

**THE MINUTES OF THE 557TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**9 JANUARY 2009
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
David Amburn, AIA
Richardson Dilworth, Ph.D.
Leslie Benoliel
Della Clark
Rosalie Leonard, Office of Council President
Sara Merriman, AICP, Director of Policy Initiatives
Daniel Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections
David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Joan Schlotterbeck, Department of Public Property
Denise Smyler, Esq.
Robert Thomas, AIA
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing & Community Development

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician

Leonard Reuter, Assistant City Solicitor

ALSO PRESENT

Stephen Rosenfeld
R. Brown, Louis Berger Group, Inc.
Gretchen Pfaehler, Ewing Cole
Michael Allietta, International Capital Management
Oscar Gomes, Ewing Cole
Michelle Mardenborough, International Capital Management
Andrew Jarvis, Ewing Cole
John Goodchild, Cancer Treatment Centers of America
Christopher E. Cummings, Esq., Stradley Ronon Stevens & Young
Sabra Smith, Preservation Alliance
C. Williams
Rod Brown
Todd Curry
Paul Stone
Lorna Katz
Leslie Potter, Esq.
Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzberg & Ellers
Frank Kakos, Kakos Architects
Loretta Irrera
Bruce Rogers

Richard Thom, R.W. Thom Architect
Fred Maurer
Brendan Kelley

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. Commissioners Amburn, Benoliel, Clark, Dilworth, Leonard, Merriman, Quinn, Schaaf, Schlotterbeck, Smyler, Thomas, and Wilds joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 556TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the minutes of the 556th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 12 December 2008. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 6.3.C OF THE RULES & REGULATIONS

Mr. Farnham reminded the Commission that, at its October and November 2008 meetings, it had reviewed and supported a proposal from the staff to process the nominations for the three smallest outstanding historic districts during 2009. As part of that plan, the staff had suggested that the Commission implement a series of measures to improve the efficiency of permit reviews including amending the Rules & Regulations to grant additional approval authorities to the staff. The staff is suggesting that this goal can be achieved with amendments to Section 6.3.c of the Rules & Regulations. Mr. Farnham noted that the suggested amendments as well as the current text of Section 6.3.c were distributed to the Commission members in their monthly meeting packets. Mr. Farnham suggested that the Commission discuss the proposed revisions and solicit public comment on them at today's meeting, but defer any official action on them until the February 2009 meeting, after the Law Department has had an opportunity to review them.

Mr. Farnham introduced the proposed revisions to Section 6.3.c of the Rules & Regulations. He stated that the proposed revisions are predicated on two goals. First, the revised rules define categories of applications that may be reviewed by the staff. The current rules are very limited; they list specific types of applications that may be reviewed by the staff. Second, the language of the revised rules is more specific and less open to interpretation, making the process more predictable for the Commission and its applicants.

Mr. Farnham stated that, if adopted, the changes would impact two types of reviews significantly. The staff would be granted the authority to approve simulated-divided-light windows and other replacement elements that replicate the appearances of historic elements, if not their materials and construction. The staff would also be granted the authority to approve internally-illuminated signs, provided the proposed signs were compatible. Mr. Farnham noted that the revised section would explicitly require the staff to comply with Section 14-2007(7)(k), which establishes the evaluation criteria that include the Secretary of Interior's Standards. It would also require the staff to base their reviews on sufficient evidence, such as documents and/or physical evidence.

Ms. Leonard asked if the revised Rules & Regulations would allow the staff to approve windows of substitute materials. He stated that it would. He noted that the revised section would require the staff to factor integrity or deterioration into their reviews. He added that the revised section would not allow for the review of any window, but only windows that accurately replicated the

historic appearance of the historic window. He also noted that the staff would still be required to be guided by the Secretary of Interior's Standards, which require replacement of material in kind, "where possible." Mr. Wilds stated that, from the Commission's perspective, the appearance, not the material, is the most important factor. Mr. Farnham noted that, for example, one window manufacturer makes a simulated-divided-light window with a composite material muntin made of wood dust that is indistinguishable from a wood muntin when painted. He added that the staff is seeking to reduce the time and cost of reviews to both the Commission and the applicants, allowing the Commission to designate additional properties without increasing its expenses.

Mr. Thomas explained that property owners often legitimately seek to replace windows for more energy efficient windows even when the historic windows are not deteriorated. Mr. Farnham agreed that the Commission is routinely confronted with this situation. He asked the Commission to think about whether it wanted its staff to be limited by the integrity requirement. He observed that there are conflicting views among staff members. Mr. Wilds stated that the proposed section would not prohibit the replacement of windows in good condition, but would only require that the applications are forwarded to the Commission for review. Mr. Farnham asserted that the staff should be authorized to approve alterations that promote energy conservation and have little or no impact on historic fabric. Mr. Thomas suggested that the staff consult the Preservation Briefs issued by the National Park Service. Mr. Thomas also suggested that the Commission be provided with training on sustainability and historic structures. Mr. Sherman asked if the Commission should promote the use of recycled materials. He suggested that the Commission develop policies to promote sustainability.

Mr. Schaaf applauded the staff on the revised section. Mr. Dilworth asked how much staff time would be saved with the implementation of the rule changes. Mr. Farnham answered the changes would save several hours per month. Mr. Farnham added that the changes will shorten Commission agendas, allowing the Commission time to discuss broader issues and reformulate policy.

Ms. Benoliel noted that shift more authority to the staff will limit the public's right to participate in decisions. Mr. Farnham acknowledged the assertion, but noted that types of applications the staff would be authorized to approve are not generally controversial. He added that the staff never approves applications when it is aware of controversy; it forwards them to the Commission. He also noted that property owners' rights will not change. They can still appeal all staff decisions to the Commission. The staff does not have the authority to deny outright.

Mr. Sherman asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak on the matter. No one addressed the Commission.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 16 DECEMBER 2008

David Amburn, Chair

800 ADAMS AVENUE

Owner: The Greenwood Cemetery Company

Applicant: Oscar F. Gomes

History: house c. 1830; cemetery c. 1865 for the Knights of Pythias

Project: Redevelop southern portion of the site, restore northern section with house

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of the redevelopment of the southern half of the site for the expansion of the hospital complex, provided the exterior envelope of the historic house is stabilized, the half-gable rear ell is retained, and a copy of the archeological report is deposited in the Philadelphia Historical Commission archives, with the staff to review restoration details, pursuant to Standard 2, 4, 5, 6, and 10 and the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Sites.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to redevelop a portion of the southern half of Greenwood Cemetery for a cancer care hospital. The proposal includes two major components, the redevelopment of a portion the site and the restoration of the character defining elements of the site.

The southern half of the cemetery presents the most deteriorated conditions. It is also the least character defining portion of the site. A cancer-care hospital stands on the adjacent parcel to the south. The applicant proposes to expand its hospital facilities and create adequate parking. The expansion would involve selective disinterment of human remains. This process would be overseen by the Orphan's Court.

The proposed restoration work concentrates on the northern half of the cemetery. The applicant proposes an overall maintenance scheme in which the landscape would be cleaned to regain its late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century appearance. This would include the removal of overgrown vegetation, the re-exposure of paths, resetting of toppled monuments, etc. The application includes the demolition of non-historic out buildings, whose loss would not present any adverse effect to the historic integrity of the site. Most of the restoration work would be concentrated on the house at the main entrance to the cemetery. The applicant proposes exterior restoration. However, the notations for this portion are not specific enough to merit a final approval as presented. The staff contends that the proposed alterations do not adversely affect the historic character of the site and its historic significance. However, the final details of the proposed restoration should be reviewed by the staff prior to execution.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architects Oscar Gomes, Andrew Jarvis, and Gretchen Pfaehler, developer Michael Allietta, and hospital representative John Goodchild represented the application.

Mr. Goodchild summarized the history and mission of the Cancer Treatment Centers of America. He observed that the hospital draws patients from a region bounded by Boston, Richmond, and Cleveland.

Mr. Allietta summarized the history of the site. He pointed out the hospital at the southern edge of the cemetery. He observed that the northern half of the cemetery retains its historic appearance, but the southern half has been neglected for decades. It is entirely overgrown and bears no resemblance to its historic appearance. He explained that an entity controlled by the hospital has obtained a controlling interest in the cemetery. The hospital is working with the

cemetery's minority shareholders as well as community groups to develop a plan to expand the hospital into some of the neglected cemetery grounds in exchange for maintaining the historic northern half of the historic site. He explained that a large portion of the southern half of the site was never used for burials because the historic path of the Frankford Creek crosses it. He stated that a green buffer would be developed between the hospital and the cemetery, blocking views from one to the other.

Ms. Pfaehler, the historic preservation architect, described the site in greater detail. It is 44 acres. The southern 24 acres has lost its historical significance because it has not been maintained for decades. The northern half retains its integrity. She is proposing to restore the landscape and pathways in the northern half. The historic house is in very poor condition and will be stabilized. She proposed fixing structural problems and removing non-historic rear additions. She stated that the historic rear ell would be retained. She said that the heat and electricity will be restored, but no use is currently proposed for the building. She intends to halt the deterioration, but not undertake a full restoration of the interior at this time. She stated their intention to retain and stabilize the receiving vault.

Mr. Jarvis provided an overview of the relocation of graves. He noted that there were very few burials in the watershed area. However, there were numerous burials in the areas to the east and west of the hospital. These graves would be relocated to an unused area at the northeast of the cemetery. The graves would be relocated to one area, not dispersed throughout the cemetery, making them easier to find. He explained that the hospital has hired an archaeological consultant to map all of the graves and prepare the documentation for their relocation. He reported that a green buffer would be left in place along the edges of the cemetery at the southern end. Mr. Jarvis provided an overview of the hospital development that would take place over many years. The hospital plans to create additional parking first and then erect a five-story hospital building and a utility plant.

Mr. Thomas asked whether the house could be reused as a guest house for the hospital. Mr. Allietta answered that they are not considering such a use at this point because it would require major modifications for ADA access and code requirements.

Mr. Wilds commended the proposal, noting that he was concerned that the historic resources at this site would be lost to neglect. Mr. Schaaf concurred with Mr. Wilds.

Mr. Reuter asked the applicants if the litigation over the zoning and ownership had been resolved. Mr. Cummings stated that it had and there is no additional litigation pending.

Fred Maurer, a resident of the area, spoke at great length to the Commission. He claimed that the cemetery company had sold its land too cheaply to the hospital. He contended that the surrounding neighbors want access to the cemetery, but the hospital will close it to burials. He expressed concern about the drainage in the watershed area. He stated that he is not opposed to the hospital's project, but it only needs four acres. He reasserted the unsubstantiated claim that this is the site of Benjamin Rush's summer home. He suggested that the hospital replenish the cemetery's trust fund. He advocated for the hospital's employees to use public transportation. He suggested that the cemetery develop a new burial plan. Mr. Wilds thanked him for his input, but suggested that he limit his comments to historic preservation matters.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve in concept of the redevelopment of the southern half of the site for the expansion of the hospital complex, provided the exterior envelope of the historic house

is stabilized, the half-gable rear ell is retained, and a copy of the archeological report is deposited in the Philadelphia Historical Commission archives, with the staff to review restoration details, pursuant to Standard 2, 4, 5, 6, and 10 and the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Sites. Ms Smyler seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2420 GRAYS FERRY AVENUE

Owner: Naval Square Associates

Applicant: Charles Breder

History: c. 1830, Naval Asylum, William Strickland, architect

Project: Construct three low-rise condominium buildings.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Philadelphia Historical Commission's approval of the previous phases of construction.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the last phase of construction for the redevelopment of the former Navy Asylum. The redeveloped site is now known as Naval Square. The proposed new construction is located at the rear of the site away from Grays Ferry Avenue. The proposal includes the construction of three low-rise condominium buildings. The low-rises would be almost identical to the Biddle Hall addition and one other low-rise condominium building reviewed and approved by the Commission. The proposed design and massing is cohesive with the redevelopment of the site and the design aesthetic already established by the earlier phases, which have been completed.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Historical Commission. Attorney Brett Feldman and developer Charles Breder represented the application.

Mr. Feldman thanked the Commission and its staff for their assistance and support during this ten-year project.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Philadelphia Historical Commission's approval of the previous phases of construction. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1821 PORTER STREET

Owner: Theodore Irrera

Applicant: Frank Kakos

History: 1907, contributing to the Girard Estate Historical District, 11/10/1999

Project: Construct addition and ramp

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the shutters are removed and more appropriate materials are substituted for the vinyl siding such as stucco or Hardiplank, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a one-story rear addition and ramp. The addition will connect to the existing kitchen and will include a bedroom and bathroom. The addition would be clad in vinyl siding with vinyl windows and shutters. A covered porch is proposed for the rear of the addition to access the back yard. The ramp, with landings, would

run along side the proposed addition and the existing house and be constructed of pressure-treated wood.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Frank Kakos and property owner Loretta Irrera represented the application.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided the shutters are removed and more appropriate materials are substituted for the vinyl siding such as stucco or Hardiplank, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

401 S. 13TH STREET

Owner: Aimen Zaki Soudi & Fatima Soudi

Applicant: Bruce Rogers

History: 1840, individually designated

Project: Demolish storefront, install café windows and awning

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the existing storefront and side storefront window and door and install operable café windows with a canvas awing. This application also proposes to enlarge two second-story windows and install one-over-one windows.

According to the nomination form, this building is part of a row of four well-preserved mid-nineteenth century, Greek Revival houses. It retains its historic storefront with display windows and transoms. A 1928 photograph shows that it once had an ornately carved wood cornice.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Historical Commission. Restaurant tenant Bruce Rogers represented the application.

The Commission determined that the application does not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 9. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1803 AND 1805 PINE STREET

Owner 1803: Andrew Frankel

Owner 1805: Brendan Kelley

Applicant: Doug Whitfield

History: c.1850; contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District

Later rear additions at the backs of both rear ells

rear addition at 1803 constructed between 1860 and 1885

rear addition at 1805 constructed between 1895 and 1910

Project: Alter and add to rear facades for garages.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as submitted.

OVERVIEW: This plan proposes converting the rear ells of these two houses into two two-car garages. The work involves demolishing the rear walls and part of the side walls of the rear ells at the ground level. The rear ells would be widened into the side yards at the ground level to create the garages. A deck would be constructed on the garages between the ells at the second floor level. The drawings for the proposal show the windows incorrectly as four-over-four rather than six-over-six. The rears are visible from 18th Street because the properties. The plastic-coated metal garage door is out of character with the historic buildings. Painted wood doors would be more appropriate.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Historical Commission. Brendan Kelley, the owner of 1805 Pine Street, represented both applications.

MOTION: Ms. Leonard moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application as submitted. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion.

Mr. Kelley stated that he was represented himself and his neighbor. He stated that he agreed with the staff recommendation and presented revised drawings reflecting this recommendation. He stated that his revised proposal also satisfies several suggestions offered by the Committee. The doors are now wood. The corners of the ells are retained. The ghosts of the windows slated for removal will be retained, especially the arched lintel.

Mr. Kelley described Panama Street as a service alley used primarily for parking and trash. He introduced photographs of the neighboring properties showing razor wire and other inappropriate features.

Ms. Smyler asked Mr. Amburn to comment on the Committee's recommendation of denial. Mr. Amburn stated that the Committee objected to the loss of historic fabric, the change of spatial relationships, and the reuse of salvaged brick. Mr. Amburn added that the revised proposal to retain the ghosts of the windows was an improvement. Mr. Wilds stated that he considered the use of salvaged brick appropriate. Mr. Wilds stated that the street was truly a service alley. He noted that the rear bay at 1803 Pine is not in good condition. Mr. Kelley stated that he would bring the poor condition to the attention of his neighbor, the owner and co-applicant. Mr. Dilworth stated that he found the proposal acceptable.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION: Mses. Leonard and Smyler withdrew their motion to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application as submitted.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the revised applications, provided that all brick is salvaged during the demolition and reused in the construction and that wood garage

doors are installed in place of the proposed doors, with the staff to review details. Ms. Smyler seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 12 to 1. Mr. Schaaf dissented.

200 MARKET STREET

Owner: Andrew M. Ullman & Sandra Schwalb, Trustees

Applicant: Richard Thom, architect

History: c.1860, altered with floor removed mid twentieth century, stuccoed. c. 2003

Non-contributing to the Old City Historic District, 2003

Project: Reface one-story diner, add floor and roof deck

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the existing brick is retained or the new brick is rectangular and a consistent red color set in the plane of the existing wall, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: The proposal for this non-contributing building involves adding a second floor and facing the building with metal siding and rustic brick. The addition would cantilever over the first floor and include a roof deck with plantings. The jagged-edged, multi-color, rustic brick veneer is not compatible with the historic district.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Richard Thom represented the application.

Mr. Thom explained that the old brick under the brick face was in deplorable condition. It cannot be restored, but must be covered. Mr. Thom introduced samples of the proposed brick veneer and stated that it complied with the staff's color suggestion.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to approve the application, provided the existing brick is retained or the new brick or brick veneer is rectangular and a consistent red color set in the plane of the existing wall, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

204 SUNRISE LANE, ESHERICK HOUSE

Owner: Robert and Lynn Gallagher

Nominator: Laura Vanaskie, intern, Philadelphia Historical Commission

Proposal: Designate to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Dilworth moved to recommend that the 204 Sunrise Lane satisfies Designation Criterion e and should therefore be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Cohen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: The Margaret Esherick House stands on a cul-de-sac in Philadelphia's Chestnut Hill neighborhood, adjacent to Pastorius Park. The small but world-famous house was designed by Louis I. Kahn, one of the most important architects of the twentieth century. It is one of only a few residential buildings designed by Kahn and one of only a few Kahn buildings standing in Philadelphia, his adopted hometown. Designed and built between 1959 and 1961, the house is a highly significant design in Kahn's portfolio, which includes such icons as the Salk Institute (1959-62) in La Jolla, California; the National Assembly Building (1962-83) in Dhaka, Bangladesh; the Kimball Art Museum (1966-72) in Fort Worth, Texas; and the Richards Medical

Research Building (1957-65) at the University of Pennsylvania. In addition, the site planning by influential landscape designer Frederick Peck strengthens the property's significance. Peck's brick patio of the mid-1960s has become a defining feature of the Esherick House.

The Commission reviewed this nomination at its December 2008 meeting and continued the review for one month, to the January 2009 meeting, at the request of the owner's son.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the nomination to the Commission.

Mr. Wilds asked if anyone in the audience represented the property owner. No one responded. Mr. Wilds summarized the review of this nomination at last month's meeting. He stated that the son of the owner appeared before the Commission and requested additional time to consider the nomination. Mr. Wilds stated that the Commission granted a one-month continuance at the son's request. Mr. Wilds added that the son never contested the merits of the nomination or suggested that the property failed to meet the Criterion for Designation. Mr. Wilds also noted that the Commission heard the evidence for designating at last month's meeting.

ACTION: Mr. Dilworth moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and find that 204 Sunrise Lane satisfies Designation Criterion e, and designate it as historic, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Smyler moved to adjourn at 11:05 a.m. Ms. Leonard 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 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

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.

Site Guidelines: Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving buildings and their features as well as features of the site that are important in defining its overall historic character.