

**THE MINUTES OF THE 594TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 2012
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D.
Dominique Hawkins
JoAnn Jones, Office of Housing & Community Development
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
John Mattioni, Esq.
Daniel Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections
David Schaaf, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Robert Thomas, AIA

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II

ALSO PRESENT

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Matt McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Diane M. Calkins
Huntley Harrison
Jeffrey Wright
Gerry Gutierrez, Group G
Bri Paxton
Jon Vimr
Belinda Fields
Leon Fields
John Bastian, Cecil Baker & Partners
Guy Gindhart
Susan Carmody, Overbrook Farms Club
Kevin Maurer, Overbrook Farms Club
Scott Maritzer, Overbrook Farms Club
Kevin Rasmussen, Rasmussen/Su Architects
Rachel Fuld
Tim Kerner, Terra Studio
Julie Dorenbos, Skin Palette
Susie Celek, Skin Palette
A. Philip Handel
Maureen Handel
Michelle Craron
Jerald Goodman, Esq., Drinker Biddle

Alison Miller
Virginia Duerr
Vernyce Dannells
Melanie Ellison Roach
V. Chapman Smith
Rob Smith
Greg James, Overbrook Farms East Residents Association
Herbert Jeschke
Subhas Mazumdar
Fong Quan Zheng
Collette Kinane
Sean Carmody
William Boyer
Lisa Weishaw
Ed Bance
Nicole Marquis, Marquis & Co.
Bishop Charles E. Bennison Jr., Episcopal Diocese
Mary Kohart, Episcopal Diocese
Tully Speaker, Logan Square Neighborhood Association
Gary Brent, MG Permits
Jim Cassidy, Waldorf School of Philadelphia
Marisa Piccarreto

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Dilworth, Hawkins, Jones, Leonard, Mattioni, Merriman, Quinn, Schaaf, and Thomas joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 593RD STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the minutes of the 593rd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 13 January 2012. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 30 NOVEMBER 2011

Richardson Dilworth III, chair

OVERBROOK FARMS HISTORIC DISTRICT

Owner: Various

Nominator: The Overbrook Farms Club

Proposal: Nomination district designation

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Overbrook Farms Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation (a, c, d, e, f, h, and j) and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places with the following revisions to the nomination: a section on the history of the apartment buildings and the sources of the illustrations should be added the Statement of Significance; and 6300 Woodbine Avenue, 6000 Overbrook Avenue, and 5898 Woodbine Avenue are classified as contributing and 2095-97 N. 63rd street is classified as non-contributing.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes the designation of the Overbrook Farms Historic District. Overbrook Farms is a suburban residential development of 497 properties located on the western edge of the City of Philadelphia and centered on the Main Line of the former Pennsylvania Railroad. The proposed boundaries are predicated on the residential development that was laid out in the early 1890s.

The period of significance of the Overbrook Farms Historic District spans from 1850, when the trains first stopped at the Overbrook Station, to 1929, when the last of the original buildings of the development was constructed and the first of the original buildings demolished.

The nomination contends that the Overbrook Farms Historic District satisfies seven Criteria for Designation (a, c, d, e, f, h, and j) and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham and Ms. Merriman explained to the Commission and audience that Deputy Mayor Alan Greenberger had requested in writing that the Commission table the nomination to allow additional time for discussion.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt Deputy Mayor Alan Greenberger's request and table consideration of the Overbrook Farms Historic District nomination. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Dilworth excused himself from the meeting.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 JANUARY 2012

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included applications 229-37 Arch Street, 46 N. Front Street, and 2041 Locust Street. Mr. Sherman asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments. Mr. Sherman asked if the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for 229-37 Arch Street, 46 N. Front Street, and 2041 Locust Street. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 127 S 18TH ST

Project: Install awning and signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: ADR 18th and Sansom LLC

Applicant: Nicole Marquis, Hip City Veg

History: 1870; storefront added, 1915

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995

Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a wood awning above the storefront at 127 S. 18th Street. The storefront is old, but not original to the building. The awning would be supported by an aluminum frame mounted into existing bracket holes. The awning will consist of six-inch oak boards spaced three inches apart over the aluminum frame. This application also proposes vinyl decal signage for the storefront window.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Côté presented the application to the Commission. No one represented the application.

Ms. Merriman stated that she deemed the proposed awning appropriate. She asked for an explanation of the Architectural Committee's recommendation of denial. Ms. Hawkins explained that the awning would be located too high on the storefront, above the typical location at the transoms of the storefront windows. She also noted that it would be wider than the storefront window opening, which is unusual. Furthermore, she stated that the proposed material is not only unusual, but is also much heavier than the typical canvas and would require more supports. However, none of the attachment details were provided.

Ms. Merriman asked why the applicant was not in attendance. Ms. Cote responded that she was surprised that the applicant had not attended the meeting.

Mr. Thomas stated that the Commission should seek a solution that works for the applicant. He noted, however, that the proposed awning was oddly positioned, on the blank wall above the storefront window rather than in the window opening. He commented that the storefront is not original to the building, but it is old and worthy of protection. He suggested that the awning should be relocated to the window opening and should be made of a fabric.

Mr. Schaaf asked about the attachment details. Ms. Cote stated that the applicant has not submitted any additional attachment details. Mr. Baron added that the wood awning will be much heavier than a canvas awning and will require a much larger supporting structure and many more holes in the masonry storefront. Mr. Thomas agreed and stated that a traditional awning should be installed at the traditional location, at the transoms.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 1. Ms. Merriman dissented.

ADDRESS: 1634 PINE ST

Project: Demolish rear slope of roof, construct roof deck and dormer

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: William J. and Ann D. O'Hara

Applicant: Timothy Kerner, Terra Studio LLC

History: 1885

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995

Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a dormer on front slope of the roof at 1634 Pine Street. The proposed dormer would be clad in cement panel siding and a metal roof with aluminum clad windows. The dormer is proposed to be set back 10 feet from the front façade and may not be visible from Pine Street. However, it may be visible from S. 17th or S. Chadwick Streets.

This application also proposes to demolish the rear slope of the main roof to make way for a roof deck. The deck would be accessed by a spiral stair leading from the roof of a two-story, rear addition. A door cut is proposed for the third-floor rear of the main block to access the spiral stair on the roof of the two-story addition. The rear of the property is visible from Waverly Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Commission. Architect Tim Kerner and Alison Miller, the daughter of the property owner, represented the application.

Mr. Kerner distributed revised architectural drawings to the Commission. He explained that the revisions are in response to the Architectural Committee's recommendations. He stated that he removed the proposed front dormer, dropped the height of the roof deck, and reduced the depth of the roof deck. He noted that the deck is set behind a garage more than 60 feet from Waverly Street.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she is opposed to the removal of the rear slope of the deck. She asked the applicants if they would be amenable to a dormer that provided access to a deck instead of removing the rear slope of the roof. Mr. Kerner stated that such a dormer would be much more complicated and more discernable. He advocated for his approach, which would be simpler and less conspicuous.

Mr. Thomas stated that he walks down this street often. He observed that the roof in question is set back a great distance from the street and will not be highly visible. He also noted that the new south-facing windows will receive significant sunlight, providing passive heating in the winter, making the house more sustainable. He asked if the applicant would consider an awning for the summer months. Mr. Kerner stated that he could add an awning.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 10 February 2012. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 1. Ms. Hawkins dissented.

ADDRESS: 229-37 ARCH ST

Project: Restore facades, replace and add windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Berger Development L.P.

Applicant: Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker + Partners

History: 1913; Berger Brothers Company; expanded, 1918

Individual Designation: 1/6/1977

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Contributing, 12/12/2003

Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the new openings on the east elevation have squareheaded one-over-one windows and that the reopened historic openings on the east elevation are arched with six-over-six windows, the infill area on the 1990s addition is either brick or contains a window, and the historic entrances and storefronts are restored, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: The site at 229-37 Arch Street encompasses several historic and non-historic buildings. The site extends from Arch Street, north along Bread Street, to Cherry Street. The site is adjacent to the Betsy Ross House, which stands to the west. There are three historic buildings within the site: a five-story industrial building facing Arch Street, a four-story industrial building at the corner of Cherry Street, and a three-story light industrial building on Cherry Street. A modern four-story addition, constructed in 1990, connects the building on Cherry with the one on Arch Street.

In December 2007, the Historical Commission reviewed a conceptual proposal to demolish the 1990 addition, construct a tower in its place, rehabilitate the façade on Arch Street, and reopen and cut window openings on both east and west elevations of the Arch Street building. The Commission voted to approve the proposal in concept.

The current application proposes to retain the 1990 addition, rehabilitate the historic façade on Arch Street, and to reopen and cut window and vent openings on both east and west elevations of the Arch Street building.

The west elevation of the historic Arch Street building is a stucco party wall and contains several non-historic openings. This application proposes a regular fenestration and brick vent pattern for this façade. The east elevation of the historic Arch Street building contains historic and non-historic, as well as, infilled openings. The historic openings had six-over-six double-hung windows. This application proposes to retain the existing non-historic windows and install windows that match the configuration of the non-historic windows in the new and reopened openings. The staff suggests that the historic six-over-six windows should be installed in the restored openings, and a one-over-over version of the historic window in the new openings. The existing windows can remain in place until such time that their replacement is necessary.

This application proposes to rehabilitate the front façade of the historic Arch Street building. According to historic photographs, the first floor contained two sets of wood double doors, flanked by storefront windows with a granite sill over a tripartite basement entrance, on either side of the central entrance. By 1976, the basement entrances had been infilled with brick. By the time of the creation of the historic district in 2003 a granite base ran the entire length of the front façade. The application proposes to remove the granite base at the two historic entrances and below the shop windows. Metal storefront doors are proposed for the historic entrances and brick infill for the area below the shop windows.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 315 CHERRY ST

Project: Construct third-story addition and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rachel Fuld & David Patchefsky

Applicant: Rachel Fuld

History: 1915

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Contributing, 12/12/2003

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: A majority of the members of the Architectural Committee failed to agree on a recommendation. Therefore, the Architectural Committee offered no recommendation.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof-top addition with roof deck towards the rear of the building. The building is a two-story light industrial building and it is situated in the middle of a row of three such buildings. The three buildings are almost identical in massing and design; however, the corner building, 317, is slightly taller than the building in question.

The proposed addition would be set back nine feet from the front façade on Cherry Street. The addition would be clad in metal panels; the fenestration would be oriented to the east. The addition would include a roof deck. The deck would be set back 14 feet from the edge of the addition, not the front façade. The total set back from the front façade of the building would be 23 feet. The applicant has submitted sight-line studies that indicate that the addition would not be visible from Orianna Street, and slightly visible from Cherry Street. The proposed roof deck would not be visible from either street.

The Commission approved a roof-top addition on a neighboring property along Orianna Street in August 2006. That addition is visible from Cherry Street. The Commission, however, denied a roof deck proposed for the roof-top space between the front façade and the addition because it would have been highly conspicuous.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architect Kevin Rasmussen and property owner Rachel Fuld represented the application.

Ms. Merriman noted that the staff recommendation had been omitted from the Architectural Committee minute. She asked Mr. Danta to provide it. He responded that the staff had recommended approval.

Mr. Rasmussen distributed color images of the project. He explained that the project would add two bedrooms to the house. He noted that he had proposed a rather low ceiling height to make the addition as inconspicuous as possible. Mr. Sherman reported that the building heights vary significantly along that block of Cherry Street. He noted that three or four feet of the top of the addition may be visible from points along Cherry Street. Mr. Rasmussen and Ms. Fuld agreed.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee members liked the design of the addition, but some worried that its approval would set a negative precedent regarding additions on roofs that are visible from front elevations. Mr. Rasmussen disagreed that an approval would set a precedent.

He noted that the Commission approved a highly visible roof-top addition on a building on Orianna Street, near the one in question. He asserted that, owing to the type of building and the significant setback of the addition, this addition will appear as independent from the historic building. It will not have an adverse effect on the historic building or the district.

Mr. Thomas asked about the height of the deck. Mr. Rasmussen stated that the deck would be located as low as possible by including part of the stair to it in the interior of the building. Therefore, there is no pilot house. The railing is the highest point on the deck. He added that the railing would be black metal with the thinnest possible dimensions. The cladding on the addition would be a gray metal. The windows would be aluminum with a dark-colored, matte frame. The glass siding would be channel glass in the same dimensions as the siding. It would light the stairway. He added that the channel glass would not be visible from the street.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to approve the application, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 1. Ms. Hawkins dissented.

ADDRESS: 1424-26 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Install signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Sunny Spring LLC

Applicant: Gary Brent, MG Permits

History: 1903; Jacob Reed's Sons; William L. Price, architect; rear 5th story added, 1909, Spencer Roberts, architect

Individual Designation: 3/29/1966

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install two signs on the front façade along Chestnut Street. This building was designed by prominent Philadelphia architect William Price, one of the most accomplished practitioners of the Arts & Crafts movement in the region. This building, which originally housed Jacob Reed's Sons' Men Clothing Store, was among the first reinforced concrete structures in Philadelphia. Its fine façade is very well preserved.

The current tenant, CVS Pharmacies, currently has four signs on this façade, two bronze wall plaques on each end pilaster, a flat sign over the entrance, and a stained-glass transom with the pharmacy's logo. The Commission approved these signs in 1996. During that review, the Commission denied the installation of an illuminated pendant sign over the main entrance. In 2007, the pharmacy requested the installation of a five-foot long illuminated sign on the front façade along Chestnut Street. The sign was proposed to be attached to the frieze of the entablature delineating the ground floor from the upper stories. The sign would have been directly attached to the original marble cladding. The Commission denied that application.

The current application proposes to install two signs in addition to the four signs that currently exist: a non-illuminated plastic face sign over the main entrance and an illuminated projecting sign. The wall sign would be 10 feet long and it would have a white background. It would be located directly above the revolving-door entrance. The entrance to the store is painted dark brown. The projecting sign would also have a plastic face and it would be installed on the

western pier directly above an existing bronze CVS wall plaque. The sign would be attached directly onto the marble. This sign would necessitate the installation of an electrical box.

The Commission's approval in 1996 balanced the needs of the tenant for advertisement with the preservation of this remarkable façade by one of the most prominent Philadelphia architects of the late nineteenth century. The two CVS bronze plaques that were approved closely resemble two original bronze plaques advertising the Jacob Reed's Sons' Store. The sign over the entrance also resembles the original sign for the store.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Expediter Gary Brent represented the application.

Mr. Brent stated that he expected the Commission to deny the application in light of the discussion at the Architectural Committee meeting.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 126 S 19TH ST

Project: Legalize awnings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: John Ciccone

Applicant: Julie Dorenbos, Skin Palette

History: 1900

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the recladding of two awnings on the front façade of this building. The building was originally constructed as a residence about 1900. Subsequently, the ground floor was altered for commercial use. The ground floor is clad in white marble, which is original to the residential design.

The building had a large box awning at the time of designation in 1995. The awning was later removed without a permit. The applicant submitted a photograph dated 1997 that shows it in place. The applicant, who is the tenant in this commercial ground-floor space, claims in a cover letter that she only replaced the canvas on an existing awning structure. The awning armature, however, was illegally installed. It is not the awning armature that appears in the 1995 and 1997 photographs. Furthermore, the photograph on Google Street View, which was taken fairly recently, shows the building without any awnings and its ground floor vacant.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Business owner Julie Dorenbos represented the application.

Mr. Danta stated that the applicant removed the awning over the door after the Architectural Committee meeting. Ms. Dorenbos apologized to the Commission for refacing the illegal awnings. She stated that they did not know that the former tenant in the retail space had illegally

installed the awnings. She stated that they would like to bring the storefront into compliance. She acknowledged that she now knows that the awning over the storefront window is not appropriate for the historic building. She asked for the Commission's guidance on an appropriate awning.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the applicant was caught in an unfortunate situation. She had been led to believe that the awnings were legal, when, in fact, they were not. She thanked the applicant for removing the door awning. She suggested that the staff could review and approve an awning that fit within the storefront window. The current awning is mounted too high on the storefront. It should be within the opening. Ms. Jones thanked the applicant for her forthrightness and willingness to work with the staff on an appropriate solution. Several Commissioners suggested that the landlord should have been forthright with the tenant.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to deny the legalization application, but approve a revised awning over the storefront window, with the staff to review details. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which unanimously.

ADDRESS: 46 N FRONT ST

Project: Alter and legalize rear alterations, construct deck, replace windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Third Federal Bank

Applicant: Gerry Gutierrez, Group G LLC

History: 1785; storefront piers added by Samuel Wetherill

Individual Designation: 11/29/1960

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Significant, 12/12/2003

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the modification of a highly significant merchant's house to partially correct illegal modifications undertaken by a former owner in 2007. In 2001, this house was completely restored with correct windows. In 2007, a developer converted the structure to a four-unit building. That developer added a floor onto the rear ell, a bay onto the west façade to accommodate a new stair and hall passage, enlarged a door opening, and installed vinyl windows without an approval or building permit. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a violation and stopped the work. The developer went bankrupt and the Third Federal Bank seized the building, which it now owns. The current application, which was submitted by a prospective buyer, seeks to correct many elements in violation including the removal of the rear bay and replacement of the vinyl windows. The rear ell would retain the additional story, but would be reduced in height to sit below the rear cornice; a sloped shed roof like the original roof would replace the current roof. The application proposes returning the widened rear door opening to its single-leaf size and installing a door with muntins. The deck seen in an older photograph of the building would be reconstructed. Wood windows with muntins would be installed in the rear ell. The Committee reviewed and recommended for approval of an identical application a few months ago, but the application was withdrawn before the Commission meeting because of uncertainty about the sale.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 2041 LOCUST ST

Project: Construct rear addition, restore front façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2041 Locust Street LLC

Applicant: Guy Gindhart, Gindhart Planning & Design

History: 1870; storefront added, 1895

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the rehabilitation of the front façade of this townhouse and the construction of a rear addition. The prospective owners are undertaking their due diligence before purchasing this long-empty, poorly-kept house. They seek to restore the masonry façade with the removal of paint and the installation of two-over-two windows and louvered shutters at the upper floors. The much altered storefront would be modified with the installation of three double hung windows with transoms within the existing masonry opening. The doorway would be restored to its c. 1920 condition with the removal of a later pediment.

The application proposes demolishing the rear wall of the rear ell and adding a full lot-width addition and garage with deck. The building would also be expanded upward with the construction of additional floors on the rear ell and the insertion of an elevator. Although it would be taller than the main block of the house, the addition would be set back 24 feet from the front façade. The addition would be visible from the rear, which faces carriage houses on an alley-like street.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 1316 WALNUT ST

Project: Replace storefront

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jason Real Estate Inc.

Applicant: Yong Quan Zheng

History: 1887; University Club; Wilson Eyre Jr., architect

Individual Designation: 7/12/2000

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the modification of this highly significant club building with an aluminum storefront. The club was converted to commercial use long ago and already has a non-historic storefront. On 6 October 2011, the applicants sought and obtained permission from Commission to demolish and reconstruct the interiors. However, they exceeded that permit and demolished a side bay and infilled rear windows with cinderblock, installed cast stone lintels, and began stuccoing the side of the building. It should be noted that the rear of the building is highly visible and was noted in the nomination as having historical significance. The side of the building, where the bay was removed and the stuccoing was started, is not highly visible. Owing to the unpermitted work, the Department of Licenses & Inspections has issued a Stop Work

Order. The plans submitted with this application do not address the work that is in violation. No work can begin at the building until the illegal work that resulted in the Stop Work Order is addressed.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Architect Subhas Mazumdar and property owner Yong Quan Zheng represented the application.

Mr. Baron displayed a revised architectural drawing. Ms. Hawkins stated that she had reviewed the revisions prior to the Historical Commission meeting and concluded that they responded to the requests of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Baron highlighted the changes to the design including the change in fenestration, the addition of a base, and the revision of the signage. Mr. Baron explained that the applicants are also now proposing to remedy the illegal work they undertook at the rear of the building. He asked the Commission to approve the revised storefront design with the condition that the rear work will be appropriately completed.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised storefront design as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 10 February 2012, provided the illegal work at the rear is corrected according to the plan under review by the staff, with the staff to review details. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1719 GREEN ST

Project: Legalize vinyl windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Constantine Tsikos

Applicant: Constantine Tsikos

History: 1854; Josiah L. Haines, builder

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000

Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install one-over-one vinyl windows in all elevations of this building and legalize four vinyl windows in the rear ell. The original windows in this building were wood. This grand Italianate building is situated on the corner of 18th and Green Streets. All elevations are highly visible from the public right-of-way.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. No one represented the application.

The Commissioners discussed the application and concurred with the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Thomas stated that this is a type of five-bay house that is particular to the Green Street area and that this particular house was the Bushrod Washington James, M.D. residence. He added that it is depicted in *King's Views*.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 6. Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 11 S 21ST ST

Project: Stucco front façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Dimopoulos Realty, L.P.

Applicant: Frank Schuch, S & S Concrete

History: 1875

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitter Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995

Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 6.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to stucco the façade of this building. The stucco would be installed over a wire lathe and the stucco material would be a masonry cement. The original exterior cladding material is brownstone. The first story has been stuccoed. The original brownstone is exposed at the upper stories, but has been painted white. The brownstone has deteriorated in several areas. The appropriate preservation treatment for the upper stories would be to remove the white paint and repair the brownstone, not cover it with stucco.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. No one represented the application.

The Commissioners discussed the application and concurred with the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 6. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 6008 WAYNE AVE

Project: Remove stained-glass windows, install clear glass

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania

Applicant: Mary Kohart, Episcopal Diocese of PA, c/o E. Greenleaf

History: 1873; St. Peter's Episcopal Church and Rectory; George W. Hewitt, architect

Individual Designation: 11/30/1965

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 5 and the Windows Guidelines.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the removal of 40 stained-glass windows and the installation of clear glass in their places at the St. Peter's Episcopal Church complex in Germantown.

The St. Peter's Parish has been closed and the complex has been deconsecrated. The Episcopal Diocese has entered into a sales agreement with the Waldorf School of Philadelphia, which plans to convert the complex for school use.

The Historical Commission reviewed and denied a similar application in December 2009. The Diocese appealed the decision to the Board of License & Inspection Review, which remanded the application back to the Commission. At the second review in May 2010, the Commission again denied the application to remove the windows. The Historical Commission asserted that the application was not ripe for review because, although the Diocese claimed that it needed to remove the windows before selling the property, it did not have a buyer for the property. The Diocese now asserts that the application is ripe because a buyer has entered into a sales agreement for the property. The agreement is contingent upon the removal of the windows (see Section 10.b). The Diocese contends that it must remove and reuse the windows in accordance with Canon law before the buyer takes possession of the property.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Jones recused from the review because she is a member of the Standing Committee of the Episcopal Diocese.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Episcopal Bishop Charles E. Bennison Jr., Episcopal Diocesan Chancellor Mary Kohart, and attorney Jerald Goodman represented the application.

Ms. Kohart explained that the Diocese recently lowered the sale price to allow the purchaser, the Waldorf School, to repair the roof. She also stated, to her knowledge, that the School has plans in place for the rehabilitation of the other buildings at the complex, but not the church building itself. She asserted that the School cannot reuse the building with the stained glass windows in place. The space would not be well lighted with the dark windows. She stated that they needed some flexibility with the church building. Mr. Sherman commented that it can be extremely difficult to adaptively reuse religious buildings. He noted that the Commission has significant experience in this area of rehabilitation. He also noted that the city is facing a surplus of vacant religious structures. He advised the Commission that it should not place roadblocks in the way of the adaptive reuse of this large historic complex. He contended that, if the Commission makes it difficult to reuse this complex, it will sit abandoned and deteriorate. He asserted that the Commission must make some compromises to allow this property to return to productiveness.

Mr. Sherman asked the applicants to explain what they would do with the windows once they were removed. Ms. Kohart explained that they have researched the intents of the donors for each of the windows. She stated that they would like to have the windows reused in other churches, especially other Episcopal churches. She added that they have retained stained glass expert Joseph Beyer of Beyer Studio to assist them, who will market the windows that cannot be relocated to other churches. She reported that the window that depicts Bishop White will be reused at the Diocese headquarters or cathedral. Mr. Mattioni asked if any of the windows would be donated to museums. He remembered the earlier application to legalize the removal of the Tiffany and Violet Oakley windows, which were transferred to the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts. Ms. Kohart stated that Mr. Beyer has determined that the remaining windows are not of the quality that would warrant their transfer to a museum.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she believes that the Commission will be confronted with many such applications in the future. She stated that she has concerns about the proposal because the clear glass was presented as a temporary solution, not the final solution. She contended that the School may have another plan for the windows. However, once the clear glass is approved, it may be in place forever. She suggested that the School present its plans to the Commission before any decision is reached. She also suggested that something other than clear glass, for example leaded glass, could be installed in the windows facing the street to mitigate the loss.

Mr. Schaaf suggested that the windows should retain their operability after the glass is replaced. He contended that there must be a means of allowing fresh air into the building. He objected to “sealing” the building with clear glass.

Mr. Sherman suggested that the Commission establish a policy regarding the removal of stained glass windows.

Mr. Thomas stated that the Commission should handle this request as it handles demolition requests. In demolition cases, if the Commission decides to approve a demolition, it conditions the approval to ensure that the demolition does not occur until financing and the permit for the new construction are obtained. He suggested that an approval for the removal of these windows should be similarly conditioned.

Mr. Sherman asked the applicants to clarify whether the agreement of sale required the removal of the stained glass windows before closing or merely the obtaining of the approval to remove the windows before closing. Mr. Goodman clarified that the agreement requires the removal of the windows before closing. Mr. Sherman asked how the Diocese would finish the windows after the removal of the stained glass. Ms. Kohart stated that their application clearly states that the Beyer Studio would install clear glass in the sash where stained glass was removed. She added that, if the purchaser, the School, decided to change the clear glass, it would need to seek the approval of the Historical Commission. She stated again that her application proposes to remove the stained glass and replace it with clear glass. Mr. Sherman stated that the Commission would not accept the boarding of the window openings with plywood after the stained glass is removed. Ms. Kohart again stated that she is proposing to remove the stained glass and replace it with clear glass; boarding has never been mentioned. The work would be done by her expert. Mr. Farnham explained to the Commission that Mr. Beyer, the stained glass expert, had appeared before the Architectural Committee and explained in great detail that he would be removing stained glass only and replacing it with clear ¼-inch glass. Mr. Beyer stated that he would not be removing any frames, sash, or structural elements, but only the stained glass itself and the lead came holding it together. The windows would retain their operability; an operable awning window would remain an operable awning window after the installation of the clear glass. Mr. Farnham noted that Mr. Beyer described the frames and sash types including stone, steel, and wood. Mr. Farnham reiterated that the stained glass would be slid from the sash and new clear glass installed where it had been. No stone, steel, or wood elements would be removed. He also noted that the glass replacement would not be temporary; it would be permanent. He asserted that it would be a mistake to understand this application as a temporary alteration. The buyer may seek the Commission’s approval to alter the windows again, but it may not. If it did not, this clear glass would last as long as any reglazing, for many decades.

Mr. Thomas stated that he would like to have an opportunity to review the School’s proposal for the windows while reviewing the current application. He stated that he would like to know what will be installed in the window openings after the stained glass is removed. Mr. Farnham responded that clear glass will be installed.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Commission must consider the implications of approving this application. It will set a precedent. Mr. Gallery stated that he is concerned about several issues raised by the application. He asserted that the agreement of sale is not a binding agreement. The buyer may abandon the sale after the windows are removed. He also asserted that the Commission should review the buyer’s proposal for the building before allowing the windows to be removed. He contended that the Commission should

not allow the Diocese to remove the windows because it is required by Canonical law; basing any approval on any such reason would set a dangerous precedent. Mr. Gallery stated that he met with the School and reviewed its plans for the site. He asserted that the plans called for several alterations that would not satisfy preservation standards. Mr. Gallery stated that the rose window is devoid of religious iconography; it does not need to be removed and it would be a “tragedy” to remove it. He asserted that many of the windows have “no overt religious messages.” He suggested that some of the windows that have limited religious meaning should be left in place. He said that the building will clearly read as a church, even after the windows are removed. Some windows should be left in place to tell the history of the building. He concluded that the Commission should not approve the application without a signed agreement of sale ensuring that the building will be sold. Ms. Kohart responded that the Diocese and the School have signed an agreement of sale. Ms. Kohart observed that they are not contending that Canon law requires them to remove the windows. She stated that the situation is more nuanced than Mr. Gallery’s portrayal of it. She stated that money collected throughout the Diocese is being spent to maintain this vacant church complex. She stated that the Diocese is barely able to sustain the property. She stated that the Diocese has marketed the property for seven years and the School’s offer is the first. She stated that the Diocese will face dire financial circumstances if it is unable to sell this property. She stated that the School insisted on this agreement. The Diocese must sell this property to the School under this agreement or face extreme consequences. She stated that the School is the only potential buyer and it is paying almost nothing for the property. She stated that, if the Commission refuses to approve this application and requires the Diocese to maintain these windows in place, it will essentially be taxing the Diocese into extinction. She stated that all denominations are facing the same problem in Philadelphia. She asserted that the Commission will bankrupt the city’s religious organizations if it does not allow some flexibility with the vacant buildings. She stated that the Waldorf School would be a great use for the property and would enrich the neighborhood. She asked the Commission to be very careful before it took any steps that might interfere with the sale.

Mr. Thomas recalled a similar situation in which he was involved in the Parkside neighborhood. He explained that to get the requisite signatures on a series of interrelated, interdependent agreements, 36 people went into a room and locked the door; no one left until all of the agreements had been signed and the permits and approvals granted. He suggested that such a meeting might be necessary in this case. He also suggested that a bond might be an appropriate way to guarantee that the project is completed.

Mr. Sherman urged the Commission to craft a compromise with the Diocese. He stated that he did not want to be left with a vacant church with no buyer and no reuse, like the Church of the Assumption. He stated that the Commission should not “put roadblocks in the way of a new use.”

Mr. Thomas again stated that the Commission should find a way to approve the removal while ensuring that the clear glass would be installed. He stated that he is concerned that the windows would be removed and then the School would not follow through with the purchase. Ms. Kohart stated that she was not opposed to providing a safeguard to ensure that the windows would not be removed until the School had committed to the purchase. She stated that she would agree to a condition that the windows would not be removed until or after the closing. Mr. Goodman apologized that the Waldorf School representative had not yet arrived at the Commission meeting. He was expected to attend. Mr. Goodman stated that an approval that allowed the Diocese to remove and replace the windows soon after the closing would be acceptable. Mr. Mattioni reviewed the terms of the purchase agreement.

Ms. Hawkins suggested a motion to approve the removal of the stained glass windows, provided the agreement of sale is finalized and the School's replacement windows are approved by the Commission, with the staff to review details. Mr. Thomas suggested conditioning the approval on the closing itself and receipt of a statement of financial capability to complete the project. Mr. Thomas then suggested that the Commission might not want to approve the removal of all of the windows. He then noted that the Commission might also want to condition the approval on the review and approval of the School's plans for the building. Mr. Farnham cautioned the Commission about basing an approval on a condition that might not be able to be met for many years. He stated that the applicant has indicated that the School would phase its redevelopment of the complex and might not work on the church building for many years. He suggested that the Commission discuss the plans for the complex with the School representative, who just arrived at the meeting. Mr. Mattioni noted that the agreement may have already expired. Ms. Kohart stated that the agreement has been extended. Mr. Mattioni also noted that the agreement does not allow for the Commission to require the retention of some of the windows. Ms. Kohart cautioned the Commission against deciding which windows have religious significance and which do not. By definition, the Commission cannot make that decision. She stated that the Diocese wants to remove all of the windows.

James Cassidy, the co-chair of the Waldorf School's site search committee, addressed the Commission. He stated that the School is considering a historically accurate restoration of the sanctuary building, but has not developed its plan to the level of window details. He stated that they would either reuse the historic window sash and frames or replicate them. He stated that the School would like to have clear, not stained, glass in the windows. He added that the sanctuary would be used as the gathering space for the School. Mr. Thomas suggested that the operability of the windows should be maintained. Mr. Farnham reminded the Commissioners that the stained glass window expert had testified at the Architectural Committee meeting that all of the extant window frames, sash, tracery, and other components would be left in place when the stained glass was removed. Only the stained glass itself would be removed and clear glass inserted in its place. He also reminded the Commissioners that the expert had testified that the windows would retain all of their operability. An operable awning window would remain an operable awning window with the swapping of the stained glass for clear glass.

Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Cassidy to explain the timeframe for the development of the School's plans for the windows in the sanctuary. Mr. Cassidy replied that the plan for the sanctuary would not be developed "for a long time." Mr. Sherman asked Mr. Cassidy if he was aware that the Commission must review all proposals to alter the exteriors of the buildings on the site. Mr. Cassidy responded that he was aware of that requirement. Ms. Hawkins stated that the application proposed a "temporary" solution. Mr. Sherman stated that Diocese would not be willing to pay for real glass and would probably attempt to install something cheaper and temporary. He asked the Diocese to explain what it would do with the window openings once the stained glass was removed. Mr. Thomas suggested a more environmentally-friendly glazing, perhaps double glazing. He suggested that the building code might not allow single-pane glazing. Mr. Goodman stated that the Historical Commission's approval was a prerequisite for a building permit. During the building permit review, the Department of Licenses & Inspections would conduct a review to determine whether the proposal complied with the building code. Mr. Goodman suggested that the Commission conduct its review and leave the building code questions to the agency charged with enforcing the code.

Mr. Mattioni noted that the agreement of sale as documented in the paperwork he received had expired. He asked the applicants if the agreement had been extended. Ms. Kohart responded that it had been extended.

Mr. Thomas stated that the applicants should provide detailed plans of the replacement of the glazing. He suggested elevation and detail drawings and specifications of the glass. Mr. Thomas stated that the applicants should not install 1/16-inch glass. Mr. Farnham noted that the application already specifies the clear ¼-inch glass that would be installed. He directed the Commissioners to the specification in the application. He also explained that the stained glass expert has already developed the replacement details for all of the window types and the applicants agreed at the Architectural Committee meeting to submit those details for the staff's review. Mr. Farnham contended that the staff has the expertise to review those details for their appropriateness. Mr. Farnham also objected to the term "temporary," which has been used to ascribe a lack of permanence to the proposed clear glass. He stated that the term had clouded the discussion of the clear glass, obscuring the real question. He contended that the application clearly proposes to remove the stained glass, preserving the window sash, frames, and other features, and install ¼-inch clear glass in the existing sash and frames, retaining all operability. He noted that there is no proposal to board the window openings with plywood after the stained glass is removed. He stated that the solution is not temporary; it is permanent. The glass that would be installed would last as long as any glazing solution. He also observed that the Diocese would both remove and replace the glass. It would not simply remove the stained glass, leave the windows open, and hope that the School would appropriately reglaze the windows. The School may propose to alter the openings at some point in the future when it has developed its reuse plans, but those plans have no bearing on the current application. He asked the Commission to review the application before it, which proposes removing stained glass and replacing it with clear glass, nothing more or less. Mr. Thomas reported that local companies can alter sash to accept a second layer of glazing.

Mr. Thomas discussed the conditions that should be placed on any approval of the removal of the windows. He suggested that any motion to approve should include a requirement that the buyer provide proof of its financial capacity to complete the project. Mr. Sherman objected to tying an approval of an application by the Diocese to actions of the School. Mr. Thomas stated that the Diocese should not remove the windows until the staff has reviewed and approved the details of the glass replacement.

Mr. Farnham observed that it appeared that a majority of Commissioners were in favor of an approval of the application with some safeguards. He noted that all agreed that the work proposed in the application did not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. He therefore advised the Commission that it should carefully justify an approval of the application according to the letter of the preservation ordinance. He noted that Section 14-2007(7)(k)(.7) of the Philadelphia Code authorized the Commission to approve applications that do not meet the Standards under very specific circumstances. He read the section, which states that:

In specific cases as will not be contrary to the public interest, where, owing to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the provisions of this section would result in unnecessary hardship so that the spirit of this section shall be observed and substantial justice done, subject to such terms and conditions as the Commission may decide, the Commission shall by a majority vote grant an exemption from the requirements of this section.

Mr. Farnham observed that, in listening to the Commissioners discuss this application, he has garnered that the Commission has concluded that it would not be contrary to the public interest to approve this application because the loss of the stained glass windows would be more than offset by the preservation of the entire complex of buildings, which is currently at risk. He observed that there appear to be special conditions in this case, specifically the current crisis regarding the abandonment of historic religious buildings in Philadelphia precipitated by changing demographics and church-going habits. He contended that this crisis is the most pressing preservation problem in the city today. He suggested that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the section, i.e. a denial of this application because it does not meet the Standards, would not only result in an unnecessary hardship for the Diocese, but would likely result in the loss of the entire complex of historic buildings, not merely the stained glass windows. He asserted that the spirit of the preservation ordinance would be observed and substantial justice done with the approval of this application, even though the glass replacement does not meet the Standards. He conceded that the public would lose visual access to these windows, but contended that that loss would be sufficiently offset by the preservation of the complex of buildings. He concluded that any approval of the application should be granted pursuant to this section. Mr. Thomas added that the Diocese is removing the windows to preserve them. They will be reused elsewhere, hopefully in a public setting. Mr. Thomas noted that he has a basement full of artifacts that he rescued from garbage cans in his neighborhood. He stated that the windows will be removed but not discarded.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to approve the application to remove the stained glass and replace it with clear glass, provided evidence of financial capability to complete the work is submitted, provided the details of the removal and replacement are approved by the staff, and provided the removal and replacement are not undertaken until the new owner has closed on the property, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Section 14-2007(7)(k)(.7) of the Philadelphia Code. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 1. Ms. Hawkins dissented.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adjourn at 11:08 a.m. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

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.

Window Guidelines: Not Recommended: Changing the historic appearance of windows through the use of inappropriate designs, materials, finishes, or colors which noticeably change the sash, depth of reveal, and muntin configuration; the reflectivity and color of glazing; or the appearance of the frame.

Section 14-2007(7)(k)(.7) of the Philadelphia Code: In making its determination as to the appropriateness of proposed alterations, demolition or construction, the Commission shall consider the following:

(.7) In specific cases as will not be contrary to the public interest, where, owing to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the provisions of this section would result in unnecessary hardship so that the spirit of this section shall be observed and substantial justice done, subject to such terms and conditions as the Commission may decide, the Commission shall by a majority vote grant an exemption from the requirements of this section.