

**THE MINUTES OF THE 549TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

9 MAY 2008

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

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
David Amburn
Leslie Benoliel
Della Clark
Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D.
Rosalie Leonard, Office of Council President
Sara Merriman, Department of Commerce
Joan Schlotterbeck
David Schaaf
Denise Smyler
Robert Thomas, AIA
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing & Community Development

Jon Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner I
Leonard Reuter, Assistant City Solicitor

ALSO PRESENT

Ron Patterson, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzberg & Ellers
Lauren Reap, Esq., Mattioni Ltd.
Dawn Tancredi, Esq., Mattioni Ltd.
R. Roth
Cindy Roth
Casey Parker
Victor Gargano, Cash Construction, Inc.
Jim Kaufmann, Kaufmann Associates
Gene Locks
Christina Carter, John Milner Architects, Inc.
Ronald J. Gelegonya
Nathan Flanigan
Jason Hill
Vito Canuso Jr., Esq.
Spence Kass, Kass & Associates
Laura Kass, Kass & Associates
Paul Wheeling
Jean Wolf, The Woodlands
Steve Pollock, Esq., Montgomery McCracken
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Gary Gordon, 3300 Henry LP

Daniel Liberatoscioli, The Restaurant School
Paul Miller, The Restaurant School
Rachel Schade, Schade & Bolender Architects
Tim Peters, Qb3
Oliver Boulind
Heather Ascher
Louis Michael Ascher
Timothy Kerner, Terra Studios

CALL TO ORDER

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

MINUTES OF THE 548TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the minutes of the 548th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 11 April 2008. Ms. Clark seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 APRIL 2008

David Amburn, Chair

226-30 N. 2ND STREET

Owner: Power Plant Productions, L.P.

Applicant: Jim Graham

History: c. 1920; contributing to Old City Historic District, 12/13/2003

Project: Enlarge front façade windows, signage on smoke stack

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the signage on the smokestack and the window alterations with an aluminum window system in the historic dark brown color, provided the new windows have the historic pane pattern above the door head, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to lower the window sills at ground floor. The existing sills sit six feet above the sidewalk. The building has retail space at the ground floor; visibility into the space is impossible from the sidewalk. The owner would like to lower the sill two feet, which would allow pedestrians to look into the sales room. The applicant proposes new display windows for the enlarged openings. The building does not retain its original windows. The applicant also proposes signage on the smoke stack. The signs would be painted onto the surface of the stack.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Property owner Jim Graham, attorney Ron Patterson, and architect Mark D'Alonzo represented the application.

Mr. Patterson introduced the project, explaining that his client is seeking to enlarge the first-floor front windows and add signage. Mr. D'Alonzo stated that his client needed to enlarge the windows to make the space desirable for retail usage. He also noted that he was proposing three window schemes. He stated that the scheme advocated by the Architectural Committee would be very expensive. Mr. Graham stated that he would replace the windows at the upper

floors in five or 10 years. He promised that the new upper windows would be designed to match whatever windows the Commission approved for the first floor.

Mr. Schaaf asked the applicants if they would paint the smokestack. Mr. Graham replied that he would not paint the entire stack, but would paint over the "WILBUR" letters and paint the new "Poggenpohl" letters in black. He added that he would retain the recessed lettering of the "WILBUR" sign, but would obscure it with paint.

Mr. Graham stated that he was proposing the alterations to satisfy his potential tenant, Poggenpohl kitchens, which would relocate to Walnut Street if he is not able to alter the building.

Mr. Baron recommended to the Commission that it accept the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Graham responded that the problem with the Architectural Committee's recommendation is that it would create three types of windows on the front façade, the storefront windows, storefront transoms, and upper windows. His preferred proposal would create two types, which would transition to one single type when the upper windows are replaced. Mr. Wilds asked him if he would accept the Scheme B, which is a compromise between his preferred proposal and the Committee recommendation. Mr. Graham responded that Scheme 2 was acceptable, stating it was "OK." Mr. Dilworth asked if Scheme B would be appropriate for a later restoration of the upper windows. Mr. Danta replied that Schemes B and C would set an appropriate tone for a later restoration for the upper windows. Mr. Graham noted that the historic photograph of the building he found at the Delaware River Port Authority would drive any later restoration. Ms. Leonard stated that she preferred Scheme C. Mr. Amburn opposed Scheme B as a bad compromise architecturally and suggested that the Commission consider A or C.

Several Commission members questioned the signage portion of the proposal and the staff's recommendation of approval of it. Mr. Farnham explained that the staff had supported the signage proposal because it was in the spirit of the historic signage on the stack. Ms. Schlotterbeck noted that she was opposed to "KITCHEN" sign around the base of the stack. Mr. Wilds suggested two, not three, signs on the stack. Mr. Graham stated that the historic signs have two faces; his potential tenant would like three faces. He explained that his client would like a face of the sign facing the bridge. Mr. Schlotterbeck recommended that the Commission approve the signage with two faces and without the "KITCHENS" section.

Mr. Dilworth suggested separating the two aspects of the application and moved to approve window Scheme A. No one seconded the motion.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to approve the application with Storefront Option C as presented at the Commission meeting of 9 May 2008 and two, not three, signs on the smokestack. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 3. Commissioners Dilworth, Leonard, and Schlotterbeck dissented.

22 S. 3RD STREET

Owner: Darren & Jason Hill

Applicant: Nathan Flanigan

History: 1837, William Strickland, architect; alterations and addition by John T. Windrim, 1897, two-story rear addition by Edwards & Green; individually designated June 1956, significant in Old City District, 12/13/2003

Project: Construct rear balcony

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the balcony, provided the structure and railings are metal, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear balcony. The Historical Commission granted a conceptual approval for this balcony as part of a larger review for this building in May 2007. The applicant proposes the balcony in the same location and of the same dimensions as previously approved in concept.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Nathan Flanigan represented the application.

Mr. Flanigan stated that he would accept a metal balcony with wood decking as the Architectural Committee had recommended. Messrs. Schaaf and Wilds stated that they would not approve of a wood railing. Mr. Flanigan stated that he would install a metal railing. Mr. Wilds asked if the marble restoration was continuing at the front façade. Mr. Danta stated that it was continuing.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the balcony, provided the structure and railings are metal, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

3900 WOODLANDS AVENUE

Owner: The Woodlands Cemetery Company

Applicant: Brad Roeder

History: c. 1787, Designated in June 1956

Project: Install ADA ramp, restore windows and masonry

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore second-floor windows to their original six-over-six light configuration, and restoration of masonry facades. The applicant proposes to install an ADA lift on the main facade. The owners seek a permanent Certificate of Occupancy, and ADA accessibility is one of the requirements. The applicant proposes the lift to be located on the side of the front façade. The lift would discharge onto a ramp that would sit on an existing terrace. The change in elevation would be minimal. The ramp would access the house through an existing French door; no penetrations to masonry are necessary.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architect Christina Carter represented the application.

Mr. Wilds asked if the lift would be added to the front or rear of the house. He also asked if the front faces the river. Mr. Danta explained that the lift would be added to the rear of the house,

not the front, which faces the river. Mr. Wilds asked if the front would be altered in any way. Mr. Danta stated that it would not.

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

231 CHRISTIAN STREET

Owner: Greg Summers

Applicant: Victor Gargano

History: c. 1825; individually designated

Project: Legalize alterations

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes legalizing work done by the applicant several years ago, when he owned the building. After the completion of the work, the current owner purchased the building with a violation for the illegal work in place. The illegal work includes installing vinyl four-over-four windows, a door and frame, railing, and exterior light fixture, and a new roof. The roofing material is a very light brown, inappropriate shingle. Vinyl capping installed on the dormer hides the wood molding and shape of the dormer and its window. Paint was removed and the front façade was pointed without the Commission's approval.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Attorney Vito Canuso represented the application.

Mr. Canuso presented two City Certifications. The first was produced at the time his client, Victor Gargano, the developer and former owner of the building, purchased the building. The second was produced when Mr. Gargano sold the building to the current owner, Greg Summers. Mr. Gargano claimed that the first City Certification did not indicate that the building was designated as historic, but the second City Certification did indicate that it is historic. Mr. Canuso claimed that his client had no way of knowing that the building was historic because it was not indicated on the first City Certification. Mr. Wilds responded that Mr. Canuso was incorrect in his interpretation of the documents. He stated that the City Certifications do not indicate whether properties are designated. Instead, they indicate whether properties have outstanding violations. Mr. Wilds noted that the property did not have violations when Mr. Gargano purchased it, but it did when he sold it. Mr. Wilds explained that the violations noted on the second City Certification were issued because Mr. Gargano undertook work to the building without Commission approvals and building permits. The second City Certification indicates that the building is designated not because it always provides that type of information, but because it reports that Mr. Gargano violated the City's historic preservation ordinance. Mr. Sherman added that the Certification is not a permit. It merely indicates whether or not the building is in violation. Mr. Canuso again claimed that the City Certification should state whether a property is designated. Mr. Wilds again corrected that that is not the purpose of the Certification; he noted that there is no box to check for designation. The second Certification indirectly indicated the designation because Mr. Gargano had received a violation for illegally working on the building. The first Certification provides no indication of the designation status because Mr. Gargano had not yet violated the historic preservation ordinance. Ms. Merriman asked Mr. Farnham if the Commission is required to indicate the designation status on the City Certification. He stated

that it is not. He stated that the owner notification requirements are enumerated in the historic preservation ordinance and were complied with. Mr. Wilds concluded that the City did not mistakenly fail to indicate the designation on the first Certification; it never provides designation information on the City Certification. Ms. Merriman added that Mr. Canuso's client would have been notified of the designation if he had sought the appropriate building permit. Mr. Canuso stated that his client is the victim because he did not receive proper notice of the designation. Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Canuso if it was true that the current owner had purchased the property from his client with an agreement that the client would remedy the violations. Mr. Canuso responded that the current owner does want the violations resolved. Mr. Canuso stated that the term "remedy" is open to interpretation. He stated that his client had agreed to make the necessary applications to resolve the violations.

Mr. Canuso asked how his client could undo the illegal work and receive the Commission's approval. Ms. Merriman noted that the minute of the Architectural Committee meeting lists the non-compliant aspects of the building. Mr. Baron outlined the inappropriate alterations to the building and stated that the dormer alterations were the most inappropriate aspect of the illegal work. Mr. Wilds stated that Mr. Canuso was simply asking the Commission legalize all of the illegal alterations. He was not offering any sort of compromise. He suggested that Mr. Canuso develop a compromise proposal for submission to the Commission.

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

2237 BRANDYWINE STREET

Owner/Applicant: Ronald Gelegonya

History: c. 1859, contributing to Spring Garden Historic District

Project: Legalize windows

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

OVERVIEW: This proposal calls for legalizing the installation of six-over-six, simulated-divided-light windows in this Italianate rowhouse. The wood bracketed cornice indicates that this Italianate building would have originally featured two-over-two windows. A former owner installed the windows without a permit after discussing the application procedures and appropriate windows with the Commission's staff. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a violation for the illegal windows to the former owner. The current owner purchased the building with the violation.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Property owner Ron Gelongoya represented the application.

Mr. Wilds asked the staff if the former owner, who replaced the windows, had discussed the Commission's process and the appropriate windows with the staff. Mr. Baron stated that he had. Mr. Wilds asked if the current owner was aware of the outstanding violation for the windows at the time he purchased the building. Mr. Baron stated that he was. Mr. Schaaf asked if a property owner could retain 6-over-6 windows that were in place at the time of designation even if those windows were inappropriate. Mr. Baron stated that an owner could retain them; they would be grandfathered. However, if the owner sought to replace them, then the Commission could

require the installation of the appropriate windows. He noted that, in this case, the former owner installed inappropriate 6-over-6 windows even though the staff had advised him that 2-over-2 windows were appropriate. Mr. Wilds agreed with Mr. Baron that the Commission typically requires a restoration when work is undertaken. Mr. Sherman asked the applicant if he could replace the sash only. Mr. Gelongoya replied that he did not know if that was possible.

Mr. Dilworth stated that the staff did not have irrefutable evidence that the original windows would have been 2-over-2. Mr. Gelongoya noted that his house is very small, only 1200 sf. He noted other houses like his in the area that have 6-over-6 windows. Mr. Baron refuted Mr. Dilworth's statement, explaining that the staff is certain that the original windows were 2-over-2. He stated that the houses on Judson Street, which the applicant claims are like his, are, in fact, very different. Mr. Baron stated that they all had Colonial Revival modifications in the early twentieth century. The 6-over-6 windows in those houses are Colonial Revival in style and complement the pilasters, door surrounds, and other Colonial Revival features. The applicant's house has none of these features. Mr. Baron stated that the applicant's cornice indicates 2-over-2, not 6-over-6. Mr. Dilworth suggested that the 6-over-6 windows had acquired their own historic significance. Several rejected that notion. Mr. Baron noted that the shutter hardware and original frames had also been removed when the 6-over-6 windows were installed.

Mr. Wilds clarified that the Commission was concerned with the inappropriate front windows only and was not suggesting that any side or rear windows be replaced.

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

700 S. WASHINGTON SQUARE

Owner: Gene Locks

Applicant: Mitch Handman

History: 1818; individually designated; Significant to Society Hill Historic District

Project: Install elevator at rear

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the elevator, provided the shaft is dark red in color and encompasses the entire historic window opening at the third floor, and provided that the removed window, sill, and brick is salvaged and stored on site.

OVERVIEW: The plans propose the construction of an elevator at the rear of the property. Most of it would be concealed on the interior, but it would project above the rear porch at the upper floor. The architect has shown it clad in wood or stucco. HVAC units would have to be relocated onto the rear slope of the roof behind a dormer. The owner should explore an interior solution given the high visibility of this significant rear façade.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Property owner Gene Locks, architect Spence Kass, and attorney Stephen Pollock represented the application.

Mr. Pollock summarized his client's application. Mr. Wilds asked him if his client was accepting of the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Pollock stated that he was.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to approve the elevator, provided the shaft is dark red in color and encompasses the entire historic window opening at the third floor, and

provided that the removed window, sill, and brick is salvaged and stored on site, with the staff to review details. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

611 LOMBARD STREET

Owner/Applicant: Robert Roth, AIA

History: c. 1810; individually designated; contributing to Society Hill Historic District

Project: Legalize rear addition facing residential courtyard constructed without a permit

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the construction of a third story on the rear ell of this rowhouse. The owner, who was himself the architect for the addition, claims that an unnamed City official told him he could build it without a permit.

The windows at both the front and rear facades of this building are vinyl. The owner claims he bought the property with these windows. The application does not address the windows.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Property owner and architect Robert Roth represented the application.

Mr. Sherman asked Mr. Baron if this addition was constructed without a permit. Mr. Baron stated that it was. Mr. Baron explained that the addition was constructed on top of a 1960s rear addition, not on historic fabric. He also noted that many neighboring buildings have been stuccoed at the rear. Ms. Smyler stated that the Commission does not condone work executed without permits.

ACTION: Mr. Dilworth moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the addition, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 11 to 0. Ms. Merriman abstained.

263 S. 15TH STREET

Owner: David Blumenfield

Applicant: Joe Gunn

History: 1922; contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Legalize façade alterations

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the removal of a metal covering and installation of stucco on the first-story façade.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Business owner Casey Parker represented the application.

Mr. Parker explained that he is unable to afford to rebuild the storefront at the moment. He stated that he would be willing to improve the storefront over time. He offered to work with the Commission to find a feasible solution. He noted that the old vestibule, which he altered, was dangerous.

Mr. Baron explained to the Commission that the work required the Commission's approval and a building permit. He reported that he spoke to the contractor before the work was undertaken and explained the Commission's jurisdiction and processes. However, the contractor undertook the work without any approvals or permits. Mr. Baron advised that the vestibule was in place before designation and is therefore grandfathered; it was legal as long as it was not altered without approval. However, the Commission has the authority to review any proposed alterations to it. Mr. Baron explained that he also spoke to the contractor about the appropriate windows and cornice for the building. Mr. Sherman noted that the cornice was replaced at some point with T-111. He opined that every alteration to this building moves it another step away from its historic appearance. Mr. Wilds asked if the Commission would have approved the stucco on the vestibule if it had been proposed to the Commission before the work was undertaken. Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Baron to explain what he would have done if the owner approached the Commission before undertaking any work. Mr. Baron stated that he would have asked the applicant to remove the cladding on the storefront to see if any historic material survived beneath it. Mr. Baron stated that he believes that the original vestibule was added with a building permit prior to designation. He also stated that he believes that the current vestibule is the old vestibule with a new cladding, not an entirely new vestibule.

Mr. Parker stated that his contractor had told him that he had complied with all requirements. He explained that his contractor used a stucco that was intended to match the old storefront material in the historic photograph. He disagreed with Mr. Baron that the historic storefront cladding was marble and claimed that it was limestone. He reported that his contractor found broken white tile under the metal cladding.

Mr. Sherman stated that he considered the vestibule to be inappropriate. Mr. Dilworth stated that he considered the vestibule to be a non-contributing component to the property. Mr. Wilds stated that the owner could have retained the vestibule forever, but should have undergone a Commission review before altering it, even if it is not historically significant itself. Mr. Wilds concluded that the Commission has the discretion to approve or deny the current storefront. Mr. Sherman asserted that the Commission would have required the removal of the vestibule, had the owner submitted an application in advance of undertaking the work.

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

2123 SPRING GARDEN STREET

Owner: 2123 Partners LP

Applicant: Michael Mattioni, Esq.

History: c. 1875; individually designated 2/7/1974; contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Legalize windows and siding

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the windows, pursuant to Standard 6; approval of the siding, provided the historically appropriate windows are installed.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of four-over-four wood windows in the façade. The windows should be two-over-two, wood, true-divided-light, double-hung sash windows. It also proposes to legalize the installation of aluminum siding on the rear bay.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Attorney Lauren Reap and property owner Corey Berman represented the application.

Mr. Sherman stated that the buildings have been sitting idle for a long time and should be brought into compliance. Mr. Reap stated that her client would like to complete the work to them. She claimed that her client was unaware of the designations when he purchased them. She claimed that they required a significant work including brick pointing, siding, and windows. Mr. Sherman disapproved of the fact that the applicants did not seek any approvals or permits before undertaking the work to these two properties. Mr. Sherman stated that the developer should have known that the buildings are designated as historic and should have sought the appropriate approvals and permits. Mr. Sherman stated that he could not believe that a developer would conclude that the work undertaken at these buildings did not require building permits. If the developer had sought permits, he would have been apprised of the designations. Mr. Wilds noted that building permits are needed to replace siding and windows in multi-family residential buildings like these regardless of whether they are designated as historic. Ms. Reap acknowledged that her client did not obtain building permits before undertaking the work. She stated that her client looked at neighboring buildings and then did what he thought was appropriate. She stated that the windows were selected to be in the character of the historic neighborhood. She stated that there are 1-over-1, 2-over-2, and 4-over-4 windows in the district. Mr. Thomas stated that the historic district contains an eclectic variety of buildings; the developer should not have guessed at the appropriate alterations, but should have consulted with the Commission. He stated that there is no standard window for all buildings in the district. He warned that if you elect to work on a multi-family building without a building permit, you do so at great risk. Mr. Wilds noted that the staff would have advised on the pointing as well had the developer consulted the Commission beforehand.

Ms. Reap asked if it would be possible to modify the windows to make them appropriate. Mr. Baron stated that it would not. He explained that, although the two buildings were similar originally, they are now very different and require different windows. He advised that the building that had been significantly modified with the bay and other alterations should have 1-over-1 windows; it now has the character of an early twentieth-century building. The other building, which retains its original mid nineteenth-century character, should have 2-over-2 windows. He also noted that holes had been cut in the facades for air conditioning units, which also require permits. Ms. Reap asserted that her client did not install the air conditioning units.

Ms. Reap explained that the Department of Licenses & Inspections issued Stop Work Orders two years ago. She stated that her client has been determining how to fund the completions of the buildings during the intervening years. Ms. Schlotterbeck noted that the Stop Work Orders prohibit work to the interiors as well as exteriors. Mr. Sherman asked the applicants why it had taken them two years to apply to the Commission to correct the problems. Mr. Berman explained that he was working with City agencies to rectify the problems. Mr. Sherman disagreed and asserted that her client was merely "sitting" for two years. Mr. Baron stated that he has been advising the property owner to submit applications to the Commission for a long time, but he has not. Mr. Sherman stated that the buildings are very valuable and there should be no financial reason why they have not been brought into compliance. Mr. Berman claimed that the appropriate windows would cost \$60,000 for the front facades. Several Commission members contended that that number was not realistic. It should be much lower, \$500 to \$1,000 per opening.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the windows, pursuant to Standard 6; and approve the siding,

provided the historically appropriate windows are installed. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2125 SPRING GARDEN STREET

Owner: 2123 Partners LP

Applicant: Michael Mattioni, Esq.

History: c. 1875; individually designated 2/7/1974; contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Legalize windows and siding

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of windows, pursuant to Standard 6; approval of siding, provided the historically appropriate windows are installed.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of four-over-four wood windows in the façade. The windows should be one-over-one, wood, double-hung sash windows. It also proposes to legalize the installation of aluminum siding on the rear of the first and second stories.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Attorney Lauren Reap and property owner Corey Berman represented the application.

The Commissioners noted that they had already discussed this application during the review of the previous application. The issues are identical.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the windows, pursuant to Standard 6; and approve the siding, provided the historically appropriate windows are installed. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

152-154 N. 3RD STREET

Owner: O.L.C.

Applicant: Kevin Angstadt

History: 152: c. 1950; non-contributing to Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

154: c. 1845; contributing to Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Construct three-story addition

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the windows in the front façade of the contributing building are wood, true-divided-light, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story addition on a two-story non-contributing building in Old City at 152 N. 3rd Street. The addition would match the height of the adjacent existing five-story building at 154 N. 3rd Street. The addition would be constructed mostly of brick but the front façade would be clad flat-locked pre-weathered zinc siding. This application also proposes to install new windows on the fourth and fifth floors of 154. Details are not provided. The staff could approve the windows provided they were wood, true-divided-light windows and shop drawings were submitted

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

The Commissioners agreed that the addition is apt, but the windows for the historic building should be historically appropriate.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided the windows in the front façade of the contributing building are wood, true-divided-light, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

4205-4207 WALNUT STREET

Owner: Daniel Liberatoscioli, Liberatoscioli, Inc., The Restaurant School

Applicant: Paul Miller

History: c. 1860; individually designated, 5/25/1965

Project: Replace porch flooring

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove the exiting wood porch floor and steps and replace them with a new floor and steps composed of bluestone pavers on a concrete base.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Commission. Property owner Daniel Liberatoscioli and Paul Miller of the Restaurant School represented the application.

Mr. Liberatoscioli stated that he would like to rebuild the porch to improve its quality and safety. He reported that approximately 600 students, 100 staff, and 150 guests use the porch daily. He stated that the porch decking is currently unattractive; it is pressure-treated gray wood. He stated that it also requires constant maintenance. He reported that Councilwoman Blackwell and the University City Historical Society both support his project.

Mr. Wilds objected to the proposal and contended that the porch never had a decking that in any way resembled bluestone. Ms. Smyler stated that she understands the applicant's concerns owing to the high traffic. Mr. Thomas suggested that applicant consider hardwoods like those used on boardwalks in New Jersey and bridges like the Strawbridge Mansion Bridge. He explained that some hardwoods can withstand heavy traffic. He stated that the structure of the porch could be reinforced, allowing the decking to last longer. He noted that buildings he worked on Parkside Avenue have steel porch structures, which have allowed the wood floors to survive for more than 100 years. Mr. Amburn noted that the Committee had suggested the possibility of constructing a concrete base for the porch with wood decking on top. Mr. Thomas suggested that a stained hardwood would be appropriate. Mr. Liberatoscioli stated that the porch is always worn and also poses safety hazards. Mr. Miller agreed and contended that the porch surface must be replaced with a safer and more durable material such as the proposed bluestone. Mr. Wilds concluded that the proposed bluestone is not an appropriate answer to the problems posed by the porch.

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

4365-4367 MAIN STREET

Owner: Bruce Cooper

Applicant: William O'Brien

History: c. 1890; in Manayunk Historic District, 12/14/1983

Project: Façade Alterations

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to PM-704.2.6.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to combine this building with its neighbor to expand Jake's Restaurant. The applicant wishes to demolish a recessed storefront and install a new storefront. The new storefront would be flush with the street and have operable café windows with large mullions and tempered glass to mimic the design of its neighbor.

An earlier iteration of this project was presented to Commission in November 2007. The proposal depicted an open, clear glass window system without mullions. The Commission approved in concept the demolition of the existing storefront and installation of a non-historic storefront. However, the storefront proposed in the current application is very different from the storefront approved in concept.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Business owner Bruce Cooper and attorney William O'Brien represented the application.

Mr. O'Brien summarized the application. He cited sections of the Manayunk Historic District ordinance and claimed that the proposed design satisfies the requirements outlined therein. He then explained that, after working with the staff since the Architectural Committee meeting, his client prepared a revised design. He presented the revised design to the Commission and asked the Commission to approve the demolition of the extant storefront and either the original or revised design for the new storefront. Mr. Cooper stated that he hoped to open his new restaurant soon and wanted the quickest path to an approval. Mr. Wilds stated that his preference for the revised design. Mr. Wilds asserted that the approval of the demolition should be predicated on the construction of the approved storefront. Mr. Baron asked about the sign. Mr. O'Brien stated that the sign shown on the drawings was not part of the application.

ACTION: Mr. Dilworth moved to approve the demolition of the existing storefront and the construction of the new storefront as documented in the revised plans presented to the Commission at its meeting of 9 May 2008, with the staff to review details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2137 ST. JAMES STREET

Owner: Michael & Heather Ascher

Applicant: Timothy Kerner

History: 1923, Spencer Roberts, architect; significant to Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Construct rear addition and alter second floor rear

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a one-story addition at the rear of this property along Chancellor Street. The addition would be enclosed by a glass roof and wall set over a masonry wall and doorway. This application also proposes to construct a roof deck on

the rear ell. The deck would be accessed by a door cut into the mansard roof and would have metal railing with obscure glass panels.

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

Raising a thorny issue, Mr. Wilds asked if the proposal included any vines or roses. The staff responded that it did not.

ACTION: Ms. Smyler moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1410 CHESTNUT STREET, AKA 100 S. BROAD STREET

Owner: LTB Limited

Applicant: John Lepone

History: designated 8/2/1973

Project: Install internally illuminated sign

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install an internally illuminated sign to the storefront. The sign would be a dark bronze extruded aluminum box with a Lexan and vinyl face.

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

Several Commission members commented that the proposed sign is not appropriate for the building, which is part of a larger historic building.

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

239 DELANCEY STREET

Owners: Jeannette and Oliver Boulind

Applicant: Rachel Simmons Shade, AIA

History: c. 1811; wagon works c. 1890; first-floor front façade rebuilt 1962

Contributing to Society Hill Historic District

Project: Install six-over-six simulated-divided-light windows, roofing, and skylights, demolish and enlarge rear dormer

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the simulated light windows, provided the muntins 7/8 inches wide and have a beveled putty slope; the first-floor rear alterations; the installation of a new skylight in the existing size and location; a new roof with Timberline shape, weathered-wood color shingles; and shutters, provided they are paneled at the first floor and louvered above; with the staff to review details. The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the new rear dormer and enlarged skylight, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the demolition of a rear dormer and its replacement with a larger dormer. The windows on the front façade will be replaced with six-over-six simulated light windows. The applicant asks for the optional replacement of the frames however the proposed details do not match historic plank frames. The proposed shutters also seem inappropriate to the façade because they do not match the historic photos and are paneled where historic photos show louvered. The applicant asks to install a new roof without specifying color or shape of the shingles and an enlarged front skylight that will be visible from Delancey Street

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Property owner Oliver Boulind and architect Rachel Schade represented the application.

Ms. Schade provided a history of the property and then summarized the proposal. She stated that the shutter designs have been revised according to the suggestions of the Architectural Committee. She explained that the skylight and dormer alterations were rejected by the Committee. She stated that the garret space is not functional in its current condition. She claimed that the rear of the building including the dormer is not visible from the public right-of-way. The parking lot at the rear is private and not accessible to the public. The rear is not visible from American Street. She also claimed that dormers on nearby houses have altered in similar ways as she is proposing. Mr. Wilds suggested that the skylight be moved to the rear slope of the roof, where it would be less visible. Ms. Schade stated that that would be feasible. She noted that the skylight on the front slope cannot be seen from Delancey Street. Mr. Thomas suggested that the skylight be operable for ventilation. Mr. Dilworth noted that the Commission approved a new window opening and a non-historic glazed door for a nearby property. He asked how this application differed from that one. Mr. Wilds noted that the rear dormer is original and would be lost. Mr. Schaaf asked why the staff had recommended against the demolition of the rear dormer. Mr. Baron stated that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards do not take visibility into account, but instead recommend the retention of all important historic fabric. Mr. Baron asserted that the rear dormer is one of the last pieces of historic fabric on the exterior of the house and is character defining. He contended that it should be preserved. Ms. Smyler agreed and asked how the Commission could justify the approval of the demolition of the rear dormer. Mr. Wilds asserted that the rear roof is already compromised. Mr. Thomas suggested that the dormer could be documented before it was demolished. He commented that the dormer might provide more benefit to the public if it was documented in the Commission's archive than if it stood on the rear roof, out of the public view.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Commission at its 9 May 2008 meeting with the amendments noted during the review, with or without the front skylight, provided documentation of the original rear dormer and roof structure is presented to the Commission, with the staff to review details. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

4806 TRINITY PLACE

Owner: Phyllis Kaniss and Paul Wheeling

Applicant: Phyllis Kaniss and Paul Wheeling

History: c. 1890; individually designated 1/28/1969

Project: Reroof slate mansard with asphalt shingles

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application as submitted, pursuant to Standard 2, but approval of the installation of authentic slate on the mansard's front elevation and Grand Manor asphalt on the side and rear, with copper ridge rolls, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove existing slate and install asphalt shingles on the mansard roof. The asphalt shingle would simulate the slate.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Property owner Paul Wheeling represented the application.

Mr. Wheeling reported that he was a member of the neighborhood group that worked for the designation of the block. He displayed photographs of several of his neighbors' houses that now have inappropriate roofing. He explained that he will spend \$20,000 on the roof he is proposing; his neighbors have spent between \$5,000 and \$10,000 on their inappropriate roofs. He added that real slate would cost \$60,000, three times his proposed roof. Mr. Wilds asked him if he would install copper ridge rolls. Mr. Wheeling stated that he would.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the application to reroof the mansard with Grand Manor asphalt shingles and copper ridge rolls. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

228-238 N. 13TH STREET

Owner: Foundation of Big Brothers Big Sisters of America

Nominator: The Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia

History: 1946, William Harold Lee, architect

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

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Schaaf moved to recommend that the property at 228-238 N. 13th Street satisfies Designation Criteria A, D, E, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Lavery seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: The Warner Brothers Distributing Corporation building, designed by William Harold Lee in 1945, meets Philadelphia Register Criteria a, d, and j because it has significant character, interest, and value as part of the development, heritage and cultural characteristics of Philadelphia, and embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Art Moderne style. It also meets Philadelphia Register Criterion e as Lee's work significantly influenced theater architecture in the city of Philadelphia, particularly between 1920 and 1940. The building represents the style Lee used for movie house designs between the 1930s and 1950s. He combined the stylistic choice of the era with function to suit the business-end of the movie industry.

The Committee on Historic Designation reviewed a nomination for this property at its 10 September 2007 meeting, but the nominator withdrew it before Commission review. At that time, the Committee recommended that the property at 228-238 N. 13th Street satisfies Designation Criteria D, E, and J, should be designated as historic, and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the nomination to the Committee. Nominator John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance represented the nomination.

Mr. Wilds observed that the property owner was not present. Mr. Farnham reported that the owner had been notified in writing of this meeting. Mr. Gallery asked if the owner had submitted anything in writing to the Commission regarding the nomination. Mr. Farnham stated that he had not. Mr. Farnham noted that the owner had opposed the designation at the Committee on Historic Designation meeting. He also reported that the owner had indicated that he would hire a consultant to evaluate the nomination. Mr. Gallery commented that the owner has had sufficient time to consider the nomination. Mr. Wilds suggested that the Commission move ahead with the review. The owner has been notified and has had an opportunity to consider the nomination; the Commission can only conclude that the owner has elected not to attend the meeting.

Mr. Gallery advocated for the designation, asserting that this nomination would bolster the Register, which currently does not represent the City's commercial history adequately. He stated that few realize that Philadelphia was important as a regional center for film distribution. He reported that every major Hollywood studio had a distribution center in Philadelphia. These centers were located in the area of 13th and Vine Streets. This is the only one that survives and is representative of the city's once prominent film district.

Mr. Dilworth stated that he supports the nomination, but is not convinced that the building played a significant role in the city's economic history. He also posited that there is no "necessary" connection between the character of the building itself and the film industry. He stated that he is concerned that Criteria A and J are "catch-alls." He stated that every big city would have had a film distribution center; Philadelphia did not play a unique role in the distribution of films. Mr. Gallery disagreed and stated that Philadelphia was a regional center for the distribution of film; not every large city was a distribution center. He also noted that the building has features unique to the film distribution business including its fireproof film vault. Mr. Schaaf highlighted Philadelphia's prominence in film history.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation, find that the property at 228-238 N. 13th Street satisfies Designation Criteria A, D, E, and J, designate it as historic, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATIONS

AMALGAMATED CLOTHING WORKERS OF AMERICA OFFICE BUILDING, 2101-2143 SOUTH STREET

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historic Preservation Board of the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission has requested that the Philadelphia Historical Commission comment on the nomination of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America Office Building at 2101-2143 South Street to the National Register. The nomination contends that the site satisfies National Register criteria A and C: the property is associated with events that have made a significant

contribution to the broad patterns of our history; and the property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction. The nomination explains that the building was designed in the Art Moderne style by Magaziner & Eberhard and housed an important labor union. The staff recommends that the Commission recommend that the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America Office Building satisfies National Register criteria A and C and should be listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

WOMAN'S MEDICAL COLLEGE OF PHILADELPHIA, 3300 HENRY AVENUE

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historic Preservation Board of the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission has requested that the Philadelphia Historical Commission comment on the nomination of the Woman's Medical College of Philadelphia at 3300 Henry Avenue to the National Register. The nomination contends that the site satisfies National Register criteria A and C: the property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; and the property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction. The nomination explains that the complex was designed in the Colonial Revival and Modern styles by Ritter & Shay and Thaddeus Longstreth and housed one of the first and most prominent women's medical schools. The staff recommends that the Commission recommend that the Woman's Medical College of Philadelphia satisfies National Register criteria A and C and should be listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the nominations for both properties to the Commission.

Gary Gordon of 3300 Henry LP, the owner of the Woman's Medical College of Philadelphia complex, advocated for the Commission to recommend that the site satisfies the National Register criteria and should be listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance explained that National Register designations are important because they make properties eligible for federal tax credits for historic preservation projects.

Mr. Dilworth asked if the properties could be listed on the Philadelphia Register simultaneously with the issuance of a recommendation regarding the National Register today. Mr. Farnham explained that the historic preservation ordinance requires that the Commission notify property owners before considering nominations. Therefore, the properties could not be considered for the Philadelphia Register today, but could be considered at a later date. Messrs. Thomas and Gallery explained the federal tax credit program and suggested that the Commission consider properties for designation after they had undergone rehabilitations using tax credits, but before the five-year federal tax credit oversight period expires.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved that the Commission recommend to the Pennsylvania Historic Preservation Board that the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America Office Building at 2101-2143 South Street and the Woman's Medical College of Philadelphia at 3300 Henry Avenue satisfy National Register criteria A and C and should be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 12:42 p.m., Mr. Wilds moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Smyler 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 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Storefronts Guideline: Recommended, Re-creating a missing storefront or storefront features that existed during the restoration period based on physical or documentary evidence; for example, duplicating a display window or transom.