

**THE MINUTES OF THE 595<sup>TH</sup> STATED MEETING OF THE  
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 9 MARCH 2012  
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET  
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

**PRESENT**

Sam Sherman, Chair  
Duane Bumb, Commerce Department  
Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D.  
Anuj Gupta  
Dominique Hawkins  
JoAnn Jones, Office of Housing & Community Development  
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President  
John Mattioni, Esq.  
Daniel Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections  
David Schaaf, Philadelphia City Planning Commission  
Robert Thomas, AIA  
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**

Matt McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr  
George E. Thomas, Ph.D., Civicvisions  
Tom Tritton, Chemical Heritage Foundation  
Ed Barnhart, AIA, Always by Design  
Mark Coggin, PE, Thorton Tomasetti, Inc.  
Dan Kayser, Saylor Gregg Architects  
Peter Saylor, Saylor Gregg Architects  
David Hollenberg, University of Pennsylvania  
Eileen B. Quigley, Esq., Ballard Spahr  
Peter Sikora, Velocitel  
Andrew Petersohn, AT&T  
Petros Tsoukalas, AT&T  
Amber Luther, Hugewindow Architecture  
Steven Pollock, Esq., Montgomery McCracken  
Joseph Figurski  
Sandy Garz, Beth Zion-Beth Israel  
Neil Sklaroff, Esq., Ballard Spahr  
Kurt Bergey  
Elizabeth Naylor  
Anthony Barsi, Little Diversified Architectural Consulting  
John O'Connor, Esq.  
Rick Blyler, MacIntosh Construction

Thomas Kirchner, AIA, BWA Architecture + Planning  
Morris Zimmerman, BWA Architecture + Planning  
Michael Ryan, MRA  
Randee Spelkoman, MRA  
Richard W. Nevius, RWN Enterprises  
Van Strother, New Covenant Church  
Ryan Sell, AMC Delancey  
Anthony Campisi, Plan Philly  
Drew Murray, Friends of Coxe Park (FOCP)  
Kristen Moses-Murray  
Arielle Levite  
Sam R. Little, Logan Square Neighborhood Association (LSNA)  
Ed Panek, LSNA  
Gayle Ruggeri  
Sarah Vogel, FOCP  
Barbara Morehead  
Sheri Ann Cowie  
Tully Speaker  
Tom Malone  
Frank Leitner  
Collette Kinane  
Nancy S. Weinberg  
C. Donald Weinberg  
Julie Kaeli  
Marisa Piccareto, FOCP  
Joseph Sirbak  
David S. Traub, Save Our Sites  
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
Heather Young, FOCP  
W.M. Armstead, LSNA  
Janet Grace  
Theresa Stuhlman, Philadelphia Parks & Recreation  
G. Neumen

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

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

#### **MINUTES OF THE 594<sup>TH</sup> STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**ACTION:** Ms. Jones moved to adopt the minutes of the 594<sup>th</sup> Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 10 February 2012. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

## **THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 21 FEBRUARY 2012**

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included applications for 36 S. 3rd Street, 2201 Chestnut Street, Unit 901, 2201 Chestnut Street, Unit 903, 2027 Walnut Street, 526 S. 11th Street, 1014 Pine Street, and 1800-04 Spruce Street. Mr. Sherman asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. Ms. Hawkins commented that, although she was not asking to move the application for 1800-04 Spruce Street to the regular agenda, she did want to note that the illegal vinyl windows at the synagogue, which are not addressed by the application, should be replaced. Mr. Sherman asked if the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments.

**ACTION:** Mr. Mattioni moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for 36 S. 3rd Street, 2201 Chestnut Street, Unit 901, 2201 Chestnut Street, Unit 903, 2027 Walnut Street, 526 S. 11th Street, 1014 Pine Street, and 1800-04 Spruce Street. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **AGENDA**

#### **ADDRESS: 36 S 03RD ST**

Project: Restore front façade, construct archival storage facility

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Chemical Heritage Foundation

Applicant: Matt McClure, Ballard Spahr LLP

History: 1855

Individual Designation: 4/5/1973

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

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the front façade is fully restored, with the staff to review details, especially window, door, and masonry repair details, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to adaptively reuse this loft building as an archival storage facility for the Chemical Heritage Foundation. The building has been vacant for many years and is in very poor condition. The Department of Licenses & Inspections recently cited the building as Unsafe because the side and rear walls of the building are failing. The side or party wall is failing because the adjacent building was demolished many years ago and is no longer supporting the party wall. The infilled basement of the demolished building is exerting pressure on the foundation of the building in question, causing the upper section of the party wall to rotate out away from the building. The rear wall is failing because the first-floor section of the wall was removed and improperly supported many years ago for an addition. It is severely cracked and in danger of collapse. The rear wall is not visible from the public right-of-way. Exacerbating these problems, the building suffered from a fire in the 1950s as well as extensive water infiltration under previous ownership. The current owner has attempted arrest the deterioration, but to no avail. A steel structure was added inside to support the rear wall, but it and the party wall continue to move. To make the building safe, the side and rear walls and roof of this building must be reconstructed. An engineer's report detailing the structural problems is included with the application.

On 3 February 2012, the Historical Commission's staff approved an application to abate the Unsafe conditions by removing part of the side and all of the rear wall, with the proviso that the walls would be reconstructed within one year. The current application proposes to reconstruct the walls and restore the front façade. The walls would be reconstructed to replicate the historic building envelope. However, a second, lower wall would be constructed 3'-8" to the north of the original party wall location to provide sufficient space for an automated archival storage and retrieval system. The front façade would be fully restored. The fire escape was also cited as Unsafe and would be removed during the restoration of the front façade.

**ACTION:** See Consent Agenda

**ADDRESS: 9 LETITIA ST**

Project: Construct five-story building

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Frase Inc., Sena Bothers

Applicant: Guiseppe Sena

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to comment that the plans should be revised to simplify the design of the front façade, replace the large single windows with two double-hung windows with historic proportions separated by masonry at each floor, delete the balconies, delete the arches with keystones, add brick detailing in place of the stucco detailing, and eliminate light fixtures above the first floor.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes the construction of a five-story building on a narrow, vacant lot in the Old City Historic District. The Commission has review-and-comment jurisdiction only over this project.

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

Mr. Baron displayed the revised design for the front façade. He stated that the architect had replaced the large single windows with two windows with historic proportions separated by masonry at each floor, added a cornice, and simplified the ornament over the windows including deleting the keystones. He stated that, with the exception of retaining the inset balcony, the architect has incorporated the Architectural Committee's suggestions. Ms. Leonard asked if the windows were double-hung. Mr. Baron replied that they are, in fact, casement-like doors onto the balconies. Mr. Schaaf asked about the inset balcony. Mr. Baron pointed it out on the plan. Mr. Thomas asked if the ground-level parking was open to the street. Mr. Baron replied that it is enclosed with a metal gate. Mr. Thomas asked if the building would connect to a restaurant building on Front Street. Mr. Baron responded that it would not physically attach to that building. Mr. Thomas asked if the architect had provided a brick sample. Mr. Baron stated that he is concerned that the façade will be constructed with a brick that is inappropriate for the district. He added that he has provided the architect with information about appropriate bricks. Mr. Thomas stated that it should be a consistently-colored red brick. Mr. Baron agreed that it should be a dark red color.

**ACTION:** Mr. Thomas moved to comment that the building proposed in the revised plans is appropriate for the Old City Historic District, provided the brick is of a consistent, appropriate color. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ADDRESS: 3601-7 LOCUST WLK**

Project: Construct rear additions, rehabilitate exterior, alter wall, install storm windows and mechanical equipment

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: University of Pennsylvania

Applicant: W. Daniel Kayser, Saylor Gregg Architects

History: 1928; Christian Association Building; Thomas, Martin & Kirkpatrick, architects

Individual Designation: 2/7/1974

District Designation: None

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application as presented to the Committee, with the staff to review the final details, including any changes to the cladding material of the additions.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to rehabilitate the former Christian Association building at the University of Pennsylvania. The building is situated at the intersection of Locust Walk and 36<sup>th</sup> Street. The application proposes restoration as well as alterations to the building.

The restoration work would include repairs to the exterior masonry, most of the original leaded windows, and the roof. The exterior masonry would be repointed and limestone trim would be cleaned and conserved. The majority of the steel casement windows with leaded-glass would be retained and restored. The application also proposes the replacement of basement-level windows, which are also steel casements. The roof is slate. The application proposes to replace it with new slate. The drawings note the replacement slate will be "uniform"; it is unclear, however, if the new slate would replicate the extant slate. The application does not include information on the uniformity or the color of the extant slate or information on the proposed slate. This element of the application may meet the Standards, but more details are necessary to complete the review.

The alterations to the building would be located away from Locust Walk. The alterations include the construction of two additions, the enlargement of areaways, and the creation of a new entrance. The additions would be located towards the rear of the building. One would house a fire stair. The other would house a new restroom core. One would be set back in the side yard of the building. This location is not easily accessible by the public and the addition at this location would be inconspicuous. The second addition is proposed for a more publicly visible area of the building. It would be located along a walkway that runs parallel to Locust Walk. This walkway is open to the public. The addition would straddle the corner of the building along this walkway and protrude from the historic plane of the wall. The addition would be clad in glass and cast concrete. The concrete would be colored to match the limestone trim on the building. The addition, although visible, would not obstruct views of any character defining elements of the historic building. Also, its massing and location would be respectful of the original building. The areaways around the basement level of the building would be enlarged. The application provides very little information about the existing conditions and the proposed enlargement. The drawings note the addition of iron guardrails and new granite curbs, but provide no information on the elements they are replacing. The existing brick wall that encloses the areaway along 36<sup>th</sup> Street is not original to the building. It likely dates to the 1940s and was present by 1951. Lastly,

a new entrance is proposed for the basement level along 36<sup>th</sup> Street. There are currently two windows at this location. The application provides little information on the design of this new entrance or the need for it; a plan of the interior was not included in the submission packet.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architect Peter Saylor and David Hollenberg of the University of Pennsylvania represented the application.

Mr. Hollenberg stated that the University purchased the property about 10 years ago and is now able to restore the building thanks to a generous gift from an anonymous donor. He stated that they would include a café in the building. He noted that the building is at the heart of the campus.

Mr. Saylor, the architect, displayed a slide presentation of the project. He noted that, originally, only two facades were visible to the public and that the location of the proposed additions would be located in areas that were historically not publicly visible. He explained that the area around the building has changed with recent construction on the campus. He pointed out the walkway that now runs along the north side of the building. He explained that the building suffers from a leaky roof, spalling masonry, and other problems, which this project will address. He explained the scope of work in detail. He explained the additions, the new lower-level entrance, and the restoration work. Mr. Saylor spoke about the new entrance and stairway down to it. He explained the changes to the garden wall, which is much modified from its historic condition. Mr. Saylor stated that the proposed cast-stone cladding proposed for the additions relates to the limestone walls that are found on the new building located on the north side of the walkway. He noted that the north addition to the west façade will be very transparent, with much glass. He also stated that it projects off the north façade to avoid covering a window on the west façade. He stated that the south addition on the west façade would not be visible to the public.

Mr. Thomas stated that the proposal was thoughtful and well developed. It is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He stated that allowing light into the basement was important, owing to the new activities at this level.

Mr. Hollenberg stated that the University supports the designation of the Rotunda, for which a nomination will be considered later on the Commission's agenda.

**ACTION:** Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application as presented to the Architectural Committee, with the staff to review the final details, including any changes to the cladding material of the additions. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ADDRESS: 2201 CHESTNUT ST**

Project: Add and relocate antennas

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Coronado Condominium Association, Inc.

Applicant: Eileen Quigley, Ballard Spahr LLP

History: 1910; Coronado Apartments; Milligan & Webber, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guidelines.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to relocate several cellular phone antennas on the roof of a Beaux-Arts apartment building in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District. The building currently has antennas that are attached to the walls of the penthouse. The application proposes to relocate these antennas to a new armature that would sit on top of a pilot house on the penthouse. The proposed armature and antennas would be highly visible.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Attorney Eileen Quigley, engineers Petros Tsoukalas and Andrew Petersohn, and site acquisition specialist Peter Sikora represented the application.

Ms. Quigley presented revised plans, which were updated based on the comments of the Architectural Committee. Ms. Quigley stated that the antennas were legally installed in 1995. She explained that the antennas will be relocated to an area atop the penthouse. She stated that the application had been revised to stipulate that the antennas would be covered by a faux brick cladding made out of foam, which would extend the existing penthouse and render the antennas invisible from the street. Ms. Quigley stated that the penthouse would be increased in height by five feet above the highest existing point. She stated that the revised proposal is more sensitive to the architecture of the building and satisfies the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Ms. Hawkins stated that, if the revised proposal had been presented to the Committee, some Committee members would have been concerned with the additional height. She noted that it was not the intention of the Committee to advise the applicant to increase the height of the elevator penthouse. She clarified that the Committee has suggested installing the antennas on the brick walls of the penthouse itself and painting the antennas the color of the brick. Ms. Quigley stated that the revisions address the concerns regarding visibility from the street. She explained that, because the existing condensing unit is 18 feet tall, the antennas need to be taller than the unit. Peter Sikora stated that the condensing unit blocks signals to antennas on one of the walls of the penthouse, making the suggestion offered by Ms. Hawkins impossible to implement.

Mr. Thomas stated that he believes that the proposal satisfies the Standards, and that the increased height is not detrimental to the public's perception of the architecture of the building. He opined that it was an improvement over the existing conditions.

Mr. Schaaf asked if the armature would be seen through the faux brick foam. Mr. Sikora answered that the foam would be solid and would not allow visibility of the armature of antennas

behind it, yet the antennas would be able to send and receive signals through it. Mr. Mattioni stated that the revised proposal is a significant improvement over the original submission.

Mr. Petersohn stated that the proposed location would be a great improvement to the quality of the signal and a benefit to AT&T customers. He noted that the current installation is not optimal.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that he appreciates that the antennas have been removed from the west wall of the building. He observed that the revised application is much better than the original application and stated that the Alliance is now in support of the application. He requested that the Commission authorize the staff to review for approval a sample of the faux brick foam panel before it is installed.

**ACTION:** Mr. Thomas moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 9 March 2012, with the staff to review details. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 11 to 1. Ms. Hawkins dissented.

**ADDRESS: 2201 CHESTNUT ST, UNIT 901**

Project: Construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Emilia and James Serazio

Applicant: Maggie Persofsky

History: 1910; Coronado Apartments; Milligan & Webber, architects

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District, Significant, 2/8/1995

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the railings are painted to match the color of the penthouse masonry, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guidelines.

**ADDRESS: 2201 CHESTNUT ST, UNIT 903**

Project: Construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Kent R. Bergey

Applicant: Maggie Persofsky

History: 1910; Coronado Apartments; Milligan & Webber, architects

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District, Significant, 2/8/1995

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the railings are painted to match the color of the penthouse masonry, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guidelines.

**OVERVIEW:** These applications propose the construction of two small decks on the roof of a Beaux-Arts apartment building in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District. Decks were present at the time of designation. These decks were recently removed for a reroofing project. The proposed decks would be installed in the same locations as they previously existed. The deck railings would be taller than the removed railings to meet current code requirements. The

increase in height would make the railings slightly more visible than they were before. The railings would be visible against the backdrop of the penthouse on the roof of the building, not the sky. The applicant proposes two color choices for the railings: a light brown color to match the color of the penthouse wall, or black. The staff recommends that the railing should be painted light brown to match the color of the wall behind it. This would minimize the visibility of the railing. The railings, although slightly taller than before, would be seen by the public against the backdrop of the penthouse on the building. These railings would be inconspicuous to the pedestrian.

**ACTION:** See Consent Agenda

**ADDRESS: 1808 SPRUCE ST**

Project: Rehabilitate building, remove garage, construct garage, rear addition, and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Emil Associates, LLC

Applicant: Stephen Mileto, QB3, LLC

History: 1855

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the front façade is restored, the bay is retained above the garage, and a window opening in the bay is converted to a single-leaf door to the terrace, with the staff to review the details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to restore the front façade of this row house. Details of the restoration were not included. However, the staff can review the window and door shop drawings as well as the paint removal, masonry cleaning, and re-pointing specifications.

This application proposes to demolish the existing garage facing the service alley of Cypress Street and replace it with a masonry garage with painted steel garage and person doors. The roof of the garage would serve as a terrace. This application proposes to modify a rear bay window. The first floor of the bay would be demolished and west chamfer would be closed off and new window openings created in the second and third floors of the bay. New window openings and balconies are proposed for the east elevation of the rear ell. Lastly, a one-story addition is proposed above the rear ell, with a roof deck with a painted steel and glass guardrail. The roof deck would be accessed by a stair penthouse.

Please note that the balconies and roof deck guardrail do not appear in the elevation drawings but are indicated in the annotations.

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

The Commissioners reviewed the application and determined that it satisfies the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

**ACTION:** Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided that the front façade is restored, the bay is retained above the garage, and a window opening in the bay is converted to a

single-leaf door to the terrace, with the staff to review the details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ADDRESS: 127 S 18TH ST**

Project: Install awning and signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: ADR 18th and Sansom LLC

Applicant: Nicole Marquis, Hip City Veg

History: 1870; storefront added, 1915

Individual Designation: None

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

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to install a wood awning above the storefront at 127 S. 18<sup>th</sup> Street. The awning would be supported by an aluminum frame mounted into the limestone using existing holes where possible. The awning will consist of six-inch oak boards spaced three inches apart by solid acrylic. The Commission reviewed a similar application last month. This proposal has brought the awning in closer to the window opening to reveal six inches between the awning and the dental molding.

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

The Commissioners reviewed the application and determined that it does not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

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

**ADDRESS: 739 S 02ND ST**

Project: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: George and Karen Roskam

Applicant: Amber Luther, Hugewindow

History: 1835

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958, 3/30/1965

District Designation: None

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guidelines.

**OVERVIEW:** This in-concept application proposes to demolish a third-floor addition and the rear wall of the main block at the third floor at this property at the corner of 2<sup>nd</sup> and Pemberton Streets. The roof line would then be extended and a full width dormer would be added. Skylights are proposed for historic rear slope of the roof. This application also proposes to enlarge the fanlight window in the gable and cut a new window opening on the third floor.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Coté presented the application to the Commission. Architect Amber Luther represented the application.

Ms. Luther distributed revised drawings showing alternate proposals for the third-floor addition based on the Architectural Committee's comments. She stated that the property owners have decided to retain the existing fan-light window in the gable, not modify it. She stated that she has redesigned the addition, stepping it back to allow the original form of the building to be perceived. She reported that the owner prefers Options 1 and 4. She stated that reducing the height of the addition to a point below the existing rear cornice would result in an unusable space with a low ceiling.

Mr. Sherman asked if the alternatives should be remanded to the Architectural Committee for review. Ms. Hawkins responded that, on first glance, it appears that some of the Architectural Committee's concerns have been addressed, but others have not. She suggested that the application be remanded to the Committee. Mr. Farnham noted that the application proposes an in-concept review. He asserted that, as such, it should not be remanded to the Committee. He suggested instead that the Commission provide feedback to the applicant so that she can revise the proposal accordingly and submit a revised proposal for final approval for the next round of reviews. He explained to the applicant that, even if the Committee recommended approval of a remanded in-concept application and the Commission then approved it at a later meeting, she would still need to submit an application for final approval before a building permit could be issued. He observed that a denial of the in-concept application today with instructions regarding a revised application for final approval would be the shortest path to a building permit. Mr. Thomas concurred that the alternative designs should be reviewed by the Architectural Committee.

Ms. Hawkins suggested that the addition should respect the rear cornice line, and not rise above it. Mr. Thomas also noted that the cantilevering of the addition beyond the rear ell was not appropriate.

**ACTION:** Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guidelines. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ADDRESS: 132 CARPENTER ST**

Project: Legalize windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joseph Figurski

Applicant: Joseph Figurski

History: 1825

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958, 6/28/1966

District Designation: None

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend legalization of the windows, provided the capping is removed from the dormer and the dormer woodwork is repaired, scraped, and painted, pursuant to Section 14-2007(7)(k)(.7).

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to legalize five vinyl windows with capping that were installed in this row house without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit.

The first and second-story windows are nine-over-nines, but should be six-over-sixes. The Commission was alerted of the work in the summer of 2010 and requested a violation.

The property owner has submitted an application claiming that the replacement of the vinyl windows with historically appropriate windows would result in an unnecessary hardship.

Section 11 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations addresses unnecessary hardship. It defines the submission requirements as:

a building permit application, a description of the scope of work, drawings if available, cost estimates for the proposed work and Federal Income Tax Returns for the previous two years demonstrating household income or other evidence to demonstrate qualification for this exemption.

The applicant has not submitted federal income tax returns, but has provided other documents including copies of the Pennsylvania Property Tax or Rent Rebate Claim, PA-1000, for 2009 and 2010, which includes a statement of total income.

Section 11 of the Rules & Regulations states that:

As its initial criterion for evaluating a request for an exception under the Unnecessary Hardship provision, the Commission may employ the Section 8 eligibility guidelines of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), which defines a low or moderate-income household as one with an income of not more than eighty percent (80%) of the median family income for the Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD Metropolitan Statistical Area.

For 2012, HUD defines the low income (80%) limit for a household of one for the Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD Metropolitan Statistical Area as \$45,500. Based on the documentation provided, the staff can attest that this property owner's annual income is below that level.

The applicant has provided two estimates to replace the five windows in violation as well as the door, transom over the door, and basement windows, which were not included within the violation. The estimates are for \$11,440.80 and \$11,165.00.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Attorney John O'Conner and property owner Joseph Figurski represented the application.

Mr. O'Conner stated that Mr. Figurski's annual incoming is estimated at \$12,000, \$8,000 from Social Security and \$4,000 from a pension. He explained that Mr. Figurski is financially strained and cannot afford to replace the illegal windows. He stated that his client accepted the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Figurski stated that he used to live with his mother, who died in 1991. He explained that she had the windows installed three years before she passed away. He explained that he was not aware of the designation until he received the violation in 2010. He asserted that, if he had known the property was designated while his mother was alive, he would have corrected the violation immediately because he was working and had a good income.

**ACTION:** Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and legalize the windows, provided the capping is removed from the dormer and the dormer woodwork is repaired, scraped, and painted, pursuant to Section 14-2007(7)(k)(.7). Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ADDRESS: 2027 WALNUT ST**

Project: Construct addition with ramp for ATM

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: AMCD Walnut St. Associates LP

Applicant: Matthew Boyle, Security Vault Works, Inc.

History: 1855

Individual Designation: None

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

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to alter the storefront and install an ADA ramp. The ramp would be installed along the front façade and project four and one-half feet from the building. No information has been provided to demonstrate that the ramp could not be constructed on the interior.

The application proposes to repair and/or replace ornately carved wood elements within the transom. This unique transom is a character-defining feature and should be preserved. No information has been provided documenting which spindles need replacement, their condition, or methods of reproduction.

An awning for the front façade will be proposed as a separate application.

**ACTION:** See Consent Agenda

**ADDRESS: 526 S 11TH ST**

Project: Cut new openings and install windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Graeme Newman

Applicant: Rick Blyler, MacIntosh Construction

History: 1833; John Lindsay, carpenter

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

District Designation: None

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the new windows are wood, six-over-six, double-hung windows and that they are horizontally and vertically aligned with one register of windows between the chimneys and the other between the front chimney and the front façade, with the staff to review the details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to cut four windows into the side elevation of this building. Currently, the elevation is stuccoed. According to an 1895 atlas, the side of this building faced an alley and was never a party wall. The applicant proposes to install windows to match those on the front façade. However, no information has been provided regarding the windows locations or how they would fit proportionally between or around the two existing chimneys.

**ACTION:** See Consent Agenda

**ADDRESS: 1014 PINE ST**

Project: Alter windows and doors, construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: David H. Naylor

Applicant: David Naylor, Ablemart

History: 1840; storefront added, c. 1900

Individual Designation: 11/24/1959

District Designation: None

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the existing storefront transoms are retained, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes the modification of this house and store for a café on the first floor. The applicants propose to modify the fixed storefront with operable café windows. The plans seem to show the alteration of the proportion of the transoms as well. A greenhouse addition would be constructed in the yard, hidden by the single-story structure at the rear. The existing cinderblock rear structure would be modified with a new roll-down garage door.

**ACTION:** See Consent Agenda

**ADDRESS: 7406 GERMANTOWN AVE**

Project: Remove rear shed, construct garage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: New Covenant Church of Philadelphia

Applicant: Van Strother, New Covenant Church of Philadelphia

History: 1800; PA School for the Deaf; New Covenant Church; altered c. 1850

Individual Designation: 4/30/1986

District Designation: None

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to add a garage to the rear of a stone house that sits of the grounds of the former Pennsylvania School for the Deaf. The plans call for removing a wood shed from the rear and adding a large garage structure. The garage would mirror the scale and design of the house. It would be clad in fiber cement boards to appear as clapboards.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Gupta recused himself from the review because the applicant is a member of the board of directors of the community development corporation he heads.

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

Mr. Baron explained that the Architectural Committee members objected to the size and scale of the addition, but not the demolition of the rear shed or the architectural vocabulary of the addition. Mr. Baron stated that he has discussed the matter with the applicant, who has agreed to reduce the size of the addition. He asked the Commission to consider approving a revised design for a smaller garage addition, with the staff to review the details.

**MOTION:** Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the application, provided the roof height is reduced by a minimum of four feet, the plane of the north façade of the addition is set back at least one foot behind the plane of the north façade of the historic house, and all attempts are made to reduce the size of the footprint of the addition, with the staff to review details. Ms. Jones seconded the motion.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance urged the Commission to deny the application. He asserted that the addition would be “huge” and “dramatically out of scale with the existing building.” He contended that the space under the large roof is “functionless.” He advised the Commission to deny the application. He stated that restricting its dimensions was not sufficient. He stated that the Architectural Committee should review a revised design.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the size of the garage could be reduced. Much of the space in it is “extraneous.” She reported that the Committee suggested breaking the single large roof structure into several smaller structures. She noted that the garage sits about three feet lower than the house. Mr. Schaaf observed that the current roofline is intended to mimic the historic roofline. He contended that simply reducing the pitch of the roof, while lowering the ridgeline, might adversely affect the design of the garage addition. Mr. Schaaf stated that he was moving to remand the application back to the Architectural Committee. Mr. Thomas noted that there was already a motion on the table. Ms. Hawkins stated that she would withdraw her motion.

**WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION:** Mses. Hawkins and Jones withdrew their motion to approve the application, provided the roof height is reduced by a minimum of four feet, the plane of the north façade of the addition is set back at least one foot behind the plane of the north façade of the historic house, and all attempts are made to reduce the size of the footprint of the addition, with the staff to review details.

**ACTION:** Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ADDRESS: 1800-04 SPRUCE ST**

Project: Add dormer and louvers for HVAC system

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Temple Beth Zion-Beth Israel

Applicant: Richard Winston, BWA Architecture + Planning

History: 1895; Church of the Covenant; Temple Beth Zion-Beth Israel; Thomas P. Lonsdale, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to modify the existing HVAC system in this building. New condensing units and an access stair would be installed at a location on the west side of the building not visible to the public. Two existing vents in the roof of the former rectory building would be expanded into ventilation dormers. The dormers, both of which would be visible from the street would require cutting into the roof. The dormers would be designed to look like window dormers but with louvers installed in place of glass.

Although not addressed by this application, it is noted that vinyl basement windows were installed at this building without the Historical Commission's approval.

**ACTION:** See Consent Agenda

**ADDRESS: 1021 CHESTNUT ST**

Project: Add storefront door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mercantile Associates, LP

Applicant: Michael Ryan

History: 1953; Mercantile Library; Martin, Stewart & Noble, architects

Individual Designation: 9/12/1990

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 sign band above the horizontal mullion is limited to either the left two or right two bays of the front façade, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes the restoration and adaptive reuse of this Modernist library building for an architect's office. The architects who will utilize the space propose to add a second entry door and extend the sign band across the front facade. They intend to restore all other elements of the building.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Property and business owners Michael Ryan and Randee Spelkoman Ryan represented the application.

Mr. Ryan objected to the Architectural Committee's recommendation regarding the sign. Mr. Ryan displayed a photograph of the building, which was taken in 1952, when the building was completed. He also displayed a rendering of his proposed design for the front façade. He stated that the Architectural Committee contended that the design of the asymmetric sign was integral to the architecture of the front façade. He noted, however, that his research at the Athenaeum proves that the original architect produced numerous signage designs for the building; he claimed that the Committee placed too much weight on the historical significance of the executed signage design, when numerous different designs could have been used for the building. Mr. Ryan stated that they will restore all aspects of the front façade except the sign and second door. He stated that they need the extended sign band to advertise not only their business, but also their tenant's business. He asserted that, without a tenant, the project is not financially viable. He concluded that their signage proposal is limited to two small stainless steel bars. It will have a limited impact on the building.

Mr. Schaaf asked Mr. Ryan about the height of the lettering on the signage. Mr. Ryan stated that the lettering would be eight inches tall, the height of the lettering on the original sign. He explained that the front façade is five bays wide; each bay is about six feet wide. The tenant will have the use of two bays; his business will have the use of three. The tenant's sign will be limited the right two bays and will be no more than eight inches tall. Mr. Ryan stated that he will be very strict about any signage to protect integrity of the Modernist building. He stated that he would not allow flashy signs behind the glass and would require that signs be limited to the sign band, to eight inches in height, and to the style of the building. He stated that consistent signage is essential to the success of his business.

Mr. Gupta asked Ms. Hawkins to explain the Committee's objections to the proposed signage. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee was very supportive of the project in general. She stated that the proposed door was acceptable because the original bay where it would be located was not a simple glazed window, but a display window. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee opposed the sign running across the entire façade because the original two-bay wide sign was "integral" to the historic architecture. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee was willing to recommend approval of a two-bay wide sign above the historic right entrance or above the new left entrance, but not both. Mr. Gupta stated that this section of Chestnut Street is sorely in need of investment. He noted that the applicant would restore a dilapidated historic building, bringing new life to it and the street. He asserted that the Commission should not unduly limit the owner's capacity to attract tenants to the site. He asserted that the proposed sign complied with historic preservation standards and should be approved, especially in light of the circumstances. Mr. Thomas agreed with Mr. Gupta. He reported that he studied at the library when he was in high school. He agreed that the signage proposal satisfies the Standards. He observed that the Commission routinely approves minor, appropriate changes to buildings to allow them to be successfully reused. He congratulated the owner for restoring the building and also for voluntarily limiting the signage to appropriate forms. He again stated that signage satisfies the Standards.

Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Commission was right in supporting the sympathetic new owner and the appropriate reuse. He stated that the restoration of this building is a "once-in-a-lifetime opportunity." He asserted that the rendering displayed at the Commission meeting shows that the signage is appropriate for this important Modernist building.

**ACTION:** Mr. Thomas moved to approve the application, with the staff to review details. Mr. Gupta seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 11 to 1. Ms. Hawkins dissented.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **ADDRESS: 2003 DELANCEY PL**

Project: Construct basement entrance with railing and planter

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Francine Sella

Applicant: Juliet Geldi, North Street Design LLC

History: 1865

Individual Designation: 1/6/1972

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

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@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 work to the front of this townhouse. The house was built in 1865 as part of a row. The property was altered in 1912 by the prominent firm of Stewardson & Page. The Commission approved an application in July 2011 that included the restoration of the front façade and the addition of a garage at the rear.

The current application proposes to add a service entrance at the front façade. The entrance would be located below grade and would require the temporary removal of the marble steps

leading to the front door of the house. The service entrance would be created by excavating beneath the marble steps. The steps would be removed and reinstalled upon the completion of the excavation. The water table would not be altered, but the cheek wall on the side of the marble steps would be altered; a window opening would be enlarged for the entranceway to the area under the steps. The steps down to the service entrance would be enclosed with a wrought iron fence. A planter is proposed to encircle the entrance. The planter would abut the marble steps.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta explained that the staff had continued the application from the February to the March 2012 Commission meeting. The applicants now request a second continuance, to the April 2012 meeting. No one represented the application.

**ACTION:** Mr. Thomas moved to continue the application to the Historical Commission's meeting of 13 April 2012. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 27 FEBRUARY 2012**

Richardson Dilworth III, chair

#### **2132-34 CHERRY ST, DANIEL MICHAUX COXE PARK**

Owner: City of Philadelphia, Philadelphia Parks & Recreation

Nominator: Thomas E. Malone and Tully Speaker

Proposal: Nomination for individual designation

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** Mr. Schaaf moved to recommend that the Coxe Park at 2132-34 Cherry Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, H, and J and should be designated as historic and listed individually on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Cohen seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 4 to 2. Messrs. Lavery and Dilworth dissented.

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes the individual designation of Daniel Michaux Coxe Park at 2132-34 Cherry Street. Architect Norman Rice designed the park in the early 1970s. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, D, E, F, G, H, and J. The nomination does not explicitly address the satisfaction of Criterion J. The nomination lacks footnotes.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff recommends that the property at 2132-34 Cherry Street does not merit designation as historic and listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Coté presented the nomination to the Commission. Tully Speaker and Tom Malone represented the nomination.

Tully Speaker, the co-nominator, stated that he has lived in Philadelphia for 40 years. He cited examples of important historic sites in his neighborhood that have been lost, such as the Baldwin Locomotive works and the Shot Tower. He stated that Coxe Park, constructed in 1971 and dedicated in 1974, is "swell" and ought to be protected. He stated that there have been efforts to modify the park, but contended that it is fine the way it is. He provided photographs of recent repairs to a brick wall at the park, which he contended were unsympathetic. Mr. Sherman asked about the identities of the owner of the park and repairer of the wall. Mr. Speaker replied that the City of Philadelphia owns the park, but the identity of the repairer is unknown. Mr.

Thomas stated that, if the park were designated, then all proposals for work to the park would be reviewed by the Commission, thereby preventing insensitive repairs.

Mr. Sherman asked if the playground equipment is the original. Mr. Speaker responded that he believes that it is original, the swings were changed from plank to bucket seats.

Mr. Gupta asked if there had been any community meetings to discuss the community sentiment about designating Coxe Park. Mr. Speaker responded that there have been several meetings conducted by the Logan Square Neighborhood Association (LSNA) and the Friends of Coxe Park (FOCP). He stated that FOCP opposes designation and LSNA has taken the position of no position and is working with Philadelphia Parks & Recreation (PPR) to seek an alternative playground site.

Drew Murray, co-president of the Friends of Coxe Park, stated that Coxe Park is full of many memories and that he too thinks that the park is “swell.” He stated, however, that sentimental feelings should not be confused with historical significance. He stated that Coxe Park did not serve as a catalyst for the revitalization of the neighborhood. He cited examples of buildings that were being constructed before or around the same time as the park, such as Park Towne Place in 1959, Moore College of Art in 1960, and the United Way building in 1969. He stated Norman Rice is considered an architect of minor importance, but he is not Louis Kahn. He pointed out that Mr. Farnham had stated at the Committee on Historic Designation meeting that Norman Rice’s home and office are classified as Non-contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District. He opined that Rice’s design for the park is neither innovative nor intelligent. He stated that locating play equipment as close as 6 inches to railings, steps, and concrete curbs is not intelligent by today’s standards and was not intelligent by the standards of 1974.

Mr. Murray stated that the FOCP had applied for and received a Community Design Collaborative (CDC) grant to develop a conceptual design for a safer park. He stated that the nomination for historic designation was submitted to the Historical Commission after FOCP received the grant to block any changes. He stated that it is evident that this nomination was submitted to settle a dispute and not necessarily because of the park’s historic significance. He stated that this is a misuse of the Commission’s authority. Mr. Murray noted that the Committee on Historic Designation had not taken the safety of the playground into account. He asked the Commission to consider the safety of the children. He asked the Commission to reject the nomination based on its merits, the manner in which it was submitted, and the safety of the children. Mr. Schaaf clarified that the Committee on Historic Designation has a narrow purview, to determine whether the nominated site meets one or more of the Criteria for Designation. Safety is not a factor in any of the Criteria for Designation. He stated that the nomination contends that the park meets nine of the ten Criteria for Designation. He stated that the Committee recommended that the park meets four of the Criteria for Designation.

Mr. Thomas stated that a designation will not freeze the park in time. He stated that a designation would protect the park, but it would not prevent change. Instead, the Historical Commission would ensure that proposals to alter the park meet preservation standards.

Mr. Dilworth noted that the Committee on Historic Designation was not unanimous in its recommendation on this nomination; it was unanimous in all other matters before it at the last meeting. He stated that the vote for the recommendation for Coxe Park was 3 to 2; he and another Committee member voted against the recommendation. He stated that he received the impression at the Committee meeting that the community was in conflict; some people wanted to change the park and others did not. He stated that, with the nomination, one side was asking

the Historical Commission to take sides in the community conflict. He stated that the claim of historical significance was contrived in an attempt to leverage the Commission's authority to achieve an end unrelated to historic preservation. Mr. Dilworth stated that the primary claim to significance in the nomination is related to the park's role in the revitalization of the community. Mr. Dilworth contended that he had not seen cogent proof that the park played this role. He noted that he was once a playground inspector for the City of New York and he asserted that the extant playground equipment was not historically significant. He stated that the nomination also claims that the park is significant because it was designed by Norman Rice; however, the nomination does not call out any features of the park that are distinctive to Rice. Mr. Dilworth concluded that the Commission should not wade into a community conflict when the case for historical significance has not been made.

Mr. Schaaf stated that it is extremely difficult to assess the relative competence of an architect; therefore, the Committee chose not to evaluate Rice's competence. He stated that Norman Rice designed this park in the 1970s, at the very end of his career. He stated that Rice was the first American student of Le Corbusier in Paris in the late 1920s and returned to Philadelphia to work for the firm of Howe & Lescaze in the early 1930s. Mr. Schaaf stated that he visited Coxe Park and found it be more nuanced than expected, with the brick wall, the arrangement of plantings and trees, and the layout of the three sections. He stated that Rice is a significant architect and the park meets at least one of the Criteria for Designation for that reason. He stated that the Committee determined that, of the nine Criteria mentioned in the nomination, four could stand.

Mr. Gupta asked if designation would impact the replacement of the play equipment in the future and if it be possible to exclude the equipment from the designation. Mr. Schaaf responded that the staff could make an assessment of the replacement of the equipment when it received an application. He stated that 85% of applications submitted to the Commission are approved at the staff level.

Mr. Farnham stated that, if designated, any alteration to the exterior physical appearance of the park would require the review and approval of the Historical Commission. He stated that this would include alterations to the fence, walls, and steps. He stated that he had some concerns about a designation that included the playground equipment from legal perspective, in that the equipment may be considered personal property and not real property. He stated that the Commission does have the capacity to regulation personal property under object nominations; however, the equipment was not nominated as a group of objects, but as part of the park's built fabric. He stated that he doubted that the Commission could or would assert plenary jurisdiction over the equipment. Mr. Farnham stated that, even if the Commission had plenary jurisdiction over the equipment, it could still approve alterations to or replacements of that equipment. He stated that, ignoring the personal property question for a moment, the Commission would review such an application as would any other and determine if the proposed change was compatible with the historic site.

Mr. Farnham asked the Mr. Sherman for the opportunity to speak to the merits of the nomination. He prefaced his remarks, stating that he was proud to live in a city where the people fight passionately for their parks. Mr. Farnham stated that he agreed with Mr. Dilworth in that there was a community dispute first and a claim of historical significance afterword. He stated that this dispute would be best handled by PPR, not the Historical Commission, because it is not a historic preservation dispute. He stated that, following the heated debate at the Committee meeting and a series of phone calls, letters, and emails from both sides, he decided to conduct some research to verify or dispute the claims made in the nomination. He reported that he found that the claim in the nomination that the park lifted up the neighborhood cannot be

substantiated. He explained that, by the time the park was constructed in 1974, Logan Square had already been completely revitalized and historic houses renovated. He stated that he found very clear evidence that the park was not the catalyst for the gentrification of the neighborhood, but instead that the park construction postdated the rehabilitation of the area. He also noted that Coxe Park was very late in the pocket park movement; Philadelphia started a pocket-park program in 1962. He explained that he had developed a lengthy Powerpoint presentation on the revitalization of Logan Square and the construction of the park and would gladly present it if the Commission deemed it necessary.

Janet Grace stated that she lives in a house designed by Norman Rice, which the Historical Commission designated it in October 2010. She stated that Commission designated the house because it was designed by Norman Rice. She opined that, if her house merited designation, then the park does as well.

Julie Caley, a resident of Logan Square, stated that she supports the FOCP. She stated that she has two small children and feels that parts of the park are dangerous, owing to the age of the slide and the steepness of the steps. Her child once fell and got her head caught between the railings. She stated that she is concerned that a historic designation would make it more difficult to update the play equipment. She stated that the current layout of the park, with several tiers, is not up to current safety standards and codes. Some in the neighborhood will use a designation and the Commission to oppose safety improvements.

David Traub of Save Our Sites stated that his organization unanimously endorses the nomination. He opined that Coxe Park is the prototype for parks in tiny urban spaces.

C. Donald Weinberg, a resident of Logan Square, stated that he moved into this area in the 1960s, when there were many vacant houses. He stated that the City chose Norman Rice to design this park because it wanted a noted architect to design a place to bring the community together. He noted that the layout of the benches is such that it forces the sitters to face each other. He stated that the history of the idea that parks unite communities together is invested in this park and the Commission should help to preserve it.

Heather Young stated that she her children attend the Greene Towne School and she supports the FOCP. She stated that she appreciates the work of the Historical Commission. She stated that the FOCP is trying to do something positive for the park in a transparent manner. Ms. Young stated that she fears that the Historical Commission is being used a weapon to stop the FOCP. She stated that the two sides on this issue are trying to come together and suggested that the Commission table the review of the nomination until a compromise is reached.

Joe Sirbak, a resident of Logan square, stated that he has three children who use the park. He stated that there are real safety concerns and the FOCP is a motivated group that wants to improve the park. He opined that a designation would prevent the community from improving the park. He stated that the submittal of the nomination caused the FOCP to lose a grant to develop conceptual plans for the park. He stated that the Commission has discretion with designations; it "may," but is not required to designate, even if the site satisfies the Criteria for Designation.

Kristen Moses-Murray, a parent and a resident of Logan Square, stated that making the park safer is a valid goal. She asked the Commission not to disregard safety. She stated that, if the park were made safer, then it would keep young people and young families in Logan Square.

Marisa Piccareto, a resident of Logan Square and co-president of the FOCP, stated that she works as an advocate for child safety. She stated that she has great respect for the space and community opinion. She stated that, recently, the two sides in this matter had a meeting in the park to see if they could find common ground. She informed the Commission that the nomination was never presented to the LSNA. She clarified that the safety concerns extend beyond the play equipment to the steps, tiers, and railings.

Gayle Ruggeri, a resident of Logan Square, claimed that the transparency and communication from the FOCP has been poor throughout this whole process. She offered examples. She stated that the park has been deemed safe by PPR. She stated that preservation will not stop safety improvements to the park. She asked the Commission to review the nomination on its merits and not in terms of safety. She stated that the community is working to come together.

Sara Vogel, a resident of Logan Square, stated that playgrounds are meant to serve children. If deemed historic, the park will become museum and not serve the children.

Bill Arnstead, a resident and officer on the LSNA board, stated that the community has been considering the historical significance of Coxe since at least 2009, when LSNA began considering submitting an application for a state historical marker for the site.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that many nominations are submitted in the midst of community disputes. He pointed to the Presser and Nugent Homes as examples. He stated that the time to submit a nomination is when a site is threatened. He claimed that Norman Rice was an important architect and that the park has a discernable architecture, especially the walls, tiers and stairs. Mr. Gallery stated that the park is also significant because it helped revitalize the neighborhood. He pointed out that the PPR has neither objected to the nomination nor closed the park owing to safety issues. He urged the Commission to designate Coxe Park.

Jeffrey Altman, a resident of Logan Square, stated that he had no doubt that the special layout and structure of the park has helped his child with special needs. He explained that he is a FEMA adjuster. He claimed that this park is a rarity. He asked the Commission to protect the park.

Ed Panek stated that he was asked to help resolve the community's two competing visions of the park. He asked that the Committee table the nomination until he has identified a viable compromise.

Sheri-Ann Cowie, a resident of Logan Square, stated that she wants the park preserved. She noted that, at first, she misunderstood the implications of a designation. She stated that she now understands that designation does not tie the hands of those proposing to update the park.

Tom Malone, the co-nominator, stated that he was disappointed that people view the submission of the nomination as a way of using the Commission for leverage in a community dispute.

Sam Little, the president of the Logan Square Neighborhood Association, stated that the LSNA covers a wide area from Broad Street to the Schuylkill River, and from Market Street to Spring Garden Street. He stated that the Park serves both the young and old and is mainly maintained by the efforts of neighbors. He informed the Commission that the LSNA has taken no stance on

this nomination. He asked the Commission to ensure that the park remains a vital part of the neighborhood.

Ms. Hawkins asserted that, based on the case made in the nomination, the Park should not be designated. She stated that the Commission might consider designating the park at some point in the future as part of either a Logan Square historic district nomination or a thematic pocket park historic district nomination, but should not designate it today because the nomination has not demonstrated that it has the requisite historic significance.

Mr. Mattioni stated that the discussion has pitted preservation against safety. He stated that the two are not mutually exclusive. He stated that he found some of the photographs of the park to be impressive. But, more importantly, he found it all the people advocating for the park to be the most impressive. He asserted that a designation would not be a deterrent to the park. He stated that denying the nomination may do more harm than good. He suggested that refusing to designate would have a negative impact on the community.

**ACTION:** Ms. Hawkins moved to reject the nomination and refuse to designate 2132-34 Cherry Street. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7 to 4. Ms. Jones and Messrs. Mattioni, Schaaf, and Thomas dissented.

### **1301 BEACH ST, PENN TREATY PARK**

Owner: City of Philadelphia, Philadelphia Parks & Recreation

Nominator: Barbara Morehead

Proposal: Nomination for individual designation

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** Ms. Klein moved to recommend that Penn Treaty Park at 1301 Beach Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, G, H, I, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Cohen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes the individual designation of the Penn Treaty Park at 1301 Beach Street. The park was constructed in three phases in 1827, 1893, and 1987. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, G, H, I, and J. This property is located within the Fishtown National Register-eligible Historic District.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Coté presented the nomination to the Commission. Barbara Morehead represented the nomination.

Ms. Morehead stated that she has loved the park since she was a little girl. She stated that it should be saved for future generations so that they may know the important history that it commemorates.

**ACTION:** Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and find that Penn Treaty Park at 1301 Beach Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, G, H, I, and J, designate it as historic, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **1219 SPRUCE ST, THEODORE M. ETTING RESIDENCE**

Owner: James R. Davis Jr.

Nominator: Staff

Proposal: Nomination for individual designation

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** Mr. Cohen moved to recommend that the property at 1219 Spruce Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and E and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Lavery seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes the individual designation of the Theodore M. Etting Residence at 1219 Spruce Street. Renowned architect Frank Miles Day designed the building, which was constructed in 1890. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and E. This property is located within the Washington Square West National Register Historic District.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the nomination to the Commission.

The Commissioners thanked Mr. Danta for his hard work on the nomination and agreed that the property merits designation.

**ACTION:** Ms. Jones moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and find that the property at 1219 Spruce Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and E, designate it as historic, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **1036-38 CREASE ST, KENSINGTON SOUP KITCHEN**

Owner: Lawrence Thomson

Nominator: Tom Potts, director, Kensington Area Neighborhood Advisory Committee

Proposal: Nomination for individual designation

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** Mr. Lavery moved to recommend that the property at 1036-38 Crease Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, I, and J, as well as H and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Klein seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes the individual designation of the Kensington Soup Kitchen at 1036-38 Crease Street. Thomas S. Levy designed the building, which was constructed in 1870. It housed the Kensington Soup Kitchen, an early and important social services agency. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, I, and J. This property is located within the Fishtown National Register-eligible Historic District.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Coté presented the nomination to the Commission.

Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that a representative the New Kensington CDC, the nominator, had been at the meeting but was unable to stay for this review. He stated that this nomination derived from a community workshop that the Alliance held last year, at which the Alliance attempted to build the capacity of neighborhood organizations to formulate, write, and submit nominations to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. He stated that the Alliance commends and supports the New Kensington CDC and their nomination of the Kensington Soup Kitchen.

**ACTION:** Ms. Jones moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and find that the property at 1036-38 Crease Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, I, and J, as well as H, designate it as historic, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

#### **4008-26 WALNUT ST, FIRST CHURCH OF THE CHRIST SCIENTIST, THE ROTUNDA**

Owner: Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania

Nominator: Colette Kinane

Proposal: Nomination for individual designation

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** Mr. Cohen moved to recommend that the property at 4008-26 Walnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, E, and J and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Klein seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes the individual designation of the First Church of the Christ Scientist, the Rotunda, at 4008-26 Walnut Street. Renowned New York architectural firm Carrerre & Hastings designed the building, which was constructed in 1909. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, E, and J. This property is located within the West Philadelphia Streetcar Suburb National Register Historic District.

Please note that although this nomination describes the interior of the building, the nomination does not propose the designation of any interior spaces.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Coté presented the nomination to the Commission.

The Commissioners thanked Colette Kinane for submitting the nomination and acknowledged that David Hollenberg of the University of Pennsylvania, the property owner, had voiced the University's support of the nomination earlier in the meeting.

**ACTION:** Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and find that the property at 4008-26 Walnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, E, and J, designate it as historic, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

#### **240 W TULPEHOCKEN ST, HARRY K. CUMMINGS RESIDENCE**

Owner: O I C INC

Nominator: Staff

Proposal: Nomination for individual designation

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** Mr. Cohen moved to recommend that the property at 240 W. Tulpehocken Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes the individual designation of the Harry K. Cummings Residence at 240 W. Tulpehocken Street. Renowned architect Frank Miles Day designed the building, which was constructed in 1893. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E. This property is located within the Tulpehocken Station National Register Historic District.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the nomination to the Commission.

The Commissioners again thanked Mr. Danta for his hard work on the nomination and agreed that the property merits designation.

**ACTION:** Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and find that the property at 240 W. Tulpehocken Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E, designate it as historic, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**CAST IRON SIDEWALK AT 1903-07 N 07TH ST**

Owner: Clifton Ellis Boggs

Applicant: Staff

History: c. 1861, Charles Carnell, machinist and iron founder

Proposal: Rescind designation

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** Mr. Cohen moved to recommend that the Commission rescind the designation of cast iron sidewalk at 1903-07 N 07<sup>th</sup> Street from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Section 5.14.b.1.a of the Commission's Rules & Regulations, as the resource has ceased to meet the criteria for listing on the Register because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes the rescission of the designation of a sidewalk comprised of cast iron tiles, once located at 1903-07 N 07<sup>th</sup> Street, from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The Historical Commission designated this unique sidewalk on 29 November 1966. In 1972, the sidewalk was documented by Historic American Building Survey. The iron tiles were removed at some point during the 1970s.

Please note that Section 5.14.b.1 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations states that the Commission may rescind a designation and remove an entry from the Register if:

- a) the resource has ceased to satisfy any Criteria for Designation because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed;
- b) additional information shows that the resource does not satisfy one or more Criteria for Designation; or,
- c) the Commission committed an error in professional judgment when it determined that the resource satisfied one or more Criteria for Designation.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Coté presented the rescission request to the Commission.

Ms. Coté stated that there was a note in the Commission's file on the property indicating that the iron tiles were relocated to the Ebenezer Maxwell Mansion. She stated that she contacted the executive director at the house museum, who has provided photographs of the iron tile floor of the laundry porch at the museum. Ms. Coté stated that they appear to be the same iron tiles. She stated that the connection between the properties appears to be that the granddaughter of the original owner of 1903-07 N. 7<sup>th</sup> Street, who served on the board of the Maxwell Mansion. Mr. Farnham stated that, although they were removed illegally, the iron tiles appear to be outside the Commission's jurisdiction at this point.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she used to serve on the board at the Mansion and that there are, in fact, iron tiles on the floor of the laundry porch. She stated that it should be noted in the Commission's file for the Ebenezer Maxwell Mansion that the tiles are located in the laundry porch.

**ACTION:** Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and rescind the designation of cast iron sidewalk at 1903-07 N 07<sup>th</sup> Street from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Section 5.14.b.1.a of the Commission's Rules & Regulations, as the resource has ceased to meet the criteria for listing on the Register because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

**ACTION:** Ms. Hawkins moved to adjourn at 12:20 p.m. Mr. Dilworth 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.

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.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving roofs—their functional and decorative features—that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. This includes the roof's shape, such as hipped, gambrel, and mansard; decorative features such as cupolas, cresting, chimneys, and weathervanes; and roof material such as slate, wood, clay, tile, and metal, as well as its size, color, and patterning.