designation and the Commission at a previous meeting approved the change in classification of the two houses to non-contributing to allow for the demolition.

Christopher Scalone, the architect, was present to answer questions and explain the proposal.

Mr. Baron noted a correction in the Committee's recommendation. It should have read approval of the demolition, not conceptual approval, and conceptual approval of the new design. The staff has posted the required demolition notices. Demolition will occur in conjunction with the issuance of a building permit for the new construction.

Mr. Spilove expressed his concern that since the architect should have the latitude to express himself; the Commission should not get involved with allowing or disallowing the battered chimney. Mr. Baron stated his personal view that a house in Society Hill occupying three lots should read as three separate components. The chimney does much to achieve that separation. Another Delancey Street house has a chimney in the front. The question of the materials for the proposed house was raised; it will be brick and limestone. Ms. Merhige asked about the owner's wishes in regards to the windows; he prefers the recommended vertical windows.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation and to approve the proposal as submitted to include the vertical orientation of the windows. Ms. Wolf seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Nomination of Rudolph D'Alessandro to Membership on the Architectural Committee

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to accept the recommendation of the Committee to appoint Rudolph D'Alessandro to the Architectural Committee in place of William Cornell who has retired.

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

128-132 Christian Street

Charles Burdumy, Owner/Applicant
DATE: c. 1970
PROPOSAL: Rear addition

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the addition with a reveal and true divided light windows with staff to review details.

This property had been restored several years ago; the present proposal involves adding a one-story brick addition to the rear of the existing house. Owing to the open side yard of the house, the addition would be visible.

The Committee recommended a reveal added to the design, where the new and old pieces join, and to specify windows with true divided lights.

The architect presented revised drawings which include these modifications.

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

423-425 Vine Street

Bill McNett, Chris Mallios, Owners

Peter Miller, Architect

DATE: c. 1760

PROPOSAL: Garage and deck

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of garage, deck, doors and railing at 42 inches, and also recommended that the applicant submit photographs to document the original fabric.

The proposal calls for building a garage and deck attached to the side of a designated house. A garage with custom wood roll-up doors and a decorative wood privacy rail and trellis would replace a yard with existing swinging doors.

The applicant proposes to replace an existing garage door, enclose an existing parking area in a lot adjacent to the house, and cut two existing side windows not visible from the street into doors. The applicant does not want to jeopardize the garage and deck if the doors pose an issue. The applicant stated that the existing windows are not original.

Cutting into the side of the designated house for a door to access the deck is the reason for bringing this proposal to the Commission. Both the Committee and Commission have concerns about the removal of historic fabric from 18th century houses. However, since this cut will not be visible from the street, the Committee urged the approval of the proposal. The Committee recommended that the applicant submit photographs to document the area where the fabric will be removed.

The question was raised about the sidewall and Mr. Miller, the architect, stated that the wall is stuccoed.

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

637-647 North 19th Street, a.k.a. 1830 Fairmount Avenue

Spring Garden Community Development Corporation, Owner

Elizabeth Masters, Architect

PROPOSAL: Build eight new townhouses, review and comment only in the pending Spring Garden Historic District

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with modification to the windows and a higher sill height on the windows flanking the central French doors. The applicant should also be encouraged to avoid front garage doors if possible.

The proposal involves constructing eight new townhouses on vacant ground within the pending Spring Garden historic district. The Ordinance limits the Commission's role in this case, which involves new construction as defined by the Ordinance, to review and comment only for a period not to exceed 45 days. The applicant proposes two rows of red brick and stuccoed townhouses facing North Street and Fairmount Avenue. The Committee thought the windows flanking the French doors should be shorter. It also believed that the front garages inappropriate for the streetscape; however, it appears that relocating them to the rear would entail the significant loss of yard space.

Mr. Baron wanted it noted for the record that in the Architectural Committee recommendation, the large panes of glass was the staff recommendation and should not be reflected in the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Wilds raised the question about the windows; the proposed windows have an applied wood grill with a raised profile but lack true-divided lights.

Ms. Merhige made a motion to approve the proposal as presented with the recommendation of larger panes of glass and shorter windows. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

2120 Shunk Street

Alfonso Gambone, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1915-16

PROPOSAL: Open one gable window, close two side windows

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the application with closure of only one side window, subject to the submission of a scaled drawing with the dimensions of the new window with staff to review details.

This proposal is for a twinhouse in the Girard Estate district. The other half of this twin has an octagonal window in the gable end. The applicant's house has a small vent. Of the other houses in the area, some have octagonal windows, some have one-over-one windows, and some have no windows.

The applicant wishes to install an octagonal window in the front and the side gable to match the adjoining house. Pictures show a wood lintel in the brickwork of the gable which perhaps indicates an original opening. Of the two side windows the applicant seeks to close, one is clearly a later addition while the other appears to be original; the Committee recommended the latter not be closed.

Mr. Wilds questioned the distance on the sidewall and the visibility of the original side window; he believed that the window could be closed with a one-inch reveal because of its angle and obliqueness.

Mr. Brownlee believed very strongly that this would give more attention to the side elevation, and lead to more requests to eliminate windows. Therefore he is not comfortable in approving the closing of the window.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to reject the Committee's recommendation and approve one octagonal window in the front gable end and the closure of two side windows. The original of the two windows will have a one-inch reveal with staff to review details. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which carried with affirmative 8 votes and 2 negative votes.

2521 South Cleveland Street

Rita Marconi, Owner

Nicholas Ghionni, Jr., Contractor

DATE: 1909

PROPOSAL: Replace concrete steps with brick and stone steps

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposed brick and stone steps

This proposal calls for replacing the original concrete steps with brick risers and stone treads. The brick piers will remain. The staff recommended rebuilding the steps in concrete to match the original and the others on the block.

Mr. Baron said that since the Architectural meeting, the applicant presented a permit application for steps in concrete, which was approved by staff as a restoration.

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

244 Queen Street

Joan Snowden, Owner

Patricia Patterson, Applicant

DATE: 1841-42

PROPOSAL: Handrail

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of this particular design

This proposal involves installation of a simple rail on marble steps. The railing will not have any balusters. The Committee believed the design unusual, even though a like example exists on the Hill Physick Keith House.

The Committee held that the design did not fit the house and questioned whether its absence of pickets posed a code problem. The Committee based its recommendation for denial on the inappropriateness of the design not the possible code issue.

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

Mr. Brownlee made a motion that staff have the authority to approve and review simple stair rails in the future. Ms. Griffith seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Mr. Spilove passed the gavel to Ms. Wolf and recused himself.

250 South 17th Street, NW corner of Rittenhouse Square Street

Rittenhouse Management Incorporated, Owner

Michael Carullo, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: 1920

PROPOSAL: Repair balconies and replace railings on fire landings

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with staff to review shop drawings and details.

The proposal involves replacement of the concrete fire balconies with diamond plate metal, and replacement of pipe rails on the balconies with simple vertical picket railings. This is a large apartment building with a series of balconies on the west elevation. The balconies will be raised up, so there is not a step down, and also expanded to project another foot. The replacement railing will be a simple metal railing with a vertical picket and will meet code requirements. Air conditioning units will be removed and reinstalled for clear accessibility to the fire stair.

Mr. Ward made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Spilove recused himself.

135 South 18th Street, NE corner Walnut Street

Rittenhouse Management Incorporated, Owner

Michael Carullo, Contractor/Applicant

DATE: 1913

PROPOSAL: Repair balconies and replace railings on fire landings

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with staff to review details

The proposal involves repair to masonry fire balconies, and replacement of pipe rails on the balconies with simple vertical picket railings. This is a service façade that is visible from Walnut Street.

Mr. Ward made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. Spilove recused himself.

3814-18 Walnut Street, Fels Center Annex

University of Pennsylvania, Owner

Richard Russell, Applicant

DATE: 1907-08

PROPOSAL: Landscape and accessibility for the disabled

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the accessible lift for the disabled and the walkways parallel to the fence.

This proposal involves installation of a lift for the disabled and new landscaping around this house. This colonial revival house has plantings and grass around it. The project entails installing a brick walkway in the grass area, relocating a set of marble steps two feet to the right and introducing a wheelchair lift. It also necessitates regrading and relaying flagstone to overcome a six-inch rise into the building.

The Committee recommended moving some HVAC units to allow a straight walkway; the architect agreed to this recommendation.

Ms. Merhige made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion which carried with 8 votes. Ms. Wolf and Mr. Brownlee recused themselves.

3601 Locust Walk

Trustees, University of Pennsylvania, Owner

Richard Russell, Applicant

DATE: 1926

PROPOSAL: Temporary accessibility ramp for the disabled

The Architectural Committee recommended approval for the ramp, not to exceed a period of three years, railing to be painted black with samples of colors and details for review by the staff.

The majority of the project entails replacement of infrastructure without interfering with current student functions. The University took ownership of the building, but the lease for the restaurant still has two years to run. The applicant explained the need for the temporary ramp for the disabled. The applicant chose the entrance on Thirty-sixth Street for this entrance. He proposes to build a temporary ramp with the understanding that the building would also undergo renovation in two to five years. Owing to the academic calendar, an urgency attaches to this proposal. On the first floor, the applicant plans to install a hardwood ramp so that it rests on the structure as it is without disturbing the stone stair and interior walls. On the Thirty-sixth Street walk, a wood platform brings a user to the level of the interior vestibule and the wheelchair lift. The ramp would be removable upon the expiration of the restaurant's lease. Then access for the disabled will be established at a different location. This proposal requires minimum alterations.

Ms. Griffith questioned the location of the existing ramp which is not in an attractive location.

Ms. Merhige made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried with 8 votes. Ms. Wolf and Mr. Brownlee recused themselves.

1300 Market Street, Wanamaker Building

Philadelphia Center Realty Associates, L.P., Owner

Patrick McGranaghan, Applicant

DATE: 1902-10

PROPOSAL: Signage facing Penn Square

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with the recommendation that future approvals will be subject to the approval of an overall plan for building signage.

This proposal calls for installing a slab type sign for Andersen Consulting in the island outside the Penn Square entrance to the building.

The Committee recommended that the building's management devise a plan for all signage, designed in such a way that it could accommodate future tenants as well.

The Commission thought the sign inappropriate for the site and expressed concern that the area will become plagued with signage, it also stated that it would be difficult to deny other tenants the

same size sign.

Marita Osbourne, Wanamaker management, explained that management does not know about future signage needs or the increase in tenant occupancy. The building is now 93% occupied. John Bosio, Hillier Group, stated that the signage in the front resulted from negotiations with Andersen Consulting, a new major tenant, and that the sign was reduced in size so as not to be taller than the figure of the boy in this planted area.

Mr. Brownlee stated that he believed that this raises two issues: (1) design and placement and (2) this sign in the context of other likely signage. He suggested that this sign proposal be rejected and returned for a multi-tenant sign. Mr. Brownlee said that the Commission has a responsibility to the building.

Mr. Tyler in his initial meetings with the applicant discussed locations such as the interior elevator lobby, and a suggestion of using the columns and pilasters of the Juniper Street entrance which Mr. Tyler thought inappropriate. He believed that the landscape area offers the best location, since the sign will not touch any historic fabric and the plantings and berm already interferes with the view of the building .

Ms. Wolf said the signage should respond to the character of the building and asked if Andersen Consulting would share a sign with other tenants; the applicant replied that Andersen made a singly sign a condition of its tenancy. Ms. Griffith said that placing the sign in the landscape area would be less disturbing than against the building. The question of ownership of the landscape arose, and it was determined that Philadelphia Center Realty Associates owns the landscape with an easement held by the City.

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

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to require the applicant to return with a masterplan for signage which also provides for additional tenants. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which carried with 9 votes. Mr. James opposed the motion.

324 Delancey Street

Tom and Tania Rorke, Owners/Applicant

DATE: c. 1900

PROPOSAL: Roof deck extension and stair house

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the application

The application involves extending an existing deck to the rear and constructing a stairhouse to reach the roof. A highly visible larger roof deck already exists on the front of the house. The applicant proposes no changes to this deck and will leave it intact. There now exists a flip-up hatch which would be replaced with a stairhouse to the roof. The applicant also proposes a new rear addition which will be hidden by the proposed new three-story house next door.

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

535 Delancey Street

Carolyn Wahrenberger, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1802

PROPOSAL: Conceptual review of adding new floor and dormer to house

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the concept unless new evidence emerges of a former fourth-story. Absent such evidence, the Committee would favorably revisit a scheme for an addition not visible from the street.

The proposal calls for removing the existing roof structure and adding a fourth floor with a gambrel roof and dormer. An early intact building, the existing house has a shallow roof with no sign of its ever having an attic and dormer. Execution of the proposal would create a false historic roof and dormer contrary to nearly all the *Standards*. The question of a previous alteration of the roof emerged, and the Committee recommended that the applicant research this both through physical and documentary evidence.

The Committee stated that it would look favorably upon this proposal if it did not intrude visibly onto the street. The applicant has come with sight line studies that show that the addition will not be visible without the dormer. The Commission recommended that this design, absent the dormer, be remanded to the Architectural Committee for review.

Carolyn Wahrenberger, the applicant, was present and stated that a sight line study indicates that the roofline will not show without the dormer.

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

201 South 18th Street, a.k.a. 1720 Walnut Street

Rittenhouse Claridge L.P., Kenneth Kaiserman, Owner

Shep Wainwright, Applicant

DATE: 1955

PROPOSAL: New storefront, awnings and signage

The Architectural Committee recommended approval on the condition that the awning's width is shortened to the ends of the opening; the awning should be equal in placement and design to the adjacent awning, be open-sided and not have internal illumination.

The proposal calls for removing the fabric of the non-original I.H.O.P. restaurant façade and awnings and installing a new dark metal and glass storefront with operable windows for a coffeehouse. This part of the building faces Walnut Street. The existing storefront has T111 siding; the original storefront had large panes of glass and dark metal piers as evidenced by old photographs of the building. The Committee favored the removal of the T111 siding and the installation of large panes of glass. The Committee also suggested decreasing the width of the awning, so that it extends only over the length of the actual opening. The submission shows the awnings with sides and not aligned with the adjacent awnings. The Committee recommended that the applicant present a drawing of the proposal which shows what exists to either side.

The applicant agreed to the recommendations, except he does not want the awnings at the height of the one next door; he desires to put the signage higher for more visibility. He said that this height would not be greater than the adjacent store's signage.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the revised submission. Mr. Ward seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1920 Spruce Street, Academy of Vocal Arts

Academy of Vocal Arts, Owner

Douglas Seiler, Architect

DATE: c. 1855/c. 1985

PROPOSAL: Remodel rear addition on Delancey Street

The Architectural Committee recommended the stuccoing of the addition with horizontal scoring, keeping the details. They recommended in favor of the fire escapes and window work.

The proposal calls for renovating the rear addition to the Academy of Vocal Arts. The architect has provided additional information about the project and a petition of neighbors who find the existing design objectionable.

The Committee believed the addition to have architectural integrity and the approval is a compromise. The Committee recommended for approval the following;

1. keeping the fences and gates as originally designed;
2. doors with large port hole windows;
3. keeping the green tiles;
4. stuccoing the cinderblock with horizontal scoring, and
5. fire escape and window work.

The question of the color of the stucco emerged.

Douglas Seiler, architect, was present to explain the project and stated that the stucco color will be gray with a sand finish.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation with that the stucco limited to the cinderblock portion only with horizontal scoring and a bluestone base. Ms. Wolf seconded the motion which carried unanimously

1701 Spruce Street, NW corner of 17th Street

David Richards, Mark Bojanowski, Owners

Richard Stange, Architect

DATE: c. 1920

PROPOSAL: Conceptual review of adding a floor with full footprint coverage

The Architectural Committee recommended approval in concept of alternate B, subject to a set back and simplified details. The uniqueness of the building prompted the recommendation, which carried with a vote of four in favor and two in opposition.

The proposal involves adding a floor to the top of this two-story building. It does not meet *Standards 9 and 10*. The addition creates a look that changes the meaning of the building. Owing to the lowness of the building, a set back will not adequately reduce the visibility of the addition.

Mr. Wilds questioned using the deco elements on the addition, for it should not look original to this building. Ms. Wolf asked about the cornice; it is masonry, and the addition would rise behind the existing parapet wall. Ms. Wolf stated that the addition does not perceptually change

the architecture nor does it transform the building. There will be a distinction between the old and the new. Mr. Brownlee asserted strongly that the building's only shortfall is its height, but it was designed as a two-story building and the greater height of the structures around it does not justify the proposed change. Although the addition will not damage the fabric of the building, the visibility issue remains very important just as it does for roof decks. Mr. Wilds inquired into the material of the addition; it will be light brick. Mr. Spilove stated that all along Spruce Street there are one and two story buildings, and the Commission can expect to see more proposals of this nature.

Mr. Ward made a motion to accept the Committee's recommendation for alternate B. Mr. James seconded the motion which carried with 8 affirmative votes and 2 negative votes.

267 South 19th Street

Alan Domb, Owner

Lanny Liebowitz, Architect

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Cut storefront window in ground floor

The Architectural Committee recommended a site visit to determine if historic fabric still remains. If the original fabric does not survive, it recommended in favor of a new storefront. If the historic fabric remains behind the new brick it recommended denial.

The proposal calls for cutting a large store window into the residential ground floor of this row house. The architect claims that the fabric of the ground floor looks newer than the brick above; however, paint covers the brick.

The Committee recommended a site visit to determine if historic fabric still remains. Mr. Baron made a site visit. The property currently has a brick base that projects 4 inches from the base of the building. Mr. Baron determined that old brick does exist behind the newer brick. Through a hole, he saw some 1930s wallpaper and red brick along a jamb. Mr. Brownlee stated that this is probably an early twentieth century commercial facade on a residential building.

Ms. Merhige made a motion to deny the proposal owing to the existence of historic fabric. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

1707 Pine Street

Glenn Krotick, Esq., Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1860, 1890

PROPOSAL: Legalize upper floor vinyl windows, replace door

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the door. The Committee tabled the window issue pending Mr. Baron's inspection of the old windows.

The applicant seeks to legalize the vinyl windows he installed without a permit. He also wishes to install a new non-historic door in place of a non-historic door.

The staff researched this property and the adjoining one in an atlas and determined that these two buildings are early to mid-nineteenth century row houses and that almost certainly they originally had six-over-six windows. They have been altered and a Queen Anne window added on the first floor with small panes. At the time of designation, the house had one-over-one wood upper floor windows. The present owner also wishes to replace a non-historic door with a non-historic door.

The staff suggested a compromise allowing the non-historic door in exchange for the restoration of the windows on the upper floor to wood one-over-one sash.

The applicant removed the upper floor's wood windows and replaced them with vinyl windows. He also purchased a non-historic six-panel door with glass in the upper panels. The applicant also believed the windows that were removed were more modern. Therefore the Committee recommended an examination of the windows to determine their possible date. Mr. Baron inspected the windows and thought that the rope and pulley system and their depth consistent, with the 1890s period.

Mr. Krotick was present and displayed the old wood windows he had removed. He stated that he agreed with Mr. Baron that the original windows were six-over-six windows. He asked leave, however, to paint the vinyl windows and also said that he should have received notice that the new windows had to be wood.

The Commission noted that the only permit issued bears the date 7 March 2000, and that it precluded changes to windows. Had the applicant sought a permit for the window work, he would have learned of the guidelines for window replacement.

Ms. Wolf stated that this is merely a question of vinyl versus wood. In response, it was observed that the design and the putty slope are also at issue.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to approve the door and deny approving the windows with the approval of the door subject to the restoration of the one-over-one, wood windows. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

834 Chestnut Street, SE corner 9th Street, Benjamin Franklin House

Benjamin Franklin House Association, Owner

Allen Roth, Applicant

DATE: 1923-25

PROPOSAL: Masonry repair

The Architectural Committee recommended approval with samples to be reviewed by staff

This proposal involves repairing masonry on the former Benjamin Franklin Hotel. The applicant seeks to repair the masonry and terra cotta with patches and a Keim coating. The work calls for temporary scaffolding and test borings.

The applicant intends to patch where possible, to make molds where large pieces require replacement and to re-point. The joints will be re-pointed and all the new and existing terra cotta coated with Keim. There are two reasons for the coating: much of the terra cotta is crazed or showing its age, and that once the balustrades are replaced in cast stone instead of terra cotta, the coating will yield a uniform appearance and will protect against water infiltration. The Keim coating is not a sand-finish; it lets the terra cotta show through.

Ms. Merhige made a motion to accept the Committee recommendation. Ms. Wolf seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

201-203 North 3rd Street, a.k.a. 245-49 Race Street

Michael Yaron, Owner

Albert Taus, Applicant

DATE: c. 1853

PROPOSAL: Alteration to visible rear stuccoed facade

The Architectural Committee recommended approval subject to the windows' matching the sill heights and proportions of the front windows.

This building on North 3rd Street has a blank stuccoed north wall. The lowness of the adjacent building renders this wall quite visible. The proposal calls for cutting four new windows in this north façade and modifying several others. The Committee objected to the horizontal orientation of the panes. The staff held that, since these are new openings, one-over-one windows would be better.

The Committee suggested narrowing the new windows to make the panes more vertical in response to the character of the building. Other openings, now filled in with glass block, will be narrowed.

The Committee urged that the applicant raise the sills to match the sills on the front. They also stated that the window heights should be the same and the windows should be true divided lights.

Albert Taus, the architect, was present to answer questions and explain the proposal. He stated that he will abide by the Commission's recommendations.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to accept the plans as submitted with the historic western windows and the one-over-one eastern windows. Mr. Brownlee seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

THE REPORT on the Activities of the Historical Commission Staff, June 2000.

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

CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES COMMENT

4951 Walnut Street, Paul Robeson Residence

This nomination for the last residence of Paul Robeson meets criteria c, and clearly should be recommended to the National Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to approve the recommendation to the National Register. Ms. Merhige seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Harry A. Batten Memorial Fund

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to approve the expenditure of \$25.02 for the Architectural Committee lunches.

Mr. Brownlee made a motion to approve the \$25.02 expenditure. Ms. Merhige seconded the

motion which carried unanimously.

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

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Hughes
Executive Secretary