

**THE MINUTES OF THE 547TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**14 MARCH 2008
ROOM 18-022, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
David Amburn
Della Clark
Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D.
Rosalie Leonard, Office of Council President
John Mattioni, Esq.
Sara Merriman, Department of Commerce
David Schaaf, RA, City Planning Commission
Robert Thomas, AIA
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing & Community Development

Jon 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
Leonard Reuter, Assistant City Solicitor

ALSO PRESENT

Matt McClure, Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll
George Thomas, Civic Visions
Kathleen Barron, Temple University Hospital System
Scott Covington, Engtech
Jim Torrey
Carl Cutter
Luisa Boverini
Craig Peterson
Ron Palts
Richard Thom, Richard Thom Architects
Paul Stone, Emerald Windows
Todd Curry, Emerald Windows
Reed Axelrod, Reed Axelrod Architects
Diana Henze
Ralph Pinkus, Esq.
William Vessal
Robert Volpe, Lily Development
Marc Pinard, Pinard Architects
David Franke, A/LA
Ben Bauman, A/LA
Antonin Roche, Roche Bobois
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Robert Torres, ART

Sonali Polite
Kerry Polite
Kevin Kline
Joe Noga
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
William Aumuiller
Kevin Smith, Manayunk Neighborhood Council
Kiki Bolender, Schade & Bolender Architects
Brett Webber, Brett Webber Architects
Julie Forejt, J.K. Roller Architects
Jonathan Broh, J.K. Roller Architects
James Hone
Neill Heath
Camille Focarino
Peter Knight
Andrew Dalzell
Jacob Cooper

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m. Commissioners Amburn, Clark, Dilworth, Mattioni, Thomas, Evans, Leonard, Merriman, Schaaf, and Wilds joined him.

ELECTION CHAIR, VICE CHAIR AND CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION

Mr. Farnham explained that the Historical Commission must appoint new members to its Architectural Committee and Committee on Historic Designation. He noted that, by virtue of his appoint to the Commission, David Amburn is the chair of the Architectural Committee. He reminded the Commission that it had elected Richardson Dilworth III as the Chair of the Committee on Historic Designation at its last meeting.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to disband the current Architectural Committee and appoint John Cluver, Rudy D'Alessandro, Shawn Evans, Dominique Hawkins, Daniel McCoubrey, and Suzanne Pentz to a new Architectural Committee chaired by Mr. Amburn. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to disband the current Committee on Historic Designation and appoint Jeffrey Cohen, Penelope Gilles, Bruce Laverty, Janet Klein, Douglas Mooney, and David Schaaf to a new Committee on Historic Designation chaired by Mr. Dilworth. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

MINUTES OF THE 546TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

The Chair recognized attorney Ralph Pinkus, who requested a correction to the minutes of the 546th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission. He requested an amendment to page 12 of the minutes reflecting a comment made by Mr. Reuter of the Law Department regarding the ordering of a demolition at 6918-26 Ridge Avenue. Mr. Farnham stated that he would review the audio tape and correct the minute if directed to do so by the Commission. Mr. Schaaf suggested a correction on page 6 regarding a projecting sign.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the minutes of the 546th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 8 February 2008, with the suggested

amendments, provided the validity of those amendments are confirmed by the staff. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL HARDSHIP, 5 MARCH 2008

Sam Sherman, Chair

100 E. LEHIGH AVENUE, EPISCOPAL HOSPITAL

Owner: Episcopal Hospital of Philadelphia, subsidiary of Temple University Health System

Applicant: Matt McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll

History: Aspinwall, 1894; Harrison, 1905; both by Hewitt Bros., architects

Project: Complete demolition of the Aspinwall and Harrison Buildings

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL HARDSHIP RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted unanimously to recommend that the Commission find that the Aspinwall and Harrison Buildings on the campus of Episcopal Hospital cannot be used for any purpose for which they are or may be reasonably adapted and approve their demolitions based on that finding as authorized by Section 14-2007(7)(j).

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend that the structural audit and cost estimates to rehabilitate the buildings are realistic; and that the buildings lack noteworthy architectural significance.

OVERVIEW: This financial hardship application presents a justification for the complete demolition of the Aspinwall and Harrison Buildings on the campus of Episcopal Hospital in Kensington. The application claims that there are no feasible adaptive reuses for the buildings. Episcopal Hospital is a non-profit entity and is a subsidiary of Temple University Health System, which is also a non-profit entity.

The hospital campus at N. Front Street and E. Lehigh Avenue is large, covering an entire city block. The Aspinwall and Harrison Buildings stand at the rear or south side of the campus, behind large, mid twentieth-century hospital buildings. The Hewitt Bros. architectural firm designed both buildings. Aspinwall was constructed in 1894; Harrison in 1905. Aspinwall is a three-story, brick, Jacobean Revival building with terracotta ornamentation. Harrison is a one-story, brick building with terracotta ornamentation. Both were significantly altered in the past. Both have been vacant for years. The exteriors of the two buildings are in fair condition; the interiors are in very poor condition and are obsolete.

The Department of Licenses & Inspections has declared both buildings Unsafe. The Commission retained the engineering firm of Keast & Hood to assess the buildings and determine whether they posed a danger to the public, as the applicant initially asserted. Two engineers from Keast & Hood and a Commission staff member inspected the buildings with several hospital representatives on 17 January 2008. The Keast & Hood engineers did not issue a formal report, but did informally opine that the buildings were not imminently dangerous and could be repaired. They did not comment on the feasibility of repair.

THE HARDSHIP APPLICATION

The historic preservation ordinance allows the Commission to approve demolitions in two instances only, when the building cannot be feasibly or reasonably adaptively reused and when the demolition is necessary in the public interest. Section 14-2007(7)(j) of the historic preservation ordinance states that:

No permit shall be issued for the demolition of an historic building, structure, site or object, or of a building, structure, site or object located within an historic district which contributes, in the Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Commission finds that issuance of the permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Commission finds that the building, structure, site or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that building, structure, site or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.

Section 14-2007(7)(f) of the historic preservation ordinance enumerates the submission requirements for a financial hardship application.

In any instance where there is a claim that a building, structure, site or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, or where a permit application for alteration, or demolition is based, in whole or in part, on financial hardship, the owner shall submit, by affidavit, the following information to the Commission:

- (.1) Amount paid for the property, date of purchase, and party from whom purchased, including a description of the relationship, whether business or familial, if any, between the owner and the person from whom the property was purchased;
- (.2) Assessed value of the land and improvements thereon according to the most recent assessment;
- (.3) Financial information for the previous two (2) years which shall include, as a minimum, annual gross income from the property, itemized operating and maintenance expenses, real estate taxes, annual debt service, annual cash flow, the amount of depreciation taken for federal income tax purposes, and other federal income tax deductions produced;
- (.4) All appraisals obtained by the owner in connection with his purchase or financing of the property, or during his ownership of the property;
- (.5) All listings of the property for sale or rent, price asked, and offers received, if any;
- (.6) Any consideration by the owner as to profitable, adaptive uses for the property;
- (.7) The Commission may further require the owner to conduct, at the owner's expense, evaluations or studies, as are reasonably necessary in the opinion of the Commission, to determine whether the building, structure, site or object has or may have alternate uses consistent with preservation.

Sections 7 and 9 of the Rules & Regulations govern the review of this application. Section 9.2.b and 9.2.c delineate the submission requirements for non-profit hardship applicants.

9.2.b To demonstrate financial hardship an applicant who proposes to alter or demolish an historic resource must submit, by affidavit, the following information as provided in Section 14-2007(7)(f)(.1)-(.6):

1. amount paid for the property, date of purchase, and party from whom purchased, including a description of the relationship, whether business or familial, if any, between the owner and the person from whom the property was purchased;
2. assessed value of the land and improvements thereon according

3. financial information for the previous two (2) years which shall include, at a minimum, annual gross income of the organization, itemized operating and maintenance expenses, real estate taxes or payments made in lieu of taxes if any, annual debt service, annual cash flow;
4. all appraisals obtained by the owner in connection with the acquisition, purchase or financing of the property, or during the ownership of the property;
5. all listings of the property for sale or rent, price asked, and offers received, if any, and;
6. any consideration by the owner as to uses and adaptive reuses of the property.

9.2.c The Commission may also require the owner to conduct at the owner's expense, evaluations and studies, as are reasonably necessary in the opinion of the Commission, to determine whether the building, structure, site or object has or may have alternative uses consistent with preservation. Section 14-2007(7)(f)(.7) of the Philadelphia Code. At a minimum, this shall include:

1. the information specified in Section 9.2.b of these Rules and Regulations;
2. identification of reasonable reuses for the property within the context of the property and its location;
3. rehabilitation cost estimates for the identified uses or reuses, including the basis for the cost estimates;
4. the current standard of building and maintenance costs for the performance of the mission or function of the organization, particularly in Philadelphia;
5. a comparison of the cost of the performance of the mission or function of the organization in the existing building and in a new building, and a comparison of the cost of rehabilitation of the existing building with the demolition of the existing building and the construction of a new building;
6. the impact of the reuse of the existing building on the financial condition of the organization;
7. the impact of the reuse of the existing building on the organization's program, function or mission;
8. the additional cost, if any, attributable to the building of performing the organization's service or function within the context of costs incurred by comparable organizations, particularly in Philadelphia;
9. grants received or applied for to maintain or improve the property;
10. the organization's budget for the current and immediately past fiscal year; and
11. consideration, if any, given by the organization to relocation.

The applicant has submitted a financial hardship application, which the staff has reviewed and considers complete, pursuant to Section 7.3.c of the Rules & Regulations.

The application presents the following requisite information.

- The applicant has not provided the amount paid for the property and the relationship of buyer and seller; however, Episcopal Hospital acquired the campus in the mid nineteenth-century and the original purchase price and grantor are essentially irrelevant now.
- The Board of Revision of Taxes assessed value is \$4.8 million for the entire campus, which is one tax parcel.
- The applicant presents recent financial information for the hospital. Owing to the hospital's non-profit status, Section 9.2.b.3 of the Rules provides a more appropriate list of submission requirements than does the ordinance. In summary, it appears that the hospital is not operating at a loss, but that the projected needs for capital investment are nearly three times the available funds for FY2008-2012. The buildings in question have produced no income for years.
- The affidavit states that the hospital has never obtained an appraisal for either building.
- The affidavit states that the hospital made good faith attempts to lease both buildings, but none has been successful. The applicant presents little information about these attempts.
- The affidavit states that the hospital has pursued adaptive reuses for the buildings, but has not successfully identified any feasible reuses. The applicant presents little information about the potential reuses.
- The application does not include any information about attempts to sell the buildings. However, the Commission has not required non-profits with large campuses to attempt to sell sections of their campuses to avoid demolition.
- The application presents very detailed cost estimates for rehabilitating the two buildings; it would cost \$3,963,310 to rehabilitate Aspinwall and \$2,982,140 to rehabilitate Harrison. It concludes that these are not reasonable investments given the limited return potential. As suggested by Section 9.2.c.5 of the Rules, the affidavit notes that comparable new buildings would cost \$1.57 and \$1.78 million respectively. The staff has analyzed the cost estimates and concluded that they are realistic, but perhaps slightly inflated. Even if the rehabilitation costs were cut by 25%, the investments in the buildings would greatly outweigh the potential returns.

The application concludes: "The estimated cost to repair either building cannot be justified. There is no prospective tenant in the marketplace who would pay a rental for either building that would come close to paying the cost of such repairs – even if such costs were amortized over an extended period of time. Based upon the foregoing, there is no feasible adaptive reuse scenario for either the Aspinwall Building or Harrison House."

The ordinance and Rules & Regulations do not precisely define "reasonably adapted," the standard set for determining hardship by the ordinance. The Commission and Committee on Financial Hardship must interpret "reasonable." One might define reasonable in purely economic terms, considering it unreasonable to require any rehabilitation that would not pay for itself over time. However, this type of analysis does not take into consideration the historical significance of the resource. It may be reasonable to require the rehabilitation of a highly significant resource even if the return does not equal the investment. Owing to the fact that the Committee must define "reasonable" and "feasible" to make its determinations, information on the significance of the buildings is included.

DESIGNATION AND HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

The Commission's initial designation of the hospital campus is not documented in the Commission's archive and, in fact, the original listing on the Register may be an error. There is

no record of the Commission voting to designate the site. The only document supporting the designation is the inclusion of the Front Street address for the hospital on the pre-1985 list of designated properties. The revised historic preservation ordinance, which went into effect in 1985, defined a Historic Building as:

A building or complex of buildings and site which is designated pursuant to this section or **listed by the Commission under the prior historic buildings ordinance** approved December 7, 1955, as amended. (emphasis added)

The complex was listed, i.e. it was on the list at the time of the adoption of the new ordinance, and therefore must be considered designated. However, there is no record of a vote by the Commission, record of a consideration by the advisory committee, official designation card, nomination, notice letter, or other document corroborating the designation. Without a record of the designation, it is impossible to know the relative values the Commission placed or would have placed on the individual buildings on the campus, which range from mid nineteenth- to mid twentieth-century buildings. The historic significances of the many buildings that stand or once stood on the campus differ greatly. The Commission's files do include a 1985 letter from the hospital to the Commission requesting "a list of the buildings on the grounds of Episcopal Hospital that are historically certified" and a response cataloging eight buildings including Aspinwall and Harrison that are "worthy of preservation." Interestingly, the Commission's written response to the hospital does not answer the questions asked; it does not state explicitly that the buildings are certified or designated, but merely states that they are "worthy of preservation."

The current applicant's preservation consultant states that the site was designated in 1957. This is incorrect; the misinformation derives from *Philadelphia Preserved*, a guide to Philadelphia's architectural history published in 1976, which erroneously states that the hospital was designated in 1957. The Commission's records for 1957 are complete and include lists of all sites designated and considered for designation; Episcopal Hospital does not appear on either list and was never mentioned in any Commission documents during that era. The first mention of the hospital in the Commission's records dates to 1976.

A very important group of c. 1860 hospital buildings designed by prominent architect Samuel Sloan once stood at the northwest corner of the hospital campus. The group had great historic significance because it was considered as the foremost model for hospital construction throughout the United States in the second half of the nineteenth century. Sloan was not only a prominent architect but also a prominent publisher. Publishing the first major architectural journal in the United States, he broadly advertised his hospital design, which became the national standard. Only one small remnant of the Sloan buildings survives, the chapel. All other Sloan buildings on the campus were demolished over several campaigns in the mid twentieth century. During the first documented involvement of the Commission with the hospital, the chair of the Architectural Committee apparently approved the last of the demolitions of the Sloan buildings in 1976. There is no record of any review or approval of this demolition by the Commission itself. The Commission itself approved the demolition of Gill House, a turn-of-the-century residentially-scaled building on the Episcopal campus not unlike the Aspinwall Building, as necessary in the public interest in 1987.

If the Commission explicitly designated Episcopal Hospital, it is very unlikely that it designated it because of the Aspinwall and Harrison Buildings. Although they were designed by a prominent Philadelphia architectural firm, the Hewitt Bros., they are some of the most unremarkable projects of that firm, which also designed the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, the Bourse Building, Drum Moir, the Wissahickon Inn, and St. Martin in the Field Church. They are relatively insignificant reworkings of residential designs for hospital use. They are subsidiary structures

erected a half-century after the important Sloan buildings. In fact, the construction of these buildings and others on the campus marks the obsolescence of the Sloan buildings. They were erected to accommodate later medical programs that the Sloan buildings could not accommodate. The Aspinwall and Harrison Buildings primarily had historic value as markers of a particular point in the history of the Sloan buildings; that value was lost when the Sloan buildings were demolished, removing the buildings in question from their historic context.

The staff will recommend directly to the Commission that it direct the staff to prepare a nomination for the Episcopal Hospital site proposing the rescission of the designation of the entire site and the new designation of the Sloan chapel, the only resource on the campus worthy of the Commission's oversight.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Attorney Matt McClure, preservation consultant George Thomas, hospital administrator Kathleen Barron, and construction consultant Scott Covington represented the application.

Mr. Sherman reported that the Committee on Financial Hardship recommended that the Commission find that the applicant has proved that it would be a hardship to retain the buildings.

Mr. McClure summarized the application. He stated that the hospital faces a Hobbesian choice, either spend needed money on obsolete buildings or demolish them. He reported that the hospital serves an impoverished neighborhood and fights to survive. He claimed that the buildings have no function or reuse. He asserted that buildings require major work to make them serviceable. He also contended that they have no real historical significance.

Mr. Thomas provided a brief history of the campus. He stated that the original buildings by Samuel Sloan of the 1860s were very significant, but had become obsolete by the 1890s. The Aspinwall and Harrison Buildings were constructed at this time to circumvent shortcomings in the Sloan buildings. He stated that the Aspinwall and Harrison Buildings had become obsolete by the middle of the twentieth century. He also noted that they suffer from inherent design problems; for example, Aspinwall has inherent moisture problems. He added that neither building has any real historic significance.

Mr. Compton explained that he had assessed the buildings and formulated estimates of the costs to make them serviceable and code-compliant again. He reported that it would cost \$3.9 million to return Aspinwall to service; \$2.98 million for Harrison. He stated that the deficiency cost for Aspinwall would be \$377 per sf; \$166 per sf for Harrison. He reported that it would cost \$211 per sf to build a new medical building.

Mr. Wilds noted that he sits on the Committee for Financial Hardship. He commented that the buildings do not appear to be in very poor condition from the exterior, but they are, in fact, in very poor condition. He asserted that the submission is complete and proves that the buildings cannot be reasonably adapted for new uses. He stated that the Committee was confident that the applicant had met the burden of proof. Mr. Sherman confirmed this claim and noted that the applicant had demonstrated that there are no potential tenants to support the rehabilitation costs. Mr. Mattioni asked if the Commission would treat this application differently if the applicant were not a non-profit entity. Mr. McClure replied that his client had met the higher burden for a for-profit entity.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Financial Hardship, find that the Aspinwall and Harrison Buildings on the campus of Episcopal

Hospital cannot be used for any purpose for which they are or may be reasonably adapted, and approve their demolitions based on that finding as authorized by Section 14-2007(7)(j). Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

The Commission directed the staff to prepare a nomination for the Episcopal Hospital site proposing the rescission of the designation of the entire site and the new designation of the Sloan chapel.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 4 MARCH 2008

Richardson Dilworth III, Chair

6918-6926 RIDGE AVENUE

Owner/Applicant: Michael S. Kershaw

History: Christopher Ozias House, c. 1805, demolished 2007

Proposal: Rescind the historic designation and remove from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted unanimously to recommend that the Commission deny the rescission application and amend the existing designation to include the declaration that, owing to the archeological potential at 6918 Ridge Avenue, the site satisfies Designation Criterion I.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the rescission of the designation 6918-6926 Ridge Avenue in Roxborough. Until recently, the early nineteenth-century, rubblestone Christopher Ozias House stood on the lot; it is now a vacant lot. The house partially collapsed in late 2007. The Department of Licenses & Inspections cited the house as Imminently Dangerous. The current property owner demolished the house and cleared the lot without a building permit or the Historical Commission's approval. The owner claims that a building inspector authorized by the former Commissioner of the Department ordered him to demolish it. The property owner submitted an application to the Commission proposing the legalization of the demolition. On 8 February 2008, the Commission reviewed and then denied that request. At that time, the Commission discussed whether the property owner should be required to reconstruct the demolished house, especially in light of the claims that a failure to maintain and perhaps deliberate damage to the historic building may have precipitated its collapse. The lot remains designated and the Commission holds plenary jurisdiction over it. The Provco Group, the equitable owner seeking to purchase the property for redevelopment, has applied to the Commission for the approval of the construction of a branch bank building.

Section 14-2007(8)(c) of the City's historic preservation ordinance requires that:

The exterior of every historic building, structure and object and of every building, structure and object located within an historic district shall be kept in good repair as shall the interior portions of such buildings, structures and objects, neglect of which may cause or tend to cause the exterior to deteriorate, decay, become damaged or otherwise fall into a state of disrepair.

Furthermore, Section 14-2007(9)(d) stipulates that:

Any person who alters or demolishes a building, structure, site or object in violation of the provisions of Section 14-2007 or in violation of any conditions or requirements specified in a permit shall be required to restore the building, structure, site or object involved to its appearance prior to the violation. Such restoration shall be in addition to

and not in lieu of any penalty or remedy available under the Code or any other applicable law.

Section 5.5.c.1 of the Rules & Regulations states:

The bases for the rescinding of an entry on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places are 1) the resource has ceased to meet the criteria for listing on the Register because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed, 2) additional information shows that the resource does not meet the criteria for the Register, or 3) error in professional judgment as to whether the resource meets the criteria for listing.

The Rules & Regulations allows the Commission to rescind a designation when “the resource has ceased to meet the criteria for listing on the Register because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed,” but it does not require the Commission to rescind. The Commission may rescind or not as it sees fit; the Commission has complete discretion with rescissions.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Attorney Ralph Pinkus represented the application.

Mr. Wilds stated that it may not be realistic to require the owner to rebuild the historic house, but he contended that the Commission should not act on the rescission request at this moment. He noted that an application to construct a bank building on this site appears later in the agenda. He remarked that the bank proposal may or may not be acceptable to the Commission, but the Commission should rescind not the designation until it has considered the proposal.

Mr. Dilworth commented on the Committee on Historic Designation’s review of the rescission request. He stated that the Committee is charged with determining whether any historic resources survive on the site, not whether the designation should be rescinded. That decision is within the purview of the Commission, not the Committee. He reported that the record of the designation does not provide any indication of the historical significance that prompted the designation. He asked Mr. Farnham to comment on the possible reasons for the designation in 1962. Mr. Farnham stated that the Commission primarily designated eighteenth and early nineteenth-century buildings such as this one during its early years, from 1956 through the 1960s. He stated that he knows of no instance of the Commission designating a site for its archaeological potential in the early 1960s. He contended that it is very unlikely that the Commission would have designated this site for anything other than the 1805 stone house standing on it. He asserted that it would not be prudent to redesignate the site at this time owing to its archaeological potential. Mr. Baron noted that the original designation includes the building, its site, and site appurtenances.

Mr. Wilds again contended that the Commission should retain its jurisdiction over the site and review the bank proposal. Ms. Merriman explained that it has been the practice of the Commission to retain jurisdiction when a building has been illegally demolished. Mr. Thomas stated that the historic building added character to the street; the new building should as well. Mr. Sherman advocated for the Commission to retain jurisdiction to ensure that the new construction is of an appropriate character. He asserted that the Commission should not be an obstacle to development, but it should require that the new construction preserve the nature of the historic building. Mr. Pinkus suggested that the Commission table rather than deny the rescission request to allow for an opportunity to review the bank project. Mr. Wilds disagreed, stating that the Commission should maintain its full jurisdiction; it should not relinquish its control

over the site. He stated, however, that he was uncomfortable with the notion of amending the designation to include archaeological significance.

ACTION: Mr. Dilworth moved to deny the request to rescind the individual designation of 6918-26 Ridge Avenue. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

700 CHURCH LANE

Owner: LaSalle University

Applicant: Ed Turzanski

History: Jewish Foster Home and Orphanage

Proposal: Rescind the historic designation and remove from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted unanimously to recommend that the Commission rescind the designation of 700 Church Lane and remove the address from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Section 5.5.c.1.1 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations and to request that the staff provide additional information to the Commission on the archeological potential of the site at the meeting on 14 March 2008.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the rescission of the designation of 700 Church Lane, the former Jewish Foster Home and Orphanage. The Commission designated the property on 12 October 1988. The Jewish Foster Home and Orphanage sold the site to the Handmaids of the Sacred Heart of Jesus in 1951. In 1975, the Manna Bible Institute purchased the five-building campus, which included a main building, gymnasium, library, infirmary, and carriage house set on a large lawn. The buildings dated to the mid and late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Famed architect Willis Hale created the main building in 1890, when he added large Moorish additions to an Italianate mansion built about 1866 for Joseph Fraley Smith, the president of the International Petroleum Company. On 1 March 1999, the main building suffered a devastating, 5-alarm, arson fire, leaving it in ruins. The Manna Bible Institute abandoned the campus and the buildings deteriorated. The Commission did not learn of the fire or neglect until the fall of 2007. By that time, the buildings were in ruins. The site had become a danger to and blight on the neighborhood.

On 13 April 2007, LaSalle University, which is adjacent, purchased the site and began to plan its redevelopment. On 6 July 2007, the Department of Licenses & Inspections declared the site Imminently Dangerous. After the plans to redevelop the site were published in the *Inquirer* on 13 November 2007, the Commission's staff contacted LaSalle University on 14 November 2007 and informed Edward Turzanski, the University's Assistant Vice President of Government and Community Relations, of the Commission's designation and jurisdiction. In a letter dated 4 December 2007 to the Commission, the University requested the rescission of the site's designation. In the letter, Mr. Turzanski stated that the Department of Licenses & Inspections "has classified the remaining structure as being in imminently danger of collapse and has ordered the University to secure and demolish the same as quickly as possible." A contractor applied to the Department of Licenses & Inspections for a complete demolition permit on behalf of the University on 5 December 2007, but the Department did not issue the permit. Without a permit, the University's contractor completely demolished the buildings and removed the debris in December 2007 or January 2008. The Commission cannot condone the illegal demolition, but it should be noted that the neglect did not occur under LaSalle University's stewardship and that the campus was in ruins at the time of demolition. The demolition may have been a fait accompli, but the Commission, not the property owner, should have made that decision.

When the Department of Licenses & Inspections declares a site Imminently Dangerous, it sends a violation notice that states: "You are hereby ordered to IMMEDIATELY demolish or repair the said premises as necessary to correct the violations below." The Commission's staff is working with the Department to amend the language in the Imminently Dangerous violation notice to include the following disclaimer for all historically designated properties:

This property is listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places and under the jurisdiction of the Philadelphia Historical Commission. The issuance of an "Imminently Dangerous" or "Unsafe" violation notice does not relieve the property owner of the responsibility to comply with the historic preservation ordinance, Section 14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code. The owner has an affirmative obligation to keep the property in good repair in accordance with the ordinance and must obtain approval from the Philadelphia Historical Commission for any repair, alteration, or demolition prior to the commencement of work.

Section 5.5.c.1 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations states that:

The bases for the rescinding of an entry on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places are 1) the resource has ceased to meet the criteria for listing on the Register because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed, 2) additional information shows that the resource does not meet the criteria for the Register, or 3) error in professional judgment as to whether the resource meets the criteria for listing.

The Rules & Regulations do not require the Commission to rescind a designation if "the resource has ceased to meet the criteria for listing on the Register because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed," but it does give the Commission the discretion to rescind if warranted.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. No one represented the application.

Mr. Dilworth stated that we know exactly why this site was designated because the Commission adopted a nomination at the time of designation. He stated that it was designated because of the social and architectural significance of the Jewish Foster Home. He asserted that it was not designated for its archaeological potential.

Mr. Wilds stated that this case is very different from the Ridge Avenue case, which the Commission just considered. He remarked that LaSalle University played no role in the neglect of the campus. He stated that the historic resource was lost before LaSalle purchased the site. He added that he does not condone the demolition without the Commission's approval or a building permit, but the buildings were lost long before the demolition. Mr. Mattioni posited that the Commission might want to retain jurisdiction over the new development. Mr. Thomas agreed and noted that Church Lane is a very significant, early road with great historic character. He asserted that this property did have historic character, which contributed to the overall character of the street, and the Commission might therefore want to retain jurisdiction. Mr. Wilds agreed that the street has significant character, but contended that this section near Chew Avenue does not retain its character. He pointed to the modern apartment building across the street.

Mr. Schaaf explained that he had asked the staff at the meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation to research the history of the site prior to the construction of the Jewish Foster Home. He stated that the site is very near the center of Germantown, which was a seventeenth-century settlement. He stated that he was concerned that the site may have had remnants of

early buildings on it. Mr. Farnham showed the results of the staff research to Mr. Schaaf. The maps and chain of title showed that the c. 1868 mansion was the first building erected on the site. Mr. Schaaf stated that he was convinced that it was unlikely that any significant archaeological remains would be found at the site.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to rescind the designation of 700 Church Lane and remove the address from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Section 5.5.c.1.1 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 1. Mr. Mattioni dissented.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 FEBRUARY 2008

David Amburn, Chair

337 S. 6TH STREET

Owner: James Hone

Applicant: Todd Curry

History: c. 1809, John Warner, carpenter

individually designated; significant to Society Hill Historic District

Project: Replace windows with simulated-divided-sash

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes installing new sash with applied metal muntins in the front façade of this significant, early nineteenth-century house.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Paul Stone of Emerald Windows represented the application.

Mr. Stone stated that the Preservation Alliance holds an easement on the building and must approve any alterations such as the replacement of the windows. He therefore requested a one-month continuance to allow time to seek the Alliance's approval.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to table this application until the April 2008 Commission meeting. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

346 S. SMEDLEY STREET

Owner: Andrew Augustine

Applicant: Todd Curry, Emerald Windows

History: c. 1850; stuccoed in the twentieth century

Project: Install windows with applied muntins

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes installing simulated-divided-light sash replacements in the existing frames. The windows would be wood with composite muntins. Simulated-divided-lights windows are appropriate for this building because it has been significantly altered and because the original window-pane configuration is not known.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Paul Stone of Emerald Windows represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that this building is not as significant as the previous building. He reported that this building has been significantly altered and noted that the original window-pane configuration is not known. He stated that simulated-divided-light sash replacements are appropriate for this building.

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

111 S. 15TH STREET

Owner: Chest-Pac Associates, LP

Applicant: Carl S. Primavera, Esq.

History: 1922, Ritter & Shay, architects

Project: Install signage

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the 3'-7" x 9'-11" sign, with the staff to review the installation plan, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: In February 2008, the Historical Commission denied a sign application for this building that proposed installing an illuminated sign on the ornate Samuel Yellin gate adorning the Chestnut Street entranceway of this significant Renaissance Revival building. The applicant has submitted a revised design for the sign. The sign has been relocated away from the Yellin gates and would be installed on the limestone wall of the building. The sign would hang from a mounting frame attached directly to the stone. The frame of the sign would be painted to match the limestone. The proposed sign would be back-lit with bronze channel letters. The electrical box and transformer would be located in the interior of the building.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Attorneys Carl Primavera and Ron Patterson and architect William Aumiller represented the application.

Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the 3'-7" x 9'-11" sign, with the staff to review the installation plan, pursuant to Standard 9. No one seconded the motion.

Ms. Merriman suggested that a sign 25 feet above the sidewalk would not be effective. She suggested that the best place for a sign is on the glass behind the Yellin gates. Mr. Wilds noted that the property across the street is now vacant, but will not be for long. A sign to the west near the corner would remain visible. He observed that the proposed sign at the corner would be visible to drivers on 15th Street. Ms. Merriman asked about the mounting of the sign to the limestone façade.

Mr. Patterson explained that the restaurant has planned three types of signage: bronze plaques on either side of the door on Chestnut Street; the existing awnings on 15th Street, which will be replaced; and the sign at the corner on the Chestnut Street façade. He stated that the plaques and awnings have already been approved. Mr. Aumiller explained that the sign is designed to alert drivers on 15th Street to the restaurant before they pass Chestnut Street. He explained that the valet service for the restaurant will be located at the Chestnut Street entrance. He also

explained that the sign design has been revised; it is now halo-lit, not back-lit. He stated that the sign would be mounted into mortar joints, not the limestone. Mr. Baron advised that it is better to drill into the center of limestone blocks than the edges; he suggested mounting the sign in the mortar joints only if the mounting holes do not overlap onto the edges of the limestone blocks. He also asked about the size of the hole needed for the electrical wiring for the sign. Mr. Aumiller stated that the electrical hole would be ½" in diameter.

Mr. Schaaf reported that he is a member of the Sign Committee of the Art Commission. He explained that the signage for this restaurant has undergone many reviews. He stated that this design is the best solution yet proposed. Messrs. Sherman, Schaaf, and Wilds all suggested that the sign should be centered on the pedimented window.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance distributed photographs of what he considered inappropriate signage on Chestnut Street. He asserted that other City agencies are not properly reviewing signage applications for historic but not designated buildings. He contended that the Commission should request that other agencies scrutinize signage applications for older buildings more carefully. He also distributed photographs of subtle signage on nearby restaurants. He urged the Commission to deny this application. He claimed that too many signs have been approved for this building. He stated that this restaurant does not need 10 signs. He asked the Commission to protect this building by denying this application. He observed that the minute from the Architectural Committee is not accurate; he corrected that he not only requested that the sign be moved off center, but also that it be reduced in size. Mr. Patterson objected to Mr. Gallery's characterization of the sign as "garish." Mr. Gallery responded that he did not call it "garish"; he called it "inappropriate." Mr. Schaaf noted that Striped Bass, which Mr. Gallery suggested was a good example of restaurant signage, is no longer in business. Mr. Gallery responded that it did not close because of the signage.

Mr. Wilds reminded the Commission that it approved a large number of signs for this building when the House of Blues was considering occupying the space. Mr. Patterson stated that the building owner considered numerous tenants for this space; he stated that this tenant is a perfect match with the space and the building. Mr. Mattioni commented that this sign is appropriate for the building.

ACTION: Mr. Sherman moved to approve the proposed sign, provided it is centered above the pediment. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 6 to 4. Commissioners Leonard, Merriman, Thomas and Wilds dissented.

6918-6926 RIDGE AVENUE

Owner: Michael S. Kershaw

Applicant: Dominic Aspite for Wachovia Bank

History: Christopher Ozias House, c. 1805, demolished 2007

Project: Construct bank building

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application, pursuant to Section 14-2007(9)(d), but approval of a bank building that replicates the location, massing, materials, and form of the primary mass of the historic building, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a branch bank building on a vacant lot at 6918-6926 Ridge Avenue in Roxborough. Until recently, the early nineteenth-century,

rubblestone Christopher Ozias House stood on the lot. The house partially collapsed in late 2007. The Department of Licenses & Inspections cited the house as Imminently Dangerous. The current property owner demolished the house and cleared the lot without a building permit or the Historical Commission's approval. The owner claims that a building inspector authorized by the former Department Commissioner ordered him to demolish it. The property owner proposed the legalization of the demolition, but the Commission denied that request on 8 February 2008. At that time, the Commission discussed whether the property owner should be required to reconstruct the demolished house, especially in light of the claims that a failure to maintain the historic building may have precipitated its collapse. Following the Commission's denial of the application to legalize the demolition, the bank, an equitable owner of the parcel, submitted this application to construct a branch bank building. The lot remains designated and the Commission holds plenary jurisdiction over it. The owner has simultaneously applied to the Commission for the rescission of the designation.

Section 14-2007(8)(c) of the Philadelphia Code requires that:

The exterior of every historic building, structure and object and of every building, structure and object located within an historic district shall be kept in good repair as shall the interior portions of such buildings, structures and objects, neglect of which may cause or tend to cause the exterior to deteriorate, decay, become damaged or otherwise fall into a state of disrepair.

Furthermore, Section 14-2007(9)(d) stipulates that:

Any person who alters or demolishes a building, structure, site or object in violation of the provisions of Section 14-2007 or in violation of any conditions or requirements specified in a permit shall be required to restore the building, structure, site or object involved to its appearance prior to the violation. Such restoration shall be in addition to and not in lieu of any penalty or remedy available under the Code or any other applicable law.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the proposal to the Commission. Attorney Carl Primavera and developer Michael Cooley represented the application.

Mr. Primavera explained that the developer's architect revised the bank design based on the suggestions of the Architectural Committee and the community. He noted that the exterior cladding has been changed from brick to stone and the verticality of the building has been emphasized.

Mr. Cooley stated that the proposed bank building would pay homage to the lost historic building. He stated the most noticeable change is the building materials, from the brick to Wissahickon schist, which is prevalent in Roxborough. It now has a more vertical appearance. The windows have been narrowed, giving it more of a residential appearance. The pediments are like gables. It is sited like the historic building. It meets the neighborhood design guidelines and relates well to the street.

Mr. Wilds stated that the design was much improved. However, he asserted that the stucco band at the parapet is inappropriate. He suggested that the band be redesigned. Mr. Cooley replied that he was willing to redesign it. Mr. Schaaf suggested bringing the schist up, not reducing the width of the stucco band. He noted that the parapet is needed to hide rooftop mechanical units.

Mr. Sherman acknowledged that the design is much improved, but noted that the latest revision has not been vetted by the Architectural Committee. He asked if the staff had had an opportunity to review the latest design. Mr. Danta stated that it had not. He added that the staff had met with the applicant and offered suggestions that led to this design.

Mr. Baron observed that the ordinance states that a building illegally demolished “shall be reconstructed.” He contended that the ordinance does not leave the decision whether to reconstruct to the discretion of the Commission. He claimed that the Commission must require a reconstruction. He stated that the Commission should be operating under the Reconstruction Standards, not the Rehabilitation Standards. He asserted that requiring a reconstruction would serve as a deterrent to others who might illegally demolish historic buildings. Mr. Baron observed that the neighboring historic building will also be demolished to build this bank. Mr. Wilds asked if it is designated as historic. Mr. Baron stated that it is not. Mr. Wilds remarked that the Commission then has no jurisdiction over it. Mr. Schaaf asked if the reconstructed historic house could serve as a branch bank. Mr. Baron stated that the building could be accurately rebuilt and then altered to accommodate the bank program. Mr. Mattioni objected strenuously to Mr. Baron’s suggestion. He stated that the Commission led the applicant to the current design during last month’s review. He asserted that the Commission would have misled the developer if it now required a reconstruction. Others also objected to Mr. Baron’s statement that the Commission must require a true reconstruction. They stated that there are many mitigating circumstances in this case. A real reconstruction would not be appropriate. Mr. Wilds commented that the applicant has done exactly what the Commission suggested at its last meeting. Mr. Schaaf asked if the second building, which is not designated, could be saved. Mr. Primavera stated that its demolition is necessary for the drive-through. He reminded the Commission it is not designated.

Mr. Thomas stated that the proposed design meets all of the requirements instated by the Commission except that of height; it does not represent the height of the historic building. Messrs. Thomas and Amburn suggested the addition of a partial or full second story to the current design. Mr. Thomas suggested that the second floor could provide office space. Mr. Sherman asked Mr. Cooley if the proposed design is a standard Wachovia plan with a redesigned façade. Mr. Cooley stated that it is. He asserted that the bank would not accept a second floor; it would walk away from the site if such a requirement was placed on the building. Mr. Sherman suggested that the building could be redesigned to appear as if it has a second floor. Mr. Thomas added that he was not suggesting a reconstruction as Mr. Baron had advised, but was suggesting that Mr. Cooley add to the standard plan.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the current owner’s offer to donate \$5,000 as compensation for demolishing the historic building is inadequate; he asserted that it greatly undervalues the lost building. However, he stated that he would consider the offer extended by Mr. Pinkus as binding regardless of the Commission’s decision on the bank proposal. Mr. Gallery contended that the bank proposal is “not unreasonable.” He stated that he prefers the option without the sunshades. He suggested that the Commission approve it in concept, giving the developer and bank a clear message that the proposal is acceptable. He also suggested that the developer present a refined design to the Architectural Committee and Commission during a later review cycle. Mr. Primavera stated that that suggestion was acceptable, provided the Architectural Committee was given clear direction.

Kevin Smith of the Manayunk Neighborhood Council objected to the illegal demolition and claimed that 10 historic houses have been demolished in the area recently. He stated that the Commission should take the preservation of the historic character of Ridge Avenue very

seriously. He suggested that the Commission require the developer to replicate the shape and massing of the historic building. Several Commissioners noted that, excepting this one, the demolished houses mentioned by Mr. Smith were not designated.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve in concept the site plan, massing, materials of the version of the design without sunshades over the windows. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7 to 3. Commissioners Amburn, Leonard, and Thomas dissented.

1636 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: George Bochetto Esq.

Applicant: Carl Primavera, Esq.

History: c 1870; contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Add penthouse and deck on mansard

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This project proposes constructing a penthouse with stair and bar as well as a deck on top of the mansard roof of this townhouse. The Commission has denied earlier versions of this project and asked the applicant to reduce the size and visibility of the addition. In the current version, the penthouse and deck will still be visible from several streets.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Attorney Carl Primavera represented the application.

Mr. Primavera requested a one-month continuance.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to table the application until the April 2008 Commission meeting. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

348 S. 16TH STREET

Owner: Frank Guinta

Applicant: Manuel Gonzalez

History: c. 1830, bay added c.1900; contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Legalize windows

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

OVERVIEW: The application proposes the legalization of the installation of eight windows. The windows would be metal clad with interior snap-in grills and subframes, which reduce the sizes of the openings. The correct windows for this building would be 6-over-6 at all floors except the second, which would be 1-over-1. A window contractor informed the owner about the historically appropriate windows prior to the purchase of the inappropriate windows. The applicant also removed paint from the façade in a way that damaged much of the outer surface of the brick. Several years ago, the current owner illegally covered the second-floor bay with vertical boards. A violation was issued, but the illegal condition was never corrected. The current application addresses the windows only.

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

The Commission members agreed that the replacement windows do not satisfy the Standards.

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

224 ST. MARK'S SQUARE

Owner/Applicants: Luisa Boverini and Jeffrey Heit

History: 1877-80, G.W. & W.D. Hewitt, architects; individually designated

Project: Construct rear deck, cut door and legalize gate and parking area

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the legalization of the demolition of a deck and a wall as well as the construction of wood fence, trellis, and parking gate. The application also proposes the construction of a large deck and the enlargement of a window into a door. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a zoning permit for the parking area and fence with trellis. The property owner claims that a plans examiner at the Department of Licenses & Inspections told her that she did not any approvals other than the zoning permit for the parking area and fence with trellis. However, this is not true. The Historical Commission's approval is required for work that would alter the exterior appearance of a building, its site, and any site appurtenances such as fences. The community association supports the project.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Property owner Luisa Boverini represented the application.

Mr. Wilds asked if the fence, gate, and related trim on Locust Street are painted. Ms. Boverini replied that the fence and gate are painted cedar. The deck railing will also be constructed of cedar. However, she has not yet decided if it will be painted.

Ms. Leonard asked why the staff recommended denial. Mr. Baron replied that he had approved a small deck for this building a couple of years ago, but did not consider the deck currently proposed to be appropriate. He stated that it would be very large and highly visible from Locust Street.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the application, provided the fence, gate, and deck are painted dark green. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2036 DELANCEY PLACE

Owner: Lily Development

Applicant: Reed Axelrod

History: Built c. 1880, contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District

Project: Alter front steps, reface garage, exterior restoration.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend Alternative Two on page AX-1A with the replication of the steps in cast stone. The Committee was divided on the material for the sides of the steps. Ms. Pentz and Mr. Amburn recommended approval of the proposal as submitted, and Messrs. McCoubrey and D'Alessandro recommended that the sides be covered in cast stone panels, not stucco.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes two alternatives for alterations to the front steps of this Second Empire house. Alternative One proposes to demolish the existing brownstone steps and reconstruct them with cast stone treads, parged side walls, and an iron handrail reminiscent of the basement window grills. Alternative Two proposes to demolish the existing brownstone steps and reconstruct them in the same style with the addition of a new handrail in cast iron. The reconstructed steps would not be brownstone, but a combination of cast stone and stucco. Both steps would roughly be the same dimensions as the existing. However, the steps in Alternative One encroach farther onto the sidewalk than the existing ones. Both options propose the elimination of a planter around the bay window and the repavement of this area with brick to match the existing herringbone pattern.

The application also includes a proposal to reface a non-historic garage on 21st Street. The new garage façade would have an expose channel lintel above a set of three individually operated garage doors. The proposed doors are of a traditional carriage-house type. They would be painted, not stained. The new façade would be accented with two light fixtures and a cast iron balustrade.

The applicant also proposes extensive restoration work to the exterior of the house. The staff has already approved some of this work and will continue to work with the applicant on the remainder of the proposed work. All proposed restoration work would require review of details and samples in the field.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Developer Robert Volpe and architect Reed Axelrod represented the application.

Mr. Danta stated that the steps, although altered, are brownstone. Mr. Volpe stated that he is transforming the building from a five-unit apartment into a single-family dwelling. He stated that he agreed with all of the recommendations except those for the front stair. He is proposing to use cast stone with a cementitious material for the sides. Mr. Axelrod also agreed generally with the recommendation. However, he asserted that the Jahn material, which is the finest material for restoring or simulating brownstone, is appropriate. He claimed that it would be very difficult and expensive to use cast stone on the sides of the steps. Mr. Wilds asked why it would be difficult to use cast stone for the sides of the steps. Mr. Axelrod stated that the cast stone sides would be created from several discrete pieces of cast stone and would not replicate the original step sides well. Mr. Wilds agreed and asserted that Jahn would be a more appropriate material for the side walls. Mr. Thomas questioned the material proposed for the handrail. Mr. Axelrod stated that it would be iron. Mr. Axelrod also noted that he would rebuild the treads and risers to meet the current building code. Mr. Schaaf complimented him on the quality of his architectural drawings.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the application as submitted, with the staff to review masonry color samples. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

258 S. VAN PELT STREET

Owner: John & Gina Moore

Applicant: Charles Capaldi

History: c. 1890 as carriage house; converted to residential in early twentieth century contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Construct rooftop addition, install green-roof, construct two-story side yard addition, and cut window openings.

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 to install a green roof over the main roof of this former carriage house; no details of the installation have been provided. The green roof would be accessed through a penthouse addition. This addition would not be highly visible from the public-right-of-way. The property has a side yard where the applicant proposes to construct a two-story addition. The addition would be located at the rear of the yard, away from Van Pelt Street. It would however be minimally visible from 22nd Street across a parking lot. The massing of the proposed addition would be compatible with the surrounding carriage houses, and it would be clad in brick. Lastly, the applicant proposes to replace windows.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architect Charles Capaldi represented the application.

Mr. Baron pointed out for Mr. Dilworth's benefit that the staff had recommended approval of the green roof because it would not be visible. He asserted that there is no exemption from the Standards for "green" alterations. Others disagreed with Mr. Baron and contended that the Commission must promote sustainability.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

339 S. 2ND STREET

Owner: Bruce and Eloaina Le Buhn

Applicant: Josh Otto, AIA

History: c. 1965, contributing to Society Hill Historic District, 1999

Project: Replace front door, replace front gate.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the gate, pursuant to Standard 9; and denial of the replacement door, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the original front door to the property. The original door design found in this property and throughout most of the row is a ribbed wood door with a side light. The proposed replacement would be a painted flush door installed within the existing frame. The subject property has a non-original gate that encloses a front vestibule, which was originally open. The applicant proposes to replace the existing gate with a more

architecturally compatible gate. The replacement gate would be constructed of steel and painted black. The applicant has submitted examples of replacement doors and other gates installed throughout this row. However, all of these alterations were undertaken before designation.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect Brett Webber represented the application.

Mr. Webber stated that he met with the owner, who would now like to replicate the historic door. He asked that the Commission give the staff the authority to review this revised design. Mr. Wilds stated that the staff already has the authority to approve restoration work; the Commission itself would not need to review a proposal to install a replica of the original door.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the gate, pursuant to Standard 9; and deny the replacement door, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1308 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: North Central Positronics

Applicant: Brett Webber, AIA, LEED AP

History: c. 1840; altered c.1900; individually designated, 1968

Project: Replace front door and security gates.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval all the work except the rear bay and roll-up gate, provided the shutter configurations are corrected, with the staff to review the details. The Committee split on the bay and gate. Ms. Pentz and Mr. Amburn recommended approval; Mr. D'Alessandro and Mr. McCoubrey recommended denial, pursuant to Standards 4 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes major work to the rear façade of the rear ell. This elevation currently has a second-floor bay and a non-historic ground floor. The applicant proposes to construct a bay that would extend three floors. The proposed bay would be recessed from the corner of the ell and it would not hide the gable of the ell. However, it would require the demolition of the second-floor bay and the removal of the third-floor masonry exterior wall. The proposed bay would be clad in an aluminum system with accents of zinc interlocking panels; casement fenestration is proposed.

The side of the rear ell currently has wood windows. The applicant proposes to install clad, simulated-light replacement sashes for those openings and entire frame replacement of deteriorated casings. These replacements would either be wood or clad to replicate the profiles of the original wood planks. Some modifications to existing masonry openings are proposed, such as the creation of a doorway; the enlargement of two separate windows into a large single window and the enlargement of a double hung window into a casement. These changes would be minimally visible from the public-right-of-way.

The application also proposes the installation of two stainless steel chimneys and a rooftop condenser enclosure. This enclosure would be minimally visible from the public-right-of-way. It also proposes to install a roll down gate in place of an existing one along Cypress Street. The housing would be concealed. Finally, this application also proposes to install shutters on the front façade of the building. The louver type and pattern needs revisions, but the staff can assist the applicant with the details.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architect Brett Webber represented the application.

Mr. Wilds asked about the differences between the proposed and existing bays. Mr. Webber displayed renderings of the proposed bay and photographs of the existing bay. He stated that the existing bay has been modified numerous times, is not worth preserving, and does not meet the owner's requirements. He stated that he seeks to remove the existing bay and construct a new bay that is clearly differentiated from and not a re-creation of the older bay.

Mr. Wilds asked if Cypress Street is a service alley. Mr. Webber explained that the property across Cypress to the south is a surface parking lot. He stated that most of the block is bounded by surface parking lots and the backs of large buildings on Spruce. He acknowledged that three small rowhouses face Cypress. He stated that it is a very narrow service alley. Mr. Baron disagreed and stated that one of the three rowhouses facing Cypress is designated.

Mr. Baron claimed that the bay was an original Italianate feature and should be restored. Mr. Danta disagreed and stated that the date of the bay is unknown. He noted that the building underwent major alterations about 1900. Mr. Webber concurred with Mr. Danta, stating the rear of the building including the bay has been significantly altered. Mr. Baron objected to the demolition of the bay. He noted proposals for buildings on the 1800-block of Green Street and the 900-block of Spruce Street and reminded the Commission that it had required owners to restore bays. Several Commission members remarked that this bay retained none of its integrity. Mr. Baron suggested building an addition on top of the existing bay. Mr. Webber rejected that idea, stating that he would not propose a falsely historic bay addition. Mr. Baron suggested a wood gate instead of the metal gate proposed for the rear.

Mr. Schaaf asked why the property owner would want a bay if it looks onto parking lots. Mr. Webber explained that the bay would face south and bring light into the building.

FAILED MOTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the application as submitted, provided the configurations of the shutters are corrected, with the staff to review details. Mr. Amburn seconded, which failed by a vote of 6 to 4. Commissioners Leonard, Merriman, Schaaf, Sherman, and Thomas dissented.

Mr. Thomas stated that he objected to the failed motion because of the metal roll-up gate, which would detract from the pedestrian experience on the alley.

Mr. Sherman suggested that the Commission separate the rear gate from the rest of the application and consider two motions, one on the alterations to the rowhouse and a second on the gate specifically.

ACTION: Mr. Sherman moved to approve the application as submitted except the rear gate, provided the configurations of the shutters are corrected, with the staff to review details. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Thomas suggested that the solid steel gate is not appropriate. He proposed a gate with an upper section open for ventilation and light. He stated that it would provide the necessary security and improve the pedestrian experience.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to approve a roll-up metal gate for the rear that is open and transparent from a line 5'-6" above grade to the top of the gate, with the staff to review details. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 1. Mr. Wilds dissented.

1613 LOMBARD STREET

Owner: Morris Rotenstein

Applicant: Morris Rotenstein

History: c. 1850; contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Legalize vinyl windows

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of vinyl windows in the front façade of this rowhouse. The historic windows were wood, 6-over-6, double-hung windows.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Commission. Property owner Ofa Noga represented the application.

The owner stated that there were no violations on the property at the time of purchase. He stated that an inspector from the Department of Licenses & Inspections noted the illegal windows and issued the violation. He stated that violations are disclosed in New York City at the time of purchase. He stated that the staff had given him a letter stating that the violation on the windows was issued in the 1980s. Mr. Cote corrected Mr. Noga, stating that the letter notified the owner of the designation; it had nothing to do with the window violation. Mr. Noga reiterated that the windows were in place when he purchased the property.

Mr. Baron explained that the Commission had reviewed a similar application recently. In that case, the Commission held the current owner liable for illegal work undertaken by the former owner and suggested that the current owner sue the former owner to recover the cost of the remediation. Mr. Sherman agreed. The Commission cannot overlook illegal work simply because a property has changed hands; if it did, the preservation ordinance would be meaningless. Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Noga about his purchase. Mr. Noga explained that he had purchased the property "As-Is." Mr. Wilds asserted that Mr. Noga was responsible; when he bought the property "As-Is," he accepted all of its problems including the illegal windows. Mr. Noga asked the Commission to clear the violation. Mr. Sherman stated that it could not. Mr. Thomas stated that the window replacement was undertaken without a permit. The fact that the City was unaware of the illegal work and did not issue a violation until after the sale does not excuse the owner from the responsibility. Mr. Noga claimed that the Commission's position on the matter was "not fair." Several Commission members countered that it was fair. If a change in ownership legalized all illegal work, the City's building permit system would break down. Mr. Noga asked how he could clear the violation. Mr. Sherman stated that he could install the correct windows.

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

2116 LOCUST STREET

Owner: Kerry and Sonali Polite

Applicant: Kevin Angstadt

History: c. 1875; contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Construct third-floor addition and roof decks

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a third-floor addition, which will be set back 9'-6" from the façade of this 1870s carriage house. The Architectural Committee has reviewed two similar proposals from these applicants for this building. This application eliminates the alterations proposed for the front façade in the earlier applications and focuses solely on the third-floor addition. During the previous reviews, the Committee was concerned with the visibility of the addition and suggested that it be set back from the front façade. Roof decks are proposed at the front and rear of the addition. The addition would be clad in pre-patinaed copper and would be visible from the public right-of-way.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Commission. Architects Kevin Angstadt Stephen Mileto and property owners Kerry and Sonali Polite represented the application.

Mr. Angstadt summarized the project. He explained that the owners have their business on the first floor and their home on the second. They would like to expand their living space. He submitted a letter of support from Council President Anna Verna's office and supplied a petition supporting the project with 64 signatures of neighbors. He reported that the addition would be clad in pre-patinaed copper. He explained that the cornice line on the addition is 7' above the roof. The headroom in the addition is 8'-6". He claimed that the parapet would hide the deck completely. Mr. Wilds asked him if the visibility of the addition from the street would be reduced if the roof were lowered. Mr. Angstadt stated that they had lowered the roof from the earlier proposals. He noted that his client is 6'-4" and stated that the visibility would be reduced only slightly if the roof were lowered to its absolute minimum.

Mr. Dilworth asked what criteria the Commission employs to judge the appropriateness of rooftop additions. Mr. Farnham noted that Rehabilitation Standard 9 and the Roofs Guidelines provide the standards. He noted that the Roofs Guidelines suggests that rooftop additions on historic buildings should be "inconspicuous" from the public right-of-way. Mr. Wilds added that the Commission must use its best judgment when making these decisions. Mr. Angstadt showed a photograph of an addition that the Commission had approved on Chancellor Street. He claimed that the addition and deck are highly visible. Mr. Thomas noted that the fact that this carriage house has an adjoining twin complicates this review; an addition would destroy the symmetry; also, the short neighboring building would allow views of the addition. He stated that this addition would be conspicuous and therefore not compliant with the Standards. Mr. Schaaf noted that the twin carriage houses are not identical. He asked the architects how they would flash the connection of the addition to the party wall. Mr. Mileto stated that it would be regletted along the property line. Mr. Polite claimed that the Center City Residents Association does not object to the proposal because it would not be highly visible.

Camille Focarino, the owner of the twin carriage house, claimed that the carriage houses were, in essence, one building. She claimed that they share a roof structure, drainage system, and crawl space. She claimed that there is no party wall between them. The architects disagreed strenuously. She also claimed that there are no front decks in the neighborhood and asked the Commission to ensure the structural stability of her property if the addition were constructed.

She stated she alone maintains the drainage and other shared systems with no assistance from the applicants. She called them hostile. Ms. Focarino insisted that the Commission protect the historic character of her property. She stated that she and her husband purchased it because it was historic. She noted that her husband is on the Board of the Center City Residents Association. Mr. Sherman explained to her that the Department of Licenses & Inspections, not the Commission, is charged with ensuring that the building could support the addition. The Department will conduct its review after the Commission conducts its review. The Commission must restrict its review to historic preservation issues. He also noted that the surface area of the building would not be increased; therefore, the new building would not add to the drainage amounts. Ms. Focarino stated that the applicants have not maintained the first floor of their building. Mr. Wilds asked her if she was opposed to the addition or merely objected to the ways in which her neighbors conducted themselves. Ms. Focarino stated that she adamantly opposed the addition because she does not want a modern penthouse on her historic building. Mr. Angstadt stated that a structural engineer would ensure that the building could support the addition.

Mr. Wilds asked if the addition could be pushed back further on the building, moving the rear deck to the front and rendering the addition less visible from the street. Mr. Angstadt explained that he could not move the addition to the back because the building code would not allow windows on the rear; they would be too close to the property line. He also stated that his clients would not be concerned about the appearance of the addition if it was not as visible from the street; they would use a much less expensive cladding in place of the copper if it was not visible.

Mr. Schaaf stated that the large overhang at the front of the addition creates a dark shadow, which emphasizes the addition. He suggested that the addition would be less prominent if the architects removed the overhang from the design. Mr. Mileto stated that they had tested the design without the overhang and deemed it unacceptable.

Ms. Focarino stated that the deck on Locust Street was "quite odd." She also claimed that the proposal did not include a railing separating the deck from her roof. The architects countered that it did. Mr. Wilds asked her if she would accept the addition and rear deck without the front deck. She stated emphatically that she would not.

Andrew Dalzell, the owner of 2112 Locust Street, voiced his support for the project.

Kiki Bolender, an architect and the owner of the neighboring property at 2118, addressed the Commission. She stated that she has resided at 2118 Locust for 13 years. She noted that 2114 and 2116 Locust are perceived as one building. She stated that 2116 already covers 100% of its lot. She claimed that the rear windows at the second floor cannot be replaced because they do not meet the building code. She claimed that fireproof windows could be installed 5 feet from the property line. She objected to the current drainage system. Mr. Mileto stated that they plan redesign the drainage system, taking storm water through the house to the sewer line in the basement. Commissioners noted that drainage is not within their purview. Ms. Bolender stated that she is opposed to the project.

Ms. Focarino stated that the applicants refused to allow her to review the plans and reported her to the police. She asked the Commission to disregard Council President Verna's letter and petition.

Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Polite to explain the history of the alterations to the front façade. Mr. Polite explained that the building was originally two separate carriage houses with a single owner. It was converted to commercial space in the 1920s. The storefront and cornice were added at that time. Mr. Wilds stated that the application presents a dilemma; the design of the addition is very good and the building has limited space. Mr. Mattioni asked the architects if they could remove the overhang from the design. Mr. Angstadt stated that he could, but noted that it helps to lower the appearance of the addition. The Commissioners concluded that the addition would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to approve the application, provided the overhang at the front of the addition is deleted from the design. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7 to 3. Commissioners Amburn, Merriman, and Thomas dissented.

309-315 ARCH STREET

Owner: 313 Arch Partners LLP

Applicant: Richard W. Thom

History: c. 1895; individually designated 4/12/1979; significant to the Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Install internally-illuminated signage

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of two signs; one would be wall-mounted in the existing cast iron band of the architrave and the other would be a projecting sign placed on the upper column between the entrance doors. Both signs would be internally-illuminated. The Commission has routinely denied internally-illuminated signs.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect Richard Thom and furniture storeowner and building tenant Antonin Roche represented the application.

Mr. Roche provided an overview of his company, which sells high-end Modern furniture. It is based in France and has 230 stores worldwide.

Mr. Amburn stated that the Architectural Committee was not opposed to the size, location, or attachment of the sign, but to its internal illumination. Mr. Thom opined that the sign would be no more intrusive than the existing Starbucks' sign at 3rd and Arch Streets. He explained that his client's design consultant selected its unusual positioning on the storefront sign band. Mr. Wilds asked if the applicants would be flexible with the placement. They stated that they preferred the proposed position.

Mr. Baron suggested placing the sign behind the storefront window. He also suggested fabricating the illuminated letters milk glass instead of plastic. Mr. Thom objected strenuously to the suggestion, explaining that the letters are individually molded and project out from the face of the anodized aluminum sign. Mr. Thomas stated that this sign was very well designed and would be made of very high-quality materials. Mr. Wilds explained that the Commission practice of rejecting internally illuminated sign derived from applications for the cheap plastic box signs with tube lighting. This sign is a very high-quality, well-designed sign.

Andie Pasacova, the real estate agent who leased the space to Roche Bobois, passed a bracelet around the table to the Commissioners and then pointed out that, like the sign, it was plastic, not glass or gold. Several Commissioners questioned the relevancy of her testimony.

Mr. Wilds moved to approve the sign, provided it is centered above the central windows. No one seconded the motion.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Sherman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1802 PINE STREET

Owner: Kevin Kline

Applicant: Marc Pinard

History: c. 1850; contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Construct roof deck on main block

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck on the main block of the building. A stairway would connect from a fourth-floor window cut down to a door to the roof deck. The deck would measure 20 feet by 21 feet and would be set back 20 feet from the front façade. The deck would be wood with 36-inch high black metal rails with vertical pickets.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect Marc Pinard and property owner Kevin Kline represented the application.

Mr. Pinard stated that the deck would not be visible from 18th or Pine Street. He did acknowledge that a small section of the railing might be seen from the southeast corner of the intersection of the streets. He stated that he designed the deck to be as inconspicuous as possible deck. It would be back 20 feet from the front facade. Mr. Pinard stated that the railing would be an understated and black and therefore not very visible.

Mr. Thomas supported this proposal as designed. Mr. Wilds cautioning that the Commission does not typically approve decks on the main blocks of rowhouses when they have rear ells as this one does. He noted that this deck would be visible from surrounding high-rise buildings.

Mr. Farnham stated that some have recently questioned the Commission's longstanding policy against decks on main blocks. They have asserted that there is no historical evidence for such a policy and is perceived by many as arbitrary. He stated that the "conspicuous from a public right-of-way" test might be more objective. Messrs. Sherman and Thomas supported abandoning the old policy and applying the Standards and Guidelines when reviewing such cases.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7 to 3. Commissioners Merriman, Schaaf, and Wilds dissented.

335 GASKILL STREET

Owner: Glenn Holsten

Applicant: Kiki Bolender

History: c. 1810; designated 01/22/1963; significant to Society Hill Historic District, 03/10/1999

Project: Install simulated-divided-light windows, door, reconstruct watertable and demolish and rebuild garden wall

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the windows, but approval of the rebuilding of the watertable with a marble lintel and reveal, a five-horizontal-panel front door, the alley door, the garden wall and the brick pavers for the patio, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install 2-over-2, simulated-divided-light sash throughout. The window details provided show an applied muntin with rounded moulding detail as opposed to a putty slope, and a sub frame, which reduces the opening. The historic windows did not have a subframe and would have been 6-over-6, true-divided-light windows with putty-slope muntins. A new eight-panel door was originally proposed; however, after a site visit with the staff, the applicant is now proposing a five-horizontal-panel door to match the original on a neighboring house. This application also proposes to replace the alley door in kind with a tongue-and-groove wood door. The revised application proposes the reconstruction of the former watertable and replacement of the concrete basement lintel with a marble lintel. Lastly, a new garden brick wall with a slate cap and new brick pavers are proposed for the rear.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Architect Kiki Bolender and property owner Glen Holsten represented the application.

MOTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the windows, but approve the rebuilding of the watertable with a marble lintel and reveal, a five-horizontal-panel front door, the alley door, the garden wall and the brick pavers for the patio, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion.

Mr. Baron stated that Ms. Bolender must have amended her application because the sample window she displayed at the Architectural Committee meeting has a beveled, flat muntin with a putty slope, not the rounded, inappropriate muntin shown in her architectural drawing included with the initial application. He noted inconsistencies in the application. He also noted that the proposed window has a subframe; the Commission does not typically approve subframes because they narrow window openings.

Mr. Wilds asked if the proposed window is a close match for the historic window, other than the simulated-divided lights. He asked if the daylight openings are the same. Ms. Bolender stated that the daylight opening is the same as the historic, but the sash stiles are narrowing to accommodate the subframe. Mr. Wilds stated that, in that case, the proposed window does not match the appearance of the historic window. He stated that the Commission would approve a matching replacement, but should not approve the proposed window.

Ms. Bolender presented two window samples. The first was her proposed Marvin simulated-divided-light window with a subframe. The second was a Weathershield true-divided-light window. She asserted that the Weathershield window is a poor replica of the historic window, but would be approved at the staff level as a replacement for the historic window. Mr. Baron stated that she was incorrect. He explained that the Commission's staff refuses to approve the

Weathershield window because it is a very poor replica, even though it has true-divided lights. He noted especially the extra strip on the lower rail.

Ms. Bolender reported that the Architectural Committee was looking to the full Commission for guidance regarding replacement windows. She stated that the historic daylight opening would not change with the window replacement. She stated that that was the most important issue. Mr. Wilds disagreed; he stated that the most important issue was whether the new window replicated the appearance of the historic window from the exterior. He contended that the proposed window does not accurately replicate the exterior appearance of the historic window. Ms. Bolender argued that the Commission needed to move into the mainstream and approve readily available, high-quality windows such as the one she is proposing. Mr. Baron stated that several manufacturers can fabricate windows that would better match the historic windows and provide the same features and functions as the proposed window. He also noted that Weathershield is updating its design to better replicate historic windows. Mr. Sherman suggested that the staff research the question and present the information on windows at a later meeting. He suggested that the Commission should maintain its standards, but also be flexible. Ms. Bolender stated that the Commission must consider energy efficiency when reviewing windows. She stated that the windows she is proposing are very efficient. She claimed that the windows the Commission approves are not efficient. Mr. Farnham observed that Ms. Bolender is “comparing apples and oranges.” He stated that she is conflating simulated-divided-lights, subframes, double-pane glass, and energy efficiency. He remarked that it appears that the Commission would approve windows with the energy efficiency she is seeking and perhaps even simulated-divided-lights, but not subframes. He asked if a Commissioner would offer such a motion.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION: Mr. Wilds and Ms. Merriman withdrew their motion to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the windows, but approve the rebuilding of the watertable with a marble lintel and reveal, a five-horizontal-panel front door, the alley door, the garden wall and the brick pavers for the patio, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

MOTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve simulated-divided-light windows that replicate the exterior appearance of the historic windows, the rebuilding of the watertable with a marble lintel, a five-horizontal-panel front door, the alley door, the garden wall and the brick pavers for the patio, with the staff to review details. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion.

Ms. Bolender objected. She stated that she cannot replace the windows without adding subframes. She claimed that the Commission was unaware of the latest window technologies. Mr. Baron responded, stating that there are several manufacturers that make the window suggested by the Commission without an added subframe. Ms. Bolender insisted that the Commission was not supporting the most energy efficient solution. Several members responded that subframes are entirely unrelated to energy efficiency. She again insisted that the subframe would not alter the exterior appearance because the glass size and location would remain constant. Mr. Wilds responded that it would; the stiles must become narrower to accommodate the width of the subframe. Ms. Bolender attempted to demonstrate here point with her section drawing through the window frame that was included with the application. The staff noted that the drawing was not accurate. Mr. Wilds stated that he would withdraw his motion because of the numerous unanswered questions about the window portion of Ms. Bolender’s application.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION: Mr. Wilds and Ms Merriman withdrew their motion to approve simulated-divided-light windows that replicate the exterior appearance of the historic windows, the rebuilding of the watertable with a marble lintel, a five-horizontal-panel front door, the alley door, the garden wall and the brick pavers for the patio, with the staff to review details.

Several Commissioners suggested that the Commission table the application to collect additional information and clarify the applicant's conflicting and confusing claims. Mr. Mattioni offered to make a motion to table. Todd Curry of Emerald Windows noted that the staff does not have the authority to approve simulated-divided-light windows. He suggested that the Commission approve the application with simulated-divided-light windows and let the staff work out the details to ensure that the new windows match the appearance of the original windows. Mr. Wilds stated that that was exactly what his withdrawn motion would have done.

Mr. Holsten, the property owner, asked the Commission why it was requiring a recess in the watertable to show where the bulkhead had once stood. He claimed that the building did not originally have a bulkhead and the Commission should not require him to indicate something that did not exist historically. Mr. Amburn stated that the Architectural Committee did not request that the bulkhead be recreated or indicated, but only that a staff member review the lintel replacement after the watertable is disassembled, revealing the underlying evidence. Mr. Wilds added that, if it is clear that the house never had a bulkhead, then the staff certainly would not require a reveal or recess to indicate one. Mr. Holsten stated that detailed surveys of 1812 and 1840 do not indicate a bulkhead. He asserted that the lines on the brick are a result of previous repairs, not a former bulkhead. The Commission asked the staff to review the evidence on site.

ACTION: Mr. Dilworth moved to approve simulated-divided-light windows, the rebuilding of the watertable with a marble lintel, a five-horizontal-panel front door, the alley door, the garden wall and the brick pavers for the patio, with the staff to review details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2019 CHANCELLOR STREET

Owner: Alon Barzilay

Applicant: Jonathan Broh

History: c. 1870; contributing to Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Construct roof deck with stair house and powder room

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: The property owner submitted an application in April 2007 that proposed the construction of a roof deck and stair house addition. The application proposed a wood deck and balustrade rail set back 17 feet from the façade. The stucco stair house containing a stair, powder room, and storage closet would be set back 24 feet from the façade. The Architectural Committee recommended approval. The application was withdrawn prior to the Historical Commission meeting.

The applicant now proposes a revised application for approval. The application proposes to construct a roof deck with stair house and powder room. The wood deck and balustrade rail would be set back from the façade 15'-6". The stucco stair house containing a stair, powder room, and storage closet would be set back about 24 feet from the façade.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Architects Julie Forejt and Jonathan Broh represented the application.

The Commissioners agreed that the addition would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and Roofs Guideline. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1933-35 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: George Karivalis

Applicant: Kijin Jay Choi

History: c. 1875; contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Install storefront

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to cut new openings and install storefront windows and doors on the south and west facades of this property, which stands at the corner of 20th and Spruce Streets. The west elevation would have single-light metal casements with transoms and a metal double door. There are no drawings provided for the south elevation. However, a rendering shows that an existing doorway would be closed and three fixed windows would be installed at the south. The applicant proposes to stucco the entire exterior and install awnings over all new openings.

A photograph from 1930 shows only the base of the property, but a simple corner entrance with storefront window on the south façade can be perceived. A photograph from 1950 shows a storefront on the first story. The south façade had commercial windows, row of transoms, and center entrance. The west façade has been greatly infilled, but former window and door opening locations can be delineated. A heavy cornice above the first story mounted the entire width of both facades.

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

The Commissioners agreed that the application was incomplete and inappropriate.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application owing to incompleteness and pursuant to Standard 6 and 9. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

105-107 COTTON STREET

Owner: Maximum Properties

Applicant: A. Robert Torres

History: Within the Main Street Manayunk National Historic District; vacant lot

Project: In Concept – Construct four-story building

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Manayunk Ordinance Section PM-704.2.7.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a four-story commercial building with a roof deck. The front facade would be clad in brick; however, the majority of the façade would be comprised of large glass windows with transoms. The Station Street elevation would be clad with stucco, metal siding, and tiles. The first story would have two sets of glass doors.

While the design of the new building is contemporary, the scale, materials, and texture of the building are not compatible with contributing buildings in the historic district. The contributing buildings in this area are mainly two and three-story row houses with stone and brick facades with cornices and have a tradition of smaller framed window openings. The overall massing is out of character in the district. The proposed rhythm of proportions, fenestration, and openings in the structure are incongruent with surrounding buildings.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Attorney Carl Primavera and architect Robert Torres represented the application.

Messrs. Primavera and Torres presented an overview of the project. Mr. Torres explained that a garden wall now surrounds the otherwise vacant property. They are proposing a four-story building with retail space on the first floor and offices above. The facades would be predominantly glass on Cotton and Station Streets. Mr. Torres stated that the building would be 50 feet tall; he noted that a nearby building facing Main Street is 55 feet tall.

Mr. Schaaf asked why there are two sets of doors at the ground floor on Cotton Street. Mr. Torres explained that they are contemplating two retail spaces. Mr. Primavera stated that there is a demand in Manayunk for office space.

Mr. Wilds asked if it would be possible to set the upper floor back from the Cotton Street façade. Mr. Schaaf stated that the architect if he could get the same effect with a change in windows or materials; he could create a crescendo. Mr. Schaaf noted the subtlety and elegance of the nearby historic buildings and compared them to this design. Mr. Amburn agreed and stated that the architect should endeavor to break down the mass with changes in scale. Mr. Schaaf suggested breaking down the scale with the inclusion of transoms in the large windows. Mr. Sherman suggested redesigning the facades, changing the windows, storefronts, and railing at the roof. Mr. Torres stated that he had anticipated the negative reactions to the design and had therefore prepared an alternative design, which he displayed. The Commissioners noted that the second design was much improved. Mr. Schaaf suggested recessing the spandrels.

Kevin Smith of the Manayunk Neighborhood Council objected to the designs. He stated that they were not appropriately scaled and exceeded the 35-foot height limit. He suggested a three-story, not four-story, building.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve in concept the second alternative design, which looks more like a traditional factory building. Mr. Sherman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

321 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: The American Interfaith Institute

Applicant: Benjamin Bauman

History: 1905, Clark Bank, T.P. Chandler, architect ; individually designated 6/30/1970, significant in Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Replace and expand vestibule, ADA ramp, and trash enclosure

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes expanding an enclosed entranceway with ramp at the Liberty Museum. The existing entrance stands on the east or Orianna Street façade of the building. The Historical Commission approved the construction of the extant curved glass and aluminum entranceway and ramp in 1980.

In August 2004, the Historical Commission approved a design for the expansion of the vestibule and ramp. The vestibule would terminate before the eighth pilaster and architectural bulge at the north end and the ramp would terminate halfway over the third pilaster at the south end. However, the museum never undertook the work.

This application now proposes a plan to expand the vestibule and ADA access ramp that is very similar to the plan approved in 2004. However, this design proposes to lower the existing brick wall along the ramp, construct a glass enclosure with standing seam metal roof, and install an open mesh metal handrail.

This application also proposes a wood trash enclosure that would cover the base of the eighth pilaster.

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

The Commissioners determined that the proposed addition was appropriate.

ACTION: Mr. Sherman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1506 LOMBARD STREET

Owner: Craig Peterson

Applicant: Danil C. Vicencio

History: c. 1960, contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Demolish garage and construct rear addition with roof decks

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a rear gate is installed at Naudain Street, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a detached non-historic garage facing Naudain Street and construct a first-story rear addition with a roof deck. This application also proposes a rear deck on the third story with a spiral stair leading to a deck on the third-story roof. The decks will be wood with wood picket balustrades.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Property owner Craig Peterson represented the application.

The Commissioners determined that the proposed addition was appropriate.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to the adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided a rear gate is installed at Naudain Street, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

115 N. ORIANNA STREET

Owner: William Vessal

Applicant: William Vessal

History: c. 1870. Contributing to Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Revise approved addition; construct roof deck

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a revision to the design of an addition already approved by the Commission as well as the construction of a roof deck. The Historical Commission approved the addition in July 2006 with detailed specifications of its height. The addition as shown in the current proposal has revised fenestration and does not conform to the height restrictions specified in the Commission's approval. The proposed deck would be constructed in front of the addition and extend the entire width of the addition. The building has a three-foot parapet that would lessen its visibility. The Commission reviewed the application in September 2007, but tabled it for a period not to exceed six months to allow the applicant to clarify his intentions.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Property owner William Vessel represented the application.

Mr. Vessal described his proposal to erect an addition and deck on the roof of his building in Old City. He stated that he had agreed to limit the height of the addition during a previous Commission review, but had since determined that the limit was unreasonable. He stated that he needed additional living space for his family. Several Commissioners noted that the addition alone is more than 2,900 square feet. He claimed that the addition and deck would be minimally visible. Several Commissioners doubted that claim and noted that the addition would be visible from Race, Cherry, and 4th Streets. The Commissioners noted that the plans were difficult to read and appeared inconsistent. Mr. Wilds encouraged the applicant to erect a mock-up that would clarify the question of visibility. Mr. Vessal objected strenuously.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to deny the application. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION OF BILL NO. 080080, QUEEN VILLAGE NEIGHBORHOOD CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Mr. Farnham explained that Section 14-900(8) of the Philadelphia Code, the Neighborhood Conservation District legislation, requires the Philadelphia Historical Commission to submit recommendations to City Council on any proposed ordinance that would create a Neighborhood Conservation District (NCD). On 8 February 2008, the Clerk of the Council informed the

Commission that Bill No. 080080 had been introduced in the City Council. That bill proposes the creation of the Queen Village Neighborhood Conservation District. William Kramer of the staff of the Planning Commission answered the Commissioners' questions about the legislation.

The Commission reviewed Bill No. 080080 and offered the following recommendation. Section 14-903(2) states that "An NCD shall consist of an area of at least two blocks by two blocks, no part of which is contained within an Historic District designated under §14-2007." Bill No. 080080 defines the boundary of the Queen Village Neighborhood Conservation District as "the north side of Washington Avenue, the south side of Lombard Street, the east side of 6th Street and the Delaware River." A portion of the northeastern edge of the proposed Queen Village Neighborhood Conservation District overlaps with the Society Hill Historic District, which the Philadelphia Historical Commission designated in March 1999 under §14-2007. For the Queen Village Neighborhood Conservation District to avoid overlapping onto the Society Hill Historic District and thereby comply with §14-903(2), the boundary of the conservation district should be redefined to delete several properties south of Lombard Street from the conservation district.

The Commission noted that it did not have an opportunity to review Bill No. 080080 in a comprehensive manner. It will request the right to provide additional recommendations on the bill to the City Council at a later date.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 4:15 p.m., Ms. Merriman moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Wilds 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.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.