

**THE MINUTES OF THE 505th STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
10 September 2004
City Council Caucus Room, Room 401, City Hall
Michael Sklaroff, Esquire, Chair**

Present

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
James Brown, III
Joseph James, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Public Property
Kathleen Murray, Assistant to President of City Council
Nathaniel Parks, Department of Commerce
David Perri, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Vincent Rivera, AIA
Harris Steinberg, AIA
Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.
Norman Tissian
Scott Wilds, Deputy Director, Department of Housing and Neighborhood Preservation

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

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jonathan Farnham, Historic Preservation Planner
Laura M. Spina, Historic Preservation Planner
Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer

Also

Elliot Shelkrot, Director, Free Library of Philadelphia
Moshe Safdie, Moshe Safdie & Associates
Isaac Franco, Moshe Safdie & Associates
John Howard, Becker & Frondorf
James Karmolinski, Kelly/Maiello Architects
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Adam Laver, Esq., Blank Rome
Phyllis Laver, Adam's mom
Frank P. Ermilio Jr., Esq.
Arlene Matzkin, Friday Architects
Jackie Ford, Friday Architects
David Krahn
Lanny Leibowitz, architect
Joseph F. Liscomb
Richard DeMarco, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers LLP
Jennifer Lecher, Agoos/Lovera Architects
Edwin Rivera, Queen Village Neighbors Association
Jane Karns, Spring Garden
Jeffrey M. Bladen, 716 Pine Street
Thomas Crowley, Christopher Beardsley Architects
Doug Seiler, architect
Michael Hauptman, architect

Daniel Kilpatrick, 1935 Spring Garden Street
Jamie Doran, John Blatteau Assoc., Architects
Harvey Spear, 48-50 S. Front Street
John P. Holland, Holland Architects
Alan Krigman, Citizens Against Historic Preservation Abuse
Stephen Anderson, West Central Germantown Neighbors
James Foster, West Mt. Airy Neighbors
David Knapton, City Planning and West Central Germantown Neighbors
Patricia Henning, Mt. Airy Historical Committee
Christine Tilles, West Mt. Airy Neighbors
Steven Tilles, West Mt. Airy Neighbors
Catharine K. Franklin, Penn-Knox Neighborhood Association
Bernard E.D. Wilson, vice president, West Central Germantown Neighbors
Susanne Finch, West Central Germantown Neighbors
Susan Wright, West Central Germantown Neighbors
Marc Stier, president, West Mt. Airy Neighbors
Lois Frischling, West Mt. Airy Neighbors, Mt. Airy Historical Awareness Committee
Anne L. Wheeler, 79 W. Johnson Street
Cindy Davis, 244 W. Johnson Street
Antoinette Yellock, Pomona Cherokee Civic Council
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Carisa Brewster, Mt. Airy Times Express
Arial Ben-Amos, Philadelphia Independent
State Representative Rosita C. Youngblood
Neil Sklaroff, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll
Carl Primavera, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers LLP
Sherman Toppin, Esq.
John A. Teets, AIA
Rev. Ray A. Barnard, Impacting Your World Christian Center (IYWCC)
Dr. Karen Jenkins
Sadie Williams, IYWCC
Dale A. McFarlane, IYWCC
Javanna Nash, IYWCC
Aishah Bradley, IYWCC
Caridad Eichelberger, IYWCC
Johnny F. Eichelberger, IYWCC
Valerie Knolls, IYWCC
Ronchel Weston, IYWCC
Minister Gary Stackhouse, IYWCC
Elizabeth Campbell, IYWCC
Edward Simon, IYWCC
Renee Badeau, IYWCC
Alfred Isley, IYWCC
Veronica Camp, IYWCC
Doris Fletcher, IYWCC
Jean Ford, IYWCC
Melanie McDonald, IYWCC
Jesse Ford, IYWCC
Joyce Oliver Adam, IYWCC
Isabell Belser, IYWCC
Audreanna McCorkle, IYWCC

Pat Brody, IYWCC
Chantee Bond, IYWCC
Deborah Jones, IYWCC
Angela Fitch, IYWCC
Stephanie Clark, IYWCC
Sabrina Scott, IYWCC
Oscar Sandler, IYWCC
Lynn Stith, IYWCC
Alicia Daniels, IYWCC
Gertrude Cousey, IYWCC
Charles King Jr., IYWCC
Cornelius Pitts, IYWCC
Marcella Pitts, IYWCC
Romania Spencer, IYWCC
Christine Brown, IYWCC
Irwin D. Cherry Sr., IYWCC
Eric Thompson, IYWCC
Ramona LeMan, IYWCC
Vince N. Baker, IYWCC
Joyce Lockett, IYWCC
Rosalyn Holly-Price, IYWCC
Aisha Freeman-Luckey, IYWCC
Mary Hampton, IYWCC
Kalita MacElree, IYWCC
Susan White, IYWCC
Nicole Blango, IYWCC
Ed Johnson Jr., IYWCC
Barbara Carpenter, IYWCC
Carlotta Bulls, IYWCC
Lovella Frion, IYWCC
Michael Cooper, IYWCC
Monique Salley, IYWCC
Donna Trice, IYWCC
Jacqueline Swift, IYWCC
Earl Ingra Jr., IYWCC
Kevin Carr, IYWCC
Jahmal Murph, IYWCC
Jacqueline Selman, IYWCC
Sandra Cooper, IYWCC
Tanya Ried, IYWCC
Frances Edney, IYWCC
LaKenya Edney, IYWCC
Jacqueline White
Melissa Bundy
Ada Scott
Terrance Ridett
Darlene Ridett
Ada Scott
Margaret Robinson
Michelle Jones
Carolyn H. Williams

Celeste Connor
 Denise Carraway
 Gail Hunter
 Lillian Scott
 William Davis
 George Baker

505th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 505th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:10 a.m.

Minutes of the 504th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Upon a motion made by Mr. Sugrue and seconded by Ms. Murray, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the 504th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 13 August 2004, Michael Sklaroff, Chair.

The Report of the Committee on Historic Designation

245 Quince Street

Joseph Lipscomb, Owner

The Committee on Historic Designation recommends the designation of 245 Quince Street to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Farnham presented the nomination. The owner of the building at 245 Quince Street in Washington Square West nominated his house for inclusion on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The structure is a handsome Greek Revival building dating to about 1830 and stands on an historically significant block. It represents an excellent example of the early nineteenth-century Philadelphia row house type.

The Committee on Historic Designation reviewed the nomination and determined that the property meets Designation Criteria A, C, and J: it has significant character, interest and value as part of the development, heritage and cultural characteristics of the City; it reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style, and it exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social and historical heritage of the community.

Mr. Farnham noted that its fraternal, not identical, twin to the south along with most of the buildings on the street were designated in 1961. It is possible that confusion over addresses prevented this property from being designated at that time.

Ms. Murray made a motion to list 245 Quince Street on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.

1900 Chestnut Street

1900 Equities, Owner

The Committee on Historic Designation recommends the designation of 1900 Chestnut Street to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Farnham described the nomination for the Robert Glenndenning Building at 1900 Chestnut Street. The Preservation Alliance has nominated the Glenndenning Building and the Friends of the Boyd Theater, a non-profit group, supports its designation. Architect Frank E. Hahn designed the building, which was erected in 1934 and which is an excellent example of the Art Deco and Art Moderne commercial buildings of the 1930s. Its corner location makes the well-designed limestone structure especially prominent. Of note is its monumental entrance on 19th Street, which includes a grand arched window, fluted reveals, decorative panels, and original Deco lanterns.

The Committee on Historic Designation determined that the Robert Glenndenning Building satisfies Designation Criteria A, C, D, and E. It has significant value as part of the commercial development of Philadelphia; it reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style, Art Deco-Art Moderne; it embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Art-Deco-Art Moderne style, and it is the work of Frank E. Hahn, an architect whose work influenced architectural development in Philadelphia.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance testified that he nominated the property because it is a rare, intact example of the Art Deco style that is representative of the two-story corner commercial building that typically was found along the Chestnut Street corridor in the early 20th century.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to list 1900 Chestnut Street, the Robert Glenndenning Building, on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Owing to his firm's involvement in the case, Mr. Sklaroff recused and passed the gavel to the Vice-Chair, Mr. Sugrue.

101-21 W. Johnson Street

Biddle Properties, Inc., aka Westmont Homes, Inc., Owner

The Committee on Historic Designation unanimously recommends the designation of 101-121 W. Johnson Street to the Philadelphia Register.

Mr. Copeland noted that the Law Department has researched the question of whether the Historical Commission and its Committees would be restrained by the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act (RLUIPA). The Department has concluded that the Act does not prevent the Commission from acting on the nomination of this property and designation of the property does not violate RLUIPA.

Mr. Farnham presented the nomination for 101-21 W. Johnson Street, the Presser Home for Retired Musicians. Theodore Presser is one of the most important figures in the annals of the history of American music. In 1876, he founded the Music Teachers' National Association, a significant organization that continues to support music teachers. In 1883, he began to publish *The Etude Music Magazine*, which developed into the most important musicians' periodical of its era. At the same time, he established the Thomas Presser Company, for decades the largest and most prestigious music publishing company in the world. At his death in 1925, Presser was celebrated by Thomas Alva Edison and many, many others as one of the most important figures in the history of

American music.

A great philanthropist, the publisher founded the Presser Home for Retired Music Teachers in the Society Hill neighborhood in 1906. Within a few years, it outgrew its quarters and Presser moved the institution to a house in Germantown. The Home quickly outgrew that house and Presser erected a new building in 1913 and 1914. Designed by prominent architects Paul and Seymour Davis, the building is a grand Renaissance Revival structure. A distinguished Tudor Revival building, the carriage house from Presser's mansion, which once stood on the grounds, is adjacent to the retirement home. Although now overgrown, the surrounding gardens were once acclaimed for their beauty. For more than a half century, the Home distinguished itself as the nation's only residence for retired music teachers. During that time, it hosted many of the world's greatest musicians including John Philip Sousa, David Rubinoff, and Zvia Lifshitz, who performed for residents and the community alike. The Presser Home is a highlight of Philadelphia's intertwined cultural, social, and architectural histories.

At its meeting, the Committee on Historic Designation determined that the Presser Home fulfills Designation Criteria A, C, D, H, and J. It has significant character, interest and value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth and Nation and is associated with the life of Theodore Presser, a person significant in the past. The Home and the carriage house both reflect the environments in eras characterized by distinctive architectural styles, the Renaissance Revival and Tudor Revival, and embody distinguishing characteristics of those architectural styles. The grand buildings and surrounding landscape on the prominent corner site represent an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community and City. The venerated institution exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social and historical heritage of the community. The Committee unanimously recommends that 101-121 W. Johnson Street be designated to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to list 101-21 W. Johnson Street on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion.

Neil Sklaroff, attorney for the owner, Westmont Homes, asked for a continuance of the hearing. Mr. Sugrue reminded him that a motion was already on the floor and that the Commission members were prepared to discuss the nomination.

Mr. Steinberg offered to rescind his motion, but Mr. Tissian refused to rescind his second.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance noted that he was prepared to testify on the notion of the Commission's granting a continuance and that granting such was not a simple concept.

Carl Primavera, attorney for the equitable owner of the property, Impact Your World Ministries, said that his client had a strong desire for a continuance because a second property that his client was in the process of purchasing at 221 W. Johnson, to the west of 101-121 W. Johnson, has also been nominated and he wanted both heard at the same meeting.

Mr. Sugrue noted the packed room for the record and asked for a show of hands to see if the audience was there for this particular case. He stated that it was disingenuous for the Commission to table the discussion when so many people took time from work or

school to come to the meeting today only for the Commission to continue the discussion without hearing them.

Ms. Murray noted the long agenda of the Commission meeting and proffered the option of having a special Commission meeting within the next thirty days to hear this one matter so that everyone who wants to get on the record may do so.

Mr. James explained that for designations the Commission only needs to discuss whether the property meets the criteria for designation or not, and the staff clearly showed that it does. Mr. Steinberg agreed wholeheartedly that it meets the criteria, but noted that the issue appears to be a very emotional one for many people in the room. Ms. Murray said that since audience seemed to be divided among those who supported the designation of the property and those who opposed it, perhaps the Commission would allow fifteen minutes per side today before they continued the discussion to the special meeting.

Mr. Tissian withdrew his second. The Commission then had no motion on the floor and debated the issue of a continuance.

Mr. James noted that if the property is not designated then the owner would not have to come to the Historical Commission for any work to be done to the property. Without designation, the community would not have the forum of the Historical Commission to review what happens to the site.

Mr. Brown opined that it would be appropriate to have a special meeting to discuss only this issue.

James Foster said that neighbors of the properties and residents in the neighborhood that are present at the meeting would like to be heard today.

Stephen Anderson, author of the nomination, said that the issue of the building's designation has been widely discussed in the neighborhood, including in numerous newspaper articles and television news broadcasts. The neighborhood and the property's owners understand what designation would mean and have had time prepare for the meeting.

Christine Tilles, who lives across the street from the Presser Home, testified that she wants to see the building stand and that the community had been meeting since February to safeguard the property. The neighborhood was unaware that the property was for sale since no sale sign was posted. She noted that she has a petition with over 180 signatures from neighbors around the properties who support the designation of the property.

Marc Stier, president of West Mount Airy Neighbors, stated that the best thing for the community was to move forward and get protection for the property.

Antoinette Yellock, president of the Pomona-Cherokee Civic Council, said that she was in favor of the continuance so that her neighbors could assess the impact of the designation. She noted that she never saw the petition to which Ms. Tilles referred.

Mr. Primavera said that his client had hired an architect to look at the site in conjunction

with the property next door and that the combined properties would need to be rezoned. He stated that they would not move forward with any proceedings during the continuance if the Commission would be kind enough to grant one.

Sherman Toppin, attorney for Impact Your World Ministries, said that he was still negotiating with Mr. Sklaroff concerning the final details of sales agreement, but that the closing on the property was imminent. Commission members asked Mr. Toppin and Mr. Sklaroff if they would stipulate that the ownership would not change hands and that neither the title or equitable owner would seek any building or demolition permits during the thirty-day continuance period. Both Mr. Toppin and Mr. Sklaroff agreed to the stipulation.

Ms. Murray made a motion to hear testimony on the nomination of 101-21 W. Johnson Street for 30 minutes, then continue the matter to a special meeting to be held within 30 days, on the condition that the property does not change ownership and no building or demolition permits are sought during the continuation period. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which passed with seven votes. Mr. James, Mr. Brown, and Mr. Steinberg dissented.

With staff and the Chair keeping time, the Commission then heard support and opposition of the nomination, with each side getting 15 minutes.

Stephen Anderson described his goal in nominating the property. He wants to preserve not only the building itself, but also its part in the history of the neighborhood. Since he lives across the street from the property, he noted his stake in the area. He hopes that the church will be able to find another site in the neighborhood so that it could continue its mission, but not at the expense of the loss of this property. He concluded by asking the Commission not to continue the discussion at another meeting.

Bernard Wilson of West Central Germantown Neighbors said that the Historical Commission's purpose is to recognize the historic value of buildings. This building is part of the historic value of the neighborhood and represents a small island of tranquility. He called it a symbol of the past and a symbol of the future and hoped that it will be preserved.

John Gallery presented the Preservation Alliance's strong support for the designation of the Presser Home. He explained that in his time with the Alliance he had never testified before the Commission in support of a nomination where the property so fully meets the criteria for designation. He then enumerated the points in which the Presser Home meets the criteria: how Theodore Presser is a person significant in the past; the purpose of the home was a part of the social movement to provide for retirees; the building is a landmark in the community, and the importance of the building for its architectural quality.

Christine Tilles said only that she wanted to leave the petition with the Commission. The petition has over 180 signatures and she had asked the president of the Pomona-Cherokee community group to pass it around, but she refused.

Larry Moyer testified that he sees the designation of the Presser Home as a chance for the community to reclaim something in the neighborhood. The neighbors never saw the buildings as a burden, but only the irresponsibility of its owners. The community

treasures these buildings. He personally went door to door with the petition and of the seventy or so people he spoke with, only one person refused to sign. He strongly supports the designation.

James Foster echoed Mr. Moyers remarks. The community was outraged with the condition the current owner has left the buildings. However, the Northwest part of the city, especially Germantown, is very diverse and culturally broad. The neighbors believe these buildings help maintain that culture.

Marc Stier opined that a conflict does not exist between the church and the neighbors because the work of God can be found in a beautiful building. He also believed that this building could be used for a good purpose.

Pastor Ray Barnard then spoke for the Impact Your World Christian Center and the Blair Christian Academy. He noted that the church occupies an historic building on Market Square at Germantown Avenue and has invested \$1 million in the facility. However, he said that the congregation values people over buildings. The church wants the site and will create a building for its people of which it can be proud.

Monique Salley said that the petition submitted by Ms. Tilles was not accurate because it left out part of West Mount Airy. She was not opposed to the church.

Melissa Bundy testified that she owns several properties in the community and she has taken several censuses of the neighborhood. The civic associations do not represent the communities and they have stifled development in the past. She believes the project will help the neighborhood grow.

John Teets noted that he has investigated the properties. He opined that the rehabilitation of the Presser Home will cost approximately \$210 per square foot and that it would not be financially feasible to preserve the building.

Karen Jenkins, the principal of the Blair Christian Academy, declared that the school's mission is to change the lives of its students. She believes that a new church building will allow the church to change lives in the community.

Aishah Bradley, a history student, noted that Theodore Presser was a philanthropist who wanted to help people and so the church would simply be continuing Presser's mission.

Mr. Sugrue noted that the thirty minutes of testimony was over and thanked everyone for coming.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

Register Rescissions

Mr. Farnham reported to the Commission that the proposals for register-maintenance rescission have been initiated by the staff to remove sites from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places that no longer include any significant historic fabric. In every case, the staff has verified that nothing of historic value remains at these sites to protect and preserve. All of the sites were individually listed; none is in a district. In most of the

cases, the historic building was demolished after being declared “Imminently Dangerous” by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. In every case, the demolition was undertaken in accordance with the Historical Commission’s ordinance and *Rules & Regulations*.

1568-1570 Adams Avenue

Domestic Linen Supply, Owner

The Committee on Historic Designation recommends the rescission of the designation 1568-1570 Adams Avenue to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

2300-2310 Germantown Avenue

ILE-IFE Black Humanitarian Center, Owner

The Committee on Historic Designation recommends the rescission of the designation of 2300-2310 Germantown Avenue to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

5324-5328 Germantown Avenue

Germantown Associates, Owner

The Committee on Historic Designation recommends the rescission of the designation of 5324-5328 Germantown Avenue to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

5330 Germantown Avenue

Police Athletic League, Owner

The Committee on Historic Designation recommends the rescission of the designation of 5330 Germantown Avenue to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

5331-5333 Germantown Avenue

Trustees of the Germantown Monthly Meeting, Owner

The Committee on Historic Designation recommends the rescission of the designation of 5331-5333 Germantown Avenue to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

5439-5441 Germantown Avenue

Redevelopment Authority of Philadelphia, Owner

The Committee on Historic Designation recommends the rescission of the designation of 5439-5441 Germantown Avenue to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

315 E. Wildey Street

Wildey Street Development, Owner

The Committee on Historic Designation recommends the rescission of the designation of 315 E. Wildey Street to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

734 South 2nd Street

George E. Hubbard, Owner

The Committee on Historic Designation recommends the rescission of the designation of 734 South 2nd Street to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

The Commission decided to vote on all eight properties in one block.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to rescind the designation of 1568-70 Adams Avenue, 2300-10 Germantown Avenue, 5324-28 Germantown Avenue, 5330 Germantown Avenue, 5331-33 Germantown Avenue, 5439-41 Germantown Avenue, 315 W. Wildey Street, 734 South 2nd Street. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

1034 Spruce Street

Central Apartments LLC, NWJ Companies, Owner

The Committee on Historic Designation recommends the rescission of the designation of 1034 Spruce Street to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

The Commission designated the building at 1034 Spruce Street in 1973. It was destroyed by fire in 2003. The owner, through his attorney Richard DeMarco, Esq., has applied to have the designation rescinded. Mr. Farnham noted that the property does not lie within a municipal historic district.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to rescind the designation of 1034 Spruce Street. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.

110-112 S. Front Street

Beaumont Corporation, Owner

The Committee on Historic Designation recommends the rescission of the individual designation of 110-112 S. Front Street to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, but the maintenance of its non-contributing designation as part of the Old City Historic District.

The historic building on this site was designated as historic individually prior to the creation of the Old City Historic District. It was demolished several years ago after two fires. The Commission recently approved the construction of a 15-story building on the site. The property would still be listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, but as a non-contributing property to the Old City Historic District.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to rescind the individual designation but not the district designation of 110-12 South Front Street. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

The Report of the Architectural Committee**1901 Vine Street, Free Library of Philadelphia**

City of Philadelphia, Owner

James Karmolinski, Applicant

DATE: 1925, Horace Trumbauer, architect

PROPOSAL: Rear addition, cut down window openings – in concept

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval in concept of the revised design, which includes the enlargement of only two windows into doors at the first-floor rear and the enlargement of all of the Pepper Hall windows at the second-floor rear.

Ms. Spina presented the application. It proposes the in-concept approval of a large addition at the rear of the main Free Library building on Logan Square. The proposed addition will be located to the north of the historic building on the lot now bounded by Nineteenth, Twentieth, and Callowhill Streets. It will include four subterranean levels, two for parking and two for unidentified uses. The above-ground portion of the building will include four levels, two of which will connect to the historic building. It will connect at the first floor, behind the monumental staircase and through the bookstacks; and at the second floor, across two skywalks running from Pepper Hall.

The addition will consist of three main components, a glazed connector band linking to the north façade of the historic building, a solid middle section with cornice lines corresponding to those of the historic building, and a great glazed arc at the north. The connector will allow visitors inside and out to see the north façade of the historic building. The details of the connection to the historic building have not yet been determined; in some drawings, the tips of the pediments project above the glass roof; in others, the pediments are fully covered by the addition.

On the north façade of the historic building, the application proposes cutting down two the central window openings at the first-floor level and all of the central openings at the second-floor level. On the first floor, the glazing from two of the openings will be removed and the openings cut into doorways for passageways linking the old and new. At the second floor, all of the central openings will be cut down; the two outer openings will be used for skywalks connecting Pepper Hall to the addition. The other openings will be cut to allow light into Pepper Hall and to provide views between the addition and historic building.

Mr. Wilds inquired about the definition of “in-concept” in this instance. Mr. Sklaroff reiterated Mr. Wilds’s question and stated that the Commission must comprehend the applicant’s understanding of “in-concept.” Mr. Shelkrot of the Free Library addressed the Commission. He reported that the library boards sought, first and foremost, a single, unified building. He stated that the addition would respect the historic building. He concluded that the library and its architect have communicated with and will continue to communicate with the preservation community. He then introduced the architect, Moshe Safdie.

Mr. Safdie began by acknowledging that the 1927 library building is a glorious building. He promised that it would be restored to its former glory. Like Mr. Shelkrot, he reported that the primary design requirement was that the new and old be unified. While designing, he sought to avoid creating a dichotomous structure; he rejected the notion of an old, quiet building and a new, vibrant addition.

Mr. Safdie provided an overview of the design with the Urban Room at the north and the Reading Room connecting the old and new. He noted that the historic north façade would become part of the new reading room. He remarked on the importance of visual and physical connections between the historic building and the addition. He commented that the sills at the north façade would be maintained where Pepper Hall will be opened to the new reading room. Architectural Committee members had requested that he investigate to see if they might be able to be preserved. He also noted that he would like an opportunity to address the proposals set forth by John Gallery.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Safdie to enumerate the aspects of the design for which he sought conceptual approval. Mr. Safdie stated that he would like to receive conceptual approval for the following:

1. the single, unified, whole building principle, incorporating new and old
2. the curved wall of the reading room, which will stand opposite the north façade of the historic building
3. the delicate glazing linking old and new, which will extend over and drop behind the historic cornice of the north façade
4. the height and massing of the new construction
5. the glazing at the north
6. the cutting of all of the second-floor, central (Pepper Hall) windows of the north façade to the floor, with the retention of the historic sills
7. the cutting of two of the first-floor, central (stacks) windows of the north façade to the floor

Mr. Wilds asked if the historic north façade would be perceptible from the exterior after it is enclosed. Mr. Safdie replied that it was his intention to maintain the pedestrian experience of that façade. He stated that it would be visible from the northeast and northwest. He noted that the curved wall of the addition would lean toward the historic building at the center, but would stand upright at the ends.

Mr. Safdie turned his attention to Mr. Gallery's suggestion that the addition be connected to the historic building with a narrow link. He stated that he opposed the notion of splitting the end pavilions with their pediments away from the central section of the historic north façade. He also contended that the link would sever the two buildings, countermanding the guiding principle of unification.

Mr. Steinberg applauded the "visionary" design. He asserted that it would be one of the "finest" Philadelphia buildings of the twenty-first century. He referred to Mr. Gallery's suggestion and agreed with his suggestion that the pedimented pavilions should remain on the exterior of the building; he asserted that the integrity of the pavilions is more important than the maintenance of an unbroken north façade. He opined that the connection of the new and old is the weakest part of the design. He suggested that Mr. Safdie restudy the connection and perhaps pull the new façade back, leaving the north pavilions on the exterior of the building.

Mr. Safdie countered Mr. Steinberg's suggestions, contending that pulling the connection inward to reveal the pavilions would create uncomfortable, dingy spaces between the old and new. He added that the rooms within the pavilions would not look into the new space if the connection was narrowed. He concluded that his goal was to create one unified building, not two separate buildings with a link.

Mr. Sugrue asked Mr. Safdie to outline those areas of the in-concept design that might change before the application for final approval. Mr. Safdie explained that two areas will change: the glazing connecting the old and new and the east and west elevations of the new building.

Mr. Parks asked if the addition is visible from Logan Square. Mr. Safdie replied that it is not visible from the front of the historic building, but is visible from east and west.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance directed the Commissioners to his memorandum, which he had faxed to them. He stated that he admires Safdie and supports the goal of unity, the basic premise of the design, but objects to the proposed connection. He contended that it does not meet the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards* and will not be approved during the Section 106 review. He noted the recently-approved addition for the museum's Perlman Building, which he prefers. It will result in two connected buildings, not one building merging old and new. He asserted that "connected" buildings can be successful. He remarked that Trumbauer sent a message when he did not articulate the center portion of the north façade; he signaled that this section of the façade was the appropriate connection point for an addition. About the proposed glazed connection, he stated: "I am wary." He concluded, advising that the Commission should defer action and review alternative plans. Mr. Safdie answered that he was compelled by Mr. Gallery's sincere critique and would investigate his suggestions.

Mr. Wilds stated that he was convinced by Mr. Safdie's justification of the current design and would not press him to explore alternatives. Mr. Sklaroff opined that the design satisfies the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards* and added that the north façade of the historic building will remain within the public realm, albeit on the interior, not the exterior. Mr. Steinberg conceded that the design of the connection was not a "deal-breaker." Mr. Tyler contended that the design meets the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards* 9 and 10; he added that less fabric will be removed in this case than will be removed for the Perlman addition.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to accept the Architectural Committee's recommendation to approve in concept the revised design. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2130 Green Street

Michael Coran, Owner

Robert Heisler, Applicant

DATE: 1854 altered c.1905

PROPOSAL: Close basement access, replace windows, add window grills, replace front door

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the following, with staff to review details:

1. *Windows with a two-over-two and four-over-four window configuration;*
2. *Four paneled door with the two upper panels glazed.*
3. *Simplified design of basement grills, with the retention of the original;*
4. *Close basement access,*
5. *Denial of the exterior grills on the front windows.*

This application proposes altering the front façade of a rowhouse. Plans call for

replacing the windows with single pane windows and the four panel door with a single panel door with a large glass light with security bars. The applicant wishes to close the areaway and install new basement windows and reconfigure the planting area. The staff recommends internal consistency for the restoration with two over two on the ground floor and four over four windows above, a four panel door and the replication of the one basement grate in the restored window to match the existing. The staff accepts the closing of the areaway, but not the addition of bars on the first floor windows and door.

Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Jamie Thorn represented the application. He stated that the design had been revised to comply with the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

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

1935 Spring Garden Street

Daniel Kilpatrick, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1860

PROPOSAL: Repair brownstone with non-color integrated material

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the pointing subject to staff review of a field sample; denial of the proposed brownstone repair 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...]

The application proposes refacing the brownstone details of the building with a cementitious mortar and coating the patches with a paint-like coating. The applicant also wishes to repoint the building.

Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission.

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

Owner Dan Kilpatrick stated that the brownstone repair would cost \$40,000 if a color-integral method was employed. He stated that he could not afford to undertake the color-integral repair. He reported that the repair he had proposed would cost \$10,000. He submitted photos of a similar repair executed at a nearby building; it was noted that it had been done without approvals. He added that he prefers the uniformity of color and texture that would be achieved with his method.

Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Baron to comment on the proposal. Mr. Baron stated that the method proposed would result in a very flat appearance that would not look like real brownstone.

Mr. Steinberg suggested that the applicant submit a hardship application to the Hardship Committee. Mr. Sklaroff responded, "This is a matter for the Common Sense Committee, us!" Mr. Baron conceded that the historic brownstone is so damaged that the suggested repair would not be entirely inappropriate in this particular case.

Mr. Sugrue withdrew his motion to accept the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Rivera, who seconded, agreed to the withdrawal.

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the pointing as well as the brownstone repair method consisting of a cementitious mortar and paint-like coating. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1900 Wallace Street

David Krahn, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1855

PROPOSAL: Legalize roof deck on rear ell

The Architectural Committee recommended the legalization of the deck and access door.

The applicant seeks to legalize a deck on the rear ell. The deck has visibility on this corner property.

Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. No one attended to represent the application.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to accept the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 10 to 1. Mr. James opposed.

1709 Brandywine Street

Fred Duling, Owner

Arlene Matzkin, Architect

DATE: c. 1920, rear addition c. 1940

PROPOSAL: Demolish non-contributing building, build new 3-story, multi-unit building with parking – final approval

The Architectural Committee recommended final approval of the proposal.

This application proposes to demolish a garage and construct a new multi-unit residence with parking. The design is similar to one approved in concept by the Commission.

Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Fred Duling, the owner, and Arlene Matzkin, the architect, appeared.

Mr. Wilds declared that he would vote to deny the proposal. He noted that he accepts the demolition, but not the new construction. He asserted that it is not compatible with the historic district.

Mr. Sklaroff noted a letter from Councilman Clarke opposing the new building because it would alter the character of the community. He also noted that the Commission had approved the project in concept.

Mr. Duling reported that the block is lined with garages, apartments, and parking lots. Ms. Matzkin stated that there is no architectural precedent on the block. She asserted that it would be "strange" to erect a pseudo-Victorian carriage house on the block. She concluded that the design is essentially the same as that approved in concept.

Mr. Tyler reminded the Commission that it has full jurisdiction over the new construction because a building stood on the site at the time of designation. Mr. Wilds reiterated that he would approve of the demolition, but not the new construction. Mr. Gallery noted that the staff may approve the demolition of a non-contributing structure. Mr. Sugrue opined that the proposal is better than a faux Victorian building.

Adam Laver, Esq., stated that he represents approximately 25 neighbors. He advocated the denial of the proposal. He requested that the applicant prepare a design that is compatible with its context. Mr. Tissian asked Mr. Laver to explain his objections. Mr. Laver replied that his clients object to the nontraditional building materials. He added that there are three carriage houses on the block. Mr. Duling noted that the proposed building does not require zoning variances.

Mr. Steinberg moved to accept the Architectural Committee's recommendation and grant final approval to the proposal as submitted. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 6 to 4. Mr. Tissian, Mr. James, Mr. Wilds, and Ms. Murray opposed.

2010-12 Chancellor Street

Acorn Property Development I, LLC, Owner

Jackie Ford, Architect

DATE: c.1880

PROPOSAL: Façade rehabilitation, addition on 2012 with roof deck, "green" roof

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the proposal contingent upon:

- 1. the Chancellor Street large openings receiving traditional carriage type doors;*
- 2. the St James Street façade of 2010 receiving a carriage-type roll up door and retention of the second floor openings;*
- 3. the St James Street façade of 2012 being repaired and repointed rather than stuccoed;*
- 4. the addition having a setback of approximately a foot and one half.*

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 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.]

This proposal involves renovations to two former carriage houses with facades on both Chancellor and St. James Streets. On Chancellor Street, the applicant proposes new windows and doors which, for the most part, do not conform to historical designs. On the St. James Street façade, the plans show the walls stuccoed with the cutting of a

garage door and the cutting, infill and moving of window and door openings. The applicant seeks to add a third floor set flush with the façade. The rooftop additions to 2010 Chancellor include an ell shaped structure and a deck, set back from Chancellor Street and a planted “green roof” forward of that. A double window would be cut into the side of 2012 Chancellor Street.

Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Arlene Matzkin represented the applicant. Ms. Matzkin stated that the addition could be set back 1 foot, not 1½ feet as recommended by the Architectural Committee.

Mr. Steinberg moved to accept the Architectural Committee’s recommendation with the amendment that the addition be set back 1 foot. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1708 Pine Street

Stephen Fox, Owner

Don Ventresca, Applicant

DATE: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: Cut down basement windows, install sidewalk grates, repave sidewalk with brick

The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the brick sidewalk, but approval of the sidewalk wells and repaving in bluestone or concrete tinted to resemble bluestone, 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...]; and 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.]

This application calls for cutting wells in the sidewalk for the elongation of the basement windows. The wells would be covered with grates and the sidewalk would receive brick pavers. These sidewalks typically had bluestone pavers. Tinted concrete could be used to suggest that material. The drawing shows incorrect 12-over-12 pane windows and paneled shutters.

Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Don Ventresca represented the applicant. Mr. Ventresca stated that he accepted the Architectural Committee’s recommendation.

Mr. Wilds asked the Commission to consider the precedent that would be set by an approval of the window wells. Mr. Sklaroff agreed that Commission should consider carefully that aspect of the application. Mr. Sugrue asked if similar wells can be found at nearby buildings. Mr. Ventresca stated that examples can be found at the rears of neighboring buildings, but not at front facades. Mr. Tyler noted that the Commission has denied similar proposals, but approved others. Mr. Wilds remarked that the applicant had not presented any evidence supporting the need for the wells. Mr. Ventresca stated that he was converting the building to a multi-family residence and planned to include living space in the basement.

Mr. Wilds asserted that the recommendation to tint the concrete sidewalk blue was ludicrous. Ms. Spina stated that the blue concrete would provide a cheap alternative to bluestone. Mr. Ventresca responded that he would not alter the existing sidewalk.

Mr. Sugrue moved to accept the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 1. Mr. Wilds opposed. Mr. Steinberg was absent.

1712 Rittenhouse Square

B. Swarbrick, Owner

Lanny Leibowitz, Architect

DATE: c. 1840, altered c.1890

PROPOSAL: Roof deck on visible rear ell

The Architectural Committee recommended approval, pursuant to Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize 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.]

This application proposes a deck on a rear ell with a substantial setback from the street at the rear of the property.

Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission.

Mr. Tissian moved to accept the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. James seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

2304 St. Albans Street

Marie Carbo, Owner

Delano Shane, Applicant

DATE: c. 1867

PROPOSAL: Rehabilitate rear bay with deck, windows

The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the revised deck proposal presented at the meeting, with staff to work with the applicant to develop the correct historic details for the bay, windows, and dormer 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.]

This applicant proposes the reconstruction of a rear dormer and bay, presently covered in stucco, and the building of a rear deck on a one-story shed.

Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Mr. Wilds asked why the staff had not approved the proposal, which is limited to the rear of the building. Mr. Baron reported that the alterations would be visible from 23rd Street.

Mr. James moved to accept the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

2110 Chancellor Street

Ara Chalian, Owner

Matthew Huffman, Architect

DATE: c. 1867

PROPOSAL: Façade rehabilitation, 3rd-story addition – final approval

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend final approval, with staff to review details.

Mr. Farnham presented the application for final approval of the construction of a 1-story addition atop a 2-story carriage house. It also proposes the restoration of the historic facades. The Commission approved the proposal in concept in December 2002, provided the HVAC equipment is not visible.

The carriage house is uniquely positioned as is indicated by the included map. Its east façade faces the eastern leg of the 2100-block of Chancellor Street; its south façade faces Van Pelt Street. It shares party walls to the north and west. The carriage house is not visible nor would the proposed addition be visible from the western leg of the 2100-block of Chancellor Street.

During the review in concept, the applicant explained that the addition would enhance, not detract from, the vista down Chancellor Street because it would block the view of an unattractive addition as well as a large roof deck and several air conditioning condensers on an adjacent building. He also asserted that the design of the addition complied with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards* because it was both differentiated from and compatible with the historic carriage house. Additionally, he noted that the Zoning Committee of the Center City Residents' Association voted not to oppose the project provided the proposed metal panels on the Chancellor Street façade be changed from a brick color to metallic gray color.

The revised design submitted for final approval is almost identical to the approved in-concept design. The only significant change is a shift from an undefined panel system to stucco at the south façade. As mandated in the Commission's in-concept approval, the HVAC equipment is hidden from view; it will reside in a cleverly designed mechanical alcove at the northwest corner of the building.

Mr. Tissian made a motion to approved the proposal, with staff to review details. Mr. James seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

2102 Spruce Street

Robert and Laurie Jacobs, Owners/Applicants

DATE: 1860

PROPOSAL: Cut windows in rear mansard

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the skylights and the new mansard windows and door, provided the westernmost window at the south elevation of the rear ell mansard is deleted from the design, 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.]

Mr. Farnham detailed the proposal. This application calls for alterations to the rear mansard roof of the rowhouse at 2102 Spruce Street. An existing door and window would be removed and three windows and a door installed in their place on the 4th-story, south-facing, mansard façade of the rear ell. A new window would be added to the west-facing slope of the mansard. A window in the main block of the house at the 4th-story, mansard level would be removed, the opening enlarged, and a new window installed. The new door and windows would be wood, true-divided-light units. Skylight would be added to the main block of the house. They would not be visible from any public right-of-way. Mr. Farnham noted that the Committee recommends approval of two of the three windows.

Peter Miller, architect for the project, stated that his client will agree to the recommendation of the Committee, but would like to have all three windows if possible. He argued that the railing of the deck hides the mansard so that none of the windows would be visible from the street. Mr. Wilds, looking at photographs, agreed.

Mr. Rivera argued that the Committee thought the historic fabric of the mansard was important to preserve regardless of its visibility, especially since this property was so close to the corner.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the skylights and the new mansard windows and door, provided the westernmost window at the south elevation of the rear ell mansard is deleted from the design, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Brown seconded the motion, which carried with eight votes. Mr. Parks and Mr. Wilds dissented. Mr. Sugrue abstained.

2219 Rittenhouse Square

Gary and Midge Dawson, Owners

Laurits Schless, Applicant

DATE: c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Cut garage door in Latimer Street façade, replace deck railing

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval, 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.]

Mr. Farnham presented this application for cutting a garage opening in a non-historic rear addition that faces Latimer Street. This block of Latimer Street is a narrow alley with rear and garages on its entire length. The new garage door would be wood and include fenestration. The application also proposes replacing an alley door with a new wood, vertical-board door and a deck railing with a wood, vertical-picket railing.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to approve the proposal with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed with ten votes. Mr. Tissian abstained.

2019 Rittenhouse Square

John Quinn, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1875; c. 1920

PROPOSAL: Install windows on front and rear facades, change front door

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the design of the rear façade, with the windows and door to be wood or aluminum-clad wood, and approval of the front façade with casement windows, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 4 [Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.] and Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize a property].

This application proposes significant alterations to the front and rear facades of this property. The building was constructed in the mid nineteenth century as a rowhouse and converted about 1920 into a Renaissance Revival commercial building.

At the front, a planter would be removed at the sidewalk and the non-historic first-floor doors and windows would be removed. The entrance would be shifted from the center to the west bay and a new door with transom, steps, and handrail installed. New six-over-six windows with panels and transoms would be installed in the center and east bays. A new planter would be installed at the sidewalk before the center bay. At the upper floors, the windows would be replaced with six-over-six, double-hung windows. The historic windows would have been casements. Any transoms would have corresponded to the windows below; the proposed do not.

At the rear, the application proposes removing the non-historic facing, stuccoing the façade, and installing a new door and six-over-six vinyl windows; transoms would be installed at the first floor. The rear façade faces a dead-end alley; one-over-one or simulated-divided light windows would be acceptable in this location, but they should be wood or aluminum-clad and, if divided, should have three-dimensional, not flat, muntins.

Mr. Steinberg expressed concern about the nature and possible significance of the glass and concrete blocks on the rear façade.

Mr. James made a motion to approve the Committee recommendation which was seconded by Mr. Brown. The motion was approved unanimously with the exception of Mr. Steinberg who abstained.

241-43 Chestnut Street

William Caton, Owner

Douglas Seiler, Architect

DATE: 1852, Stephen Button, architect, cast-iron storefront by Daniel Badger of Architectural Iron Works, New York, significant in district

PROPOSAL: Cut windows in west party wall

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of single, one-over-one double-hung windows on the upper floor and one-light awning windows on the lower floor, with no windows south of the chimney, 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 proposal calls for cutting windows in the former party wall of 241 Chestnut Street for two different condominium owners. The proposed windows are coupled, four-over-four metal-clad wood windows, like those approved for the addition at the rear of this building. These will be highly visible from Chestnut and 3rd Streets. The applicant agreed to change the proposal to meet the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to approve the Committee recommendation. The motion was seconded by Mr. James and unanimously approved.

214 Delancey Street

Bryan Miller, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1756 by John Goodwin, carpenter; front façade restored, c. 1957

PROPOSAL: 3rd floor addition on rear ell, rear decks – in concept

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, 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 5 [Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.], 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 the concept proposal, which calls for adding a third story to the rear ell of this intact Georgian house. The main section has a gambrel roof with a shed roof dormer, and the rear ell has the original half-gable roofline. To accommodate the addition, the roofline would be extended from the ridgeline, demolishing the roof at the rear. The rear wall of the house and rear ell are presently stuccoed; the plans call for the addition to be stuccoed as well. Two wood decks would extend off the rear ell at the second and third floors with double-leaf doors. Ms. Spina noted that the applicant was neither at the Committee meeting nor at the meeting present for the Commission meeting.

Mr. James made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee to deny the proposal. The motion was seconded by Mr. Tissian and approved unanimously.

716 Pine Street

Jeff Bladen and Margot Palley, Owners

Christopher Beardsley, Applicant/Architect

DATE: c. 1809 by William Thackara, plaister [sic] for Robert A. Thackara, druggist; raised to 4 stories and new Italianate façade, c. 1850

PROPOSAL: Demolish garden wall and construct carport

The Architectural Committee voted to approval the proposal, 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.]

The proposal calls for demolishing a stucco garden wall and garage and building a carport on a street that has several garages already. The carport would have stuccoed CMU walls, a wood cornice and paneled wood doors. A pyramidal skylight would sit at the middle of the roof.

Mr. Steinberg moved to accept the Committee recommendation to approve the proposal. The motion was seconded by Mr. James and approved unanimously.

1825 Porter Street

Joseph Rollo, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1907, James & John Windrim

PROPOSAL: Legalize roll-down gate at rear

The Architectural Committee voted to adopt the recommendation of the staff to deny the application, 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.]

Without a permit or Commission approval the owner installed a metal roll-down gate at the rear of the property, which faces Roseberry Street. Although they are not part of the Girard Estate Historic District, houses across Roseberry Street face the illegal addition.

Mr. Wilds and Mr. Sugrue asked about the placement of the gate and the openness of the yards along the street. Ms. Spina explained that there is a mix of garden walls.

Mr. James moved to accept the Committee recommendation to deny the legalization of the gate which was seconded by Mr. Tissian. The motion was approved with a vote of 8 to 3. Messrs. Park and Wilds and Ms. Murray voted against the motion.

1723 Porter Street

Louis Acciavatti, Owner

Liz Pisano, Applicant

DATE: 1906, James & John Windrim

PROPOSAL: Rear deck and balcony, rear garden wall with garage door

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the balcony, deck and basement steps with staff to review details and approval of the introduction at the rear of three brick piers slightly more than two feet in width with a metal, picket pedestrian door and gate 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.] 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 the proposal. The Commission approved a two-story rear addition on this property several months ago. The applicant returns with several modifications. The owner now wishes to add a balcony at the second floor and a deck at the first floor. At the rear property line, the proposal calls for a new garden wall with a roll-down garage door and a flush metal pedestrian door.

Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Acciavatti if he is in accord with keeping the garage door area visually open. He said that he is for now.

Ms. Murray asked if he had presented the revisions to G.E.A.R. and was told that he had not.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Committee to approve the proposal, which was seconded by Mr. Riviera and unanimously approved.

1010 Arch Street

Jennifer Lecher, Architect

DATE: 1902, William Prichett, architect

PROPOSAL: Cut windows on west side

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the one of over windows 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 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.] It also voted to table the hopper windows until a future meeting and the submission of plan, section and detail drawings.

This submission entails the cutting of windows on the west side. One group of windows will be fixed light one-over-one aluminum, to differentiate them from the original two-over-two windows on the same façade. These windows match those on the east façade that the Commission approved several months ago. Another group of eight will be single light, hopper or awning windows.

Mr. James made a motion to approve the Committee recommendation and approve the proposal. This was seconded by Mr. Riviera and approved unanimously.

Mr. Brown left the meeting.

1429 Diamond Street

Jonathan Weiss, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1889, attributed to Angus Wade, architect; John Stafford, builder

PROPOSAL: Stucco rear ell

The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the proposal, pursuant to Standard 7 [Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damages to historic materials will not be used.]. The brick should be pointed and the plywood and CMU infill painted a red color to match the surrounding brick.

Ms. Spina described the application. A previous owner altered the rear ell of this building by closing down the window openings and infilling them with plywood and CMU. Now that the neighboring house has been demolished, the rear ell is visible from Diamond Street. The current owner wishes to add a sand-finish stucco to the rear ell. The interior has been finished for the reduced window openings and it would be expensive to reopen the windows to their historic sizes.

Mr. Sugrue made a motion to accept the Committee recommendation to deny the proposal but allow an alternate treatment of painting the window infill a brick red color. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Old Business

102 N. Front Street

Alan Karpo, Owner

George Baker, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1840

PROPOSAL: Install lottery window, remove bulkhead

The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 6 [Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials]; Standard 9 [New additions, exterior alterations, or related 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 the application. The owner proposes to install a sliding glass window within the large plate-glass storefront window and replace the single-leaf door with another single-leaf door that opens in the opposite direction. The proposal also includes removing the historic central basement bulkhead and infilling the area with concrete. The owner wants the change to be able to sell lottery tickets to disabled patrons.

In April 2002, the Historical Commission approved a handicap-access ramp for the property. This would be a simpler and more architecturally appropriate solution to the owners needs.

Mr. Steinberg made a motion to accept the Committee recommendation to deny the proposal, which was seconded by Ms. Murray and passed unanimously.

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

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

HARRY A. BATTEN MEMORIAL FUND

Mr. Tyler asked the Commission to approve the expenditure of \$33.58 for the Architectural Committee lunches.

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

Mr. Sklaroff announced an all day training session for Commission members and staff given by the Pennsylvania Bar Institute on November 16, 2004 on the 10th floor of the Wanamaker building.

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

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron
Jonathan Farnham
Laura M. Spina