

**THE MINUTES OF THE 633RD STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 8 MAY 2015
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman Jr., chair
Ralph DiPietro, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Anuj Gupta, Esq.
Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP, chair
Rosalie Leonard, Esq., Office of City Council President
Melissa Long, Office of Housing & Community Development
John Mattioni, Esq.
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
R. David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Robert Thomas, AIA
Betty Turner, M.A.

Jonathan E. Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Broadbent, Historic Preservation Planner I
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

Andrew Hart, John Hubert Architects
Edward Ross, Core Property Development
Chris Carickhoff, Morrissey Design
Jerry Ginsberg
Joel Spivak
Bobbie Jo Coles
Justin Myers
Lawrence Gilbert
Stephen Pollock, Esq.
Cindy Wilson Hamilton, Heritage Consulting
Charles B. Norman, National Real Estate Development
Alexandra Brinkman, BLT Architects
Michael Prifti, BLT Architects
Josh Horvitz, Esq., Fineman Krekstein & Harris P.C.
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Andre Williams
Aaron Kavulich
Derek Ziegler
Leonard F. Reuter, Esq.
Frank Graff, MFD
Michael Loonstyn, MFD
Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Architecture

Jeremy LeCompte, Harman Deutsch Architecture
Yao Huang, YCH Architect
Sterling McCray II, Greater Exodus Baptist Church
Helen Heintz

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman, the chair, called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. Commissioners DiPietro, Gupta, Hawkins, Leonard, Long, Mattioni, Merriman, Schaaf, Thomas, and Turner joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 632ND STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the minutes of the 632nd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 10 April 2015. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL HARDSHIP, 29 APRIL 2015

Sam Sherman Jr., Chair

ADDRESS: 201 S 13TH ST

Project: Legalize removal of balcony, stain brick on east façade, patch and paint masonry

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Walnut Square Partners

Applicant: Joshua Horvitz, Fineman Krekstein & Harris P.C.

History: 1900; St. James Hotel; Horace Trumbauer, architect

Individual Designation: 8/2/1973

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend:

- denial of the removal of the balcony and installation of the infill, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 6;
- denial of the stain at the east façade, with the suggestion that the old brick is cleaned to allow for a comparison of the new and old brick colors, pursuant to Standard 6; and,
- denial of the installation of the masonry patches and paint, owing to incompleteness.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL HARDSHIP RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Merriman moved that the Committee on Financial Hardship recommend that the Historical Commission table this application for 90 days to allow the applicants to submit additional information as requested and that the Historical Commission remand the supplemented application to the Committee on Financial Hardship for additional review and a recommendation. Ms. Long seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes:

- the legalization of the removal of a balcony at the seventh floor, north façade and the installation of infill where the balcony was removed without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit;
- the application of a stain to new brick installed in the east façade with a building permit, but without compliance with conditions placed on the Historical Commission's approval; and,

- the legalization of the installation of masonry patches and paint to repair deteriorated ornament on the facade.

After the Historical Commission's staff witnessed work underway without and/or in excess of permits or approvals, the Historical Commission's staff advised the contractor and owner of the necessity for approvals and permits and the Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a verbal stop work order at the request of the Commission. The work was completed despite the City's efforts. The City initiated an enforcement action in court; the court ordered the property owner to seek the Commission's approvals for remedies for the work undertaken without permits and approvals. This application results from that order. In addition to the Architectural Committee, the Committee on Financial Hardship will review application before it is presented to the Historical Commission.

With regard to the legalization of the removal of a balcony, the application requests an exemption from the requirements of the historic preservation ordinance because repairing or replacing the balcony in kind would have imposed a financial hardship and an unnecessary hardship on the property owner. The terra cotta clad balcony was removed, the opening infilled, and Dryvit installed over the infill without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit.

The application proposes to apply a stain to new brick installed in the east façade to change the color of the new brick to a better match for the surrounding, original brick. In January 2013, the Historical Commission approved masonry repairs to the east façade, with the condition that the Commission's staff would review pointing and brick samples in the field for approval. The work was completed without the requisite staff reviews and the brick that was installed does not match the surrounding brick. The application proposes to stain the brick, but offers no details about the selected stain or the area or method of application. In concept, the stain may be the appropriate fix, but a final decision cannot be reached without additional details.

The application proposes to legalize repairs to ornament on the building undertaken without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit. Ornament was removed and replaced with a "cement material." The cement material was then painted. The repairs do not replicate the appearance of the removed ornament. The application neither provides an inventory of the repairs nor information about the repair materials. This segment of the application should be deemed incomplete.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Leonard recused because her brother-in-law is a partner in the ownership of this property. Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. Attorney Josh Horvitz represented the application.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to table the application for 90 days to allow the applicants to submit additional information as requested and to remand the supplemented application to the Committee on Financial Hardship for additional review and a recommendation. Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 21 APRIL 2015

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included applications 940 E. Washington Lane, 2108 Mount Vernon Street, and 905 Pine 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. Turner moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for the applications for applications 940 E. Washington Lane, 2108 Mount Vernon Street, and 905 Pine Street. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 940 E WASHINGTON LA

Project: Install solar panels

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Gili Ronen

Applicant: Gili Ronen

History: 1914; Jean Smith House

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Awbury Arboretum Historic District, Significant, 5/14/2010

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the shrubbery is planted to create a dense screen and the height of the panels is no taller than six inches below the top of the fence, pursuant to Standard 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install ten ground-mounted solar power panels at a private residence located in Awbury Arboretum. The panels will be located along the northeast property line near a fence. This application proposes to shield views of the solar panels with shrubs of various sizes. Although the application provides information about the arrangement of the equipment in plan, it does not provide complete information about the heights of the panels. Additional information should be provided to determine whether the panels will be visible from public portions of Awbury Arboretum.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 704-12 N BROAD ST

Project: Replace existing sign with new LED sign

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Greater Exodus Baptist Church

Applicant: Sterling McCray, II, Greater Exodus Baptist Church

History: Greater Exodus Baptist Church, Our Lady of Blessed Sacrement

Individual Designation: 11/2/1972

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as submitted but approval of a freestanding LED sign in a location that does not block the windows, provided the second sign is removed, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace an existing sign mounted at the ground-floor level on the front façade of the church. The proposed sign would have an LED animated face within a sign cabinet of the same dimensions as the existing sign, and would be installed into the masonry at the same location. The staff suggests that a freestanding sign on the sidewalk may be more appropriate.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Committee. Deacon Sterling McCray represented the application.

Deacon McCray stated that he would be willing to install a freestanding sign rather than one attached to the building. He stated that the new sign would be placed to the right of the existing sign. Mr. Thomas suggested that the south end of the sign should not extend into the window area. Deacon McCray agreed. Mr. Thomas suggested that the sign could extend over the alleyway to the north.

Mr. Schaaf asked about the removal of the sign to the left of the front entrance. Ms. Hawkins stated that its removal was discussed at the Architectural Committee meeting. She stated that the Committee members suggested that the sign should be removed because the new LED sign would render it unnecessary.

Mr. Schaaf stated that he understands the applicant's proposal for a freestanding sign, but cannot fully imagine its appearance. He asked whether the Historical Commission should review a more detailed application. Ms. Merriman stated that she was comfortable with the staff reviewing the details if the parameters were clearly in the motion.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the alleyway is used for egress. Deacon McCray stated that it was not.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to approve a freestanding version of the proposed sign, not attached to the face of the building, provided it does not stand in front of any window and the masonry is repaired where the old sign is removed, with the staff to review details. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 302 MARKET ST

Project: Construct building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owners: Jerry Ginsberg

Applicant: Joel Spivak

History: c. 1830, destroyed by fire 2014

Individual Designation: 11/14/1976

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

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story building on the site of an historic four-story building destroyed by fire. The proposed new building has a light stone facade and large plate glass windows that neither resembles the lost building nor is compatible with the historic district. The design is incompatible in materials, massing, and scale with the historic building that stood on the site, its twin to the west, and the district.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Committee. Expediter Joel Spivak, owner Jerry Ginsberg, architect Lawrence Gilbert, and attorney Stephen Pollock represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the applicant had submitted a revised drawing showing a two-story building with a brick façade with corbelled detailing, punched openings, and a more traditional storefront. Mr. Thomas commended the applicant for having addressed the Committee's concerns.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting on 8 May 2015, with the staff to review details. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 19-25 S 12TH ST

Project: Restore/rehabilitate facades, add bridge

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owners: Stephen Girard Estate Trusts

Applicant: Alexandra Brinkman, BLT Architects

History: Constructed 1896, James Hamilton Windrim, Architect

Individual Designation: 12/12/2008

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the bridge, pursuant to Standard 2; denial of the lighting and signage, owing to incompleteness; approval of the remainder of the application, provided more stone is retained at the first-floor east façade and the west entrance has either three or four doors, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate the exterior envelope of this office building, while reinvigorating the first floor with new commercial spaces

The first-floor 12th Street façade entryway and storefronts will be partially restored based on historic photographs. New entries will be cut on the other three facades to allow for a variety of new uses. The north façade will have later bays removed and storefronts installed that will more closely replicate the original large plate glass windows, but with some added doors. Sections of a stone base and tripartite stone window mullions will be removed from the east façade, which is the least public façade, to create new entrances. The standards would suggest that more of the original stonework and design should be retained, but it is a rear façade on a service alley. A bridge will be added to the east face of the building to connect this building to the one to its east. This bridge is in an area not currently seen by the public. The bridge should be attached in such a way as to not remove the stone beltcourse cornice. Finally, a basement entrance will be altered and a later metal railing will be relocated for safety reasons from the north to the east façade.

At the top of the building, the terra-cotta cornices and parapet will be partially repaired and retained and partially replaced with glass fiber reinforced concrete (GFRC). GFRC has been chosen over real terra-cotta for scheduling reasons; new terra cotta has a very long lead time. New HVAC units will be placed on the roof in an inconspicuous area.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architects Alexandra Brinkman, Michael Prifti, and David Smallets, preservation consultant Cindy Wilson Hamilton, and developer Charles B. Norman represented the application.

Mr. Baron read the Committee recommendation. He explained that the applicants withdrew the signage and lighting portions of the application and will resubmit them in a new application at a later date. A discussion ensued about the appropriateness of the new bridge on the east façade. There was some confusion about a photograph of an existing bridge on the south façade of the building, which is not the subject of the review. The applicants explained that they had modified the proposed bridge since making the original submission so that it would not impact one cornice, but conceded that adding it would require modifying a second cornice because of the floor heights. They said that, although they had not yet finalized the exact use or program of the building, they wanted to be able to offer a prospective hotel tenant the ability to have facilities such as a gym in the adjacent building to the east. Ms. Hawkins opined that the new bridge would require removal of historic fabric. Others were concerned that the bridge would create a dark shadow over the newly created public space below. Others noted that the space was now a dingy alley, so concerns about the impact of the proposed bridge misplaced. The applicants explained that they explored moving the bridge to higher point; however, the floors in the two buildings only come into alignment at the proposed level. Some Commission members deemed the bridge acceptable because it would be located in an area largely out of public view; others thought that it was premature to approve the bridge without knowing the needs and layout of the new use. The applicants officially withdrew the bridge from the application.

Mr. Schaaf asked if the doors on the flanking storefronts at the front façade could be centered under the caryatids rather than offset. Mr. Baron explained that the doors on the flanking storefronts at the front façade as proposed would stand at the historic locations. Sometimes, he contended, history is not symmetrical. Mr. Schaaf then asked if the central doors could be redesigned without a stile at the middle of a door. The applicants explained that they are no longer proposing that feature because they had redesigned the entrance with only three doors to match the original design.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve all aspects of the application except the signage, lighting, and bridge, which had been withdrawn, with the staff to review details. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1800 DELANCEY ST

Project: Construct/modify roofdeck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owners: 1800 Delancey Street Partners L.P.

Applicant: Yao Chang Huang

History: c. 1855

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitter 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 denial.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to modify and legalize a deck that was not constructed according to approved plans. The deck, which was approved by the Historical Commission in 2014, was required to be set back to the point where it would not be visible from the public right-of-way. In fact, the deck is currently constructed so that it is highly visible currently from every side. The applicant proposes to correct the as-built design by changing the handrail to vertical pickets, removing the planter, and setting the deck back farther from the facades. Despite the revisions, the deck will still be visible from the street, particularly from east on Delancey Street. The staff recommends that the deck could be made inconspicuous by setting it back an additional seven inches on the east side. It may not be possible to make the deck invisible from the street, but the Standards require inconspicuousness, not invisibility.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Thomas recused because he rents office space to the attorney representing the applicant. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Attorney Leonard F. Reuter and architect Yao Huang represented the application.

Mr. Baron read the Committee recommendation and explained that the applicants had submitted a revised application, which was distributed to the Commission members, showing a railing placement with a greater setback. Mr. Reuter distributed photographs of the railing mock ups.

Ms. Hawkins explained that the Committee recommended denial because the Commission had voted to approve a railing that was invisible, not inconspicuous, from the public right-of-way. She also noted that the Committee objected to the glass railing because it would be highly reflective. The Committee agreed with the Commission's original decision.

Mr. Reuter explained that the applicants were all in agreement that the initial as-built railing was unacceptable and expressed their regrets. He reported that all other elements of the work on the building had been completed successfully. He contended that the new metal picket railings and railing placement would be inconspicuous.

Mr. Huang guided the Commission through photographs of the deck from various locations and claimed that only four inches of the new railing would only be visible from a position south of Pine Street. From all other areas, the rail would be invisible.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting on 8 May 2015. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 1. Ms. Hawkins dissented.

ADDRESS: 32 S 22ND ST

Project: Modify roof to correct violation

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owners: Wilson Eyre Condominium Association

Applicant: Helen Heintz

History: Architect Wilson Eyre 1888 for St. Anthony's Club

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of real terracotta tile on the front slope and CertainTeed Grand Manor shingles on the remainder, with copper flashing, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a new roof on this building. The current, inappropriate roof was installed without the Commission's approval or a building permit. The illegal work was cited in a violation issued on 5 November 2010. The property owners submitted a legalization application, of which the Architectural Committee recommended denial in September 2011, but that application withdrawn before being reviewed by the Commission.

The application proposes a Grand Manor bevel-cut asphalt shingle roof in red or grey. The roof was originally clad in red barrel or Spanish tile. The application includes samples of several asphalt shingles as well as pricing for tile, metal faux tile, and asphalt. The property owners do not wish or cannot afford to install real tile. One option that could minimize cost as well as provide the appearance of the barrel tiles and ridge details would be to install real tile on the small front slope and the two ridges and use the "Monaco" red asphalt tile on the rest of the roof. It has been reported that the real tile would cost approximately an additional \$450 for the material, exclusive of labor, for the small front pitch and that it is possible to marry two different roofing materials at those ridges.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Condominium association representative Helen Heintz represented the application.

Ms. Merriman asked Ms. Heintz for her comments. Ms. Heintz said that the view from the north and south would reveal the change in material from tile to asphalt. She opined that the mixed roofing would look ridiculous. She said that the additional cost to install the tile would be \$6,000 out of a total cost of \$73,000 dollars. She claimed that the mixed roofing would be unsuccessful aesthetically. Ms. Merriman noted that the Commission would prefer that the entire roof was covered in real tile, but acknowledged that that was infeasible. Ms. Heintz reported that real tile on the entire roof would cost \$120,000, which they could not afford. Ms. Hawkins said that she had walked down Walnut Street to see the building and concluded that the tile roof would be very significant part of this façade. She said that she thought that the change to asphalt for the rest of the roof was a successful compromise to mitigate cost. Mr. Thomas gave other examples of a mix in materials and suggested that the mixed materials could be successful. He also explained the Commission's desire to compromise. Ms. Heintz again said that she thought

it would look silly. She said that she thinks the copper flashing will be a worthwhile addition, but claimed that one would have to strain one's eyes to even see the tile. Mr. Thomas noted that the limited visibility can just as easily be an argument for mixing the roofing because the transition will not be obvious. He observed that the change in material will alert the public that an important attempt has been made at preservation. He remarked that the city has lost many grand mansions in this area and he commended Ms. Heintz for helping to save such an important building by architect Wilson Eyre. Mr. Thomas suggested that the applicant work with the staff to develop a mutually acceptable solution.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to approve real terracotta tile on the front slope and CertainTeed Grand Manor shingles on the remainder, with copper flashing, with the staff to review details and develop a mutually acceptable solution. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2001 SPRING GARDEN ST

Project: Renovate former church building for multi-family use

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Carkim Holdings LLC

Applicant: Rotciver Lebron, Harman Deutsch Architecture

History: 1864; Spring Garden Methodist Church

Individual Designation: 5/1/1975

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

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that storing the stained glass windows on site is considered; the rooftop plumbing vents are combined as possible and painted a dark color; and the replacement window pattern is regularized and spandrel glass is considered between two single-hung windows; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to adaptively reuse a church building for as a multi-family residence. The project would install a third-floor system at a current mezzanine level within the sanctuary space to create three full floors of livable space, with six units per floor.

The only proposed changes to the exterior are the replacement of windows, two side doors, and the roofing of the eastern tower. The application does not propose any modifications to the front façade on Spring Garden Street, but does propose the replacement of nearly all windows on the other three elevations, the majority of which are stained or painted glass, with clear glass.

The application proposes to restore the ground-floor windows on the 20th Street facade, which are currently rectangular vinyl replacement windows set within arched openings, to their original material and configuration. The tall arched windows within the sanctuary space, which are currently non-operable stained-glass windows, would be replaced with sets of two clear-glass, single-hung, wood windows and a clear-glass arched transom. Windows on the north and west facades, which are only marginally visible from the public right-of-way, would be replaced with similar treatments.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architects Jeremy LeCompte and Rustin Ohler represented the application.

Mr. Sherman asked whether the community organization had opined on the proposal. Mr. LeCompte responded that the Spring Garden Community Development Corporation supports the project.

Mr. Sherman opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting on 8 May 2015, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2001-21 NORTH ST

Project: Convert industrial building to residential, demolish warehouse, construct townhouses

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joe Valones

Applicant: Michael Loonstyn, MJL Contracting LLC

History: 1947; Potts Ice Cream

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in-concept, but denial as presented, owing to incompleteness.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the partial demolition of an existing industrial/warehouse building in the Spring Garden Historic District. The application proposes to retain the large two-story, buff brick and cast stone Art Moderne portion of the building at the corner of 20th and North Streets, but to demolish the red-brick portions of the building that extend west along North Street.

Despite the fact that the Spring Garden Historic District's period of significance extends from 1850 to 1930, and this building was constructed in 1947, the property is listed as Significant in the district inventory. By definition, a building constructed outside the period of significance cannot contribute to a district's significance. Preliminary historic map and zoning research indicates that the red brick portions of the building proposed for demolition were constructed circa 1960, and as such, the staff does not consider them a contributing portion of the historic resource.

The application proposes to make the following modifications to the Art Moderne structure: painting or coating the buff brick on both facades; reconfiguring the windows on the 20th Street elevation from three bays to five bays, and replacing the original glass block with fixed, plate glass and awning windows; expanding the window openings on the upper floor of the North Street elevation by cutting decorative brickwork; and eliminating one window opening on the first floor of the North Street elevation to add a garage entry with wood panel surround. The application also proposes to construct a rooftop addition with deck. The proposed addition would be flush with the north façade, but would be set back from the east (20th Street) and south (North Street) elevations.

The application also proposes to demolish the red-brick loading dock and garage portions of the building and to construct seven, four-story townhomes in their place. The proposed townhouses

would feature front-loading garages, ground-floor entry doors, central bays with asymmetrical windows, and roof decks with pilot houses.

The application was submitted without any consultation with the staff. The application lacks necessary details such as existing conditions drawings and is internally inconsistent. The architectural drawings lack annotations beyond “existing 2-story building to be renovated,” and visual comparison between photographs of the existing building and the proposed drawings indicate some inconsistencies and inaccuracies. While the demolition of the non-historic loading docks and garages for the construction of new townhomes is appropriate, the design of the proposed townhouses, particularly the front-loading garages and fenestration pattern warrant reconsideration.

DISCUSSION: Messrs. Mattioni and Gupta recused, owing to business relationships with the applicants. Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Developer Michael Loonstyn, contractor Frank Graff, and architect Chris Carickhoff represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins praised the modifications to the design, but noted that, while she understood the need for the front-loading garages, she still did not approve of them. Mr. Schaaf commented that the zoning for the building allows for front-loading garages.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the replacement of the brick on the historic building was inappropriate, and Mr. Loonstyn responded that he would be willing to retain the existing brick.

Ms. Hawkins suggested that the applicant explore offsetting the cornice line of the new construction to better articulate the transition between the new buildings and the old. Mr. Loonstyn responded that they had originally designed the new buildings to be various heights, but that the neighborhood association did not approve of that. Ms. Hawkins replied that she did not mean that the new buildings themselves should be different heights from one another, but that there should be some sort of delineation between the new and old construction, and perhaps between the buildings themselves.

Mr. Sherman asked whether the historic building would be used multi-unit or a single-family residence. Mr. Loonstyn responded that he intended to use it as his own residence.

Mr. Thomas noted that this portion of North Street has aspects of an alley. He noted that, since there is no rear access, he assumed utilities would be run onto the properties from North Street, at which point the street would need to be dug up. He suggested that, when the street and sidewalk were relaid, the applicant consider using a textured asphalt to resemble pavers, which would increase the attractiveness of the street and the marketability of the units. Mr. Schaaf agreed with Mr. Thomas, and noted that many sidewalks in Spring Garden are brick, and opined that brick would be a handsome material for the sidewalk at this location.

Mr. Sherman opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting on 8 May 2015, provided the yellow brick is retained, not replaced, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2108 MOUNT VERNON ST

Project: Construct third story over existing two story rear ell

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Francis & Deborah Bobb

Applicant: John Hubert, John Hubert Associates

History: 1855

Individual Designation: 2/7/1974

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

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a third story over an existing two-story rear ell on a four-story rowhouse located within the Spring Garden Historic District. The new addition will require the removal of the half gable roof of the existing rear ell, and is proposed to have a stucco finish. The new story will not be visible from Mount Vernon Street, but will be visible from Clay Street, a service alley at the rear of the property.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 905 PINE ST

Project: Construct rear addition, rehabilitate front façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Core Property Development, LLC

Applicant: Edward Ross, Core Property Development, LLC

History: 1836

Individual Designation: 11/24/1959

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear addition onto a three-and-a-half story rowhouse. The existing rear addition, rear roof slope, and a rear dormer would be removed to accommodate the new addition, which would be built on the existing foundation and would have a deck on the roof of the third floor. The rear of this property is not visible from any public right-of-way. This application also proposes restoration work to the front façade, including new windows and repair and painting of wood elements.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 1201-09 N 02ND ST

Project: Install 11 banner signs

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mercedes Sanchez

Applicant: Lauren Calisti, Hyperion Bank

History: c. 1871; 8th National Bank; Thomas S. Levy, architect

Individual Designation: 5/9/2001

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@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 eleven banner signs onto the second floor of Hyperion Bank, located at the corner of West Girard Avenue and North 2nd Street. The signs would be mounted into mortar joints at each cove between the bays. The banners are nine feet tall and two feet wide.

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

Ms. Merriman noted that no one attended the meeting to represent the application and suggested that the Commission should adopt its Committee's recommendation.

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.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 10:24 a.m., Ms. Merriman moved to adjourn. Ms. Hawkins 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.

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.