

**THE MINUTES OF THE 552ND STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**8 AUGUST 2008
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
David Amburn, AIA
Leslie Benoliel
Della Clark
Eileen Evans, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Sara Merriman, Department of Commerce
David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia 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
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II
Leonard Reuter, Assistant City Solicitor

ALSO PRESENT

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Sabra Smith, Preservation Alliance
Elise Vider, Preservation Alliance
Michael Fettner, Lyman & Ash
Elizabeth Warshawer, Curtis Institute
Roberto Diaz, Curtis Institute
Seth Cohen, Venturi Scott Brown & Associates
Constantine Doukakis, Keast & Hood
Tim Noble, Noble Preservation Services
Sophie Boyer, Councilman Green's Office
Michael Brookshier, RAZAKCO
Alan Razak, RAZAKCO
Mary Daniels
Carl Primavera, Esq.
Charles Loomis
Bonnie Schmelz
Tania Rorke, Three Bears Park
Mark Ueland, UJMN Architects
Jacqueline Roberts
Sophie Socha Philadelphia Girls' Rowing Club
Karen Loveland, D2 Solutions, Inc.
Chris Duisberg, AFIAA US
Helen Fine, Judith Repp Architects
Judith Repp, Judith Repp Architects

Richard Thom, Richard Thom Architects
Steven Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Amburn, Benoliel, Clark, Evans, Merriman, Schaaf, Thomas, and Wilds joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 551ST STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Mr. Amburn requested that the minutes be corrected to indicate that he recused during the review of 832 Lombard Street.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the minutes of the 551st Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 11 July 2008, as corrected. Mr. Amburn seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATION, 28 JULY 2008

Scott Wilds, Chair

Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Farnham to report on Bill No. 080527 and the Commission's review of it. Mr. Farnham explained that Bill No. 080527, which Councilman Bill Green introduced at City Council on 22 May 2008, would amend the City's historic preservation ordinance. Under the current ordinance, the Historical Commission regulates the exteriors of buildings, structures, sites, and objects. This bill would expand the Historical Commission's purview, additionally authorizing it to designate and regulate interior portions of buildings and structures that are, or were designed to be, customarily open or accessible to the public by invitation or otherwise. The Home Rule Charter authorizes the City Planning Commission to review all proposed changes to the zoning code, which includes the historic preservation ordinance. The City Planning Commission has requested that the Historical Commission comment on the bill before it reviews it and makes a recommendation to the City Council. Mr. Farnham reminded the Commissioners that, at their July meeting, they had created an ad hoc Committee on Legislation to review the bill and report back to the Commission. He reported that Mr. Wilds had chaired a lengthy public meeting of that Committee to review the bill and take testimony from interested parties on 28 July 2008. He noted that the report of that Committee meeting was before the Commissioners. The Committee's conclusions can be briefly summarized as follows:

- The Commission should support the legislation with two amendments.
- The definition of "Public Interior Portion" in the bill should be amended as suggested by the Committee to clarify the exemption from designation for interiors that have been significantly, physically altered during their conversions to private use.
- The bill should be amended throughout to authorize the Commission to designate and regulate interiors of structures as well as those of buildings.

Mr. Farnham added that, since the Committee meeting, Lewis Rosman, the City attorney who authored the legislation, has revised the bill, amending "Public Interior Portion" and adding the authority to designate the interiors of structures. The new definition of "Public Interior Portion" is not identical to the wording suggested by the Committee, but does appear to capture the spirit and intent of the Committee's recommended language. He explained to the Commission that it must formulate a recommendation on the bill today, which will be forwarded to the City Planning Commission. The City Planning Commission will meet on August 19 or September 16, review

the bill, and formulate a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council will reconvene on September 18 and consider the bill with the City Planning Commission's recommendation.

Mr. Wilds thanked the Committee members, staff, and public for their participation in the lengthy meeting of the Committee on Legislation. Mr. Wilds concurred with Mr. Farnham that the revisions drafted by Mr. Rosman as a result of the Committee meeting capture the spirit of the Committee's conclusions. He recommended using the revised bill as the basis for the Commission's discussion. Mr. Wilds then acknowledge Councilman Bill Green, who arrived at the meeting. The Councilman thanked everyone for their efforts and stated that he supported the proposed revisions to the bill. Mr. Sherman thanked Councilman Green and his staff for their hard work and support of the Commission.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance supported the revised bill. He stated that the preservation community has been waiting for many years for the addition of this authority to the Commission's powers. He commended the Committee on its thoughtful review of the bill. He praised Councilman Green and his staff for introducing this legislation and then working diligently to revise it with the Commission and interested parties.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to resolve that the Philadelphia Historical Commission formally support Bill No. 080527 as revised and recommend to the Planning Commission that, pursuant to Section 2-307 of the Home Rule Charter, it recommend passage of the bill to the City Council. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 16 JULY 2008

Richardson Dilworth III, Chair

1910 CHESTNUT STREET, BOYD THEATER

Owner: Clear Channel Communications-Live Nation

Nominator: Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia

History: 1928, Hoffman & Henon, architects

Proposal: Designate as historic and list on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Klein moved to recommend that 1910 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, D, E, F, H, and J, warrants historic designation by the Historical Commission, and listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: The Preservation Alliance has nominated the Boyd Theater at 1908 Chestnut Street for designation as historic. Constructed in 1928, the Boyd was one of the first grand movie palaces designed in the Art Deco style. Today, it is the last surviving movie palace in Center City, an area that was once home to many impressive motion picture palaces. The nomination prepared by the Preservation Alliance contends that the theater satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, D, E, F, H, and J.

Satisfying Criteria A and J, the Boyd, the lone surviving movie palace in Center City, has significant interest as part of the development and cultural characteristics of the city and exemplifies the cultural, economic, and social heritage of Philadelphia. Satisfying Criterion B, the Boyd was at the center of two highly significant court cases that ultimately affirmed the right of cities and municipalities to designate and protect historic resources in Pennsylvania. Satisfying Criterion D, the Boyd is significant for being one of the earliest motion picture palaces to embody distinguishing characteristics of the Art Deco style, or the "modern French style" as it

was called at the time. Satisfying Criterion E, the Boyd is an important example of the work of the architectural firm Hoffman & Henon, the premiere motion picture theater designers of Philadelphia. Satisfying Criterion F, the Boyd contains elements of innovative design including its creative plan, which set a standard for theaters in urban settings. Satisfying Criterion J, the Boyd, by virtue of its Art Deco façade including the recessed open lobby, is a familiar landmark on Chestnut Street.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Commission. He illustrated his presentation with a series of historic photographs of the building. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance represented the nomination.

Mr. Sherman invited members of the audience to comment on the nomination.

Mr. Gallery, the nominator, thanked the Committee on Historic Designation for its efforts. He noted that the theater satisfies several Criteria for Designation. It is the site of an important event. He highlighted a letter from Jean Cutler, the director of Bureau for Historic Preservation of the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission. In her letter, she remarked that the court cases in the early 1990s regarding the designation of the Boyd confirmed the constitutionality and authority of municipalities in the Commonwealth to designate properties as historic without the consent of the property owner and to regulate such properties for the purposes of their preservation. This decision is the basis for the last 15 years of progress in local protection of historic resources in hundreds of municipalities across Pennsylvania. Mr. Gallery also noted that the Committee requested additional information, which he is providing today and which he would like to have incorporated into the nomination. The information places the Boyd in its context and includes a map showing the locations of theaters and movie palaces in the early twentieth century. Mr. Gallery contended that the Boyd is a unique historic resource that deserves designation. He urged approval of the nomination.

Howard Haas, the president of Friends of the Boyd, addressed the Commission and advocated for the designation of the theater.

Gersil Kay of Building Conservation International and the International Council on Art Deco Societies urged the Commission to designate the Boyd Theater.

Adrian Fine, the director of northeast field office of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, voiced his organization's support of the designation. He noted that the Trust had placed the Boyd Theater on its list of the 11 Most Endangered Sites in the country.

David Brownlee, an architectural historian and a former chair of the Committee on Historic Designation, stated that the Boyd is very significant because it stands at the intersection of two important historic forces that define the roaring 20s, Art Deco architecture and the Hollywood of talking pictures. He urged the Commission to designate the theater.

Shawn Evans, the co-chair of AIA Philadelphia's Historic Preservation Committee, urged the Commission to designate. He stated he has been working with Messrs. Haas and Gallery on the designation for more than six years. He has spoken publicly on many occasions about the theater. Mr. Evans asked for all those in the audience in support of the designation to stand and show their support to the Commission. Approximately 20 people stood.

Mr. Wilds asked if the current marquee is original or a later addition. Mr. Haas replied that it was installed during the conversion of the theater for Cinerama in 1953 and then altered in 1973 when the Sameric Corporation purchased the building.

Mr. Sherman thanked the interested parties for their hard work and perseverance.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the supplement to the nomination submitted by the Preservation Alliance, to find that 1910 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, D, E, F, H, and J, and to designate the property as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

WALNUT LANE BRIDGE OVER THE WISSAHICKON

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Nominator: Aliya Turner

History: 1908

Proposal: Designate as historic and list on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Cohen moved to recommend that the Walnut Lane Bridge over the Wissahickon satisfies Criteria for Designation A, F, G, and H, as well as Criterion D, and warrants designation by the Historical Commission, and listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: Aliya Turner, a summer intern funded by the Preservation Alliance and working at Historical Commission, has nominated the Walnut Lane Bridge over the Wissahickon for designation as historic. The nomination contends that the bridge satisfies Criteria for Designation A, F, G, and H.

The Walnut Lane Bridge will turn 100 years old this fall. Cliveden of the National Trust, the historic site in Germantown, is celebrating the 100th anniversary with an exhibition and a series of events including a recreation of the bridge opening ceremony in October. David Young, Cliveden's curator, suggested the nomination. The City's Streets Department supports the nomination. The bridge, which was the longest single-span masonry bridge in the world when completed, spans the Wissahickon Creek and connects Roxborough and Germantown. The bridge was design by George S. Webster and Henry Quimby of the City of Philadelphia's Department of Public Works, who were internationally considered innovative concrete bridge engineers. The Quimby Surfacing Method, which was developed on this and other Philadelphia bridges during the first decade of the twentieth century, became the industry standard method for finishing concrete surfaces for durability and beauty. The graceful concrete span was a product of the City Beautiful movement, which was dedicated to creating urban infrastructure that was simultaneously beautiful and useful. George Webster, the head of the City's Bureau of Surveys, was a leader of the City Beautiful movement and was involved in not only the Walnut Lane Bridge but also the Ben Franklin Parkway, Ben Franklin Bridge, Roosevelt Boulevard, Cobbs Creek Park and Parkway, and Pennypack Park. The Walnut Lane Bridge was significant as an ornament in the picturesque valley and also as the most efficient link between Manayunk and Roxborough to the south and Germantown, Mt. Airy, and Chestnut Hill to the north. As a material artifact of the City Beautiful and reform movements, the Walnut Lane Bridge is a monument of the Progressive Era.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Commission.

Mr. Schaaf explained that the bridge was a technological marvel. Mr. Farnham agreed, reporting that the bridge had a tremendous impact on bridge design at the time. He noted that engineers from around the country and the world visited Philadelphia to see the bridge.

Mr. Thomas explained that the bridge was a key factor in the growth of the city. Before the bridge was constructed, it was very difficult to travel between the Manayunk-Roxborough area and the Mt. Airy-Germantown area. It was a six-mile drive, which was impassible in inclement weather. The construction of the bridge allowed for easy travel between the neighborhoods and led to increased development.

Richard Thom, a board member of Cliveden of the National Trust, which is hosting the exhibition on the bridge, remarked on the importance of the bridge and advocated for its designation.

Ms. Benoliel noted that she is a resident of Mt. Airy. She explained that the bridge, which is both beautiful and functional, has great significance for the people of her community. She advocated for its designation.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance supported the nomination and thanked Aliya Turner, the intern who authored it.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to find that the Walnut Lane Bridge over the Wissahickon satisfies Criteria for Designation A, F, G, and H, as well as Criterion D, and to designate the property as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Benoliel seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 JULY 2008

David Amburn, Chair

1610-1618 LOCUST STREET

Owner: Curtis Institute of Music

Applicant: Curtis Institute of Music

History: 1610 Locust Street, John H. Converse House, Wilson Brothers architects, c. 1893, individually designated 2/28/1967, significant in Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District

1612-1616 Locust Street, c. 1960, non-contributing in the district

1618 Locust Street, Charles Custis Harrison House, c. 1855, John Notman architect, façade alterations by Wilson Eyre, 1888, significant in Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District

Project: Demolish all but front facades of two buildings, restore facades, construct building

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

- a. the demolition permit not issue until the new construction permit issues;
- b. the Curtis Institute provides binding assurances that the project will be completed;
- c. the Curtis Institute submits HABS-level photographs and measured drawings of the extant buildings at 1610 and 1618 Locust Street to the Commission;
- d. the Curtis Institute commemorates 1610 and 1618 Locust Street with a suitable exhibit that is prominently and perpetually displayed;
- e. the front facades 1610 and 1618 Locust Street are completely restored to their 1893 and 1888 appearances, respectively, including the arched, first-floor window; all masonry restoration in natural stone; the front door with ornate grill at 1610; and the leaded glass transom in the first-floor bay at 1618; and

- f. the pinning of the front facades of 1610 and 1618 from the interior, not the exterior as proposed.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the entirety of the non-contributing building located at 1612-1616 Locust Street and all but the facades of the significant buildings located at 1610, and 1618 Locust Street. In their places, it proposes to construct a ten-story building incorporating the historic facades. The building will house practice spaces and residences for students and faculty of the Curtis Institute, a music school located on the 1700-block of Locust Street. The Historical Commission reviewed an in-concept application for this project at its meeting of 9 November 2007. At that meeting, the Commission found that the demolitions of all but the Locust Street facades of 1610 and 1618 Locust Street for the construction of the proposed Curtis Institute rehearsal and residential building are necessary in the public interest. With this finding, which allowed for the approval of the demolition, the Commission unanimously approved the project in concept with the following conditions:

- a. the demolition permit not issue until the new construction permit issues;
- b. the Curtis Institute provides binding assurances that the project will be completed;
- c. the Curtis Institute submits photographs and measured drawings of the extant buildings at 1610 and 1618 Locust Street to the Commission;
- d. the Curtis Institute commemorates 1610 and 1618 Locust Street with a suitable exhibit that is prominently and perpetually displayed; and
- e. the front facades 1610 and 1618 Locust Street are completely restored to their 1893 and 1888 appearances, respectively.

The current application for final approval provides information related to the restoration of the historic facades and the construction of the new building only. It does not address the claim that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or the Conditions A-D. The Commission can decide whether or not to review the evidence that the demolition is necessary in the public interest again, but the applicant should be prepared to present the evidence, perhaps in an abbreviated form, to the Commission. The applicant should not assume that the in-concept approval is binding on the Commission. Section 6.7.c.3 of the Rules & Regulations states:

An endorsement of a review in concept of a development program shall not constitute a final review for permit purposes, shall not vest a right in a permit, and shall be subject to review of the final plans by the Commission before the Commission takes final action on a permit application and before a permit may issue.

Likewise, the Commission need not review material related to Conditions A-D, but the applicant should inform the Commission, preferably in writing, that it either accepts and will comply with the conditions or will contest them.

Condition E states that the facades of 1610 and 1618 Locust Street must be “completely restored to their 1893, and 1888 appearances, respectively.” The proposed restoration conflicts with this condition in several ways. At 1610 Locust Street, the applicant does not propose to restore the arched window that once graced the ground floor of this townhouse and can be seen in an historic photograph. Instead, the applicant proposes to maintain the non-historic storefront window opening and replace the existing aluminum window with a wood window that is related to the windows at the upper floors. The applicant proposes to selectively recreate eroded or damaged carved elements of the façade, with priority given to those elements visible from the street. The front door would be recreated in a simplified version, without the ornate metal grills that it once had. The balustrade at the third floor is proposed in either natural or cast stone. At 1618 Locust Street, the applicant does not propose to replicate the stained glass transom above

the Wilson Eyre bay window. There appears to be sufficient photographic evidence to recreate the transom in clear leaded glass that replicates the design but not the colors of the original window.

In addition to the restoration details, two other features of the design raise concerns. The structural drawings for the stabilization of the free-standing facades propose the insertion of numerous stainless steel Helifix Dryfix anchors directly into the historic brick and brownstone of the facades to tie the cladding and backing together. To install the anchors, holes would be drilled in the front facades, the anchors inserted, and the holes patched. Anchors installed from the interior side of the facades would be more appropriate and would not result in dozens of patches on the historic facades. At the Architectural Committee meeting, the applicants offered to install the anchors from the interior.

Likewise, the proposed interior windows in the historic facades raise concerns. The historic wood, leaded, and stained glass windows in the retained historic front facades would be backed by metal windows in the interior. It is unclear whether these interior metal windows would be operable or fixed. This configuration may trap moisture between the old and new windows and may create heat pockets, both of which could accelerate the deterioration of the historic windows.

The design of the new building has remained largely unaltered from the conceptual review. The applicant has refined some elements along the Locust Street façade to harmoniously link the new building to the historic facades of 1610 and 1618 as well as the rest of the block. The use of brownstone and granite in the new construction continues the refined, restrained appearance of the block and establishes a clear link to the historic surroundings. The biggest changes occur along Latimer Street and at the residential tower. The Latimer Street façade has been changed to create a more pedestrian friendly environment. The applicant now proposes a clearly defined entrance along this elevation. The mechanical systems and louvers that were located along Latimer have been moved to the penthouse. This change in the location of the systems has led to the elimination of residential space in the penthouse.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Attorney Richard DeMarco, Elizabeth Warshower of the Curtis Institute, architect Seth Cohen, and masonry preservationist Tim Noble represented the application.

MOTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application with the following conditions, with the staff to review all details:

- a. the demolition permit not issue until the new construction permit issues;
- b. the Curtis Institute provides binding assurances that the project will be completed;
- c. the Curtis Institute submits HABS-level photographs and measured drawings of the extant buildings at 1610 and 1618 Locust Street to the Commission;
- d. the Curtis Institute commemorates 1610 and 1618 Locust Street with a suitable exhibit that is prominently and perpetually displayed;
- e. the front facades 1610 and 1618 Locust Street are completely restored to their 1893 and 1888 appearances, respectively, including the arched, first-floor window; all masonry restoration in natural stone the front door with ornate grill at 1610; and the leaded glass transom in the first-floor bay at 1618; and
- f. the pinning of the front facades of 1610 and 1618 from the interior, not the exterior as proposed.

Ms. Merriman seconded the motion.

Mr. DeMarco stated that his clients agreed with most points of the Committee's recommendation. He noted that his memorandum of law, which he submitted during the in-concept review, makes the argument that the demolitions are necessary in the public interest. He asserted that the Curtis Institute has local, national, and international cultural importance. He requested that the Commission grant final approval for the project.

Mr. Wilds stated that, in his opinion, it was not necessary for the Commission to reconsider the demolition question. He opined that the Commission's discussion of the matter during the in-concept review was complete. He stated that he stood by the Commission's decision that the demolition was necessary in the public interest. He suggested that the Commission adopt its earlier finding and concentrate its review on the restoration details and new construction. He then observed that the application does not propose a full restoration of the façades of the historic buildings despite the Commission's in-concept decision. He suggested that the Commission should require a full restoration of the two historic facades as a condition of the demolition. Mr. DeMarco countered that the current application proposes a complete restoration.

Mr. Amburn stated that the Architectural Committee's recommendation was recorded incorrectly in the meeting minute. He noted that the recommendation stated that "masonry restoration" should be undertaken "in natural stone." It should instead state that all "masonry replacement," not "repair," should be undertaken in natural stone. He stated that the method proposed for the repair of stone with Jahn products was acceptable. Mr. Wilds agreed that the recommendation should be corrected as noted by Mr. Amburn.

Mr. Farnham suggested that Mr. Wilds and Ms. Merriman revise their motion to include an adoption of the Commission's earlier finding that the demolitions of all but the front facades of 1610 and 1618 Locust are necessary in the public interest. He observed that the Architectural Committee had not considered the demolition issue during its recent review of this proposal because the Commission had already approved the demolition in concept, placing it beyond the Committee's purview. Mr. Farnham remarked that the demolition is still within the Commission's purview. He explained that Mr. Reuter, the Commission's attorney, had counseled that the Commission must justify any final approval of the demolitions with a finding of hardship or public interest. Mr. Wilds and Ms. Merriman agreed that they would amend their motion to include an adoption of the in-concept finding that the demolition is necessary in the public interest.

Mr. Cohen, the architect, provided an overview of the design process and the reasons for the major design decisions. He stated that the Curtis selected the location because of its proximity to the existing Curtis buildings, Kimmel Center, and Academy of Music. The school plans to create a campus. Mr. Cohen used photographs to describe the context on Locust and Latimer Streets. He stated that the project will enliven Latimer Street. The project will include a drop off lane, new trees, and lighting along Latimer. Mr. Cohen explained that the dormitory would consist of four-person suites. The exterior cladding materials for the new building will be brownstone with sandstone and limestone to complement the neighborhood. He noted that the bay at the main entrance on Locust Street is a key element; it corresponds to the bays on 1610 and 1618 and to other buildings on the block.

Mr. Cohen turned to the rehabilitation of 1610. He stated that they are not proposing to restore the arched window at the first floor, which was enlarged and squared off when the building was converted for commercial use. He reported that new window in the existing first-floor, storefront opening would be a wood window with mullions based on the other windows in the building. The original window had stone mullions. Mr. Cohen explained that, if the original window opening

was restored, the sill would be about 6 feet above the finished floor level, which is unacceptable for the dining room proposed behind it. He also contended that the storefront opening was created in 1939 and therefore is historic itself.

Ms. Merriman asked how the window opening could be accurately replicated from a single photograph in which not every detail is discernable. Mr. Baron stated that the photograph shows a great deal of detail. He explained that missing details could be garnered from elsewhere on the building as well as from other buildings by the same architect. Mr. Sherman asked Mr. Cohen how he would restore the arched window. Mr. Cohen stated that the removal of existing good material would be necessary to weave the new into the old. Mr. Noble stated that the key consideration is to match the stone. They have been trying to find a source for the stone for several weeks and may be able to obtain a reddish material in England, not the U.S. He recommended using natural stone if a good match can be found, but was concerned that a match might be impossible.

Mr. Baron stated that, although some joints in the stone might be necessary, the window opening can be reconstructed in new natural stone. The front façade of the Reading Terminal Head House was reconstructed in new natural stone. The stone used in the reconstruction of the front steps at the Union League was a reddish pink stone, which Mr. Baron suggested might be an excellent match for this stone. Using a dye to tint a natural stone is also possible and is a common practice. Mr. Baron contended that the facades should be restored fully to offset the loss of the majorities of these buildings due to the demolitions. He asserted that this restoration should be comprehensive; the public will gain the restored facades to counterbalance its losses of the rears of the buildings. Mr. Cohen responded, saying the applicants are prepared to comply with almost all of the recommendations; for example, they will recreate the missing balustrade in natural materials if a match can be found. They will also restore the missing door and iron grill work. Mr. Noble stated that he intends to conserve as much of the existing historic material as possible, not replace it with new material. He asserted that Mr. Baron is, in fact, advocating for the removal of historic material; he countered that his approach will preserve as much historic material as possible.

Mr. Schaaf suggested that the mullions in the historic first-floor window may align with the mullions above. Mr. Cohen replied that it was difficult to determine the precise locations of the mullions from the historic photograph. Mr. Schaaf noted that the basement windows may provide clues.

Mr. Cohen stated that they were conducting some tests to determine if it would be possible to comply with the recommendation to pin the front facades together from the interior rather than the exterior. He was confident that they would be able to comply with the recommendation even though the work would be more difficult from the interior. Mr. Wilds responded that the applicants could seek relief from the Commission if they were unable to pin the facades from the interior. Mr. Cohen also stated that they would vent the interior storm windows to protect the historic windows. They would also be operable and have climate control.

Messrs. Cohen and DeMarco stated that they cannot comply with the first condition, which requires the issuance of the demolition and construction permits at the same time. They explained that, to meet their construction schedule, some portions of the buildings will need to be demolished before the construction drawings are ready for permitting. This demolition is related to the stabilization of the front facades of the historic buildings. They must be stabilized before any other work can take place. They requested that the Commission allow for selective demolition before the new construction permit is issued. Ms. Evans contended that the condition

could be satisfied even if a partial demolition permit was issued before the building permit. The applicants stated that the complete construction drawing package would not be ready for six months. If they wait six months to stabilize the front facades, the project will be delayed for an entire academic year.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance asserted that the most important aspect of this application is the claim that the demolition is necessary in public interest. He stated that it is rarely used as a justification for demolition. He reminded the Commission that the phrase "necessary in the public interest" is not defined in the ordinance. He warned the Commission that they should interpret that phrase with great care. He explained that the buildings proposed for demolition are viable, functional buildings without structural problems. He claimed that the interiors in 1610, although outside the Commission's jurisdiction, retain their characters. He claimed that the proposed demolitions are certainly demolitions in the eyes of the ordinance. Mr. Gallery noted that most of the Commissioners were not involved in the in-concept approval. He contended that they should consider for themselves the arguments for and against the claim that the demolitions are necessary in the public interest. He asked the new members of the Commission if they were willing to blindly adopt a decision made by Commissioners appointed by the "Street Administration." He suggested that the new Commissioners review the case and not simply accept a decision made by people associated with the "Street Administration." He asserted that this case promises to reinterpret the phrase "necessary in the public interest." He asked the Commissioners if they were certain that this is the only appropriate site for this project. He asked if providing private dormitory space for foreigners could possibly be necessary in the public interest of the people of Philadelphia.

Attorney Michael Fettner renewed his client's objections to the proposal, which have been enumerated in writing.

Mr. DeMarco explained that he was prepared to restate his argument that the demolitions were necessary in the public interest if the Commission desired. He asserted that his memorandum of law, which was submitted to the Commission with the in-concept application, fully articulated the claim that the demolitions are necessary in the public interest. He stated that he was incorporating all material submitted with the in-concept application into this final approval application. Ms. Warshawer echoed Mr. DeMarco and stated that she would happily restate their position on the demolitions. Mr. Farnham noted that the Commission had received as part of their material for today's discussion a 10-page summary of the earlier discussion of the demolition and public interest. He asserted that this document educated the new Commissioners on the issues raised by this case and allowed them to determine for themselves whether it was necessary to revisit the issue today. The Commission discussed whether to reopen the demolition justification matter, but decided that that was unnecessary because the earlier review had been very thorough and conclusive.

AMENDMENT OF MOTION: Amending their motion, Mr. Wilds and Ms. Merriman moved that the Historical Commission adopt its in-concept finding of November 2007 that the demolitions of all but the Locust Street facades of 1610 and 1618 Locust Street for the construction of the proposed Curtis Institute rehearsal and residential building are necessary in the public interest, pursuant to §14-2007(7)(j), and approve the application with the following conditions, with the staff to review all details:

- a. the complete demolition permit not issue until the new construction permit issues;
- b. the Curtis Institute provides binding assurances that the project will be completed;
- c. the Curtis Institute submits HABS-level photographs and measured drawings of the extant buildings at 1610 and 1618 Locust Street to the Commission;

- d. the Curtis Institute commemorates 1610 and 1618 Locust Street with a suitable exhibit that is prominently and perpetually displayed;
- e. the front facades 1610 and 1618 Locust Street are completely restored to their 1893 and 1888 appearances, respectively, including the arched, first-floor window; all masonry replacement in natural stone; the front door with ornate grill at 1610; and the leaded glass transom in the first-floor bay at 1618; and
- f. the pinning of the front facades of 1610 and 1618 from the interior, not the exterior as proposed.

ACTION: The Commission voted unanimously to adopt the amended motion proffered by Mr. Wilds and Ms. Merriman.

340 S. 24TH STREET

Owner: Edward and Bonnie Schmelz

Applicant: Charles Loomis

History: c. 1830, altered c. 1970, contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler District.

Project: Legalize windows, replace front door, construct deck.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the legalization of windows and the installation of the vinyl window above door; approval of front door, deck, synthetic slate roof, and operable painted wood shutters that fit the windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of six vinyl windows on the front façade of this building overlooking Fitler Square. In addition to the legalization, the applicant proposes to enlarge an opening above the entryway and install a vinyl double-hung window; to install a wood entry door; to install a synthetic slate roof over the entranceway; and to construct a roof deck with a metal guard rail. The deck would be visible from Fitler Square. The building had a roof deck in the same location as currently proposed; it was demolished illegally.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Property owner Bonnie Schmelz and architect Charles Loomis represented the application.

Mr. Loomis stated that his client accepts the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and would replace the illegal windows.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the legalization of windows and installation of the vinyl window above door; approve the front door, deck, synthetic slate roof, and operable painted wood shutters that fit the windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

500 WOODLAND TERRACE

Owner/Applicant: Kevin Takakuwa

History: c. 1850, architect Samuel Sloan; individually designated 1/22/1963

Project: In Concept – Install curb cut, driveway and parking lot.

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter the rear yard of this property for the installation of a driveway, and three (or four) parking spaces. The applicant claims in his cover letter that the property had a driveway and parking area on the proposed location at an unspecified date, which was later filled in. However, this claim is not substantiated with any evidence. The Historical Commission file does not contain any photographs of the property with a parking area. The proposed driveway would require a curb cut along Baltimore Avenue.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Property owner Kevin Takakuwa represented the application.

Mr. Takakuwa reported that he has expended considerable resources restoring this grand Italianate mansion, which had suffered while used as a fraternity house. He proposed a curb cut and driveway at the rear along Baltimore Avenue, a busy thoroughfare. He explained that the rear of his property abuts a property with an apartment building, which has a curb cut on Baltimore. He expounded, stating that he uses the entrance to his home that is at the rear, along Baltimore Avenue. He would like to retain the historic appearance of the front of the house, which faces Woodland Terrace, yet have the convenience of the parking. He noted that he has a hectic schedule and goes in and out day and night. Mr. Takakuwa claimed that the property once had a driveway at the rear. Mr. Wilds stated that he has lived in the neighborhood since 1973 and was unaware of the existence a driveway at this property in the past. Mr. Takakuwa replied that he believes that the driveway dated to the 1930s. Mr. Sherman suggested that Mr. Takakuwa investigate permit parking for the area. Mr. Wilds observed that a curb cut for this driveway would take away from the public, on-street parking and disrupt the streetscape. Mr. Takakuwa again noted the curb cut at the neighboring property; that driveway is used for Dumpsters. Mr. Thomas objected to the proposal and stated that the Baltimore Avenue façade is as important as the Woodland Terrace façade. Curb cuts are acceptable on alleys and side streets, but not major thoroughfares. Mr. Baron suggested that Mr. Takakuwa landscape the side and rear yards.

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

1221-1223 LOCUST STREET

Owner: Larry Krasner

Applicant: Jamie Wyper, architect

History: 1891, architects Furness Evans Company, altered for Princeton Club;
individually designated

Project: Renovate building, add deck and stair tower

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the renovation of this pair of mixed-use buildings bounded by Locust, Camac, and St. James Streets. The first floor will house a restaurant. The upper floors will include office and residential space. The rear or St. James Street façade of the building will be rehabilitated; a new door and windows will be installed. A stair tower will be extended on to the roof and a deck and HVAC units will be added. Most of the work is to a twentieth-century service wing addition to the original house and will be hidden or marginally visible from St. James Street.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Property owner Larry Krasner and architect Jamie Wyper represented the application.

The Commissioners discussed the project and agreed that it was appropriate.

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. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

325 S. 18TH STREET

Owner: Nguyen Jack Trung

Applicant: Yao Chang Huang, architect

History: c. 1850 with modifications c.1900; contributing to Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District

Project: renovations, addition of bays/decks, rehabilitate façade.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the front deck; approval of the remainder of the application, provided the building is re-roofed slate and the details of the doors, stairs, shutters, cornice and bay are corrected, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes renovations to a long vacant and decaying building at the corner of 18th and Delancey Streets. The Commission approved a renovation plan in 1996, which was begun, but abandoned before completion. This plan largely follows those approved plans, but deviates with a change to the size of the rear bay and the addition of another deck. The plans call for the replacement of the mansard roof, new brickwork on the side bay, and the construction of a bay on the rear. A new deck on the side bay would be accessed through a new door in a cut-down dormer. The plans lack details for the replacement of the cornice, doors, stairs, shutters, and wood paneling on the bays. The drawing shows the replacement of a front window as a single clear pane rather than the leaded glass that existed at the time of designation.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Property owner Jack Nguyen represented the application.

The applicant presented an updated proposal. Mr. Wilds asked the staff if it had had an opportunity to review the revisions. Mr. Baron stated that he had not; he added that the revised plans appear to have the same problems with the stairs, transom, and doors. Mr. Baron noted that this building has stood in an unfinished state for a long time. He encouraged the rehabilitation, but advocated for correcting the details.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance asked for the applicants to clarify whether the proposed bays are existing, recreations of historic bays, or entirely new. He suggested that some are not compatible with the historic building. Mr. Baron replied that the Commission has documentation showing the configurations of the historic bays. He stated that the proposed bays do not entirely reflect the historic bays.

Mr. Wilds suggested that the staff review the details of this project. If the staff and applicants cannot agree on the appropriate details, the applicants could submit a new application to the Commission seeking approval of those details upon which they could not agree.

Mr. Thomas asked whether the rear would be fenced or would be used for parking. Mr. Baron stated that a rear fence had been removed without the Commission's approval to allow for parking. However, the current application does not address the fence or the parking. He suggested that the applicant submit a additional application for later review by the Commission for the rear yard and any fencing or parking.

Charles G. Scott, a resident of 1700 Addison Street, recalled that the illegal rehabilitation of this building by a former owner was stopped by the Department of Licenses & Inspections in 1996. The property has sat unfinished since then. Mr. Nguyen, the property owner, assured Mr. Scott and the Commission that he intends to reside in this building and will work to maintain cordial relations with the neighbors.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the front deck, but approve of the remainder of the application, provided the building is re-roofed in slate and the details of the doors, stairs, shutters, cornice and bay are corrected, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9 and 10. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1520 RACE STREET

Owner: Friends Center Corporation

Applicant: Mark Ueland, architect

History: 1856, individually designated

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to add an entry vestibule to a connector that links the historic meeting house to a modern addition. The vestibule would enclose one window on the historic building. The applicant has shown two alternate designs. One is historicist, the other is in a more Modern style. The staff recommends Alternate B, the more modern of the two designs, because it better matches the character of the Modern building.

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

The Commissioners reviewed the application and agreed with the advisory committee's recommendation.

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

1442 LOMBARD STREET

Owner/Applicant: Jacqueline Roberts

History: c. 1840 as house with corner store

Individually designated 1968, contributing to Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District, 1995

Project: Legalize door and shutters

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the legalization of two doors and vinyl shutters on 16 windows. The staff met with the property owner and her representatives on several occasions to explain the Historical Commission's process and specify the appropriate doors and shutters. The owner did follow the process when she replaced her windows, but did not when she replaced her doors and shutters. The doors and shutters are not appropriate in materials or design.

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

The Commissioners reviewed the application and agreed with the advisory committee's recommendation.

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

1601 JOHN F. KENNEDY BOULEVARD

Owner: One Penn Associates, L.P.

Applicant: Michelle Kleschick

History: 1929, designated 6/14/2000

Project: Install ATM

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a bank drop box install an ATM in a storefront along John F. Kennedy Boulevard. The drop box will be removed from the side window of the vestibule and replaced by glass applied with black-out film on the inside. The ATM would be surrounded by an aluminum panel.

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

Mr. Wilds asked how the proposed ATM would differ from the extant drop box. Mr. Sherman responded that the drop box was bronze; the ATM would have signage and lighting. Mr. Baron explained that the Commission typically requires that ATMs be located in the interiors of historic buildings. Ms. Merriman objected to the blackout film on the glass. She noted that this building has lost much of its transparent glass. Mr. Thomas objected to this ATM, which he believes would significantly change the appearance of the building.

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

1201-1209 N. 2ND STREET

Owner: 2nd and Girard Company, LLC

Applicant: Barry Kaplan

History: 1871; designated 5/9/2001

Project: Install signage and drive-through canopy

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a blue, metal, internally-illuminated, projecting sign with cut-out, push-through, white letters. The sign would be mounted to the brick at the second-story level of the Girard Street façade. This application also proposes to construct a single lane drive-up teller canopy with accessory signage. The canopy would be finished in a grey-beige, sand-finish stucco. Two of the canopy signs would be directional while a third sign would be a flat version of the sign proposed for the bank building. The third sign would be face mounted to the canopy.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architect Barry Kaplan, attorney Darwin Beauvais, and bank president Joe Matisoff represented the application.

Mr. Matisoff explained that the bank had invested \$2.1 million in restoring the building.

Mr. Beauvais stated that he was confused by the recording of the Committee's vote on the canopy in the meeting minute. He claimed that four Committee members had not opposed the drive-in canopy. Mr. Amburn, the chair of the Architectural Committee, clarified that the Committee's vote to recommend denial was unanimous. The Committee felt that the size and location of the signage on the canopy were inappropriate. He noted, however, that the Committee was not opposed to the concept of a drive-in teller at the proposed location. The recommendation of denial resulted from the details, not the concept.

Mr. Beauvais turned to the sign on the bank building. He asserted that the sign would have very little impact on the building itself. He stated that Girard Avenue is a wide, busy corridor and the bank needs to be able to establish a presence on it. He remarked that it was not feasible to move the sign to 2nd Street, as some had suggested. The traffic is on Girard. He also argued that the size of the sign could not be reduced any more than it already had. If it were any smaller, it would be blocked by trees. Regarding the canopy, he noted that it is detached from the historic building and therefore needs signage including traffic control signage.

Mr. Wilds commended the restoration of the bank building. He asked if the applicants had prepared revised designs for the drive-in teller in response to the Committee's concerns. Mr.

Amburn added that the objection to the canopy related to the amount and size of the signage and the bulk of the canopy, which could be much lighter. Mr. Kaplan replied that the canopy is steel and a synthetic stucco matching the color of the building, with a sandstone and granite beige finish. He stated that he is willing to reduce the size of the canopy. He noted that it is supported by only two columns, not the usual four. Mr. Beauvais contended that the Committee did not provide adequate guidance for revisions. Mr. Kaplan then introduced a revised design that had not been reviewed by the Committee or staff. Mr. Wilds reaction stated that it was not possible for the Commission to review the revisions without the guidance of the Architectural Committee. He suggested that the applicants submitted the revised design for a subsequent review cycle.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the projecting sign, with the staff to review the attachment details, but to deny the drive-up teller canopy, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Evans seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1401 ARCH STREET

Owner: AFIAA U.S. Investments

Applicant: Karen Loveland

History: 1897-99, added to in 1926; by 1917 storefronts altered from arched to square-head
Individually designated 6/24/1987

Project: Install entrance

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes two options to convert a window bay into an entrance on the Broad Street façade of the former UGI building. The new entrance would allow direct access to a retail space. Option 1A proposes cutting down the widow and installing a storefront system with double glass doors at the street level. Option 1B proposes a set of stone stairs on the exterior that match the existing stone façade with brass hand rails and a new brass storefront system with double glass doors.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architect Karen Loveland and owner's representative Chris Duisberg represented the application.

Mr. Danta introduced the written request to amend the application from an application for final approval to one in concept.

Ms. Loveland stated that the property owner has been unable to lease this retail space because there is no direct access to it from the street. The retail space has been vacant for two years. Mr. Sherman questioned the need for direct street access to the space. He stated that the retail space can be accessed through the lobby currently. Ms. Loveland replied that consumers demand quick and easy access from the street. Mr. Duisberg added that potential tenants have indicated a reluctance to share the lobby with McDonald's, which occupies another retail space in this building.

Mr. Amburn noted that the Architectural Committee was opposed to any exterior stair. He stated that he preferred Option 3, which locates the entrance in the northern bay and places the steps in the interior. Mr. Wilds noted that he had voted against the similar alteration for the Starbuck's in the Wanamaker Building. Mr. Duisberg stated that they are hoping to locate a LaColumbe café in this space. Mr. Sherman noted that this alteration would be easily reversed.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve in concept Option 3, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

14 KELLY DRIVE (BOATHOUSE ROW) , PHILADELPHIA GIRLS' ROWING CLUB

Owner: Philadelphia Girls' Rowing Club

Applicant: Judith Repp, AIA

History: 1861; Individually designated 1/5/1984

Project: In-Concept – Install stair to deck

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a stair from a non-historic wood deck leading down to the river's edge. Currently, there is a stair inside the building. However, the applicant seeks additional space and a code-compliant means of egress. The stair would be visible from the river, but only minimally visible from Kelly Drive.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Club president Sophie Socha and architect Helen Fine represented the application.

The Commissioners reviewed the proposal and determined that it was appropriate from a historic preservation perspective.

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

2523 S. 20TH STREET

Owner: Michael and Lisa Grasso

Applicant: Michael Grasso

History: 1910; contributing to Girard Estate Historic District, 11/10/99

Project: Legalize windows and door

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of eight-over-eight, simulated-divided-light, clad windows, a twenty-light door on the second story, and the panning of brick molds. The April 2000 designation photograph shows one-over-one windows, gated second-story door, and exposed brick molds.

The appropriate windows are eight-over-eight, wood, true-divided-light sash on the first and second stories and a six-over-six, wood, true-divided-light sash flanked by four-over-four, wood, true-divided-light sash windows in the dormer. The brick molds should be exposed. The appropriate second-story door is a wood, double-leaf French door with ten lights per leaf.

The applicant contacted a staff member in September 2006. The staff member advised the applicant on the appropriate windows and Historical Commission procedure, provided a historic photograph of the building, and documented the communication.

In November 2007, a staff member observed that inappropriate changes had been made to the property without the Commission's approval or a building permit and violations were subsequently issued.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Property owner Michael Grasso represented the application.

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

Mr. Grasso stated that he had met with the staff before proceeding with his project. He thought that he could replace the windows without a review if the new windows matched the historic windows. His father-in-law, a retired contractor, replaced the windows without the Commission's approval or a building permit. He thought that he was complying with the law because the new windows were similar to the historic windows. Mr. Grasso explained that the new windows are Pella windows and as expensive as wood replacement windows. Mr. Wilds asked if the window frames were covered with capping. Mr. Grasso stated that he did not know.

Mr. Baron suggested a compromise. He proposed that the Commission legalize all of the windows at the side and rear if the capping is removed and appropriate windows are installed in the front façade. Mr. Baron noted that Pella replacement sash require subframes, which are very inappropriate from an historic preservation perspective. He also noted that Pella does not make a true-divided-light window, which the Commission typically requires. He stated that this was a very generous compromise. Mr. Sherman agreed. Ms. Merriman objected to the legalization of the door. Mr. Wilds asked if work continued after the applicant received the violation. Mr. Grasso stated that it did not. He noted that the French door at the second floor has not yet been painted. Mr. Sherman stated that he considered the Pella dormer window acceptable because of its height above the sidewalk. Mr. Grasso stated that his neighbors have complimented him on the windows.

ACTION: Mr. Sherman moved to legalize the windows, French door, and capping, provided the capping is removed and the windows are replaced with the appropriate, wood, true-divided-light windows at all three floors on the front façade, pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 5 to 4. Commissioners Amburn, Benoliel, Evans, and Merriman dissented.

304 RACE STREET

Owner: Hanlan Midgett Scriven, L.P.

Applicant: Sherry Yang

History: 1925

Individual designated, 6/5/1980; contributing to Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Legalize signage

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of an internally-illuminated, plastic, box sign and vinyl banner sign bolted to the façade of this building. The February 2004 designation photograph shows a small projecting banner sign. The current signs were installed after designation without the Commission's approval or a building permit.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Property owner Keith Scriven represented the application.

Mr. Scriven explained that he had paid \$700 to a Sherry Yang, an expeditor, to obtain permits for the sign. He later discovered that no permits had been issued. He offered an apology, expressing his embarrassment about the situation. He objected Richard Thom's portrayal of the sign an "albatross" and asked for the Commission's guidance in rectifying the matter. He acknowledged that his complaint is with the expeditor.

Mr. Wilds stated that an internally illuminated sign is not appropriate for the historic district and suggested that he confer with the staff about more appropriate signage. Mr. Schaaf suggested that the applicant check the zoning regulations regarding signage.

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

1803-05, 1807, AND 1809 SPRING GARDEN STREET

Owner: Metropolitan Regional Council of Carpenters

Applicant: Robert Fitzpatrick

History: 1966; Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000, non-contributing.

Project: Reconstruct façade

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reconstruct the front facades of the buildings on the 1800 block of Spring Garden Street. The project proposes to join 1803-09 Spring Garden Street with neighboring 1811-13 Spring Garden Street by constructing a curtain wall over the alley between the two sets of buildings and stretch the 1925 Art Deco façade of 1811-13 Spring Garden Street over the facades of 1803-09 Spring Garden Street. Materials, dimensions, and shop drawings have not been submitted for review.

1811-13 Spring Garden Street was originally constructed in 1875 and received its Art Deco façade in 1925. It is designated as contributing within the Spring Garden Historic District. 1803-09 Spring Garden Street were constructed in 1966 of brick and stucco and are designated as non-contributing within the district. The Historical Commission reviews non-contributing buildings to ensure there is no detriment to the historic district rather than the non-contributing buildings themselves.

The building at 1811-13 Spring Garden Street was constructed much earlier and independent of its neighboring buildings at 1803-09 Spring Garden Street. To stretch the historic façade over four additional buildings creates a false history, destroys the spatial relationships of the existing structures, and is adverse to the historic significance and integrity of the contributing building.

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

Ms. Sell explained that she had received a telephone call from the applicant, who stated that he intended to withdraw the application. He was told that he would need to submit his withdrawal request in writing. At the start of the meeting, no request had been received.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, and 9. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

100 LOMBARD STREET

Owner / Applicant: Anh Thai & Peter Knight

History: c. 1970, contributing to the Society Hill Historic District

Project: Install front door

HISTORICAL COMMISSION ACTION: The Commission tabled the application to its 8 August 2008 meeting.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a front door in an original open vestibule. Most of the buildings in the row have security gates. The applicant originally proposed to remove his existing security gate and install a solid wood door with three glazed porthole windows at the plane of the security gate, not the plane of the original door. The Commission reviewed that proposal at its July 2008 meeting and suggested to the applicant that he revise the design of the door; the Commission tabled the application for one month to allow him an opportunity to develop and document a new design. The applicant has prepared a new door design, which follows the Commission's suggestions and is more appropriate for the building.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Committee. Property owner Peter Knight represented the application.

Mr. Wilds asked the applicant to compare the latest design with the earlier, rejected designs. Mr. Knight stated that the Commission had rejected the door design with three port holes because it was not compatible with the architecture of the building. Since that rejection, he has redesigned the door. The door design proposes a glazed door with three rectangular lights. Mr. Wilds suggested that a single-light door, rather than a three-light door, would be more appropriate. The applicant opined that a single-light door would be too plain. Mr. Schaaf asked if the applicant had concerns about privacy with the glazed door. Mr. Knight replied that the door would be glazed with an obscured glass to allow light in but guarantee privacy. Mr. Thomas stated the windows in the townhouse are vertical; the door should have a vertical orientation to it as well. He objected to the obscured glass. Mr. Knight stated his preference for three panes, not one expensive pane. Mr. Knight agreed to remove the muntins.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the door, provided the glass is a single pane, not divided. Mr. Amburn seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

713 WALNUT STREET

Owner: Barbara Caine

Applicant: Daniel Promislo

History: 1799-1801 by Benjamin Latrobe; individually designated 4/30/1957; significant to the Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Legalize signage

HISTORICAL COMMISSION ACTION: The Commission tabled the application for a period not to exceed six months to provide an opportunity for the property owner and tenant to reach a compromise.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of an aluminum awning with signage on the front façade. The awning covers the original historic fanlight and door moldings. This application also proposes to legalize a temporary hanging sign on the first-story façade, a wooden box addition with five metal figurines on an existing brick planter, and a circular light fixture mounted adjacent to the doorway. This application proposes the installation of a flat aluminum sign to be mounted between the first-story windows and new metal street address numbers mounted to the masonry.

The Commission reviewed this application at its February 2008 meeting. At that meeting, the property owner claimed that she had not authorized the tenant, who runs a business on the first floor, to submit the application. The Commission tabled the application for a period not to exceed six months to provide an opportunity for the property owner and tenant to reach a compromise. The six-month tabling period is expiring and the Commission must act on the application.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Property owner Barbara Caine attended the meeting. The applicant did not.

Ms. Sell explained that the owner of the property and the applicant, who is a tenant, had not reached an agreement. Mr. Reuter recommended that the Commission deny the application because the applicant does not have an authorization from the property owner. Ms. Caine stated that the tenant has refused to compromise. Mr. Wilds noted that the Commission cannot review a building permit application without an authorization from the owner. Mr. Schaaf noted that the C-5 zoning classification for this property does not allow projecting signs.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Upon a motion proffered by Ms. Merriman and seconded by Mr. Schaaf, the Commission unanimously voted to adjourn at 1:15 p.m.

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 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

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.

Site Guideline: Recommended: Designing new onsite parking, loading docks, or ramps when required by the new use so that they are as unobtrusive as possible and assure the preservation of the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape.

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