

**THE MINUTES OF THE 613TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 13 SEPTEMBER 2013
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman Jr., Chair
Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D.
Anuj Gupta, Esq.
Joann Jones, Esq., Office of Housing & Community Development
Rosalie Leonard, Esq., Office of City Council President
Michael Maenner, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Joseph Palantino, Department of Public Property
R. David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Betty Turner, M.A.

Jonathan E. Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Erin Coté, Historic Preservation Planner II

ALSO PRESENT

Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance
Robert Powers, Powers & Co.
Kevin McMahon, Powers & Co.
Leo Addimando, Alterra Properties
Sergio Coscia, Coscia Moos Architecture
Joe Schiavo
Jerald Goodman, Esq., Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP
Brendon Ardietta, Esq., Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP
Gerald Kitzhoffer, Overbrook School for the Blind
Joseph Van Bernum, Overbrook School for the Blind
Dan Jalboot, Daley & Jalboot Architects
Mort Isaacson, Daley & Jalboot Architects
Jeff Hawver, Studio Agoos Lovera
Michael Koep, Greythorne Development
Michael Pentz, Seiler & Drury Architects
John McDevitt, Please Touch Museum
Teresa Isabella
Joel Frisch
Rebecca Vieyra
Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Christopher Mote, Hidden City Daily

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Dilworth, Gupta, Jones, Leonard, Maenner, Merriman, Palantino, Schaaf, and Turner joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 612TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the minutes of the 612th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 9 August 2013. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 AUGUST 2013

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included four applications: 247-259 Market Street and 3-05 N. 03rd Street; the stained glass application for 1903 Spring Garden Street; 6002 and 6008 Wayne Avenue; and 4231 Avenue of the Republic, Memorial Hall. Mr. Sherman asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. No Commissioners offered comments. Mr. Sherman asked if the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments.

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for 247-259 Market Street and 3-05 N 03rd Street; the stained glass application for 1903 Spring Garden Street; 6002 And 6008 Wayne Avenue; and 4231 Avenue of the Republic, Memorial Hall. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 247, 249, 251, 253, 255, 257, 259 MARKET ST, 3-05 N 03RD ST

Project: Renovate, reconstruct, demolish, and construct buildings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Marvin D. Ginsberg; David L. Pransky; Faye Carol Lingerie, Inc.; 247MGATE LLC

Applicant: Adam Jeckel, Coscia Moos Architecture, LLC

History: see staff overview

Individual Designation: see staff overview

District Designation: see staff overview

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided

1. existing storefront elements are preserved and reused where possible;
 2. the paint is removed from the brick front facades of 251, 253, 255, and 257 Market and the facades are restored in consultation with the staff;
 3. the façade of the new building facing Church Street is not set back from the sidewalk line, but is shifted to the plane of the first floor;
 4. the revised signage presented at the meeting is coordinated with the restoration and reconstruction of the entablature and/or storefront cornice;
 5. the facades of the new buildings are clad in brick or a three-part true stucco system rather than EFIS, fiberboard, or other alternative; and,
 6. the design of the façade of the new building at 3-05 N. 3rd Street, especially the fenestration, is revised to be more compatible with the historic district;
- with the staff to review details, pursuant to Rehabilitation Standards 6, 9, and 10 and the Reconstruction Standards.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate, construct, reconstruct, and consolidate a series of buildings at the northeast corner of 3rd and Markets Streets for a mixed-use commercial and residential development. These buildings, commonly known as the Shirt Corner, have been vacant for several years and are in poor condition, but are very important elements of the streetscape in this area.

The construction dates and designation histories of the various buildings included in this site are summarized below:

- 247 Market Street: mid twentieth century at front and c. 1830 at rear; Non-Contributing in Old City Historic District, 2003
- 249 Market Street: mid twentieth century; Non-Contributing in Old City Historic District, 2003
- 251 Market Street: c. 1830; individually designated, 1976, Contributing to Old City Historic District, 2003
- 253 Market Street: c. 1830; individually designated, 1976, Contributing to Old City Historic District, 2003
- 255 Market Street: c. 1830; individually designated, 1976, Contributing to Old City Historic District, 2003
- 257 Market Street: c. 1830; individually designated, 1976, Contributing to Old City Historic District, 2003
- 259 Market Street: c. 1830, Contributing to Old City Historic District, 2003
- 3-05 N. 3rd Street: c. 1915; Non-Contributing in Old City Historic District, 2003

The two-story building at 259 Market Street, at the corner, would be reconstructed in its historic four-story form using evidence from an historic photograph and a commercial panorama of N. 3rd Street. Historic fabric from the existing building such as lintels would be salvaged wherever possible. The buildings at 251, 253, 255, and 257 Market Street would be restored. The three Non-contributing buildings would be demolished and new buildings constructed in their places. All buildings would be connected internally. A single large commercial space would occupy the entire first floor of the complex and would be entered at the corner of 3rd and Market. The upper floors would house residential units. The lobby for the residential units would be located on 3rd Street. The new buildings at 247 and 249 Market Street would be four stories in height, faced in red brick on Market Street and stucco on Church Street, and fenestrated with punched vertical openings. Above the first floor, the facade of the new building on Church Street would be set back from the sidewalk and include projecting balconies. In general, the elimination of the blighted condition and the restoration of the historic buildings would bring great benefits to Market Street, Old City, and Philadelphia generally.

ACTION: See the Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 6333 MALVERN AVE

Project: Remove/demolish pool wing

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Overbrook School for the Blind

Applicant: Joseph Van Bernum, Overbrook School for the Blind

History: 1900; PA Institute for the Instruction of the Blind; Cope & Stewardson, architects

Individual Designation: 5/26/1970

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend that the Commission find that the removal of the pool wing is a demolition and remand the application to the Committee on Financial Hardship.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove or demolish a wing of a building that houses a swimming pool at the Overbrook School for the Blind. The application “seeks the issuance of the permit based upon the financial hardship imposed upon the School by the prohibitive cost of maintaining this unsafe and obsolete structure for which the School has no viable use.”

The architectural firm of Cope & Stewardson designed and constructed the original campus for the school between 1897 and 1900. The pool wing was not part of the original design, but was added by Cope & Stewardson in 1906 and 1907. The pool wing extends off a rear wing of the original school complex. The pool wing faces a service alley at the rear of the campus, away from Malvern Street, Wynnewood Road, and N. 64th Street, which bound the campus. The pool wing is not visible from the public right-of-way.

The designation date of the Overbrook School for the Blind is unknown, but it was entered on the Philadelphia Register on 26 May 1970. At that time, the Historical Commission confirmed the designations of several “major 19th century buildings certified by the Philadelphia Historical Commission several years ago but not put on its list at that time.” Among those “major 19th century buildings” was the “Pennsylvania Institute for Instruction of the Blind, 64th and Malvern.” The designation predates the Commission’s use of nomination forms. Therefore, the various

buildings on the school's campus were not inventoried or graded as to significance at that time. Nothing in the Commission's record indicates the Commission's appraisal of the architectural or historical significance of this wing.

In May 2007, the Historical Commission approved a new aquatic center on the campus, which replaced the pool in question. The older pool is no longer used. The plan to demolish the pool wing was noted at the time of the review of the new aquatic center, but not officially proposed as part of the application. In September 2012, the Historical Commission considered and denied an application proposing to remove the pool wing, determining that it was incomplete. The current application expands on the application deemed incomplete in 2012. It argues that the retention and reuse of the pool wing would impose "a significant financial burden" on the school. It claims that the pool wing suffers from "numerous structural deficiencies" that would be "prohibitively expensive and exceptionally difficult to remediate." It concludes that "the cost of repairing and maintaining the former pool building" would "financially burden the School by diverting funds required to advance the educational mission of the School to the maintenance of an obsolete, unsafe, and unused facility."

To support its claims, the application includes the documents required of a financial hardship application for a non-profit institution as well as an engineer's report on the condition of the pool wing and a proposal to repair the wall of the adjacent building where the pool wing would be removed. Additional information submitted with the first application supplements the current application.

Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance authorizes the Commission to approve demolitions only in two instances, when the issuance of the permit is necessary in the public interest and when the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted (hardship). When reviewing this application, the Commission must first determine whether the removal of the pool wing constitutes a demolition. Not all removals are demolitions in the legal sense. Some removals may be reviewed as alterations, precluding the need for a public interest or hardship analysis. Section 14-205(88) defines demolition as:

The razing or destruction, whether entirely or in significant part, of a building, structure, site, or object. Demolition includes the removal of a building, structure, site, or object from its site or the removal or destruction of the façade or surface.

In this case, the "building" in question is the Overbrook School for the Blind. Therefore, the proposed removal is not a complete demolition. In this case, the Commission must determine whether the razing of the pool wing constitutes a demolition "in significant part" of the designated resource, the school. Rehabilitation Standard 2 can provide guidance in determining whether the loss of the pool wing would constitute a demolition "in significant part." It reads:

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.

A demolition in significant part can be defined as a partial demolition that results in the loss of the "historic character" of the property, i.e. the removal or inappropriate alteration of those attributes that engender the property with historical importance. Does the pool wing "characterize" the property? Is the retention of the pool wing essential to the preservation of the "historic character" of the resource? Are the materials that make up the pool wing "distinct"? The materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize the property as a whole would include the Spanish Colonial architectural style, stucco, red tile, cloister plan, dome,

towers, arched openings, perimeter wall, and lawns. In that the Commission is charged with protecting historic resources for the public, public accessibility must factor into any identification of “significant part” and distinct, character-defining features. Visibility from the public right-of-way is not the sole determining factor, but it is a factor.

If the Commission determines that the razing of the pool wing is a “demolition” in the legal sense, then it may only approve the application after finding that the issuance of the permit is necessary in the public interest or that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may reasonably be adapted. The application does not explicitly contend that the demolition of the pool wing is necessary in the public interest. The application does contend that the pool wing cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted or, in other words, the required retention of the pool wing would result in a hardship to the school.

Upon receipt of financial hardship applications proposing complete demolition, the staff typically forwards them to the Architectural Committee and Committee on Financial Hardship before presenting them and the resulting recommendations to the Commission for action. However, in this case of partial demolition, owing to the open demolition vs. alteration question, the staff is forwarding this application to the Architectural Committee and Commission as though it proposes an alteration. If the Commission disagrees and finds that the removal of the pool is a demolition, not an alteration, it can remand the application to the Architectural Committee and Committee on Financial Hardship for review under the hardship provisions. If the Commission agrees that the removal of the pool is an alteration yet denies the application, it should then remand the application to the Architectural Committee and Committee on Financial Hardship for review under the hardship provisions.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Joseph Van Bernum of the Overbrook School for the Blind, architect Dan Jalboot, and attorney Jerald Goodman represented the application.

Mr. Goodman asserted that the proposed removal of the pool wing would not constitute a demolition in significant part. He reported that it is a later addition to the historic school building and comprises only 3% of the total area of the school building. He stated that it is at the rear of the facility and not visible from any public right-of-way. He stated that the pool wing is located among the school’s service buildings at the rear of the property along an alley. He noted that there is a tall wall on the other side of the alley. He reported that the pool wing is not original to the building and has been altered since it was constructed. For example, the tile roof was removed and replaced. The wing’s integrity has been compromised. He stated that the pool has not been used since 2008, when the school’s new aquatic center opened. He stated that the pool is obsolete and unsafe. He reported that the school has studied alternative uses for the building, but has not identified any feasible reuses. The school explored converting it to a greenhouse, but found that it would be prohibitively expensive. He stated that the structure of the building has been significantly compromised because of the many years of very high humidity. He stated that the school has agreed to undertake the mitigation measures suggested by the staff.

Ms. Merriman stated that she agreed with the assertion that the removal of the pool wing would constitute an alteration, not a demolition, in the legal sense. Mr. Schaaf asked the applicants to confirm that they were prepared to undertake the suggested mitigation. Mr. Goodman confirmed that they were willing to undertake it.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to find that the removal of the pool wing is an alteration as defined in Section 14-203(15) of the Philadelphia Code, not a demolition as defined in Section 14-203(88), and approve the removal, pursuant to Standard 2, provided the following documents are submitted as mitigation to the Historical Commission within one year of the Commission's action:

1. a recordation report with photographs and/or measured drawings documenting the history and features of the pool wing, and
2. an inventory of all buildings on the campus, keyed to a map, with photographs and information including dates of construction and alteration, architect, original and current uses, and a physical description to assist with the review of future applications for the historic resource.

Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1903 SPRING GARDEN ST

Project: Legalize removal of eight stained-glass windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Greythorne Development

Applicant: Louis D'Addezio, Archdiocese of Philadelphia

History: 1873, Hogg Residence; converted to La Milagrosa Chapel, 1912

Individual Designation: 11/6/1975

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR STAINED-GLASS WINDOW APPLICATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend legalization of the removal of the stained-glass windows, provided the historically-appropriate windows are installed within one year, with the staff to review details.

ADDRESS: 1903 SPRING GARDEN ST

Project: Renovate building, remove and construct rear additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Greythorne Development

Applicant: Mike Koep, Greythorne Development

History: 1873, Hogg Residence; converted to La Milagrosa Chapel, 1912

Individual Designation: 11/6/1975

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR REHABILITATION APPLICATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the restoration at the front façade, with the staff to review details; and denial of the alterations at the rear, owing to incompleteness.

OVERVIEW: These applications propose the conversion of a rowhouse used as a church to a multi-family dwelling. The building was constructed as part of a row of three grand houses at the northwest corner of 19th and Spring Garden Streets about 1873. The Hogg family, wealthy proprietors of carpet mills in Philadelphia and elsewhere, owned the property from the 1870s until 1912, when they sold it to a Spanish Vincentian order. The religious order converted the house to Capilla Catolica Hispana de la Medalla Milagrosa or Our Lady of the Miraculous Medal and held Spanish-language Catholic services at the chapel until recently. The Spanish order

closed the chapel in June 2013 and has sold it to developer, who is proposing to convert the building back to residential use.

The Commission individually designated the property at 1903 Spring Garden Street at its November 1975 meeting. The Commission did not single out 1903 Spring Garden for designation at that meeting, but individually designated all properties on the 1900-blocks of Wallace, Mt. Vernon, and Brandywine Streets and the north side of the 1900-block of Spring Garden Street as part of an ongoing project to create a de facto historic district in the Spring Garden neighborhood. The property was later included in the Spring Garden Historic District, which the Commission designated in October 2000, and was classified as Significant. The related rowhouses to the east and west are also classified as Significant. The inventory notes its original construction date (c. 1875), but makes no mention of the conversion of the house to a chapel.

The first of the two applications proposes to legalize the removal of eight stained-glass windows. The Archdiocese of Philadelphia submitted the application, but does not own the property, and is acting on behalf of the Spanish order, the property owner. Five of the stained-glass windows were located in first-floor openings in the Spring Garden façade; three others were located at the rear. The windows bear the signature of the artist Ellwood Potts and the date 1934. The Spring Garden Historic District inventory entry for the property does not mention La Milagrosa Chapel or any of the alterations undertaken to convert the house to a chapel in 1912. It describes the first-floor, front, stained-glass windows as “replacement steel sash 3-light windows” without mentioning the stained glass. The rear façade is not described in the inventory. The period of significance for the district is 1850 to 1930, which includes the conversion to the chapel in 1912, but not the stained-glass windows, which date to 1934.

The second of the two applications, from the developer, proposes converting the building for multi-family residential use. The front or Spring Garden Street façade would be restored to its 1870s appearance. At the front façade, the windows would be replaced with wood windows appropriate for the original building. The masonry would be pointed and cleaned. The slate mansard roof would be repaired. The cornice and other trim would be repaired and painted. A non-historic canopy would be removed. A basement window that was converted to a door would be converted back to a window. At the rear, part of a 1952 rear chapel addition would be removed and two additions would be constructed and clad in stucco. Two decks would be added. Parking spaces would be added. The rear of the building faces a service alley.

Rehabilitation Standard 4 mandates that “Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.” The Commission must decide whether the stained-glass windows and the chapel addition at the rear “have acquired historic significance in their own right.” The preponderance of the evidence seems to indicate that they have not acquired their own significance. The rowhouse was individually designated, apparently for its streetscape value as part of a de facto district, seemingly not because it was a chapel. When the rowhouse was included in the Spring Garden Historic District in 2000, neither the use as a chapel nor the exterior manifestations of the chapel was mentioned in the inventory. The conversion to a chapel in 1912, the stained-glass windows, the religious sculpture in the second-floor niche, and the rear chapel addition were not mentioned in the inventory. The rowhouse was converted to a chapel in 1912, during the period of significance of the historic district. However, the surviving exterior elements of the conversion date to 1934 and 1952, after the period of significance of the district. Nothing in the Commission’s record for this property

indicates that it was designated to preserve its appearance as a chapel. The record appears to indicate that the Commission identified it for preservation as an Italianate rowhouse.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the applications to the Commission. Architect Jeff Hawver, developer Michael Koep, and preservation consultant Bob Powers represented the rehabilitation application.

Mr. Schaaf asked the staff to point out the rear addition that would be removed. Mr. Farnham displayed several images of the building, front and rear, and noted that the rear addition was constructed in 1952, more than two decades after the end of the historic district's period of significance, which runs to 1930.

Mr. Farnham noted that the applicants supplemented the application after the Architectural Committee meeting because some Committee members were concerned that the initial submission lacked some details. He explained that both the initial and supplemental drawings were provided to the Commissioners in their meeting materials packets. Mr. Sherman asked Mr. Farnham if the supplemental drawings address the concerns of the Committee. Mr. Farnham stated that he believes that the supplemental drawings provide the details sought by the Committee. Mr. Sherman asked the applicants if the parking would be gated or otherwise screened from the alley or open to the alley. Mr. Koep responded that the parking area would be open to the alley because the alley is too narrow for a gate. Ms. Merriman asked about the number of residential units in the rehabilitated building. Mr. Koep responded that it would house seven units.

ACTION: On the stained glass application, see the Consent Agenda.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to approve the supplemented rehabilitation application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 13 September 2013, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 4, 6, and 9. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 6002 AND 6008 WAYNE AVE

Project: Renovate former church complex for school

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 6008 Development Associates, LLC

Applicant: Leslie Greene, McCoubrey/Overholser, Inc.

History: 1873; St. Peter's Episcopal Church and Rectory; G.W. Hewitt of Furness & Hewitt, architect

Individual Designation: 11/30/1965

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided:

1. a mock up of the installed Ludovici tile is reviewed for approval by the staff;
 2. the handrail within the loggia is held back from the arched openings;
 3. the color of the asphalt shingle roof on the chapel matches the color of the tile on the church;
 4. the ramp at the rectory is a composite material to match the color of the wood porch and has a simplified metal railing; and,
 5. the proposed stair and ramp combination at the south entrance of the rectory is changed to a ramp alone with a simplified railing;
- with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate the former Saint Peter's Episcopal Church complex into a campus for the Waldorf School of Philadelphia. The church complex has been vacant for several years. The school purchased the property in June 2013. The complex is made of four buildings, a church, parish house, chapel and rectory. The current application proposes minor alterations to the exterior of all four buildings, most of which is restoration work and can be approved at the staff level. Most of the exterior work would involve reroofing, repairs, and provisions for accessibility. The restoration work includes masonry cleaning and repointing, window replacement, carpentry restoration, roofing restoration and repairs. Other minor alterations include the installation of a steel basement hatch. All of this work can be reviewed by the staff during the final administrative review for building permits. The Commission, however, must consider the following alterations, which exceed the staff's authority to approve:

CHURCH

- Remove existing stairs on west elevation and replace with new stairs and ADA ramp.
- Remove slate roof and replace with Ludovici tiles to match the color, texture, and pattern of the original slate roof. The installation of the Ludovici tiles would extend to the port cochere that connects the church building to the chapel.

PARISH HOUSE

- Remove non-original wood ramp and stairs and replace with concrete ramp, stairs, and landing with metal handrails on north elevation.
- Install fire-escape stair on south elevation. This would require converting an existing third-floor window into a door. This location would minimize the impact on the historic building and would not be visible from the primary public areas of the campus.

CHAPEL

- Install stairs on west elevation.

- Remove stairs on east elevation and replace with concrete ADA ramp.
- Remove stairs in covered walkway and replace with concrete stairs.
- Remove slate roof and replace with GAF slate-line asphalt shingles.

RECTORY

- Install wood ADA ramp and stair on north elevation.
- Install wood platform on south side and replace stairs on north side of building.

ACTION: See the Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 4231 AVENUE OF THE REPUBLIC, MEMORIAL HALL

Project: Install waterproofing to dome

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia/Please Touch Museum

Applicant: Philip Scott, KSK Architects Planners

History: 1876; Memorial Hall; Herman Schwartzmann, architect

Individual Designation: 7/6/1978

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the color is amended to better replicate a copper patina, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: The Historical Commission reviewed and approved an application in-concept to install a non-reversible coating on the outer dome of Memorial Hall in Fairmount Park in December 2012. The outer dome has been experiencing water infiltration for years. The inner dome was temporarily wrapped during the rehabilitation of the building for Please Touch Museum in 2004. That intervention was a temporary solution, which protected the interior plaster finishes from further water-related damage. The current proposal is a long-term solution. The proposed material would be applied to the exterior of the outer dome. The material, known in the trade as Decothane, is a translucent mesh-reinforced epoxy. It can be tinted to match any substrate. The applicant has installed sampled on the building using one of the company's standard colors. The sample was reviewed by the Historical Commission and Parks & Recreation staff, who determined that the sample appeared slightly too yellow for a convincing copper patina color. The applicant will work with the manufacturer to amend the color to better replicate a copper patina before installing the custom blend on the dome. Aside from the color question, however, the sample did not present any adverse effects on the perception of the dome from the ground.

ACTION: See the Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 1027-31 ARCH ST, UNIT 102

Project: Legalize storefront windows, install awnings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Spring Easton, LLC

Applicant: Scott Hartner, Hartner Architecture & Construction

History: 1901; Pitcairn Building; Hewitt Brothers, architects

Individual Designation: 9/14/1988

District Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of storefront windows, which were recently installed without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit. It also proposes to install four shed awnings, which would be mounted into the brick.

The property in question is a commercial condominium on the first floor of a building at the northeast corner of 11th and Arch Streets. The unit is located at the rear of the building and includes four large storefront bays that open onto N. 11th Street. The storefront bays have ornate window surrounds with original transoms over non-historic storefront systems. Paired casement windows above a fixed single-light horizontal window were installed in the non-historic storefront systems in two of the four storefront bays. The pane configurations as well as the heavy, thick window frames are inappropriate for the storefronts.

This application also proposes to install shed awnings at the four storefront bays. The drawings and renderings provide conflicting details regarding the awning attachment.

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

Mr. Sherman noted that the applicant was not present. Mr. Farnham reported that the applicant had not attended the Architectural Committee meeting either. The Commissioners agreed that the window do not satisfy the Standards. They also noted that the awning details are incomplete and contradictory.

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

ADDRESS: 415 S CROSKEY ST

Project: Construct third-floor addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joel Frisch

Applicant: Rebecca Vieyra

History: 1860

Individual Designation: None

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

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to add a rooftop addition on the two-story rowhouse at 415 S. Croskey Street, which stands in a row of nearly identical two-story rowhouses on the east side of the narrow street. The addition would be set back from the front façade of the building. Several cladding options for the addition are provided. The applicants erected a mock-up of the addition showing the height and location of the southwest corner of the addition. The staff visited the property and photographed the mock-up. The addition will be visible from Croskey Street at locations to the south of the row of buildings in question and to the north of Lombard Street.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owners Joel Frisch and Rebecca Vieyra and attorney Michael Sklaroff represented the application.

Mr. Sklaroff distributed some additional information to the Commissioners. The information included the designation photograph of the building, a photograph of the entire row of buildings with the changes to them highlighted, a photo-simulation of the building with the addition, and a map of the historic district. He stated that the house is classified as Contributing in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Residential Historic District, but is not designated individually. He reported that it has 1,000 sf of floor area. The addition would add 300 sf. It would make the house "livable." It would allow the owners to continue to reside in the house after their child is born. Mr. Sklaroff pointed the Commissioners to the photo-simulation of the building with the addition and noted that the height of the addition has been reduced since the Architectural Committee meeting, in response to the Committee's suggestion. He explained that the addition would be minimally visible from the south, near Lombard Street, but would not be visible from in front of the house on Croskey. He asserted that the addition is "modest and respectful." He contended that historic fabric would not be destroyed and historic features would not be occluded with the construction of this addition. He stated that the addition would not be visible from within the historic district, but only from one small area outside the district. He stated that the addition would not adversely affect the contribution that this building makes to the historic district; it will continue to contribute to the historic district. He reiterated that the addition would not be visible from within the boundaries of the historic district. He offered that the owners are "willing to restore the dimensions of the original windows." He stated that they would "redo the windows in a way that is a restoration." Mr. Sklaroff objected to Mr. Baron's claim that the addition would be conspicuous. He stated that it is not conspicuous in the district because it is not visible within the district. Whether it is conspicuous from outside the district may or may not be relevant, he contended. Mr. Sklaroff provided the definition of the term "conspicuous." Synonyms include "arresting, vocacious, bold, brilliant, catchy, commanding, noticeable, dramatic, emphatic, eye-catching, flamboyant, grabby, etc." Antonyms include "inconspicuous, unemphatic,

unflamboyant, unnoticeable, unobtrusive, unremarkable, and unshowy.” He concluded that the addition would be modest, respectful, and compliant with the Standards including Standards 9 and 10.

Mr. Maenner asked the applicants to identify the locations from which the addition would be visible. The applicants responded that it would be visible from a small section of Croskey Street to the south, toward Lombard Street. Mr. Sklaroff explained that the boundary of the historic district runs down Croskey Street and then to the east along the south party wall of the adjacent building at 417 S. Croskey. He stated that the addition would be visible from a short section of Croskey south of 417, to the north of Lombard. Mr. Sklaroff pointed out the red building at the northeast corner of Lombard and Croskey in a photograph and explained that the addition would be visible over the garden wall at the rear of that building, outside the historic district. He concluded that the addition would be inconspicuous from that point outside the district and invisible from within the district.

Ms. Leonard asked if the Architectural Committee had suggested reducing the height of the addition. Mr. Sklaroff reported that it had and that his clients had reduced the height in response. Mr. Gupta asked whether a change in the siding material proposed for the addition would render it less conspicuous. Mr. Baron responded that the applicants proposed two siding materials, wood scallops and metal siding. The Architectural Committee preferred the metal siding, which will be less conspicuous. Mr. Sklaroff stated that his clients are willing to commit to the metal siding. Mr. Sherman asked about the color of the metal. Ms. Vieyra responded that it would be a light gray. Ms. Merriman asked if the front façade of the addition would include windows. Ms. Vieyra stated that it would include windows. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the staff could review the details of the addition and front façade windows.

ACTION: Mr. Dilworth moved to approve the application with the metal siding, provided the first-floor front window openings are restored to their original sizes and historically appropriate windows are installed, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Mr. Gupta seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 1. Ms. Jones dissented.

ADDRESS: 325 S 18TH ST

Project: rear addition, windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Teresa Isabella

Applicant: Teresa Isabella

History: constructed c. 1860

Individual Designation: 11/4/1976

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10 and owing to incompleteness.

OVERVIEW: The applicant seeks to make a three-story addition to the rear façade of this building at the corner of 18th and Delancey Streets. In 1995 and 1996 the Commission approved the removal and reconstruction of bays at the side and the rear of the property based on their reproduction. Some progress has been made on the reconstruction of the side bays although their cornices and trim are missing. The rear bay is also still missing. The owner now seeks to

add a large addition rather than to rebuild the rear bay. The addition will be much larger than the previous bay. It will sit on posts like the previous bay to provide a parking area, but will extend out nearly twice the width to provide more bedrooms. It will also be higher and have a glazed solarium. The building will now have an internal elevator that will exit directly to the side yard through a door to be cut in the side front bay. The plans show a new metal fence.

The plans for the project are incomplete because they are missing east and west elevations. The north elevation which is provided is inaccurate, and lacking in mention of materials. Pieces that have been removed from the old building which are to be restored are shown missing.

The rear ell should be narrower and smaller in size than the existing portions of the building. The applicant made a commitment to restore the rear ell in 1996. That plan should be carried out.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Teresa Isabella represented the application.

Ms. Isabella explained that she seeks to build the addition to compensate for the interior space that will be lost when she installs the elevator in the side bay. She explained that, with the addition, the building will now house four units. The elevator will serve all floors and will render all of the units handicapped accessible. Ms. Isabella stated that she will live in the first-floor owner's unit. She noted that she lived in the building between 1973 and 1991. She reported that she has undertaken such rehabilitation projects including installing a new roof, footings, and a foundation. She explained that the proposed addition would be in the same style as the existing bays. Cars would be parked at ground level beneath the addition. She said that her current architect failed to provide complete plans. Therefore, she will be switching to a new architect, who will generate complete plans. She explained that she copied architect Sabrina Soong's old plans for the property that had been approved by the Commission and sketched the new addition herself on those plans. She contended that the Commission has approved similar additions in the past. She also proposed a new fence based on historic drawings of her property from the mid nineteenth century.

Ms. Merriman asked her when her new architect will complete the new architectural drawings based on her sketches. Ms. Isabella replied that they would be completed soon. Ms. Merriman explained that the Commission meeting is not the appropriate forum to be designing the rear addition. She proposed deny the current proposal, but encouraging a new submission prepared by the new architect that takes into account the recommendations of the staff and Committee. Ms. Isabella recounted her tribulations with the property including her divorce and the theft of the property. She said that she has been tortured by the City and her neighbors. She said that the City has forced her to come to the Commission unprepared. She said that, if she could simply move forward with the project, she could have the exterior of the building completed by Christmas. She asked for partial approvals. Ms. Merriman stated that she appreciates Ms. Isabella's passion for the property. She suggested that Ms. Isabella work with Mr. Baron on the segments of the application that can be approved at the staff level including the fence and railing. Mr. Baron explained that the staff has approved segments of the project including the rebuilding of the front wall, roof, and bays. He noted that the staff can approve a fence. He explained that the Committee recommended denial for two reasons: because of the incompleteness of the drawings, and the size and scale of the proposed rear addition.

Mr. Sherman recommended that Ms. Isabella choose an architect who can create complete architectural drawings that reflect the comments of the Architectural Committee and can be approved.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10 and owing to incompleteness. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

COMMENT ON NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS

ADDRESS: 1801 VINE STREET, FAMILY COURT BUILDING

Owner: City of Philadelphia

ADDRESS: 1701-07 TULIP STREET, A.J. REACH SPORTING GOODS COMPANY COMPLEX

Owner: Tulip & Palmer Associates

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on National Register nominations of the A.J. Reach Sporting Goods Company Complex at 1701-07 Tulip Street and the Family Court Building at 1801 Vine Street. PHMC is charged with implementing federal historic preservation regulations in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, including overseeing the National Register of Historic Places in the state. PHMC reviews all such nominations before forwarding them to the National Park Service for action. As part of the process, PHMC must solicit comments on every National Register nomination from the appropriate local government. The Philadelphia Historical Commission speaks on behalf of the City of Philadelphia in historic preservation matters including the review of National Register nominations. Under federal regulation, the local government not only must provide comments, but must also provide a forum for public comment on nominations. Such a forum is provided during the Philadelphia Historical Commission's meetings.

The Family Court Building is nominated to the National Register under Criterion C as it embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction. It represents the work of a master and possesses high artistic values. The building is one of the most significant early twentieth-century Beaux Arts style buildings in Philadelphia and was the largest public art project created under the Public Works Administration in Philadelphia as well. The Family Court Building was designed by John Torrey Windrim and construction was completed by 1941. The property was designated to the Philadelphia Register in 1971 and more recently the interior public space were listed on the Philadelphia Register on 13 May 2011.

The A.J. Reach Sporting Goods Company Complex in Fishtown is nominated to the National Register under Criterion A. It was the largest Philadelphia manufacturer of baseballs and other sporting goods in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It was the inventor of the cork-centered baseball and it was the manufacturer of the first official baseball of the American League. A.J. Reach played professional baseball for the Philadelphia Athletics from 1865 to 1875. After he retired from professional baseball, he opened his own sporting goods store. He became owner and president of the newly formed Philadelphia Phillies in 1883 and continued as owner and president through 1902. In 1882, Reach partnered with Benjamin F. Shibe to form the A.J. Reach Company, a manufacturer of baseballs and other sporting goods. The company utilized small tenant factory spaces in Fishtown until 1889, when it moved into the former

Vickers & Weston hosiery mill on Tulip Street. The Company continued to operate out of this location until 1934, adding buildings to the complex, with a total of 6 buildings by 1923. Around 1975, the Vickers & Weston buildings, known as Buildings 1 and 6, were demolished. However, Buildings 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the Reach complex survive. Given this demolition, the State Historic Preservation Office has some concerns about the loss of integrity for this complex. However, the nomination addresses this issue in the physical description section:

While it is certainly unfortunate that Buildings 1 and 6 were demolished in c. 1975, their absence does not negate the overall significance of the complex nor prevent it from effectively conveying the history of the complex. Buildings 1 and 6 were designed by Vickers and Weston, the company who formerly occupied the site, and therefore had no original relationship to the A.J. Reach Company. They were also constructed outside of the period of significance for the complex, making their absence further immaterial. Lastly, the functions that occurred within were duplicated within the other extant buildings at the complex. As such, their demolition does not eliminate unique functions within the complex thus not adversely affecting the narrative history of the site.

The staff recommends that the Commission recommend that the Family Court building is significant under Criterion C, for architecture, and should be listed on the National Register of Historic Places and that the A.J. Reach Company Complex is significant under Criterion A, for industry, and should be listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the nominations to the Commission.

Mr. Sherman asked if either these properties were up for rehabilitation. Mr. Farnham stated that the owner of the A.J. Reach Complex is seeking the designation to become eligible for the Rehabilitation Tax Credit and that the City, as the current owner of the Family Court Building, is seeking the designation to allow redevelopment partners to access the tax credit.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to recommend to the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission that the A.J. Reach Sporting Goods Company Complex at 1701-07 Tulip Street and the Family Court Building at 1801 Vine Street satisfy the criteria cited in the nominations and should be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 10:30 a.m., Mr. Schaaf moved to adjourn. Ms. Merriman 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 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.

Reconstruction Standard 4: Reconstruction will be based on an accurate duplication of historic features and elements substantiated by documentary or physical evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different features from other historic properties. A reconstructed property will re-create the appearance of the non-surviving historic property in materials, design, color, and texture.