

**THE MINUTES OF THE 601ST STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 2012
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
Anuj Gupta
Dominique Hawkins
JoAnn Jones, Office of Housing & Community Development
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Joseph Palantino, Department of Public Property
Dan Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections
David Schaaf, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Robert Thomas
Betty Turner

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II

ALSO PRESENT

Mark Merlini, Brickstone
John Connors, Brickstone
Arman Chowdhury, Stantec
Christian DiCicco, Esq., myphillybankruptcylawyer.com
Pete Crippen, Overbrook School for the Blind
Dan Jalboot, Daley & Jalboot Architects
Mary Tracy, Scenic Philadelphia
Robert Powers, Powers & Co.
Lorna Katz-Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association
Eleanor Gesensway, Let Lits Live
J. Thomas Becker, Philadelphia University
Bill Martin, Esq., Fox Rothschild
George Skarmeas, Preservation Design Partnership
Adam Montalbano, Moto Design Shop
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Benjamin Leech, Preservation Alliance
Dan Reisman, Esq., Eckert Seamans
Michael Black-Smith
Sarah Leuzzi
Mark Leuzzi
Chris Scarlett, Harman Deutsch Architects
Christian Busch, 20th C. Preservation, LLC
Richard Thom, Thom Architecture
Vera Kiselev, WRT

Lawrence F. Meehan
Hal Kessler, Philadelphia Drafting & Design
Pablo Meninato, Ivano D'Angella Architects
Tricia Desmarais-Clark, Esq., Bochetto & Lentz
C.J. Tsikos
Murat Aslansan
Mark Shaw
Gabe Canuso, D3

CALL TO ORDER

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

MINUTES OF THE 600TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the minutes of the 600th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 10 August 2012. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 AUGUST 2012

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included applications for 3230 W. School House Lane, 305 Cherry Street, 247 S. Van Pelt Street, and 249 S. Van Pelt Street. Ms. Hawkins abstained from the consideration of the application for 3230 W. School House Lane, owing to her firm's involvement in the project. Mr. Sherman asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments. Mr. Sherman asked if the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments.

ACTION: Ms. Jones moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for 3230 W. School House Lane, 305 Cherry Street, 247 S. Van Pelt Street, and 249 S. Van Pelt Street. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. Ms. Hawkins abstained from the vote on 3230 W. School House Lane.

ADDRESS: 3230 W SCHOOL HOUSE LA

Project: Remove non-historic rear additions, construct rear addition, rehabilitate building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Philadelphia University

Applicant: George Skarmas, Preservation Design Partnership

History: 1802; Roxboro House

Individual Designation: 11/24/1964

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details including the relationship of the addition to the historic bay, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate and adaptively reuse a historic house on School House Lane as the Senator Arlen Specter Center for Public Policy at Philadelphia University.

The historic section of the house will be rehabilitated. The roof will be replaced with a new standing-seam metal roof. A chimney will be reconstructed with salvaged brick. Dormers will be reconstructed using salvaged trim. The historic cornice, which is in storage, will be reinstalled. The wood siding will be repaired or replaced in kind. The windows will be replaced with windows matching the historic designs and materials. Missing shutters will be replicated. The front porch will be repaired and missing pieces will be replicated to match the originals.

At the rear, non-historic additions will be removed and the historic rear porch will be revealed and reconstructed using salvaged pieces.

An elevator, stair, and restroom addition will be constructed at the northeast corner of the building, away from the primary public views of the building. It will be clad in stucco and glass and have an open metal stair. It will attach to sections of the building that have been disturbed by later additions. It is designed to be differentiated from but compatible with the historic building, to connect below the historic cornices, to reveal the corners of the historic building, and to be completely reversible.

Limited site work will be undertaken. A few new parking spaces will be added to the existing drive. Some minor signage will be added. A storm water management system will be added.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 701-39 MARKET ST

Project: Install signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Independence Center Realty, LP

Applicant: Mark Merlini, Independence Center Realty LP

History: 1859; Lit Brothers Store; various buildings, 1859-1906

Individual Designation: 5/26/1970, 6/30/1970

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted 3 to 2 to recommend approval of Option 1A of the lighting, with the staff to review attachment and wiring details; and denial of the signage.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of signage and lighting on the Lit Brothers Building on the 700-block of Market Street.

The Lit Brothers Department Store was one of Philadelphia's most important department stores and, with Gimbel's, Snellenberg's, Wanamaker's, and Strawbridge & Clothier, anchored one of the most significant retail districts in the country. The Lit Brothers Building is not one building, but is a conglomeration of mid nineteenth-century to early twentieth-century buildings consolidated into one structure. The architectural firm of Collins & Authenreith constructed the building at the northeast corner of 8th and Market Streets for Lit's in 1893. The complex grew eastward, annexing earlier buildings dating to the mid and late nineteenth century. By 1907, when architect Charles Authenreith constructed the corner building at 7th and Market, the department store occupied the entire north side of the 700-block of Market Street. The last additions were completed during World War I by architects Simon & Bassett along N. 7th Street. The sprawling building faced with brick, stone, terra cotta, and cast iron is one of the most significant examples of commercial architecture in the country. The Lit Brothers building was saved from demolition in the 1980s and rehabilitated using federal historic preservation tax credits.

The application proposes adding facade lighting on Market, 7th, and 8th Streets. The fixtures would be installed on sills at the second and top floors to provide washes of light on the building. The fixtures would not be visible from the street. The staff should review all details of the installations of light fixtures and conduits.

The application also proposes the reconstruction of an enormous historic sign along the roof line on Market, 7th, and 8th Streets. The historic sign underwent many alterations over the years, but stood on the building in one form or another from the 1890s to the 1980s. Originally, the sign was painted wood. By 1910, it had been replaced with a metal screen with painted metal letters attached. This metal-screen sign remained in place until the building was rehabilitated in the mid 1980s.

The reconstructed sign would replicate the material, size, location, and appearance of the historic sign in most, but not all, regards. Unlike the earlier sign, the letters themselves would be lighted, employing an array of LEDs on the metal screen that would recreate the Lit's sign. Moreover, the sign would have the capacity to produce programmable, high-resolution, moving images at the two corners of the building. The sign is designed to take advantage of a recent City ordinance allowing large format signage on this section of East Market Street. The ordinance was designed to encourage investment in and activity on this stretch of Market, which has suffered in recent decades. To qualify for such a sign, a building owner must make at least

\$10 million in investments in capital improvements. The City Planning Commission is charged with certifying the investment.

The ordinance prohibits such signs on buildings designated as historic under the City's preservation ordinance unless the Historical Commission "determines that the placement of the sign is consistent with historic precedent with respect to such building and the sign does not materially obscure the view of the building's key architectural, historic or character-defining features." The sign appears to comply with the requirements of the ordinance. The placement of the sign would be consistent with the historic precedent. The proposed sign would stand where the historic sign stood. The sign would not materially obscure the view of the building's key architectural, historic or character-defining features. It would wrap around the balustrades at the tops of the corner towers, but would do so in the same way that the original sign did.

Valid preservation arguments can be formulated for and against the new sign. Arguing in its favor, one would note that the sign would recreate one of the retail landmarks of Philadelphia. Moreover, it would represent and interpret a significant moment in American cultural and economic history for passers-by. Our current notions of consumerism, commercialism, advertising, and retailing were invented by the owners of department stores like John Wanamaker along this stretch of Market Street, Alexander Turney Stewart in New York, Rowland H. Macy in Boston, and Marshall Field in Chicago. The large scale signs would remind viewers of the primary significance of the Lit Brothers Building as a commercial palace and would invoke the historic appearance of the Market Street shopping district, which was awash a riot of garish, attention-grabbing signs. One could claim that, in its current condition, the clean, white Lit's building is sanitized and thereby divorced from its historic appearance and context. Also, in the late nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, department stores were at the forefront of advanced advertising methods and technologies. Wanamaker, for example, was the first to install electric lights, telephones, and the wireless telegraph in his store. The proposed sign would invoke East Market Street's prominent position in American retailing history. With regard to the Secretary of the Interior's Rehabilitation Standards, one could contend that the programmable, high-resolution sections of the sign satisfy the Standards. In size, scale, materials, and proportion, the proposed are essentially equivalent to the historic sign. No historic materials, features, or spatial relationships that characterize the property would be destroyed. The integrity of the property and its environment are protected. In fact, federal historic preservation reviewers agreed with this Standards-based assessment when the 1980s rehabilitation project was certified for tax credits. At that time, the reviewers approved the removal of "the deteriorated roof sign" and stipulated that a "new sign similar in scale but contemporary in design may be installed." Finally, in favor of an approval of this sign, one could point to the \$10 million capital investment as a significant positive feature of the project.

Arguing against the sign, one could contend that the programmable, high-resolution, television-like billboards at the corners of the building did not exist historically, would not satisfy the Standards, and should not be added. One could claim that the brightly-colored, changing, moving images would distract viewers from the architectural qualities of the refined, detailed historic building and would adversely impact spatial relationships at the building. One might assert that such crass marketing of soda and fast food was inappropriate for a building certified as historic. One might also argue that the proposed sign should be rejected because promoting good taste and reducing visual clutter is an essential part of contemporary historic preservation, even if it is not explicitly recognized in the Standards. It could be noted that the original sign was poorly designed from an architectural perspective and that the new sign, like the old, would wrap around the decorative caps on the corner towers, blocking views of historic features and changing perceptions of the building. Beyond the corner signs, one might object to the LEDS

that form the recreation of the historic parts of the sign because they would present a different appearance than the historic illuminated painted metal sign did.

The arguments are compelling on both sides. Whether the proposed sign does or does not meet the Standards is open to discussion. Different, equally valid, interpretations of the Standards and other review criteria produce opposite results when applied to this unique case. There is no clear right and wrong answer in this case.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Owners John Connors and Mark Merlini, preservation consultant Bob Powers, and architect Arman Chowdhury represented the application.

Mr. Connors stated that his company, Brickstone, restored and redeveloped the Lits Brothers building after the department store closed. He stated that he and his company are committed to historic preservation and have undertaken numerous preservation projects. He stated that the company won national awards for the redevelopment of the Lits and Wanamaker buildings. He reported that they also redeveloped the historic City Hall Annex building as a hotel. He stated that he and his partners take historic preservation very seriously. He noted, however, that these buildings are not only historic monuments, but they are also vibrant commercial buildings that contribute to the city's economy. He reported that he and his partners spent hundreds of hours collaborating with the National Park Service when they rehabilitated the Lits building to ensure that the work complied with preservation standards. He stated that they not only had to meet preservation standards, but also ensure that these buildings would be economically sustainable. He noted that the building was wonderfully restored. He commented that East Market Street is in need of revitalization and the newly-authorized large-format signs will play a part of that revitalization. He explained that he was an early advocate of large-format signs for East Market. He stated that East Market Street needs help. Large-format signs will provide funding to revitalize the area. He reported that it cost \$100 million to renovate the Lits building to Class A office condition and it costs a lot to keep it in that condition.

Mr. Connors explained that he has been contemplating recreating the historic sign for many years, but did not actively pursue the project until the media mesh technology became available, which would allow the sign to be recreated accurately and appropriately. He pointed out that he never proposed recreating the sign with inappropriate materials like plastic box signs or building wraps. He stated that he would not propose a sign that he did not perceive as appropriate for the historic building. He contended that the proposed media mesh is true to the historic precedent. He reported that he has had extensive discussions with members of the preservation community about the sign. He observed that they generally applaud the static recreation of the historic sign, but some object to the sign's animated mode. Many object to the advertising. Some even call it crass commercialism. Mr. Connors noted, however, that the building is and always has been a commercial enterprise. It is a commercial structure and advertising has always been a part of it. He also noted that the building is very expensive to maintain and the signage will ensure that it remains economically viable. He concluded that the building is both a historic landmark and a commercial enterprise.

Mr. Chowdhury projected a digital presentation on the signage and lighting. He stated that the basic rule guiding his design was that he would propose nothing that would detract from the historically significant facades. He stated that the design was also guided by historic precedent. He showed images of historic signage on the building. He stated that they are proposing to recreate the historic chain link sign with a contemporary technology known as media mesh. He showed a sample of the mesh. He explained that it has LEDs embedded in it. He showed

representations of the proposed façade lighting and discussed the various options for the lighting. He stated that the applicants are willing to select the option preferred by the Architectural Committee. He stated that the light fixtures would be hidden on the wide ledges of the building. He showed a sample of the light fixture. Returning to the signage portion of the application, he explained that the high-definition sections of the sign would be limited to the corners of 7th and Market and 8th and Market. He noted that the extent of signage is limited by ordinance. He showed a roof plan with the high- and low-resolution sections of the sign indicated. Mr. Chowdhury displayed a series of videos of representations of animated advertising on the sign. He stated that there would be a screen behind the high-resolution LEDs. He stated that the media mesh would be transparent when not in use; the sky would be seen through it. He also showed animations of the proposed lighting schemes.

Mr. Connors stated that the building is actually 13 different buildings that are unified by the façade paint. He stated that they must repaint the façade every seven years at a cost of \$500,000. He stated that Mellon Bank, a former tenant, once shared the expense, but now the entire cost falls on the property owner. He also explained that, above the cost of the sign and lighting, the property owner must invest \$10 million in East Market to qualify for the sign. He stated that they are excited to make that investment. In order to ensure that this building has a sustainable future, it must be able to generate revenue and compete in the marketplace. If the building is too constrained, its long-term sustainability will be threatened.

Ms. Jones asked about the advertisers' response to such a sign and also the potential profitability of such a sign. Mr. Merlini stated that he could not yet answer those questions because the calculations and projections have not been completed. He reported that they have hired A2aMEDIA to manage the advertising. He stated that the cost of the sign including design and installation is between \$8.8 and \$10 million. The revenue stream at 50% leasing would be about \$1.7 million in the third year, with a loss in the first year. Ms. Jones asked what percentage of leasing would make the sign viable. Mr. Merlini stated that they have not yet worked out all of the numbers. He stated that they decided that they needed to determine whether the Historical Commission would approve such a sign before they invested heavily in investigating the financial feasibility of the project. He stated that it is very hard to predict the revenue that the sign could generate until it is approved.

Mr. Gupta asked the applicants to explain where the animated portions of the sign would be installed. Mr. Merlini stated that the sign ordinance that allows for such large-scale signs limits the total square footage of the signs. He stated that they plan to install about half the total allowable square footage of sign at each of the Market Street corners of the building. The remainder of the sign will not have the high-resolution mesh, but will support the replication of the historic Lits sign.

Mr. Schaaf stated that there are several historic buildings in the East Market district, but this is the best candidate for large-scale signage because of the historic precedent. He called the proposal "handsome and exciting" and advocated for an approval. He stated that the photographs of the building in 1936 show a chaotic, exciting department store with many signs and other decorations. He quoted architect Robert Venturi, who liked "messy vitality over obvious unity." He stated that the building now exhibits an obvious unity, but historically had a messy vitality. He stated that the installation of this sign would restore some of that messy vitality.

Ms. Hawkins reported that the Architectural Committee had concerns about the transparency of the media mesh, compared to the historic sign. She stated that the proposed sign may be able

to be modified with the removal of some LEDs, rendering it more transparent. She suggested a mock up of the sign on the roof to judge the transparency of it. She stated that she thought that the sign would be perceived as an additional floor of the building.

Ms. Leonard asked if the sign would ever be static, or would always be animated. Mr. Merlini replied that it would often be in static, non-changing mode, but the precise timing of the sign has not yet been determined. Ms. Leonard asked about the hours of operation. Mr. Merlini stated that the current plan calls for the sign to be off from 2:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m.

Mr. Sherman asked if any of the sign was retained when it was removed in the 1980s. Mr. Connors answered that nothing was preserved. He noted, however, that it was nothing more than typical chain-link fencing on standard tubular poles.

Lorna Katz-Lawson of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that the association opposed the sign ordinance. She acknowledged that the building is not in or near the Society Hill area, but opposed the sign nonetheless. She stated that the sign would overwhelm the building. She asserted that the sign is intended solely to generate revenue. She said that the sign might be visible to some Society Hill residents who live on the upper floors of high-rise buildings.

Eleanor Gesensway introduced herself and explained that she had been associated with Let Lits Live in the early 1980s, an organization founded to prevent the demolition of the building. She said that the installation of the sign would be a travesty. She stated that the removal of the historic sign in the 1980s was appropriate because it was no longer the Lit Brothers building. She asserted that the new sign would be inappropriate. She applauded Mr. Connors and Brickstone for saving the building from demolition and restoring it, but contended that the sign should be denied.

Mary Tracy of Scenic Philadelphia explained that she lives in Hopkinson House. She asserted that the sign would be able to be seen from some locations within the high-rise building. She stated that digital signs have negative impacts on their surroundings. She stated that this sign would have a negative impact on Independence National Historical Park. She stated that the Historical Commission's action on this application will set an important precedent. She applauded Brickstone for saving and preserving the building, but asserted that this sign would be inappropriate. She stated that the historic sign was an identity sign. The proposed sign would be something else, a place for commercial branding. She urged the Commission to deny the application. She said that the sign would be a safety hazard and would distract drivers. She said that it would destroy an iconic building. Mr. Connors disagreed with Ms. Tracy that the historic sign was not only used for the Lit Brothers identity; it was also used to advertise particular products. Ms. Tracy responded that businesses, not signs, will revitalize East Market Street.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that he supports Option 1A to light the building. He also stated that he supports the recreation of the historic sign. He stated that he has reservations about the high-resolution sign. Mr. Gallery stated that the Architectural Committee unanimously supported the lighting and recreation of the historic sign. Ms. Hawkins disagreed and stated that four Committee members supported the lighting and recreation of the historic sign; one was opposed to the recreation of the historic sign. Mr. Gallery asserted that the digital signs are the stumbling block. Mr. Gallery recounted that he and hundreds of people marched around the building with signs in the early 1980s protesting its proposed demolition. Mr. Gallery reported that he worked for four years to save the building. He acknowledged that John Connors and Brickstone ultimately saved the building from demolition and then restored it "beautifully." He also acknowledged that it has been maintained "beautifully" since then. He also

agreed with the claim proffered by Mr. Connors that Brickstone is committed to historic preservation and has made great contributions to the city. Mr. Gallery stated that he did not spend four years advocating for the preservation of the building only to have digital signs installed on the roof. He stated that the Alliance opposed the large-format sign ordinance. The Alliance advocated for historic buildings to be exempted from the ordinance. The ordinance does allow for the historic sign to be restored on the historic building. Mr. Gallery stated that he has a strong personal objection to this application. He stated that he polled the board of the Alliance and received varying responses to the proposed sign. He stated that he asked the membership of the Alliance to email the Historical Commission with comments on the signage. He asked why the Commission's staff had made no mention of the emails it received from his membership regarding the sign. He stated that the Alliance received 280 emails, 60% of which were in opposition to the sign. He stated that some supporters suggested limiting the times during which advertising was displayed. Mr. Gallery noted that Independence National Historical Park, which owns a property across Market Street from the Lits building, issued a letter opposing the sign. He stated that the Park Service has great experience in interpreting the Standards and that it contended in its letter that this sign violates "Stipulation 9." He explained that the Park Service probably meant "Standard 9" when it used the unorthodox term "Stipulation 9." Mr. Gallery stated that the Alliance has reservations about the design. He suggested that the Commission require a mock up. He claimed that the proposed sign would not recreate the historic sign. He agreed with Ms. Tracy that the historic sign was related to the historic business; the proposed sign would not be related to the current business. He concluded that his organization is not fully opposed or fully in support of this application. He conceded that there are pros and cons. He asked the Commission to require a mock up to judge its transparency, to require the complete reconstruction of the historic sign, and to consider regulating the programming of the sign with regard to the timing of changing images. He asserted that the historic sign should be illuminated 50% of each hour.

Mr. Farnham noted that Mr. Gallery had implied that the Commission's staff had not provided all correspondence from interested parties related to this application to the Commissioners and the public. Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission had received only one single piece of correspondence on this application, the letter from the superintendant of Independence National Historical Park. He reported that that letter was made available to the Commissioners and the public.

Ms. Jones asked Mr. Gallery how he would balance the interests of historic preservation with the need to generate revenue to appropriately maintain a historic building. Mr. Gallery responded that the applicants are making a financial hardship argument; they are claiming that they need to find ways to generate new revenue because the current revenue is not sufficient to maintain the building. He asserted that there may actually be a financial hardship, but one has not yet been proven. Until one has been proven, all such arguments should be disregarded. No facts to support such a claim have proffered. Moreover, no evidence supporting an assertion that the signage is the only means to raise such funds has been proffered. He added that the true intent of this ordinance is to generate real reinvestment and change, not simply provide maintenance.

Mr. Thomas stated that he has struggled with such questions and always returns to the Standards for answers. He read Standard 9. He stated that he finds the lighting to be compliant with the Standards. He recounted a disappointing experience with the redesign of the Spring Garden Bridge and stated that the transparency of materials will be very important in this situation. He suggested a mock up to determine transparency. He agreed with Mr. Schaaf that messy vitality is important, but observed that it must meet the Standards. He pointed out the

Hard Rock Café's revolving guitar sign as an example of a messy vitality and contended that it meets the Standards. He also mentioned the historic PSFS sign, which is also on East Market Street. He contended that it is possible to add messy, vital signs to historic buildings, but asserted that they should meet the Standards. He claimed that the proposed sign does not meet the Standards when it is operating in its animated mode. He contended that, in that mode, it overwhelms the building. He stated that he could support an open, transparent sign that was more static in nature. He objected primarily to the animated motion.

Richard Thom of the Old City Civic Association stated that his organization opposes non-accessory billboards. He stated that this location is outside but near the district covered by his association.

Mr. Gupta stated that he agreed with Mr. Thomas regarding the moving, scrolling images. He also noted that historic buildings should be self-sufficient and the sign would create a revenue source from which to maintain the building. He asked the staff about the possibility of limiting the changes and motions of the images on the sign. He noted that he found Mr. Gallery's suggestion to require the historic illumination 50% of the time to be unreasonable because the historic Lit Brothers sign would have no economic value. On the other hand, he opined that constant advertising would detract from the historic building. Mr. Farnham responded that it was his belief that the Historical Commission could regulate the aspects of the sign's animation and frequency of change. He noted that the Commission is empowered to condition approvals to ensure compliance with preservation standards. He noted that he has practical concerns about imposing conditions that seek to regulate aspects of the programming of the sign. He stated that it would be impractical for the staff to monitor the sign in the field, but added that it could examine reports or logs of the sign's activity submitted by the owner or manager. He also suggested that the Commission might seek the Law Department's advice on this question. Mr. Sherman stated that he found the vertical movement of the images to be distracting, but not the horizontal movement. He noted that Piccadilly Circus in London is in the historic core of the city, yet still has many, many large animated signs that do not detract from the setting. He stated that East Market Street needs business and activity. He asked the Commission to find a middle ground that would protect the historic resource but allow the goals of the ordinance to be achieved. Mr. Schaaf stated that the sign would compel him to look at and appreciate the building more, not less. Ms. Hawkins stated that she fully supports the lighting scheme. She advocated for static, not moving, messages on the sign.

Mr. Gallery advised the Commission that the Art Commission had entered into an agreement with the Center City District to regulate colors and frequency of changes in the recently installed lighting along S. Broad Street. He suggested that the Commission could review that agreement as a model.

Lawrence Meehan, who represents Hopkinson House, a residential tower several blocks to the southeast, stated that the residents of the building oppose this project.

MOTION: Mr. Gupta moved to approve the application in concept, provided the applicants undertake additional discussions with the Commission and staff to establish reasonable controls on the advertising such that the signage complies with Standard 9. Ms. Jones seconded the motion.

Ms. Hawkins stated that individuals can interpret Standards very differently. She stated that the applicants and staff need clearer guidance. Mr. Gupta stated his concern regards the "oscillation" of the advertising. He stated that he is not concerned about the transparency of the

sign. Mr. Sherman asked the applicants if they could erect a mock up of the sign on the roof using the real mesh. Mr. Connors stated that they could. Ms. Hawkins noted that the Commission should not forget the lighting. Mr. Powers stated that they would not install the lighting without the signage. Mr. Farnham asked the applicants if they were willing to convert their application to a request for approval in concept from a request for final approval. Mr. Powers stated that they did agree to do so. Ms. Leonard asked if the approval in concept would lock the Commission into a final approval of the moving sign. Mr. Sherman responded that it would not lock the Commission into anything. Mr. Palantino suggested new language for the motion.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION: Mr. Gupta and Ms. Jones withdrew their motion to approve the application in concept, provided the applicants undertake additional discussions with the Commission and staff to establish reasonable controls on the advertising such that the signage complies with Standard 9.

ACTION: Mr. Palantino moved to approve the application in concept, with final approval contingent on the approval of an in situ mock-up of the rooftop sign and on the approval of the timing of static and moving displays. Mr. Gupta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 6333 MALVERN AVE

Project: Remove pool wing

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Overbrook School for the Blind

Applicant: Scott Hecht, Alliance Environmental Systems, Inc.

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

Individual Designation: 5/26/1970

District Designation: None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to incompleteness.

OVERVIEW: The Overbrook School for the Blind proposes the removal of a wing of a building that housed a pool. In May 2007, the Commission approved an application for the construction of a new aquatic center elsewhere on the school's campus. The need to remove the pool wing was noted at the time of the review of the new aquatic center, but the removal was not part of the application or approval for the new aquatic center.

The Overbrook School for the Blind was designed by the renowned architectural firm of Cope & Stewardson between 1897 and 1900. The pool wing was not part of the original construction of the campus. Cope & Stewardson designed the pool wing, which was built at some point between 1912 and 1918. The pool wing is located at the rear of the campus, away from Malvern Street along a rear service alley. It was designed in the same style as the main campus building, albeit in a simplified manner. The wing extends off the rear of a rear building that is part of the main complex of the school.

The school submitted a letter from its structural engineer stating that the pool wing is in poor condition owing to degradation of the walls and roof structure by humidity. The letter also states that the removal of the pool basin would be impossible without the removal of the wing itself. The letter does not include a full engineer's report with photographs of the damage. Also, the

application does not provide information detailing the post-demolition treatments of the wall of the building where the wing would be removed or the site itself.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Peter Crippen, the facility manager for the Overbrook School for the Blind, and architect Dan Jalboot represented the application.

Mr. Jalboot stated that the building opened in 1904 and housed the pool. He described the building as a little nondescript building at the back of the campus. He distributed photographs showing the condition of the building. He stated that the school has a new aquatic center on the campus and that it is time to remove this obsolete building. He stated that there is an eight-foot high wall along the property, which makes the building invisible from the neighboring properties. He stated that, when the building was constructed, humidity could not be properly controlled, leading to deterioration of the mortar in the stone and brick load-bearing walls. He also noted that the non-insulated wood roof has suffered owing to moisture exposure for over 100 years. He concluded by stating that the building is “falling apart.”

Ms. Hawkins observed that the argument for demolition was based on the physical condition and repair costs of the building. She stated that she lives at Alden Park, which has a swimming pool building with an unconditioned space. She stated that the pool building at Alden Park has been rehabilitated successfully and is enjoyed by the residents. She stated that she is troubled by the condition of the building and how it was allowed to deteriorate. She stated that there also appears to be an argument that the demolition would be in the public interest or at least the students’ interest. She suggested that the applicant submit an application for demolition, owing to financial hardship and/or necessity in the public interest.

Mr. Crippen stated that this building would not be able to be rendered ADA compliant. He stated that they had looked into other uses for its rehabilitation, such as a green house, but such scenarios were found to be cost prohibitive. He stated that the school is concerned with the health and safety of the staff and student population, who are the immediately affected by this building, not the general public. He noted that the building accounts for less than two percent of the square footage of the historic campus. He stated that years of moisture buildup have deteriorated the building beyond the point of repair.

Mr. Farnham advised the Commissioners that they can review this proposal as an alteration or as a demolition and explained the difference between the two. He stated the Commission can only approve a demolition in two instances: if it is necessary in the public interest or if it is financial infeasible to rehabilitate the building. He suggested that the Commission first determine whether the proposal constitutes an alteration or a demolition. He stated that the preservation ordinance defines demolition as removal of a building in whole or significant part. He stated that, if the Commission deems the proposal an alteration, an approval for the removal of the building could be granted today. He clarified, however, that, if the Commission deems the proposal a demolition, then the applicant must be directed to the financial hardship and/or necessary in the public interest process.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia stated that the Alliance views this proposal as a demolition, not as an alteration, and therefore the applicant should go through the appropriate application process. He stated that the current application does not fully address either the financial hardship or the public interest.

ACTION: Ms. Leonard moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, owing to incompleteness. Ms. Hawkins seconded the nomination, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 140 N CHRIS COLUMBUS BLV

Project: Install rooftop mechanical equipment and railing

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Philadelphia Fringe Festival

Applicant: Vera Kiselev, Wallace Roberts & Todd LLC

History: 1902; High Pressure Fire Service Station

Individual Designation: 4/6/1972

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as submitted, but approval, provided the rooftop equipment is located in such a way to allow for a future restoration of the light monitor.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install rooftop mechanical equipment. The Philadelphia Live Arts / Philly Fringe purchased the former High Pressure Pumping Station from the City of Philadelphia in order to convert the building into performance, office, and restaurant spaces. The Historical Commission reviewed and approved a phased proposal for the rehabilitation of the building in September 2011.

The approved proposal did not include mechanical details, since those were not fully developed at the time. The assumption was that the mechanical equipment would be located in the attic space of the building with some vents on the roof. As the design team developed plans, this approach proved inadequate. The acoustic requirements of the performance space would not allow for the location of the units in the attic space of the building. Therefore, the applicant proposes to locate the mechanical equipment on a flat section of the roof. The equipment would be surrounded by a safety railing as required by the code. This area of the roof originally had a large light monitor, which was removed in the 1950s.

The historic profile of the roof was not a traditional hip; instead it had a conspicuous light monitor. The location of mechanical equipment on the roof is not out of character with the original design; however, the equipment should be shielded from view by some sort of screen. Ideally, the applicant would consider the restoration of the monitor, or a screen that resembles it. This approach would provide a closer restoration to the historic appearance of the building, as well as the installation of the mechanical equipment as designed.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Project manager Gabriel Canuso and architect Vera Kiselev represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the eastern set of HVAC units could be relocated five feet to the west so as not to obstruct the potential reconstruction of the monitor. Ms. Kiselev stated they could and would be relocated. Ms. Hawkins thanked the applicant for taking into account the Committee's recommendation and amending the application to accommodate a future restoration of the light monitor.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission on 14 September 2012, provided the rooftop equipment is located

in such a way to allow for a future restoration of the light monitor. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 305 CHERRY ST

Project: Reconstruct 4th floor, green roof/deck

Review Requested: Final

Owner: 305 Cherry Associates

Applicant: Brett Harmann, Harmann Deutsch Architects

History: c.1760, 1860

Individual Designation: 7/21/1977

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the option to remove the fire escape, provided the railing is set back to a point where it is inconspicuous and the publicly-visible section of the side wall is brick; with the staff to review details and to undertake a site visit to determine acceptable visibility; pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the reconstruction of the fourth floor of this former commercial structure based on an historic photograph taken in 1911. The applicant will partially restore pieces of the front façade including arched windows and one bay of the historic storefront. He plans to construct a green roof and deck on top of the new floor, which will be set back 8 feet from the front façade. The new addition and green roof/deck railing will be somewhat visible from 4th Street, owing to the shorter buildings and a parking lot to the west of this building.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 1636 SPRUCE ST

Project: Legalize replacement of dormer windows and pediments

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Alexander Bochetto

Applicant: Carl Primavera, Klehr Harrison Branzburg L.L.P.

History: built c.1885

Individual Designation: 11/29/60

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

Preservation Easement: No

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 5, 6, and 9 and owing to incompleteness.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize modifications to the dormers of this corner townhouse. The owner had the wood two-over-two windows removed and new one-over-one windows installed in their place with storm windows. In addition the wood beadboard pediments above the windows were removed and replaced with glass. A violation was issued by the Department of Licenses & Inspections for the illegal alterations. An application identical to this was reviewed by the Committee in January of 2012 and was forwarded to the Commission with a recommendation of denial. The applicants withdrew the application before it was heard by the Commission. Please note that the illegal work to the roof deck is not part of this application.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Attorney Tricia Desmarais-Clark represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the deck, which is also subject to a violation, is not part of this application. Ms. Clark stated that there are other one-over-one windows on the block and that she thinks that the new windows fit in the context as well as the two-over-two windows that were removed. She said that the owner has determined that he cannot simply install new snap in muntins to achieve the look of the old windows. She said that, while the owner probably would not qualify as having a financial hardship, it would be quite expensive to install the correct windows. She said, however, that the owner would be willing to reinstall the beadboard in the pediments above the windows even though that work is not part of the submitted application.

Ms. Merriman stated that she does not have a great deal of sympathy for work done without permits. She said that she thinks it is important to reinstall the twelve, two-over-two windows as well as the beadboard pediments.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application pursuant to Standards 5, 6 and 9. Ms. Leonard seconded the nomination, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 247 S VAN PELT ST

Project: Construct third-floor additions

Review Requested: Final

Owner: David Fetkewicz and Michele Leff

Applicant: Andrew Lengel, Blackney Hayes Architects

History: 1860; façade modifications

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 approval of the application, provided the proportions of the first-floor transom are improved by raising the door, the sides of the mansard are faced in stucco, and the windows are metal with narrow profiles, the brick above the second-floor windows is not rebuilt, and the façade is painted grey, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: The Historical Commission approved in concept this application to construct an addition on this nineteenth century carriage house and modify the front façade. The proposed addition would be a mansard with a single centered window. The mansard would be finished with zinc shingles. The mid-19th century front façade had its arched windows and door squared off at the top and the façade painted grey to hide the new brick.

The proposed alterations to the front façade include the removal of the ornamental balcony at the second floor and its replacement with a single projecting balcony on the middle bay. That bay would be reopened to accommodate a French door; however, the architects do not propose to reconstruct the arch. The flanking windows in the second floor, which currently have steel windows from the 1941 alteration, would be replaced with clad casement units. The garage door would be replaced. The pedestrian door would receive a new rectangular transom but the architect does not propose to reestablish the arch.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 249 S VAN PELT ST

Project: Construct third-floor addition

Review Requested: In Concept

Owner: Jon Merz

Applicant: Andrew Lengel, Blackney Hayes Architects

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 approval of the application with the tan brick tile façade and an eight-inch brick return on the side façade, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: The Commission approved in concept a proposal to construct an addition on a nineteenth-century carriage house. The addition would have a seven-foot set back from the front façade; a small deck would be located in this area. The deck would have a metal railing. The addition would be clad with tan brick tiles on the front and stucco on the sides. The design of the addition is very reminiscent of the historic façade of the carriage house. The Commission approved the design provided it was clad with a material that better differentiates the addition from the historic building. The Commission suggested a different color brick or stone. The applicants have proposed a light color brick tile for consideration.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 626 S. FRONT ST

Project: Demolish former garage structure, construct 4-story house, restore original house

Review Requested: Final

Owner: Pablo Meninato

Applicant: Pablo Meninato

History: house 1760, garage structure c.1920, modifications to rear structures 1975

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application, provided the cantilever is pulled back from in front of the ell and the pent eaves are not restored, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: The application proposes the partial restoration of this c. 1760 Georgian house. The building, which had been converted to restaurant, has been vacant for many years. The new owners would reroof the house with appropriate shingles and install new wood windows. The ground floor, which has been covered in a modern brick, would be revealed and the original openings reconstructed. Two pent eaves at the second and third-floor lines on Front Street would be reinstalled. The frontispiece on Bainbridge Street would be reconstructed based on the historic photograph of 1868.

The plans do not show a complete restoration. For example, the applicants do not propose to rebuild the horizontal cornice or pent eaves on the Bainbridge Street façade. The reconstructed door opening on Front Street would be infilled with recessed brick. The window muntin configuration will need to be adjusted for historical accuracy. They are proposing to stucco the base of the building.

A section of the existing structure to the west along Bainbridge, originally constructed as a garage in the twentieth century, will be demolished. In its place, the applicants propose to construct a new house. The Commission has previously approved a similar plan for a different applicant for this section of the structure. The sale of the new house will help to make the restoration of the old house economically feasible. The design of the house appears to be compatible with the historic structure and the streetscape.

The historic two-story rear ell of the old building has been modified over the years with a ground-story extension. The applicants plan to reconstruct that ground-story extension with new brick and make it part of the new house to the west. They also plan to construct a section of the new house that would cantilever over the roof of the ell.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Architects Pablo Meninato and Christian Busch represented the application.

Mr. Baron read the Committee recommendation. He added that this project involves work to an extremely significant and rare early building. The new construction will, to some extent, compromise the historical building, but the proceeds from it will fund the restoration. For this reason, the staff suggests that it is very important to restore the façade as a condition of the partial demolition and construction of the new house. The Committee found the restoration of the two Front Street pent eaves inappropriate with the simultaneous restoration of the Bainbridge Street portico because the features did not exist together as shown in the 1868 photograph. Mr. Baron suggested that the restoration of the Bainbridge Street cornice should be a condition of any approval because the cornice and doorway are shown together in the photograph.

Mr. Schaaf spoke in favor of the project, but asked if the first floor windows of the new house could be revised to be vertical in proportion to harmonize with the rest of the windows in the façade. Mr. Busch said that the applicants would be willing to make the change to the window to the left of the door, but suggested that the window in the link should remain differentiated from the historic windows. Mr. Thomas supported that idea. Ms. Hawkins said that the applicants had complied with the Committee's suggestions. She also supported the staff's suggestion of the restoration of the Bainbridge Street cornice. Messrs. Busch and Meninato asked if the restoration of that cornice was necessary. Mr. Busch said that they have already committed to restoring other elements on the old building, which will add an unknown amount of cost to the project. Mr. Meninato said that he is concerned that the new cornice will not match the old. Ms. Hawkins noted that the program originally called for restoring two pent eaves, but that that restoration had been eliminated. She opined that the deletion of those elements should offset the cost of the cornice. Mr. Danta spoke in support of restoring the building because of its great significance. He noted that the Commission's earlier approval of similar work to this building included the restoration of that cornice. Mr. Busch asked about simplifying the cornice to achieve a cost savings. Ms. Hawkins spoke of the importance of that cornice and its need to be restored. She suggested that the applicants consult with the staff on ways to achieve the look of the cornice while minimizing cost.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the application, provided the missing gambrel cornice is restored and the design of the first-floor window in the new building is revised, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

Mr. Palantino excused himself from the meeting.

ADDRESS: 1929 SPRING GARDEN ST

Project: Legalize vinyl windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Constantine & Helen Tsikos

Applicant: Constantine Tsikos

History: 1875

Individual Designation: 11/6/1975

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

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of vinyl windows on the façade of this building without the approval of the Historical Commission or a permit from the Department of Licenses & Inspections.

In November 2001, the Commission reviewed and approved an application to install vinyl windows on the rear elevation only. A photograph from 2009 shows the wood windows that were in place at the time of designation. In March 2012, the staff received a neighbor complaint, performed a site visit, and observed that vinyl windows were installed.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Owner Constantine Tsikos represented the application.

Mr. Tsikos explained that he and his wife bought the property in June 2010. He stated that they received a clean City certification and proceeded with the purchase. He claimed that they did not change any windows. He stated that he removed security bars on the first-story windows and power-washed the building, exposing the vinyl windows, in March 2012. He stated that they planned to reinstall the bars, but received a violation from the Department of Licenses & Inspections. He explained that he appealed the violation to the Board of License & Inspection Review and the case was remanded to the Historical Commission. He contended to the Commission that he had been duly diligent and should not be penalized after the fact. He suggested that he could not have second-guessed the City certification. He stated that this could happen to anyone. He explained that, over time, with the accumulation of dust and dirt, the windows will look like the ones at 1933 Spring Garden Street. He acknowledged that those windows on that property were grandfathered with the designation in 2001.

Mr. Sherman explained that changes made prior to designation are not in violation and that permits must be obtained for changes made after designation. He concluded that the applicant claims that the previous owner installed illegal windows. Mr. Thomas affirmed that the applicant made an effort to obtain information about potential violations before he purchased the property. He noted that the certification states that the property is designated as historic and that there is a clause that states that the certification does not guarantee that the property is free of code violations. He acknowledged that investigating code violations that have not yet been identified is difficult. Mr. Thomas asked if there is a mechanism with which to allow the violation to remain until the windows are corrected in the future, but not enforce it.

Ms. Hawkins explained that, although the City certification is clean, there is no way for the Commission to know what the property looked like at the time of purchase in 2010 beyond a verbal claim from the owner. She cautioned the Commission against taking that claim at face-value without some evidence to show the appearance of the property at the time of sale.

Ms. Merriman asked if the property is a rental property or a private residence. Mr. Tsikos stated that it is a rental property. Ms. Merriman reported that the Commission has occasionally approved maintaining a violation in place unenforced while the windows are replaced slowly over time. She suggested replacing two windows per year. She stated that this option may be more financially palatable than wholesale replacement.

Mr. Tsikos asked if the bars could be re-installed. Mr. Baron explained that the Commission typically approves interior bars, but not exterior bars. He explained that, when a change is made to a building without a permit, a permit is subsequently required to legally reverse the illegal change. Mr. Quinn stated that exterior bars would not be permitted by code, owing to egress requirements. Mr. Thomas explained that there are interior bars with a quick-release latch on the inside for egress.

Mr. Gupta asked whether the Commission would require the applicant to replace the windows with the correct windows if the illegal vinyl windows were present at the time of purchase. Mr. Baron explained that the staff uses the designation photograph as the baseline. He stated that all changes after that point must be approved and permitted. Any change that is not permitted is illegal, regardless of the ownership at the time of the change. He explained that there are instances where changes are made without permits and are therefore "in violation" even if an actual violation has not been issued. He stated that a change in ownership does not simply clear all old violations. If that were the case, the City would never be able to enforce any violations.

Mr. Tsikos asked if he would be charged \$2000 per day as the violation notice states. Mr. Quinn explained that the fine is not issued by the Department of Licenses & Inspections, but rather the courts. He suggested Mr. Tsikos open the case in Municipal Court to make an arrangement.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9, but to suspend enforcement of the violation as long as two of the eight non-compliant windows are appropriately replaced each year, with the staff to review details. Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2525 S GARNET ST

Project: Replace roof

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Sarah J. Lewis

Applicant: Vincent Mancini, Landmark Architectural Design

History: 1910; John T. Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Girard Estate Historic District, Contributing, 11/10/1999

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the terracotta roof with red asphalt shingles.

In December 2011, the Commission reviewed and approved an application to remove the terracotta tile roof and replace it with a high-quality synthetic slate shingle. The applicant claimed the terracotta tile roof had failed. Applications reviewed by the Commission for the past 10 years have confirmed that these tile roofs in the Girard Estate Historic District are at the ends of their lives. Research on the tiles concluded that replacement in-kind was extremely labor-intensive and expensive and there is no alternative material that would exactly match the original tile. The synthetic-slate shingle that was previously proposed and approved would closely mimic the original terracotta in color, shape, and dimension. The currently proposed asphalt shingle does not match the original in shape or dimension.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Owner Sarah Lewis and architect Vincent Mancini represented the application.

Ms. Lewis explained that they have completed all of the renovations that were approved by the Commission in December 2011 except the roof. She stated that, in reviewing the minutes from the December 2011 meeting, they noticed that the minutes stated that other terracotta tile roofs in the Girard Estate Historic District had been approved for replacement with asphalt. She explained that the cost of their renovation project is exceeding their budget. Therefore, they must find a way to cut costs. She stated that there are only two terracotta tile roofs left in the historic district. All other buildings that had terracotta roofs now have asphalt shingles. She explained that the synthetic slate that they proposed and that the Commission approved is putting them over budget. She stated that the cost is \$310 more per square foot than the asphalt replacement. She stated that the synthetic slate would cost \$7000 more than the asphalt shingles. She stated that they obtained an estimate from the roofing supply company. She stated that her husband will do the installation and the labor for the synthetic slate is an additional four to five days. She explained that, in total, it will cost from \$12,000 to \$15,000 more for the synthetic slate than the asphalt shingles. She took photographs of roofs on Porter Street that were approved for the removal of original terracotta and replacement with asphalt. She stated that her husband met with the owner of one of the properties, who directed him to the material he used, which is a Slateline asphalt shingle.

Ms. Hawkins thanked the applicant for supplying the additional information that was requested at the Architectural Committee meeting. She stated that the Committee also requested that they research other asphalt options beyond the shake-like proposed material. She stated that the Slateline asphalt has a square cut and is more uniform and therefore closer in appearance to the terracotta tiles.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the application, provided a Slateline asphalt shingle is used, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 332 SPRUCE ST

Project: Cut opening in garden wall, install gate

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Marc Shaw

Applicant: Murat Aslanan, Masa Construction

History: 1831; Girard Row; William Struther, marble mason

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Significant, 3/10/1999

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to breach a historic brick wall at the rear of the property. The wall faces Cypress Street, and it is directly across the street from Three Bears Park and the gardens of the Physic House. Cypress Street along this stretch of the Society Hill Historic District is not a service alley, but a heavily trafficked street. The property is part of a row of five Greek Revival townhouses. The garden wall at the back of the subject property is connected to the rear walls of the other four properties. They all retain their historic appearance. This continuous wall runs unbroken behind all five properties. It only contains person doors, not vehicular entrances. The rear yard of the subject property retained its original privy until recently. It was apparently demolished without any permit or approval. The privy was connected to its neighbor's privy at 330 Spruce Street. The site plan submitted with the application does not delineate the footprint of this historic feature. It appears, however, that the proposed doors would be located in an area where the privy recently stood. The application does not include any information related to the proposed demolition of this historic feature.

The Historic American Buildings Survey, the arm of the U.S. Library of Congress that documents historic buildings throughout the country, photographed this property about 10 years ago, and the survey includes photographs of the historic privy and rear wall. The property was individually designated a historic property in 1957, and classified a Significant historic resource within the Society Hill Historic District in 1999. The alteration of this original brick wall, part of a larger unit, and the demolition of an original privy would adversely alter the rear of this property as well as the historic streetscape of Cypress Street

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Commission. Developers Mark Shaw and Murat Aslanan and architect Richard Thom represented the application.

Mr. Shaw stated that he and Mr. Aslanan acquired the property two months ago and was not aware that the privy was an open issue until the Architectural Committee. He stated that the privy was already gone when they viewed the property prior to purchase. He stated that he contacted the former property manager and the real estate agent involved in the sale, both of whom said that the privy has not been there for years. He supplied a letter from each with a statement to that effect. Mr. Shaw stated that the property was converted to a five-unit multi-family dwelling several years ago. He has purchased the property and converted back to single family.

Mr. Shaw stated that Mr. Thom met with the staff earlier this week. He stated that during that meeting a photograph of the rear yard with the privy was discussed. He stated that he does not know the date of the photograph, but it must be several years old. He compared the photograph in question with a current photograph and stated that the vegetation has clearly grown.

Mr. Aslansan stated that the edge of the proposed carriage doors would be thirty feet away from Three Bears Park and that he disagreed that Cypress Street is a heavily trafficked street. He stated that the street is nothing more than a service alley. Mr. Shaw concurred. Mr. Aslansan stated that being an owner and a steward of such an historic property is quite an undertaking and responsibility. Such an owner deserves the amenity of a parking space on site.

Mr. Shaw stated that the proposed carriage doors would be manually operated. Ms. Hawkins stated that Cypress Street may not have a lot of vehicular traffic, but it does have quite a bit of pedestrian traffic. She stated that the street is much more than a typical service alley. Mr. Thom stated that he and his clients agree that the wall is a significant historic feature. He indicated in the submitted photographs that the wall has some condition issues. He stated that repairing and replacing brick are part of this project. He explained that they plan to use the brick salvaged from the opening created for the carriage doors to replace badly deteriorated brick in the remaining sections of the wall. He stated that this proposal is reversible in that the wall can be rebuilt. He informed the Commission they plan to pave the rear yard with brick pavers and indicate the location of the privy pit with a circular brick pattern. He stated that the wisteria on the site is believed to be cut from Wister Mansion and will be maintained. He stressed that they are not removing the wall, but restoring and cutting an opening. He stated that it will still feel like a solid wall when traveling down Cypress Street.

Laura Lane, a neighborhood resident, stated that she does not support the application. She stated that she was concerned that, if the Commission approved the cut in the wall, it would set a precedent and other owners in the Girard Row would submit similar proposals, ultimately resulting in a parking lot behind these five historic homes.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Alliance owns an easement at 330 Spruce Street. He stated that the Alliance is opposed to the demolition of this wall that spans the five Girard properties. He stated that he is also concerned by the precedent that an approval might set. He requested that the Commission deny the application.

Ms. Lane noted that the rear wall at 328 Spruce was knocked down by the developer when that house was converted into condominiums in the early 1980s. She stated that she did not know why, but the wall was reconstructed. Ms. Cote clarified that the wall at 328 Spruce Street was demolished illegally and the Commission required its reconstruction in 1984.

Mr. Shaw stated that he has encountered Mr. Gallery on several occasions and he intends to seek façade easements for 332 and 334 Spruce Street. He stated that this rear wall is bowing, has been repaired with new brick in some spots, and is not in the condition it was when originally built. He stated that they presented the proposal to the Society Hill Civic Association and gained its support. He stated that they have the support of the neighbors at 336 and 338 Spruce Street, which have carriage doors. He stated that he viewed that this side of the street is a service alley. He stated that they propose carriage doors, not a garage, which is sympathetic to the neighborhood. He invited any Commission members to come see the interior, which they have restored. He opined that Stephen Girard would be proud. Ms. Cote clarified that 336 and 338 Spruce Street are not part of the Stephen Girard Row and were built separately.

Ms. Merriman asked if the proposed carriage doors are as narrow as they can be. Mr. Thom replied that they are designed to allow a turning radius for a car. He stated that nine feet is typical gate size. Mr. Shaw stated that they would be narrower than doors at the Physick House and those at 336 and 338 Spruce Street. Mr. Schaaf asked if they would install an angle iron and remove the brick below for the carriage doors. Mr. Thom stated that they would do that. Mr.

Schaaf expressed concern that the old brick may not support the angle iron. Mr. Thom stated that it has to go at least six inches into the brick. He stated that they may have to rebuild the interior of the wall.

Lorna Katz-Lawson of the Society Hill Civic Association Zoning and Historic Preservation Committee stated that the Association supports the proposal, but she personally does not. She added that the neighbor at 330 Spruce Street is not in favor of the proposal.

The Commissioners agreed that the wall is a very significant feature and that the cutting of the large opening for parking would clearly violate the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 569 N 20TH ST

Project: Construct roof deck

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Bromley Investments Group, LP

Applicant: Hal Kessler, D&D Drafting and Designs

History: 1886

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to incompleteness.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck over a garage/carriage house that faces Wilcox Street. A window would be cut down and made into a door to access the deck. It appears that there is an existing door, but the drawings do not indicate how this will be treated. There has been no information provided regarding the material of the proposed deck and railing.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Cote presented the application to the Commission. Hal Kessler represented the application.

Mr. Kessler distributed revised drawings to the Commission. He stated that he added a site plan to indicate the location of the proposed deck. He stated that they have stepped back the deck four inches off the edge of the wall to address the Committees concerns about the visibility of the deck support structure. He stated that they now propose to use the door to access the deck as opposed to cutting down a window. He stated that the last revision they made is to reduce the railing height from 42 inches to 36 inches. Mr. Kessler has provided a section drawing showing that the deck will be supported by wood sleepers.

Ms. Merriman asked about the condition of the property. Mr. Kessler responded that this portion of the property has been vacant for some time, but the main row house that faces 20th Street has recently been rehabilitated.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the Architectural Committee was confused by the drawings. The Committee had some concerns about the design. She suggested that some further investigation is still needed and requested that the Commission send the application back to the Committee for further review.

Mr. Thomas stated that he is familiar with Wilcox Street and it is a service street. He asserted that the proposal is appropriate for the street. He concurred that there are some open questions about details, but suggested that the staff could review them. He contended that this project meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and should not be needlessly delayed.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to approve the application, with the staff to review details. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed by a vote 9 to 1. Ms. Hawkins opposed.

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 1229 SPRUCE ST

Project: legalize windows, storefront and signage

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: George and Valerie Anni

Applicant: Adam Montalbano, Moto Design Shop

History: 1825

Individual Designation: 2/27/1962

District Designation: None

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.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize a series of alterations undertaken at this building without permits over many years. The Historical Commission has, beginning in 1997, had violations and even a stop work order issued to this property owner for work without permits. These have been ignored. Recently, the court imposed a large fine on the property, which the owner is seeking to have revoked. As can be seen from the designation photograph of 1968, the building had six-over-six wood windows and a dormer with an arched top window and frame. These were replaced with vinyl windows and aluminum capping by a former owner, who received a violation in 1997. The current owner contends that he purchased the property with those alterations and should not be required to correct the misdeeds of a former owner. He has provided an appraisal from 1995 with a photograph that shows those alterations. The current owner has remodeled the storefront and sign twice, both times without a valid permit. The first remodeling in 1999 added a new stoop and wood storefront. The most recent alteration to the storefront, in 2008, clad the first floor with stone panels that project out from the façade and added café type windows. The sign has been altered with new faces and large projecting channel letters with exposed bulbs. The sign does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards because it is too large and aggressively illuminated for this residential building and streetscape. Neither the windows, dormer capping, nor storefront alterations match the original design for those elements.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Property owner George Anni and architect Adam Montalbano represented the application.

Mr. Montalbano reported that a building permit had been issued for the storefront under the 1231 Spruce address, which is not designated as historic. It was permit number 71827. He said that the work to the upstairs windows and dormer was undertaken by a previous owner. He said that the owner would be willing to propose a compromise application that addressed some of the violations.

Mr. Baron spoke to clarify the record. He said that the permit referred to by Mr. Montalbano specifically states that no work will be undertaken to the storefront at 1229 Spruce Street, the historic building. Therefore, the work that was undertaken to the storefront of the historic building was done without any permits or approvals. In addition, although the work to the upper windows and dormer was undertaken by a former owner, a violation for the illegal work was in place at the time that the current owner purchased the property. Violations travel with the property and are not cleared simply because the property is sold. He indicated that the staff hopes to work with the applicant to correct the illegal work under a separate application.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 6, 9 and 10. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

COMMENTS ON APPLICATIONS TO THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented six nominations to the National Register of Historic Places to the Historical Commission. They include nominations for the Dreuding Brothers & Co. Building, Hotel Pennsylvania, Penn Towers, Quaker City Dye Company, a Yorktown Historic District, and a Kensington Multiple Property Documentation Form. Mr. Danta stated that the staff had reviewed all six nominations and deemed them to be complete. Mr. Danta advised that the Commission should recommend that all six nominated resources be listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Ms. Hawkins acknowledged that her firm was involved in the preparation of the inventory for the Yorktown Historic District and she therefore recused from participating in the discussion of that nomination.

Mr. Gallery stated that the Alliance proposed two of the six nominations, the Kensington Multiple Property and Yorktown Historic District nominations. He noted that the Alliance had nominated these resources to make the resources eligible for federal tax credits and assist in their preservation.

Mr. Gallery stated that the Alliance has reservations about the nomination for Penn Towers and suggested that the Commission should as well. He asserted that Samuel Oshiver, the architect for Penn Towers, was an insignificant architect. He described him as “not one of the great form giving architects of the mid twentieth century.” He stated that Penn Towers was an average to mediocre design. He stated that the building is not a leading example for Oshiver’s work. He stated that the Alliance has reservations about the justifications for the listing of the building, specifically the claim of a regional Modernism unique to Philadelphia. He stated that this claim is not convincing and reported that he was unaware of any examples of this so-called regional Modernism. He noted that the building has lost integrity. He distributed a historic photograph of the original ground floor and a contemporary photograph for comparison. Mr. Gallery pointed out that the ground floor has been dramatically altered from its original design, which has negatively impacted the integrity of the building. He described the nomination as “weak.” He suggested that Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission should reject the nomination.

Mr. Farnham stated that the Historical Commission’s staff had had some concerns about the nomination, but, overall, considered the building worthy of inclusion on the National Register. Mr. Danta read his overview of the nomination in which he asserted that the nomination makes

enough of a convincing argument to support a designation. He claimed that the building meets Criterion C for Community Planning. Mr. Gallery strongly disagreed with the staff's opinion that the nomination meets Criterion C for Community Planning. He stated that this building had nothing to do with Bacon's Plan for Penn Center and that its construction was an independent venture. He stated that the nomination is not completely wrong, but that it should be amended and revised. He reiterated that the arguments are not convincing. Mr. Danta stated that the nominator did not claim that the construction of Penn Towers was part of the Bacon Plan. Mr. Danta stated that the construction of the building, although not under the direction of Bacon and the City's Planning Office, was part of a larger vision to create a modern downtown west of City Hall, which was ultimately achieved. Mr. Danta stated that this building should be considered within this larger context even if it was a private venture outside the scope of the Penn Center project. Mr. Farnham agreed with Mr. Danta position and noted that the comments expressed by Mr. Gallery would be included in the Commission's advisory letter to the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adjourn at 12:47 p.m. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.