

**THE MINUTES OF THE 586TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**10 JUNE 2011
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
Hal Fichlander, Office of City Council President
Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP
Susan Jaffe
JoAnn Jones, Office of Housing & Community Development
John Mattioni, Esq.
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Daniel Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections
David Schaaf, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Joan Schlotterbeck, Department of Public Property
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
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II

ALSO PRESENT

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Daniel Collins
Jack Paruta, Gensler & Associates
Thomas Chapman, Esq.
Ed Barnhart, Always by Design
Lin Hua
Herbert Victor
John Reydler
Carl Massara, Carl Massara Architect
Rolf Andeer, Bookhaven
Paul Steinke, Reading Terminal Market
James Iovine, Reading Terminal Market
Vincent Iovine, Reading Terminal Market
George Baker, George Baker Architect
John Weckerly, Boxwood Architect
Paul Palladino
Sal D'Angelo

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Commissioners Fichlander, Hawkins, Jaffe, Jones, Mattioni, Merriman, Quinn, Schaaf, Schlotterbeck, and Thomas joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 585TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Ms. Merriman noted that the second vote regarding the interior designations at the Family Court was not recorded on page 20 in the minutes. She requested a correction.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the minutes of the 585th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 13 May 2011, as corrected. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 3 MAY 2011

Richardson Dilworth, Chair

615 W. HARTWELL LANE, FLEER RESIDENCE

Owner: Monique Delapenha (owner at notice), Daniel Collins (current owner)

Nominator: Janet Grace, DOCOMOMO

Proposal: Designate property

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Klein moved to recommend that the property at 615 W. Hartwell Lane satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Cohen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: The Mr. and Mrs. Edward H. Fleer Residence at 615 W. Hartwell Lane is located at in the Chestnut Hill Section of Philadelphia. The architectural firm of Montgomery & Bishop designed the residence in the Mid-Century Modern style. It was constructed in 1958. The Nomination contends that the Fleer Residence satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the nomination to the Commission. Daniel Collins, the new property owner, attended the review.

Mr. Collins stated respectfully requested that the Commission not designate his property. He stated that he spoke with Janet Grace, the nominator, who explained that her intent was to save the property from demolition. He reported that a tree had fallen on the house and it was in poor condition. He expressed his appreciation for the Historical Commission and its mission, but stated that he and his wife are not in favor of the restrictions for future alterations or renovations that a designation would bring. He assured the Commission that his intent is to restore the property to the original condition. He noted that he is an architect. He reported that he is studying the original paint colors and restoring the roof. He claimed that his bank has asserted that the designation would negatively impact the property's appraisal value.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she has toured this house, both before and after the tree fell. She stated that it is a very unique and significant house that satisfies the Criteria for Designation.

Ms. Schlotterbeck asked Mr. Farnham if the nominator could withdraw a nomination. Mr. Farnham answered that the Rules & Regulations do not address the issue, but it has been the Commission's practice to allow a nominator to withdraw a nomination prior to the Commission's consideration of it. He stated that nominators have withdrawn nominations in the past. He noted,

however, that he has seen no indication that this nominator is considering withdrawing this nomination. He noted that she is a member of a group that advocates for the preservation of Modern architecture. Mr. Mattioni and Ms. Schlotterbeck observed that the nominator was not present, which may indicate her lack of interest in the nomination. Mr. Collins stated that he received an e-mail from the nominator indicating that her intent was to save the house from demolition. Mr. Collins again stated that he intended to restore the house. He contended that designation is not necessary.

Mr. Schaaf reminded the Commission that the Committee on Historic Designation found that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E. He suggested that the Commission take an up-or-down vote on that finding. Mr. Mattioni stated that he did not believe that the property satisfied the Criteria or was worthy of designation.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to find that the property at 615 W. Hartwell Lane satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 6 to 4. Ms. Schlotterbeck and Messrs. Fichlander, Mattioni, and Quinn dissented. Mr. Sherman abstained.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 MAY 2011

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included applications for 305-19 Chestnut Street, 22-42 S 23rd Street, and 1126-36 Arch Street. Mr. Sherman asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. Ms. Jones requested the removal of 1126-36 Arch Street from the Consent Agenda. Mr. Sherman asked if the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for 305-19 Chestnut Street and 22-42 S 23rd Street. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 305-19 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Chemical Heritage Foundation

Applicant: Edward Barnhart, Always by Design

History: 2001, Chemical Heritage Foundation

Individual Designation: 11/6/1980

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of an addition at the rear of the building. The addition would not be visible from Chestnut Street, but it would be visible across a parking lot from Second Street. It would also be visible from Franklin Court. The addition would be finished in materials already found at the rear of the existing building. These materials are gray

metal panels, brick, and earth-tone stucco. The portion of the addition that would be visible from Franklin Court would be finished in stucco.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 433-41 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Install HVAC equipment and signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: KHP II Chestnut, LLC

Applicant: Jack Paruta, Gensler & Associates

History: 1907, James H. & John T. Windrim, architects, Lafayette Building

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of roof-top HVAC units, pursuant to Standard 9; and denial of banner, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of roof-top HVAC units on several locations on this 12-story building. The units would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. Some units may be slightly visible at a great distance, usually one block or more away. The application also proposes the temporary installation of a banner at the corner of 5th and Chestnut. The banner would wrap around the corner of the building and be roughly 48' or four stories in height. The Commission approved the installation of significantly smaller banners that do not wrap around the corner of the building for a period not to exceed 18 months at its April 2011 meeting.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Jack Paruta and attorney Thomas Chapman represented the application.

Mr. Paruta provided an overview of the application. He presented plans, elevations, and sightline studies showing the locations and visibility of the proposed rooftop mechanical equipment. He stated that the equipment will be virtually invisible from the street. He showed numerous photographs of the building from various vantage points.

Mr. Paruta stated that he is proposing a temporary banner sign, which would hang on the building during the course of construction. He stated that the hotel is scheduled to open in the late summer of 2012. He said that the banner is intended to inform the public about the purpose of the construction. The proposed banner is three and one half stories tall, from the third floor to the sixth floor. He called the banner "minimal"; it would not detract from the building's appearance. He stated that the banner might be moved or removed during construction, owing to the façade restoration work.

Mr. Chapman explained that this sign would be temporary. He stated that the Commission already approved a similar, but smaller banner for a period of 18 months. He noted that his client is seeking the appropriate approvals and permits for the signs; many property owners install temporary construction banners without any reviews or approvals.

Ms. Merriman asked the representative of the Department of Licenses & Inspections about the requisite permits and approvals for such a sign. Mr. Quinn responded that the sign would

require a building permit and perhaps a zoning permit. Mr. Paruta stated that they are prepared to seek all of the necessary permits and approvals.

Mr. Mattioni asked the applicants if they are seeking an approval for one year or for the duration of construction. Mr. Paruta answered that they are seeking an approval for the duration of construction, which he expects to be one year. He added he would not be surprised if the sign was removed or relocated during the year to accommodate the exterior work.

Ms. Merriman asked the applicants why they would propose this sign, which is of a much larger size and scale than the signs that were already approved, in light of that approval. She stated that the Commission was very clear about the sizes of signs that are and are not appropriate for this building when it approved the earlier signs. Mr. Paruta contended that the banner currently proposed is not much larger than those that were approved for 18 months. He stated that this banner is needed for the period of construction to explain to the public that a major investment is transforming this vacant building into a hotel. He again contended that this banner would not detract from the appearance of the building.

Ms. Hawkins remarked that the two approved banner signs are less than 30 feet in height, but this proposed sign is 48 feet in height and wraps around the corner of the building. She also objected to the notion that the mounting of this banner would require drilling numerous holes in the exterior of the building. She suggesting a banner attached to scaffolding or other construction equipment, not the building. Mr. Paruta responded that they will not employing any sidewalk protection or other structures or equipment for the duration of the project. He stated that any mounting holes will be drilled in mortar joints and later repaired. He stated that they are restoring the grandeur of this building; they will not harm it.

Mr. Chapman asked if the Commission was concerned about the size of the sign or the duration of its installation. Ms. Hawkins asserted that banner signs at this location, across from Independence Hall, are not appropriate. She stated that there should be numerous places where construction signage can be temporarily installed without attaching directly to the building. She added that the applicant is, in essence, trying to convert the Commission's previous 18-month approval into a 30-month approval. Mr. Mattioni disagreed. He stated that the previous approval and this application are not linked; this application proposes signage for the construction period. He contended that the Commission should support this endeavor, which will restore an important building to its former glory. He contended that the Commission should help the owner enhance the viability of the project. He asserted that the sign would not detract from the building or its surroundings. Ms. Jaffe commented that vinyl is not appropriate for this building.

Mr. Chapman asked Ms. Hawkins if the attachment was her primary concern. Ms. Hawkins stated that she is "opposed to any banners on the corner of 5th and Chestnut." She contended that no sign is temporary. She again stated that she is opposed to any banner sign at this building.

Mr. Paruta reported that the building had several inappropriate signs on it when the project began. They have removed several bad signs including bank and restaurant signs. They want signs that will enhance, not detract from, the building's appearance.

Ms. Schlotterbeck concurred with Mr. Mattioni and suggested that the temporary banner could be approved for a specific time period, regardless of whether the construction is completed. Mr. Chapman and Mr. Paruta noted their agreement this limitation. Mr. Paruta reported that the Art

Commission has approved this banner. Mr. Thomas suggested mounting any construction signage on scaffolding, cranes, or other construction equipment.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the mechanical equipment portion of the application. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

MOTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to deny the signage portion of the application. Ms. Jones seconded the motion.

Mr. Chapman asked the Commission to table the signage portion of the application to allow his design team to revise the proposal. Ms. Jones noted that a motion to table would take precedence over the motion on the floor.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to table the signage portion of the application for a period not to exceed six months. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 10 to 1. Mr. Mattioni dissented.

ADDRESS: 227 N CAMAC ST

Project: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Lin Hua

Applicant: Sherry Young

History: 1840

Individual Designation: 4/25/1974

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided requisite details are presented at the Historical Commission meeting, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a rear addition to a mid nineteenth-century rowhouse. The rear of the property retains some original fabric, but it has been greatly altered from its original configuration. The proposed addition would extend the rear ell. The addition would be kept at the level of the rear cornice and it would not alter the roof over the main block. The addition would be slightly visible from 12th Street across a large parking lot northeast of the property. The drawings do not depict the roof of the property accurately. The roof is shown on the drawings as a flat roof, but in reality the roof is pitched.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Lin Hua represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the revised plans now appear consistent, thereby overcoming the Architectural Committee's concerns.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the application as presented to the Historical Commission on 10 June 2011, with the staff to review details. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1531-33 LOCUST ST

Project: Legalize sign

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: VDM LLP

Applicant: Herbert Victor

History: 1928, Zantzinger & Borie, architects, E.W. Clark & Company Bank

Individual Designation: 4/18/1990

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 Standards 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of new plastic faces on two existing internally-illuminated box signs. One sign is located over the main entrance to the building along Locust Street and the other sign is located over what had been an ATM on 15th Street. The Historical Commission staff met the contractor during the initial review of this application. At that time the staff informed the contractor that the Commission would have to review any applications for plastic face signs at its monthly meeting. The staff does not have the authority to approve such plastic face signs. The staff worked with the contractor to approve temporary banners over the existing boxes to allow the tenant to have some signage at the opening of their business. The staff understood at the time that the contractor or the tenant would submit an application shortly after for the approval of the permanent plastic face signs. The banners were never installed and the plastic face signs, as originally proposed to the staff, were installed instead.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Herbert Victor and business owner John Reydler represented the application.

Mr. Danta stated the applicants have revised the design of the plastic faces for the signs. Copies of the plans for the revised design were distributed to the Commissioners. Mr. Danta explained that he had thoroughly researched the history of these box signs and discovered that the boxes predate designation. He also noted that the Commission had approved new faces for the signs in the past. Ms. Hawkins stated the Committee was uncertain whether the signs were grandfathered and, if they were, whether it was compelled to recommend approval for new faces. She also noted that the Committee was uncertain whether it could assert jurisdiction over the lighting in the signs. She stated that the Committee objected to the largely stark white faces of the signs, which would radiate light at night. She stated that the revised design for the faces would reduce the radiation. She also suggested eliminating the lights altogether. She suggested that the frames of the boxes should be painted to recede.

Mr. Mattioni asked about the Commission's authority over the content of the signs. Mr. Baron contended that the Commission has full jurisdiction over the faces. Mr. Danta stated that both boxes existed at the time of designation. The Commission has subsequently approved new faces for the boxes. Mr. Mattioni asserted that, if the boxes are grandfathered and legal, then the Commission should not regulate the content of the faces. He contended that doing so would be akin to regulating the image on a billboard, which is not legal except in a very narrow set of specific circumstances. He also suggested that the Commission has no jurisdiction over the illumination unless the owner is proposing to alter the illumination.

Ms. Hawkins asked the question to License and Inspection does a new face mean a new sign. Mr. Quinn was unsure of the answer. Mr. Mattioni said this cannot be so, unless changing the

type of illumination. Mr. Danta clarified it is for the plastic face only the applicant is not proposing any changes to the face itself but that is not what they are proposing. It will be kept exactly as is.

Mr. Victor stated that he thought that his tenant had complied with the Architectural Committee's advice to reduce the whiteness of the background of the faces of the signs. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee also suggested that the faces should not be plastic, but some other material. Mr. Victor disagreed, claiming that the Committee mentioned illumination but not material. He stated that the Committee only addressed the whiteness of the plastic, not the plastic itself. Mr. Schaaf asked if the applicants would have new faces fabricated or would modify the existing faces to add the beige color. Mr. Reydler stated that he would do whatever the Commission directed him to do. Mr. Victor stated that they would fabricate new faces. Mr. Sherman stated at the proposed faces with the beige background blends better with the façade.

Mr. Mattioni moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission on 10 June 2011. No one seconded the motion.

Mr. Thomas asked about the plans for illumination. Mr. Reydler stated that they had no plans to change the illumination. He noted that they could control it with a switch. He stated that they would like to illuminate the signs. Mr. Victor asked if the Commission could inspect the signs when illuminated and determine whether the illumination is appropriate. Mr. Danta stated that the staff would prefer not to accept that responsibility.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission on 10 June 2011, provided the signs are never illuminated. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 10 to 1. Ms. Hawkins dissented.

ADDRESS: 259 AND 261 S. 17TH STREET

Project: Alter storefront and rear, replace windows, add canopies and signs, construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: LMT Associates

Applicant: Carl Massara, Carl Massara & Associates

History: 1860; first floor at 259 refaced in marble in 1920 by Stewardson & Page; 261 was refaced, new brick, cornice removed, c. 1960

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler 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 approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes exterior alterations to two adjoining buildings.

A new storefront is proposed on the first-story façade of 261 S. 17th Street. The existing façade is non-historic and was refaced with brick in the 1960s. The storefront would be a glass and wood frame, four-panel folding partition system with a four-lite transom and seven-foot canopy. The applicant proposes two options for the canopy. The desired option is a glass canopy to allow light into the restaurant space. The alternate option is a retractable cloth canopy that would block sunlight. A sign and menu box are also proposed on the façade. However, no material or attachment details have been provided. This application proposes six-over-six windows, cast stone around the storefront, and a cornice to match the neighboring building. However, no material or design details have been provided. A steel gate and metal pergola are

proposed over the side alley and entrance to the rear yard. Decorative flower boxes, to match the existing flower box on 259 S. 17th Street, are proposed for the second and third-story windows on the facades of both buildings. The staff suggests the boxes are installed within mortar joints.

This application proposes fourth-story additions on the rears of both buildings. The addition on 259 S. 17th Street would not be visible. The party wall side of the addition on 261 S. 17th Street would be minimally visible from 17th Street and set back two feet from the rear edge of the 3rd-story. The rear elevations are not visible from the public right-of-way. Balconies with French doors are proposed in the additions. Other rear alterations for first-story glass doors, balcony, bay, and cast stone balustrade were previously approved by the staff.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Carl Massara represented the application.

The Commission reviewed the application and determined that it met Standard 9, as the Architectural Committee had recommended.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 22-42 S 23RD ST

Project: Repair and/or replace windows, enlarge elevator tower

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: First Troop Philadelphia City Cavalry

Applicant: Jim Wiesenhutter, C. Erickson & Sons, Inc.

History: 1900, Henry Gillette Woodman, architect, First City Troop Armory

Individual Designation: 1/3/1985

District Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate this building and repair damage caused by a fire that occurred early last year. In addition to several interior renovations, this application proposes the demolition and reconstruction of an elevator shaft that no longer meets code. The shaft will be expanded three feet in width. The existing penthouse for the shaft is minimally visible from the side.

This application also proposes the replacement of windows in the head house. However, no material or design details have been provided. The cover letter states that the windows will be replaced in kind.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 323 S SMEDLEY ST

Project: Install windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Barbara Schmidt

Applicant: John May, J&M Windows, Inc.

History: 1840; wood lintels and sills, pressed metal cornices, c. 1890

Individual Designation: 5/27/1969

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, pursuant to Standard 6.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the removal of wood, true-divided-light windows and their replacement with new composite windows. The proposed windows would have subframes that would reduce the sizes of the glass areas. The panes of glass would substantially differ in size from the existing. The meeting rail would be a different size as well. The drawings do not show the retention of the existing brickmold. However, the staff has been advised that the brickmold will be retained. No muntin profile is provided.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application. No one represented the application.

The Commission agreed with the Architectural Committee that the proposed window project fails to satisfy Standard 6.

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

ADDRESS: 2202 FAIRMOUNT AVE

Project: Reopen historic window openings, install windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rolf Andeer

Applicant: Rolf Andeer

History: 1859

Individual Designation: None

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

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the second and third-floor windows in the front façade of this rowhouse. The window openings would be enlarged to their original sizes and aluminum-clad one-over-one windows and frames would be installed. The proposed brickmolds are inappropriate. The original windows would have been two-over-two with ogee brickmolds.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Rolf Andeer represented the application.

Mr. Andeer stated that he has owned the building and the bookstore in it for about 25 years. He explained that he recently moved into the apartment above the store and is renovating. He

reported that the front façade of the building is faced with cement over the historic brick façade. He stated that the sizes of the window openings have been altered and the current windows are non-historic. He stated that he would like to install high-efficiency windows that will also provide more light. Mr. Sherman stated that he knows the building. He advised the owner that it is located in a historic district. Mr. Andeer stated that he has improved the appearance of the building over the years, for example removing the aluminum capping and restoring the cornice. He stated that he has consulted with a contractor, who determined that the brick under the cement facing could not be restored.

Mr. Thomas stated that the building is a contributing structure to Spring Garden Historic District. He praised the owner for restoring the cornice. He explained to Mr. Andeer's that the Commission cannot compel an owner to make changes to his historic building, but the Commission does have authority to review proposals when the owner decides to change a historic building. In that way, buildings are restored incrementally over time. He informed the owner that the Commission requires changes to be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Mr. Sherman agreed and recounted that he has incrementally restored his house in the Spring Garden Historic District, including removing stucco from the front façade and replacing windows. He contended that the Commission should require historically appropriate windows in this front façade. He noted that there are several energy efficient options.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1126-36 ARCH ST

Project: Construct restaurant

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Iovine Brothers Bar & Grill Inc.

Applicant: Marianne Baker

History: 1893; Wilson Brothers, architects; Reading Terminal Market

Individual Designation: 2/5/1981

District Designation: None

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.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes constructing a new restaurant in the current location of the beer garden in the Reading Terminal Market. The existing non-historic fittings, equipment, signage, and partitions would be removed and replaced with new fittings, equipment, signage, and partitions. A 1994 covenant grants the Historical Commission jurisdiction over interior alterations at the market.

The market is composed of a grid of aisles, with numbered avenues running east-west and lettered avenues running north-south. Some sections of the aisles are paved in gray bricks. The current beer garden is bounded on the south by Avenue 4, on the north by Avenue 6, and straddles Avenue 5. The current beer garden has entrances at its east and west ends on axis with Avenue 5. The proposed restaurant would likewise straddle Avenue 5 and have entrances at the east, west, and north sides. The entrance at the east would have swinging gates. A bar that currently sits in the middle of Avenue 5 would be removed and a new bar constructed in a different location, perpendicular to the current bar. Like the old bar, the new bar would encroach on Avenue 5. New partitions would reduce the width of the entrance at the west.

The covenant that grants the Commission authority to review applications for interior alterations states that new establishments “shall continue to be arranged in the current format of a grid-like pattern, with common aisles for access and egress, which aisles separate rows of business establishments.” Like the current beer garden, the proposed restaurant would appear to violate that standard. Also, Standard 9 advises that “new additions ... or related new construction” should not “destroy historic ... spatial relationships.” To satisfy the covenant and the Standards, the bar and any other encroachments on Avenue 5 should be avoided to restore the original spatial characteristics of the aisle.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Market manager Paul Steinke business owners James and Vincent Iovine, and architect George Baker represented the application.

Ms. Jones suggested that the Commission should carefully comply with the covenant. She noted that her meeting materials had only included part of the document. She stated that the Commissioners should have been provided with the entirety of the covenant. Mr. Reuter asked when the current beer garden was installed. The applicant responded that it was created in the 1980s. Mr. Reuter noted that the beer garden already encroached on the aisle when the covenant was recorded. He also noted that the covenant stipulates that the market should be arranged in a grid-like pattern, but it does not require the retention of this specific grid-like pattern. He observed that the current beer garden was part of the grid-like pattern at the time of the covenant and concluded the Commission should determine whether the proposed restaurant would comply with the terms of the covenant, even if it encroached on Avenue 5. Ms. Jones asked if the covenant had been or could be amended. Mr. Reuter replied that the property has had a very complex ownership history and various covenants has been combined and subsumed into one another. Mr. Reuter noted that the Commission recently approved changes to the north-south aisle that runs along the east side of the market. He stated that that project will change the historic course of the aisle, but will maintain the grid-like pattern. He suggested that the Commission determine whether this proposed change is or is not consistent with the maintenance of the grid-like pattern.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, with the staff to review details. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 802 S HANCOCK ST

Project: Construct two-story side addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Paul Palladino

Applicant: Sal Guerro, Boxwood Architects

History: 1810

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee could not reach a consensus and offered no recommendation.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a two-story addition to the side façade of this freestanding house. The side façade is visible from the public right-of-way. The house is a rare example of a

half-gable structure with the gable end as the street façade. It is even rarer because it is a wood-framed and clad building, not a masonry building. Several years ago, it was restored with the Historical Commission's approval. The applicants have proposed two options for the addition: one clad in clapboard with a pitched roof and a second clad in board and batten siding with a flat roof.

The Architectural Committee reviewed an application proposing a larger addition to this building at its April 2011 meeting. The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9, and 10. The application was withdrawn before it was reviewed by the Commission.

Although the proposed additions are smaller than that proposed last month, either would still result in the substantial demolition of historic fabric, partially encase the long side façade of the house, and alter the massing and shape of the structure. The property has a small rear yard, which may be an appropriate place for an addition.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect John Weckerly and property owner Paul Palladino represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the Architectural Committee offers no recommendation on this project because it could not reach a consensus. Three members advocated for approval and three for denial.

Mr. Weckerly stated that they had incorporated the comments of the Architectural Committee and reduced the size of the addition. Initially, the addition was set back only one foot from the plane of the historic front façade. It is now set back much farther and would only cover 50% of the south-facing historic façade. He stated that they have also reduced the amount of demolition of the south-facing historic façade by relocating the bathroom, which would now connect to the new bedroom, not the old building. He also said that they responded to comments suggesting that the second-floor powder room was excessive. In response, they eliminated the third bathroom.

Mr. Sherman asked if the application had been revised since the Architectural Committee meeting. Mr. Weckerly stated that it had. The extent of the removal of the south façade has been reduced. Ms. Hawkins contended that the design revisions only impacted the interior. Mr. Weckerly disagreed with Ms. Hawkins. He stated that they are now proposing to remove less of the historic exterior façade. Ms. Hawkins stated that the change was immaterial because it would be within the interior of the expanded house. Mr. Weckerly responded that he was reacting to the Architectural Committee's suggestion that he remove less historic fabric from the façade. Ms. Hawkins replied that the Commission has no jurisdiction over the interior. Mr. Weckerly stated that the change was made to reduce the impact to the historic exterior, albeit a section that will become part of the interior.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the applicants have been very responsive to the Architectural Committee's advice. She stated that the original proposal, which was reviewed by the Committee, but then withdrawn before the Commission meeting, proposed a three-story addition that occupied the entire side yard and covered the entire south wall. The current proposal is very much reduced from the original proposal. Ms. Hawkins stated that the house is very unusual and she acknowledged that the owner and architect realize its importance and have worked hard to minimize the impact of the addition. She noted that an addition could be constructed in the rear yard. The owner, Mr. Palladino, responded that the small rear yard is

very important to them and they would like to keep it open. He stated that he and his wife like the neighborhood and the house and do not want to move, but will be forced to move if they cannot enlarge the one-bedroom house. He noted that they both work in the neighborhood.

Ms. Schlotterbeck stated that she is a neighbor and is very familiar with the property. She stated that she considers the revised addition to be appropriate. It requires the removal of very little historic fabric and does not change the character of the house. Ms. Merriman agreed, asserting that it is compatible in scale.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the Architectural Committee questioned whether one can construct a wood-frame addition at a party wall. Mr. Weckerly responded that he had researched the question and determined that the proposed addition would meet code if it were clad in a fiber cement panel that would look like clapboard.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance described the house as a special jewel. He observed that wood frame houses are extremely rare in Philadelphia. For that reason, the Commission should hold the applicant to a high standard. The Commission must comply closely with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards when buildings are rare and noteworthy. Mr. Gallery noted that the staff has twice recommended that the proposals are not consistent with the Standards. During its first review, the Committee agreed that the proposal did not meet the Standards. The Committee split when it reviewed the second or current proposal.

Mr. Gallery recounted that he asked the three members of the Architectural Committee who voted to recommend approval of the current application to explain how it satisfied the Standards. Although not recorded in the minutes, Mr. Evans responded that the extent of the removal of historic fabric probably violated the Standards, yet he supported the application. The two other members who voted for a recommendation of approval did not explain how the project satisfies the Standards. He claimed that the application does not meet the Standards owing to the removal of fabric and the change in the character. The Commission's Rules & Regulations stipulate that the Commission shall be guided by the Standards. He contended that, if the Commission approves this project, it must explain why it believes that this project satisfies the Standards.

He suggested a compromise. He noted that at the end of the Committee meeting, after the vote on a recommendation, Ms. Hawkins suggested sliding the addition back further away from the street façade to reduce the amount of demolition at the side wall and to reduce the impact of the addition on the building's massing. Mr. Gallery stated that he investigated the suggestion offered by Ms. Hawkins and then sent a letter to the Commission with his findings including sketches. He asserted that his plan would preserve 60% of the side wall; the proposal would only save 40% of it. He contended that the impact of this addition could be reduced if his suggestion was incorporated into the plan. He acknowledged that the addition would intrude into the rear yard, but declared that the Commission's duty is to protect historic resources, not rear yards. He advocated for the Commission to deny the current proposal and direct the applicants to investigate his proposal.

Mr. Palladino responded that they had already investigated Mr. Gallery's suggestion. He claimed that Mr. Gallery had ignored one important fact about the design he proposed: a bed would not fit in the redesigned bedroom. He stated that he and his architect endeavored to minimize the impact of the addition on the house as much as possible. Mr. Weckerly added that shifting the addition into the rear yard would significantly detract from the yard and would also render the project non-compliant with the zoning.

Mr. Baron stated that he wanted “to make a comment on the rarity issue of this thing.” He stated that there are only a few buildings like this in the city. They are located in Queen Village, Fishtown, and Old City. Some are designated as historic; others are not.

ACTION: Ms. Schlotterbeck moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission on 10 June 2011, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7 to 3. Mses. Hawkins and Jones and Mr. Thomas dissented. Mr. Sherman abstained.

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 256-58 S 20TH ST

Project: Legalize awning with fans

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Salvatore D'Angelo

Applicant: Dennis Torres

History: 1860; 256: façade stuccoed, 1964, storefront, nd; 258: Queen Anne storefront, c. 1885

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler 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 Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the recent installation of an awning without approval of the Historical Commission or a permit from the Department of Licenses & Inspections. The awning consists of a metal structure and a canvas cover with closed sides. The large awning spans across the facades of two buildings and covers a historic wood storefront cornice. Lighting and electric fans hang from the awning.

This property owner is aware of the Commission’s jurisdiction over this property and its processes and procedures. In February 2000, this owner received a violation for alterations to the storefront undertaken without the Commission’s approval or a permit. The owner submitted an application to legalize the alterations. After a lengthy review process and many meetings between the current applicant and the staff, the Commission approved a partial restoration of the storefront in September 2003.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property and business owner Salvatore D'Angelo represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee recommended denial because awning spans two buildings, ignoring the differences between them and the rhythms of the storefronts. She also objected to the fans and lighting under the awnings. Mr. D'Angelo stated that he obtained an electrical permit for the fans and lighting. Ms. Hawkins stated that they change the exterior appearances of the buildings and therefore needed a building permit and the Commission’s approval as well.

Mr. D'Angelo contended that one of the buildings has no historic value; it suffered a fire in the 1970s. Ms. Sell responded that both buildings are within the historic district. Mr. D'Angelo stated that he obtained a zoning permit for the awning. Ms. Sell replied that the zoning permit is one

prerequisite to the building permit; the Historical Commission's approval is another prerequisite to the requisite building permit, which was not obtained. Mr. D'Angelo noted that aspects of the building at 256 S. 20th Street are not historic, such as the Plexiglass. Ms. Sell answered that features that were in place at the time of designation are grandfathered.

Mr. Mattioni asked if separating the awning into two awnings would satisfy the concerns of the Architectural Committee. Ms. Hawkins replied that it would improve the design, but would not account for the lighting and fans. Mr. Mattioni asserted that the Commission should provide the applicant with useful advice so that he can rectify the situation. Ms. Hawkins stated that there are awnings that would be appropriate for these buildings; however, the awnings that were installed are not appropriate. Mr. Farnham stated that he believes that a compromise awning design that was acceptable to all parties would be easy to devise. He noted that the staff can approve appropriate awnings. Mr. Farnham recounted that he and other staff members had worked extensively with the current applicant on one of the storefronts in question. He offered to have the staff work with Mr. D'Angelo to find a compromise design that would be acceptable to all and approvable at the staff level. Mr. Thomas agreed with the notion of seeking a compromise design. Mr. Mattioni suggested tabling the application to allow time to seek such a compromise.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to table the application for a period not to exceed six months. Ms. Schlotterbeck seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Thomas moved to adjourn at 11:01 a.m. Ms. Schlotterbeck 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.