

**THE MINUTES OF THE 579TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**12 NOVEMBER 2010
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
Leslie Benoliel
Richard Dilworth, III, Ph.D.
Dominique Hawkins, AIA, LEED AP
Susan O.W. Jaffe
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President
John Mattioni, Esq.
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Daniel Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections
David Schaaf, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Joan Schlotterbeck, Department of Public Property
Robert Thomas
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing & Community Development
Miles Wilson

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Preservation Planner III
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II

ALSO PRESENT

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Emmanuel Rucci
Adrian Paulus
Samuel Weiner, Iron Stone
Kevin Rasmussen, Rasmussen/Su
Vivian Su, Rasmussen/Su
Michael Parsell, JBCB Properties
Caryl Cogan
Nathaniel Fox
Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association
David Rosenberg
Bryan Seder
Liz Macoretti, West Mt. Airy Neighbors
Bonnie Law
Janet Grace
Paul Welde
Ellen Sheehan, East Falls Historical Society
William Graham, Councilman Rizzo's Office
Lorna Katz, Society Hill Civic Association
Tiffany Loomis

Yao C. Huang, YCH Architect

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. Commissioners Benoliel, Dilworth, Hawkins, Jaffe, Leonard, Mattioni, Merriman, Quinn, Schaaf, Schlotterbeck, Thomas, Wilds, and Wilson joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 578TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the minutes of the 578th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 8 October 2010. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 OCTOBER 2010

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham presented the Consent Agenda to the Commission.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee for 1022 Waverly Street. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 2 NOVEMBER 2010

Richardson Dilworth III, Chair

EAST LOGAN STREET HISTORIC DISTRICT

Owners: Various

Nominator: Sandra Lark, Historic East Logan Street

Proposal: Designate historic district

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Lavery moved to recommend that the E. Logan Street Historic District meets Criteria for Designation A, C, D, I, and J and should be added to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places with the following revisions: elimination the parcel known as 4856-60 Stenton Avenue from the district and revision of the district boundaries to reflect the elimination; elimination of Criterion E because the buildings cannot be concretely attributed to any specific architect; and inclusion of Criterion I because the residential area includes open spaces that have a high likelihood of archaeological resources. Mr. Cohen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: The proposed East Logan Street Historic District is located along E. Logan Street between Germantown Avenue and Stenton Avenue in the Germantown section of Philadelphia. The proposed East Logan Street Historic District is a nineteenth-century suburban development comprised of 30 parcels populated by single-family detached houses, carriage houses, garages, outbuildings, semi-detached houses and one industrial building. The houses represent a variety of Victorian styles and are arranged along the street to create a Romantic landscape. The majority of houses date from the early-to-mid nineteenth century, but some are late-Victorian and early twentieth century as well.

The nomination, which was prepared by a community member, contends that the East Logan Street Historic District satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J, which are delineated in paragraph 5 of the City's "Historic Buildings" ordinance, section 14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code.

Satisfying Criterion A, East Logan Street "has significant character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth or Nation" and "is associated with the lives of Thomas Fisher, T. Charlton Henry and Joseph Pennell, persons significant in the past."

Satisfying Criteria C and D, East Logan Street "reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style(s)," including the Colonial, Italianate and Gothic Revival styles and embodies "distinguishing characteristics" of those styles.

Satisfying Criterion E, the houses and landscape on East Logan Street collectively "is the work" or inspired by the work of group of architects and designers including A.J. Downing, "architects...whose work has significantly influenced the historical, architectural, economic, social, or cultural development of the City, Commonwealth, or Nation."

And satisfying Criterion J, the East Logan Street Historic District "exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social or historical heritage of the community."

The Historic Preservation Ordinance mandates that the Philadelphia Planning Commission comment on District nominations. The Philadelphia Planning Commission comments, and the Philadelphia Historical Commission staff concurs, that the parcel known as 4856-60 Stenton Avenue should not be included as part of the district. It does not share the same history or characteristics as the residential parcels along Logan Street. The parcel was developed for industrial purposes and it was oriented towards Germantown Avenue and not Logan Street. The parcel was occupied for the entire period of significance of the district by the Stenton Mills. The parcel is currently vacant and classified as non-contributing. The Commission does not typically include non-contributing parcels on district boundaries; if it does not contribute, then it should not be included in the district unless dictated by geographical necessity.

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

Mr. Wilds asked about the impact of including Criterion for Designation I, the archaeology criterion, with the designation. He asked if the Commission would require archaeological studies for gardening or landscaping. Mr. Farnham stated that, in his opinion, the Commission would not and should not require archaeological studies or any reviews for landscaping or gardening proposals. He added that the inclusion of the criterion would give the Commission the opportunity to consider archaeology when reviewing construction projects that include ground disturbing activities, but the Commission could decide on a case-by-case basis when to require archaeology. Mr. Farnham asserted that, in general, the Commission should not require archaeological study for minor ground disturbing activities like the construction of rear additions or garages.

Mr. Farnham explained that some members of the East Logan Street community are advocating for the inclusion of a vacant parcel on Stenton Avenue to create a green buffer for the residential area on E. Logan Street. Historically, an industrial facility was located on the parcel. The parcel would be classified as Non-contributing to the district. Typically, the Commission has

not included Non-contributing properties on the boundaries of districts because there is no historically based justification for the inclusion.

Mr. Wilds asked why the staff chose to process this historic district at this time, and not one of the proposed districts that has been waiting longer in the queue. He also asked if the staff believes that it has the capacity to administer additional historic districts. Mr. Farnham replied that the Commission directed the staff to proceed with the processing of the nominations for small districts including East Falls, Parkside, Awbury and East Logan about 18 months ago. This is the last of the four small districts to be processed as the Commission directed. In general, the staff does not process historic district nominations without being directed by the Commission. Regarding the capacity question, Mr. Farnham explained that the staff has taken several measures to become more efficient in recent years. He stated that the staff has the capacity to administer this and the other new, small districts. He explained that the staff will seek direction from the Commission on the proposed Overbrook Farms district in the near future.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance spoke in support of the nomination. He stated that he finds it gratifying when community members seek designations for their neighborhoods. Mr. Gallery stated that the development of this suburban enclave is interesting. Most developments like this, with the landscape features based on the principles of Andrew Jackson Downing and the Italianate houses based on the architectural principals of Samuel Sloan, are found in West Philadelphia, not Germantown. He stated that transportation improvements led to this development, just as they led to those in West Philadelphia. Mr. Gallery stated that he agrees with the Committee's recommendation to delete Criterion E from the nomination. Although this development was influenced by Downing and Sloan, it is not the "work" of the two famed nineteenth-century architects. Regarding the Stenton Avenue property, Mr. Gallery stated that he agrees in principle with excluding Non-contributing properties from districts when they are proposed for the boundaries. However, he contended that this parcel would comprise an important buffer. He noted that the current owner obtained it from the City and is in bankruptcy. He asked if the City might retake control of that property. He asserted that, if the City regained control of the parcel, it should consider turning it over to the community.

Mr. Sherman asked why the City Planning Commission suggested deleting the vacant Stenton Avenue parcel from the district. Mr. Schaaf stated that the staff of the Planning Commission reviewed the nomination and concluded that the district would not conflict with the Commission's long-range plans for the area. Mr. Farnham stated that the Planning Commission itself had addressed the vacant parcel when the Historical Commission staff presented the nomination to the Planning Commission at its 19 October 2010 meeting. Mr. Farnham explained that the Planning Commission had contended that the Historical Commission should not seek to regulate development on a property that has no historic fabric and that had no involvement in the history of the district as that history is defined in the nomination's statement of significance. Mr. Farnham stated that, other than the vacant Stenton Avenue parcel, the Planning Commission supported the district designation. The Planning Commission noted that had recently completed a plan for the area around the nearby Wayne Junction railroad station and this designation would complement that plan nicely.

Mr. Sherman asked if there is a mechanism through which the community can take control of the Stenton Avenue property. Ms. Schlotterbeck stated that the Redevelopment Authority (RDA) is involved in the bankruptcy proceeding. Mr. Wilds explained that the deed for the property may include a reversion clause, allowing the property to revert back to City control under special circumstances. Mr. Sherman suggested that the neighbors work with the RDA and other City

officials. Mr. Thomas stated that merely dedicating it as open space may create more problems than it solves because it may not be maintained. He suggested that, perhaps, the property could be sold to the abutting property owners, thereby ensuring its protection and maintenance.

Mr. Thomas pointed out that the statement of significance mentioned the Philadelphia Norristown & Germantown Railroad, which is important because it was the first rail line in Philadelphia. He explained that the railroad to Germantown followed Wingohocking Creek.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and find that the E. Logan Street Historic District meets Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J, designate it as historic, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places with the following revisions to the nomination: elimination the parcel known as 4856-60 Stenton Avenue from the district and revision of the district boundaries to reflect the elimination; elimination of Criterion E because the buildings cannot be concretely attributed to any specific architect; and inclusion of Criterion I because the residential area includes open spaces that have a high likelihood of archaeological resources. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

3419 W. SCHOOL HOUSE LANE

Owners/Nominators: Paul Welde and Janet Grace

Proposal: Designate individual property

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Dilworth moved to recommend that 3419 W. School House Lane meets Criteria for Designation D, E, and F and should be listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Klein seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: The Dr. and Mrs. Jacoby T. Rothner Residence at 3419 W. School House Lane in the East Falls section of Philadelphia is an important architectural and historical landmark in Philadelphia and is eligible for inclusion on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Designed by architect Norman N. Rice in the Modern style, the house was constructed in 1951. The nomination claims that the Rothner Residence satisfies Criteria for Designation D and E, which are delineated in Section 14-2007(5) of the Philadelphia Code. Specifically, the Rothner Residence embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style, Mid-century Modernism (Criterion D); and is the work of an architect, Norman Rice, who has significantly influenced the development of the City, Commonwealth and Nation.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the nomination for 3419 W. School House Lane to the Commission.

Architect Richard Thom claimed to have known Norman Rice, the designer of the nominated house. He said that Mr. Rice was a fabulous architect and voiced his support for the nomination. He also complimented the nominator, staff, and Committee on Historic Designation for supporting the designation of examples of Modern architecture. He lamented the fact that the Commission had not always recognized the historic value of Modern architecture. He noted that the Old City Historic District's period of significance ends at 1929, excluding many mid twentieth-century examples of architecture. He stated that he nominated several Modern buildings including the iconic orange tile façade National Products building. He commended the Commission for beginning to consider Modern architecture including works executed by ordinary practitioners like Rice. He stated that Rice did exemplary work in the city and contributed enormously to the richness of the architecture of the Philadelphia region.

Ellen Shannon of East Falls Historical Society voiced her organization's support of the designation. She remarked that School House Lane is one of the oldest roads in the city. Historically, it connected Germantown Pike with Ridge Pike. Many historic properties including Raven Hill Academy are located on School House Lane.

Mr. Dilworth stated that the nomination was well prepared.

Mr. Wilds noted that the nomination refers to the property as 3421 W. School House Lane, but the City's Office of Property Assessment (OPA) calls it 3419. He asked the staff to confirm the address. Mr. Farnham stated that 3419 is the official OPA address, which the Commission and the Department of Licenses & Inspections will use.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and find that 3419 W. School House Lane meets Criteria for Designation D, E, and F, designate it as historic, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

4947-49 N. BROAD STREET, PSFS, LOGAN BRANCH

Owner: Citizens Bank of Pennsylvania

Nominator: Lynn Alpert

Proposal: Designate individual property

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Dilworth moved to recommend that 4947-49 N. Broad Street meets Criteria for Designation A, E, and J and should be listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places with the following revisions: elimination of Criterion B; and inclusion of Criteria D and H. Mr. Laverty seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: The former Philadelphia Savings Fund Society (PSFS), Logan Branch is an important landmark on North Broad Street and important to the development of the Logan section of Philadelphia. It was constructed between 1925 and 1926 in a then rapidly expanding area of north Philadelphia. The bank stands as an early and rare example of a branch bank building from the 1920s. It also stands as a landmark to one of Philadelphia's most important financial institutions; The Philadelphia Savings Fund Society. The Logan branch, along with one other identical branch in West Philadelphia, and two other very similar branches in Kensington and South Philadelphia were designed by George Howe; famed Philadelphia architect. These early branch bank buildings would eventually lead him to design the iconic PSFS building on Market Street in center city Philadelphia bringing forth a tectonic shift in American architectural history and forever changing the way American cities look. The building is thus not just important to the Logan neighborhood, but to the City of Philadelphia and the nation. The building meets designation Criteria A, B, E, and J of Section 14-2007(5) of the Philadelphia Code and should be listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

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

Mr. Wilds pointed out that the historic photographs of this building show that it had ironwork by Samuel Yellin. He noted that some of the other similar PSFS branches in the city retain their original Yellin ironwork. He asked if any Yellin ironwork survives on this building. Mr. Farnham stated that it appears that no Yellen ironwork has survived on the exterior of this building. Mr.

Danta stated that Yellen ironwork survives on the South Philadelphia PSFS branch, which has lanterns identical to those that once hung on this building.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance spoke in favor of the nomination. He stated that this building is one of his favorites. As one drives by, it pops out, he explained. He called it a wonderful example of the architect Howe as he transitioned from the firm of Mellor, Meigs & Howe to a solo career and the main PSFS building. He stated that it is wonderful that the neighborhood appreciates the value of this building, which makes a contribution to the community. He also mentioned that it would be gratifying to see the other three PSFS branches by Howe designated. He offered that the Preservation Alliance would be pleased to work with the Commission's staff to nominate the others.

Mr. Dilworth asked the staff if the Yellen lamps, had they survived, would be considered fixtures or parts of the designated building. Mr. Farnham stated that the Commission has always considered permanent fixtures on the exteriors of buildings as parts of the exteriors and therefore designated with the designations of the buildings.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and find that 4947-49 N. Broad Street meets Criteria for Designation A, D, E, H, and J, designate it as historic, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Merriman seconded the nomination, which passed unanimously.

3501 MIDVALE AVENUE, FALLS OF SCHUYLKILL LIBRARY BRANCH OF THE FREE LIBRARY

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Nominator: Friends of the Falls of Schuylkill Library

Proposal: Designate individual property

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Dilworth moved to recommend that 3501 Midvale Avenue meets Criteria for Designation A, E, and H and should be listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Klein seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: The Falls of Schuylkill Library Branch of the Free Library of Philadelphia is an important landmark in the East Falls section of Philadelphia. The library is associated with Pittsburgh industrialist Andrew Carnegie and his famous Libraries Grant Program. The library was designed by the Philadelphia architectural firm of Rankin, Kellogg & Crane. This prominent firm also designed other landmark buildings such as the Inquirer Building on North Broad and the Main United States Post Office at 30th Street. The Falls of Schuylkill Library Branch of the Free Library of Philadelphia meets designation Criteria A and E of Section 14-2007(5) of the Philadelphia Code and should be listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

One could contend that the Falls of Schuylkill Library is a landmark on Midvale Avenue. Its presence on Midvale Avenue has become a familiar visual feature of the community. As such, the library may also meet Criterion H (Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristics, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community or City.) The nomination could be amended to include Criterion H.

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

Ellen Shannon of the East Falls Historical Society stated that the library building was erected with funds donated by Andrew Carnegie, the famous philanthropist. She stated that, owing to

concerns about the funding of branch libraries, the community would like to have the building designated to ensure that it will be retained as a focal point of the community. She explained that the library building is in the same Tudor Revival architectural style as the adjacent historic district, which the Commission designated recently. Both this building and the nearby historic houses have grand, two-story windows. She described the catfish weathervane on the library's cupola; the catfish is the symbol of the community along the river. She observed that the library is the main community gathering space in the neighborhood. The Friends of the Falls of the Schuylkill Library has more than 400 members. The branch will celebrate its 100th anniversary in 2013.

Mr. Wilds suggested that the East Falls residents should read the library's deed carefully. He noted that many Carnegie Library deeds include clauses that require that the properties revert back to the donor if they cease being used as libraries.

ACTION: Ms. Leonard moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and find that 3501 Midvale Avenue meets Criteria for Designation A, E, and H, designate it as historic, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Benoliel seconded the nomination, which passed unanimously.

1709 BENJAMIN FRANKLIN PARKWAY, UNITED WAY BUILDING

Owner: United Way of Southeastern Pennsylvania

Nominator: Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia

Proposal: Designate individual property

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Dilworth moved to recommend that 1709 Benjamin Franklin Parkway, United Way Building, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, F, G, and H and should be listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Cohen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: The United Way Building on the Benjamin Franklin Parkway has been described as one of the most important mid-century modernist designs in Philadelphia. The building was designed in 1968 and constructed in 1971 on a prominent intersection along the Benjamin Franklin Parkway. The building was designed by the acclaimed firm of Mitchell/Giurgola. The firm was the leading practitioner of the "Philadelphia School" from the 1960s through the 1980s. The firm not only designed and built influential buildings in Philadelphia, but throughout the world. The building was built for the United Way of Southeastern Pennsylvania and it remains to this day the organization's headquarters. The building's design incorporates innovative design elements that address the building's location. The United Way Building meets designation Criteria A, E, F, and H of Section 14-2007(5) of the Philadelphia Code and it should be listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Wilson recused, owing to his involvement with the United Way. Mr. Danta presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that his organization nominated the property. He stated that he decided to nominate a Mitchell/Giurgola building because, although the firm was one of the three internationally-prominent Philadelphia architectural firms active at the time, it had not received the acclaim of Louis Kahn or Robert Venturi. Mr. Gallery contended that the United Way building is a very important Mitchell/Giurgola project that shows the firm's sensitivity to environmental and urban design. He pointed to other important examples by Mitchell/Giurgola in Philadelphia including the Penn Mutual Tower and the INA addition. Mr. Gallery stated that

the United Way building is very distinctive and is considered one of the finest examples of Philadelphia architecture of the period. He explained that Mitchell/Giurgola established its reputation with successful entries into international competitions including the one for the new Parliament building in Canberra, Australia. The firm won second prize in the Boston City Hall competition. Mr. Gallery remarked that the Boston design so impressed him that he moved to Philadelphia.

Ms. Benoiel asked if the sculpture was part of the United Way property. Mr. Farnham answered that it is not. It sits on a parcel owned by the City.

Mr. Farnham informed the Commission that architect Emmanuel Kelly, a member of the Art Commission, had telephoned him to express his support for the nomination. Mr. Kelly explained that he was working at the Mitchell/Giurgola firm as a young architect when this building was designed.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and find that 1709 Benjamin Franklin Parkway, United Way Building, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, E, F, G, and H, designate it as historic, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Leonard seconded the nomination, which passed unanimously.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND OBJECTS, CITY HALL, ROOM 400

Owners/Nominators: City of Philadelphia

Proposal: Designate interior and objects

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Klein moved to recommend that the City Council Chambers, Room 400 of City Hall, 1400 JFK Boulevard, meets Criteria of Designation A, B, C, E, H, and J of Section 14-2007(5) of the Philadelphia Code and should be listed as an interior on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Cohen moved to recommend that the City Council President's desk, the City Council President's chair, the Clerk of Council's desk, and the 16 City Council desks in the City Council Chambers, Room 400 of City Hall, 1400 JFK Boulevard, meet Criteria of Designation A, B, C, E, H, and J of Section 14-2007(5) of the Philadelphia Code and should be listed as objects on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Moody seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: The City Council Chambers in City Hall is the first interior nominated for designation by the Historical Commission. This room has been in public use since 1895. It was designed by architect Washington Bleddyn Powell in 1895 and subsequently redecorated by Powell in 1907. The chambers is not just one of the most impressive public rooms in City Hall, but has served for more than a century as the backdrop for innumerable important events in the history of Philadelphia. The nomination contends that the City Council Chambers satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, C, E, H, and J of Section 14-2007(5) of the Philadelphia Code and should be listed as first interior on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

In addition, a nomination of historic objects associated with the chambers is appended to the interior nomination. The object nomination proposes the designation of the Council President's desk, the Council President's chair, the Clerk's desk, and 16 Council desks. All of the objects have been associated with the room for more than one century and are integral to the aesthetic and historic significance of the space. The nomination contends that the objects satisfy Criteria

for Designation A, B, C, E, H, and J of Section 14-2007(5) of the Philadelphia Code and should all be listed as Historic Objects to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the nominations for the City Council Chambers and objects to the Commission.

Ms. Merriman noted that the address on the nomination for the Department of Public Property was not correct. She requested a correction.

Mr. Wilds stated that the inventory of fixtures is confusing because the historic and non-historic elements are listed on the same page. He asked the staff to confirm that the Commission is not claiming jurisdiction over the non-historic elements. Mr. Danta confirmed the assertion. The Commission would not seek to preserve those items listed as non-historic.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance voiced his support of the designation. He stated that it is wonderful that a nomination for a City Hall interior is the first considered by the Commission. He expressed his appreciation to Council President Verna for her support of the nomination and her leadership in the restoration of the chamber after the water damage. He also thanked Ms. Schlotterbeck, the Commissioner of the Department of Public Property, for her support of the nomination and exemplary efforts to maintain the historic room.

Mr. Wilds asked if the Commission would review paint color choices when the room is repainted. Ms. Schlotterbeck responded that extensive studies of the paint scheme were undertaken when the room was restored after the flood. Those studies would inform any new painting campaign.

Mr. Farnham thanked Mr. Gallery and Preservation Alliance for the preparation of the nomination. He explained that the Preservation Alliance hired and paid a consultant to prepare the nomination, even though the City is listed on the nomination as the nominator. Mr. Farnham also thanked Carl Doble, an architect who worked on the restoration and also prepared the nomination for the Alliance.

ACTION: Ms. Leonard moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and find that the City Council Chambers, Room 400 of City Hall, 1400 JFK Boulevard, satisfies Criteria of Designation A, B, C, E, H, and J of Section 14-2007(5) of the Philadelphia Code, designate it as an historic interior, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Schlotterbeck seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and find that that the City Council President's desk, the City Council President's chair, the Clerk of Council's desk, and the 16 City Council desks in the City Council Chambers, Room 400 of City Hall, 1400 JFK Boulevard, satisfy Criteria of Designation A, B, C, E, H, and J of Section 14-2007(5) of the Philadelphia Code, designate the objects as historic, and list them as objects on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Hawkins joined the meeting.

7048 GERMANTOWN AVENUE

Owner: Iron Stone Strategic Capital Partners

Applicant: George Thomas on behalf of Iron Stone

History: 1836, Thomas U. Walter; altered c. 1855; lost to fire, 2009

Designation: individually designated, 1/13/2006

Proposal: Rescind designation

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Cohen moved to recommend approval of the rescission of the designation of 7048 Germantown Avenue, pursuant to Section 5.14.b.1.a of the Rules and Regulations, "because the qualities that caused [the property's] 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 the property at 7048 Germantown Avenue. At the time of designation, a nineteenth-century house and barn stood on the site. About 1836, tobacco merchant George Garrett commissioned famed architect Thomas U. Walter to convert a stone farm house into a Greek Revival summer house. In the 1850s, when Garrett retired and moved permanently to the site, he added a large Italianate section to the house. The house was enlarged at the rear in the early twentieth century.

The Historical Commission designated the property on 13 January 2006. The Commission found that the property satisfied Criteria for Designation A, B, C, D, E, F, H, and J.

- (A) Has significant character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth or Nation or is associated with the life of a person significant in the past; or,
- (B) Is associated with an event of importance to the history of the City, Commonwealth or Nation; or,
- (C) Reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style; or,
- (D) Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style or engineering specimen; or,
- (E) Is the work of a designer, architect, landscape architect or designer, or engineer whose work has significantly influenced the historical, architectural, economic, social, or cultural development of the City, Commonwealth or Nation; or,
- (F) Contains elements of design, detail, materials or craftsmanship which represent a significant innovation; or,
- (G) Is part of or related to a square, park or other distinctive area which should be preserved according to an historic, cultural or architectural motif; or,
- (H) Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristic, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community or City; or,
- (J) Exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social or historical heritage of the community.

The Commission agreed with the nomination that the property satisfied nine of ten Criteria for Designation. The Commission did not find that it satisfied Criterion I, which relates to archaeological resources:

- (I) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in pre-history or history;

At about the time of designation, John Capoferri, a real estate developer, purchased the property. Capoferri initially intended to demolish the nineteenth-century house and barn and

construct a residential development on the large site. After the designation, Capoferri was persuaded to rehabilitate rather than demolish the house and barn and construct the townhouses at the rear of the site. The Commission reviewed and approved his project in stages in 2006 and 2007. Capoferri began work in 2007, exceeding his permit and dismantling much of the house and barn. A portion of the barn wall collapsed when struck by construction equipment. In 2008, Capoferri's development business suffered from financial problems and he abandoned the project and property, leaving the buildings dismantled and the mortgage holder, architect, and contractors unpaid. In late 2008, the Historical Commission filed a petition with the Court of Common Pleas asking the court to order Capoferri to secure and stabilize the property. Capoferri could not be located, but his mortgage holder did intervene and provide funding to secure and stabilize the building. The stabilization work was administered by the Preservation Alliance, which generously agreed to undertake the project on behalf of the Commission. Capoferri was subsequently convicted of several felonies related to his failed development business. In August 2009, the house was struck by lightning and burned to the ground during one of the worst electrical storms to hit the area in years. At least two other houses were also struck and burned in the area. Immediately after the fire, the Department of Licenses & Inspections declared the property Imminently Dangerous and ordered the demolition of the remains of the structures to ensure the public safety. However, without an owner to hold responsible for the property (the mortgage holder had not foreclosed on Capoferri), the Department was unable to compel anyone to undertake the demolition. In May 2010, Iron Stone purchased the property at sheriff's sale. In September 2010, the Historical Commission's staff approved the complete demolition of the buildings as Iron Stone sought to comply with the Department's order. The buildings were demolished soon thereafter. Nothing that led to the designation of the property survives at the site.

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

Ms. Merriman stated that she was saddened by the loss of this very significant historic building. She reminded the Commission of the excitement that accompanied the discovery that Thomas U. Walter, the architect of the dome of the U.S. Capital, had designed this building. She contended, however, that historic resources at the site had been lost and the designation should be rescinded.

Lizabeth Macoretta, the Executive Director of West Mount Airy Neighbors, explained that her organization had advocated for the designation and preservation of the Garrett House. She thanked the Commission and the Preservation Alliance for its efforts to save the property. She stated that the lightning storm that caused the fire in August 2009 had been "horrificing." She stated that some of her constituents regretted the demolition of the remainder of the barn, but added that she understood the need to make the site safe. Sam Weiner, who represented the current property owner, noted that the demolition was legal and had been approved by the Commission.

Mr. Farnham stated the barn was not involved in the fire, but had been largely demolished and left in a ruined state by the former owner. He explained that the former owner had demolished all of the superstructure associated with the barn, leaving just two stone wall fragments, one of which was then damaged by a piece of construction equipment. The Department of Licenses & Inspections declared the site including the barn Imminently Dangerous after the fire. The inspector considered the barn Imminently Dangerous because it had partially collapsed and the stone wall fragments were not well supported. Mr. Farnham reported that he had been to the site several times. He stated that the Department of Licenses & Inspections was adamant that the site must be made safe as soon as a responsible owner emerged. The former owner, John

Capoferri, had walked away from the property. From the time of the fire until recently, the City had no one to hold responsible for the conditions at the site. The City itself did not have the funds to make the site safe. The new owner moved very quickly and legally to make the site safe.

Ms. Jaffe asked Mr. Weiner if he had salvaged anything at the site. Mr. Weiner answered that he salvaged the stone from the barn, which is piled on the site, and the doorway from the house. He stated that the doorway is in very bad condition and may not be able to be saved. Mr. Farnham reminded the members that if they vote to rescind they are giving up all jurisdiction to the site and any objects on the site.

Mr. Sherman asked Mr. Weiner about Iron Stone's intentions for the property. Mr. Weiner answered Iron Stone is moving forward with the development of a townhouse project. Mr. Sherman suggested that the developers might reference the lost building with their new construction. However, he acknowledged that the Commission would not have a role in the review of the new design if it rescinds the designation. Mr. Weiner said he has considerable experience with historical properties and is sensitive to them.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and approve the rescission of the designation of 7048 Germantown Avenue, pursuant to Section 5.14.b.1.a of the Rules and Regulations, "because the qualities that caused [the property's] original entry have been lost or destroyed." Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 OCTOBER 2010

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

341 PINE STREET

Owner: Bryan & Marci Seder

Applicant: Kevin C. Rasmussen AIA

History: 1968-69, Joseph Praissman, architect

Designation: Contributing to the Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Construct addition on rear ell, glaze arched rear openings

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a third-floor addition on the rear ell of a Redevelopment Era townhouse in the Society Hill Historic District. The design proposed in this application is a revision to a previously approved design. The first design was reviewed and approved by the Commission in April 2010. The applicant has revised the proposed addition to address the concerns of a neighbor. The revised design proposes to construct a smaller third-floor addition with a small deck. In the first proposal, the addition extended the entire length of the rear ell. The current design proposes a shorter addition. The open space at the end of the shorter addition would be used for a deck. The design for the window on the addition has not changed from the previous application.

The second floor rear of the main block includes an open arcade. The applicant proposes to glaze the arcade openings with arched-top casement windows. The Commission previously reviewed and approved this alteration.

The first application proposed a parking space in the garden, which would have necessitated the installation of a garage door in the garden wall. This parking and door have been eliminated from the current application, which does not propose any changes to the garden wall along Pine Street.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architect Kevin Rasmussen and owner Bryan Seder represented the application.

Mr. Sherman asked the applicant if he was in agreement with the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Rasmussen replied that he and his client agree with the recommendation.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1700 PINE STREET

Owner: JBCB Properties

Applicant: Michael Parsell

History: c. 1845

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

Project: Legalize alterations to front door

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 5, 6, and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize alterations to the front door of this apartment building in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. The building was constructed in 1845 and it is part of a row of twenty Greek Revival Style townhouses. The subject building (1700 Pine Street) and its next door neighbor (1702 Pine Street) were converted into an apartment building in the first decades of the twentieth century. However, both buildings are separate parcels; they have not been consolidated. Both buildings received Colonial Revival alterations as part of the conversion to an apartment building from single family houses. The alterations have achieved their own historic significance. The front doors were changed at that time into wood doors with multi-light glazing. The Colonial Revival doors with Gothic-arched glazing were extant at both 1700 and 1702 Pine Street at the time of designation in 1995. The Historical Commission staff requested violations for the removal of both doors on 15 March 2010. The Department of Licenses & Inspections only issued a violation for 1700 Pine and did not cite 1702 Pine. The same person owns both properties, which were purchased at the same time. The applicant is only seeking a legalization for the door at 1700 Pine Street, the property that was cited. Although no legalization is currently sought for 1702 Pine, the Commission should be aware of the full history.

The replacement door installed at 1700 Pine Street was a flush door with three square glazed panels. The door was inappropriate. The applicant claims in his cover letter that this door was only "temporary." The applicant appealed to the Board of License & Inspection Review. The applicant then withdrew the appeal as he had not yet applied to the Historical Commission. After the appeal had been withdrawn, the owner re-installed the original 1910s door and asked the Commission's staff to inspect the property to lift the violation. The staff observed at that time that the door with three glazed panels had been removed and the historic door reinstalled, but

with a solid panel that eliminated three-thirds of the glazed panels, leaving only the Gothic-arched upper panels in place. The applicant proposes to legalize the alteration as installed.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Michael Parsell and Carey Borish represented the application.

Mr. Danta informed the Commission that the Department of Licenses & Inspections had recently cited the 1702 Pine Street property for the replacement of the door. Initially, the Department had cited the 1700 property, but not the 1702 property. The current application only seeks to legalize the door alterations at 1700.

Mr. Wilds noted that both buildings had the divided-light, fully-glazed doors in place at the time of designation. Mr. Danta concurred. Mr. Wilds explained that, at some point, the owner replaced the door at 1700 with a non-historic door. After receiving the violation for the door replacement, the owner reinstalled the historic door, which had been significantly modified. Mr. Danta said that the modifications to the door do not satisfy the Standards.

Mr. Sherman asked the applicant to present his case. Mr. Borish, a co-owner of the property, stated he was not aware of any violations for the 1702 property. He said the building at 1702 Pine was purchased with the non-historic door in place. He claimed that the door was in place before the building was designated. Photographs showed that the historic door, not the current door, was in place at the time of designation. The applicants claimed that the door at 1700 Pine was damaged by a vandal and, for security purposes, was replaced quickly and temporarily. The bottom part of the door was totally destroyed. Mr. Borish stated that the non-historic door at 1702 was in place since he purchased the building in 2007. He stated that he has been told that the non-historic door at 1702 was installed more than 20 years ago.

Mr. Parsell stated that he would restore the door at 1700 to its original design and place a grate behind it for security purposes. Mr. Wilds stated there is no need to legalize the work since the applicant stated that he would restore the historic door. He suggested that the applicants meet with the staff for guidance.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 5, 6, and 9. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1022 WAVERLY STREET

Owner: Adrian Paulus and Ashim Paul

Applicant: Adrian Paulus

History: c. 1830

Designation: individually designated, 11/24/1959

Project: Construct rear addition with decks

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an addition and roof deck, and rear decks to a non-historic rear addition of this house. The house faces Waverly Street at the front and Addison Street at the rear. The front of the house retains its historic appearance; the rear is non-historic. The Commission reviewed an application for this property in July 2009. At that time the applicant proposed a deck on the front portion of the roof that would have been visible from

the front, historic portion of the property. The Commission denied that proposal, but approved a deck on the back of the building:

Mr. Thomas moved to deny the proposed design, but to approve a deck, provided nothing is constructed to the north of the existing access hatch, with the staff to review details. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

The current design meets that condition. The deck would be south of the hatch and would not be visible from Waverly Street. The addition and decks would be visible from Addison Street, but would not impact the public perception of the historic portion of the building.

ACTION: SEE CONSENT AGENDA

1323 RODMAN STREET

Owner: Robert M. Boucher & Karen A. Wisniewski

Applicant: Rustin Ohler

History: c. 1835

Designation: Individually designated, 3/20/1964

Project: Legalize rear addition and alterations

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the legalization of the rear addition, provided the deck rail is replaced in either wood or metal in a dark color, the shutters are removed, the base is painted a compatible color, and the front door and basement and first-story windows are replaced with appropriate elements, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the construction of a one-story rear addition with roof deck and vinyl railing and installation of a fiberglass door with vinyl capping without a permit or approval. The addition is clad in siding. According to aerial photographs, the addition and rear alterations were undertaken sometime between 2004 and 2006.

When the staff reviewed aerial photographs of the site, it became apparent that incompatible façade alterations, including installation of a stucco base, red shutters, window grill on the first story, and door, also occurred without the Commission's approval during the same time period, between 2004 and 2006. However, at this time, the applicant seeks legalization of the rear addition and door only.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Property owner Karen Wisniewski and architect Rustin Ohler represented the application.

Mr. Wilds asked about a letter from the architect claiming that the addition and deck at the rear were not visible. Ms. Sell replied that the addition and deck are minimally visible. Mr. Wilds asked the staff if it would have approved an application for the work if it had been presented before the work was undertaken. Ms. Sell replied that the staff would have approved the application with a more appropriate deck railing. The white vinyl railing is conspicuous.

Mr. Sherman asked the applicants if they would accept the Architectural Committee's recommendation and undertake the suggested modifications. Ms. Wisniewski replied that they were in agreement with the recommendation. Mr. Ohler asked for a clarification regarding the shutters. The Commissioners responded that the staff could approve appropriate shutters, but the current shutters are inappropriate and should be removed.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approval of the legalization of the rear addition, provided the deck rail is replaced in either wood or metal in a dark color, the shutters are removed, the base is painted a compatible color, and the front door and basement and first-story windows are replaced with appropriate elements, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2123 PORTER STREET

Owner/Applicant: Emanuel Rucci

History: 1914, John & James Windrim, architects

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

Project: Replace tile roof with asphalt shingles

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove the original terracotta tile roof and replace it with asphalt shingles. The house at 2123 Porter is a twin in a row of six California Mission style houses. The clay tiles are significant, character-defining features. The roof planes of the front cross gable as well as the roof of a side bay are visible from the public right-of-way, Porter Street; the rear sections of the roof behind the peak of the gable running parallel to the street are not.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Emmanuel Rucci represented the application.

Mr. Rucci, the owner, stated that all of the roofing must be replaced. He explained that his house has suffered from significant water damage. He stated that his roofer cannot guarantee a repair of the roof with salvaged materials, as the staff has suggested. He noted that his neighbors on both sides have replaced the original terra cotta with asphalt shingles since the historic district was established. He reported that his roofer did those replacement jobs. Mr. Wilds asked him if he would replace the red terra cotta with red asphalt shingles. Mr. Rucci stated that he would use the red shingles, as his neighbors have done.

Mr. Sherman asked Mr. Farnham to comment on the roof replacements at the neighbors' houses. Mr. Farnham stated that he was involved in the review of the replacement of the roof at the neighboring house to the east, which is a mirror image of and connected to the current applicant's house. He remembered that he had visited the house with Richard Tyler, the former director. The roof was in poor condition and would have been expensive to repair. He stated that, at that time, he searched for a supplier of new tiles to match the old, but was unable to find one. He stated that this terra cotta tile is very unusual. It is a thick, flat tile that fits tightly together. He noted that there are no asphalt shingles that can replicate the look of this tile. He reported that the Commission approved the removal of the tile and its replacement in red asphalt at this house. Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission had also approved the replacement of the red tile roof with asphalt for the current applicant's neighbor to the west, across the side yard. He stated that that review occurred before he joined the Commission's staff. He recalled that the replacement of the tile with asphalt had been approved under the unnecessary hardship rules.

Mr. Rucci stated that it would be expensive to salvage tile from the rear and install it on the front. He asserted that his roofer could not guarantee this type of repair. Mr. Baron claimed that terra cotta roofing had been successfully repaired at several houses in the neighborhood.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the property owner and roofer were not present at the Architectural Committee hearing. She stated that the Committee had no information regarding the condition of the roof. She suggested that the staff should visit the site and inspect the roof to determine whether the conditions warranted the replacement of the tile. Mr. Thomas agreed.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to approve the application, provided that the staff confirms that extant roof cannot be reasonably repaired, with the staff to review details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

127 N. 11TH STREET

Owner: Wai Man Law

Applicant: Huai Jen Hsu, YCH Architects

History: c. 1825, altered twentieth century

Designation: Individually designated, 4/25/1974

Proposal: Demolish rear, restore windows in front façade, remove paint, install storefront

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to a lack of information.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the rear of this house including the rear ell and the rear slope of the main roof. A large addition would be constructed at the rear. In exchange for the loss at the rear, the applicant proposes to install 6-over-6 windows in the front façade, remove the blue paint from brick, and install a new, compatible storefront in place of mid twentieth-century brick infill.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Yao C. Huang and property owner Bonnie Law represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that what had initially appeared to be a red brick façade painted blue was, in fact, a blue-glazed brick façade that was constructed directly in front of the old red brick façade. Mr. Baron stated that the old red brick façade survives intact behind the blue façade. Moreover, the original windows survive in the original façade. The old windows in the red brick façade exist in place behind the new windows in the blue façade.

Mr. Schaaf asked Mr. Baron if the blue-glazed brick façade could be removed and the original red brick façade exposed and repaired. Mr. Baron stated that he thought that the later façade could be removed to reveal the original façade.

The Commissioners asked about surviving fabric at the roof and rear. Mr. Baron explained that the front and rear slopes of the main roof as well as the front and rear dormers survive. The arched sash of the front dormer and the original rear wall of the main block at the third-floor level are also extant. The original rear ell was demolished when the building was converted to a factory. The projecting rear that replaced the ell dates to about 1920. Mr. Baron explained that the Commission recently reviewed a similar project for a nearby building and agreed to the demolition at the rear in exchange for some restoration at the front. Mr. Baron suggested that the Commission approve the alterations at the rear in exchange for removal of the blue façade

and restoration of the red façade with an appropriate storefront. Mr. Baron contended that, without the restoration of the front, the Commission would lose much fabric, but gain very little.

Mr. Schaaf asked if any of the historic façade survives at the first floor. Mr. Baron replied that he does not believe that any of the first-floor façade survives. He again stated that the façade survives at the upper floors. Mr. Schaaf asked if the proposed storefront was compatible with the building. Mr. Baron asserted that it was. It is similar to the one that was recently approved for this row. Also, one building in the row retains part of its historic storefront, which is similar to the one proposed.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the proposed windows are not sized or located like the historic windows.

MOTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the application, provided the blue brick façade is removed and the underlying front façade is restored, with the Architectural Committee to review details. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion.

Mr. Huang, the architect, stated that his client is willing to install the storefront, but is not willing to remove the blue façade and restore the underlying red brick façade. He stated that the condition of the underlying façade is unknown, but is presumed to be damaged because it was covered with the blue facade. His client is afraid of finding a façade that cannot be repaired. He noted that the building has been vacant for many years and has suffered significant water damage. Ms. Law, lifelong resident of Chinatown, stated that this building had a blue façade when she was a child.

Mr. Huang stated that he had been the architect for the recent nearby project referred to earlier, which the Commission approved. He stated that this proposal is very similar to that one. He stated that his current client was encouraged by the approval of the other project. He stated that, if his client is unable to undertake this project, then the building will remain vacant and dilapidated.

Mr. Sherman asked if the blue brick is a veneer or real brick and how it is attached to the old facade. Mr. Baron answered that the blue brick is a full-width brick. He stated that it is unknown how it is attached to the old façade.

Ms. Hawkins explained that she suggested remanding the project to the Architectural Committee so that the Committee could review alternatives based on the conditions discovered when the blue façade was removed. She stated that the underlying brick façade may need to be stuccoed if it is found to be in poor condition. Ms. Hawkins also stated that removing the blue brick façade would allow for the water infiltration problems to be addressed more completely. After being questioned by fellow Commissioners, Ms. Hawkins clarified that her motion would require the removal of the entire blue-brick façade. She added that, after the removal of the façade, they could then assess the state of the original façade and perhaps approve stucco for it if the brick was in poor condition. Mr. Sherman stated that the removal of the blue façade may result in damage to the red façade. Ms. Law stated that she did not want to remove the blue brick. Ms. Hawkins contended that the restoration of the front was an appropriate mitigation of the adverse effect of the demolition at the rear. The building would be more profitable with the enlarged rear; some of those profits should be used for preservation. Mr. Wilds countered that a new stucco front façade would not justify the effort to remove the blue façade. He also noted that the Commission recently approved a similar project for the neighbor with a storefront as the only mitigation.

Mr. Baron noted that the blue brick façade has a parapet that extends above the historic roof line. The parapet can trap water. He also noted that the historic windows exist. He wondered if they would be removed if the blue façade was retained. Mr. Wilds stated that the historic windows are now interior features; the Commission has no jurisdiction over them.

FAILURE OF MOTION: By a vote of 10 to 4, the Commission rejected the motion offered by Mses. Hawkins and Leonard to approve the application, provided the blue brick façade is removed and the underlying front façade is restored, with the Architectural Committee to review details. Mses. Benoliel, Jaffe, Merriman, and Schlotterbeck and Messrs. Dilworth, Mattioni, Quinn, Schaaf, Sherman, and Wilds dissented.

Mr. Danta asked the Commission if the storefront should align with the old, red or new, blue façade. Mr. Wilds stated that the storefront should be aligned with the blue façade. Mr. Sherman advised the applicant that he would have to prove to the Department of Licenses & Inspections that the blue brick façade will be supported appropriately above the new storefront. The Commissioners agreed that the new windows in the blue façade should be compatible with it, not the underlying facade.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the application including the insertion of the proposed storefront in the extant blue glazed brick façade, the replacement of the front windows in existing openings, and the proposed alterations at the rear, with the staff to review details. Mr. Quinn seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 10 to 4. Commissioners Hawkins, Leonard, Thomas, and Wilson dissented.

1802 DIAMOND STREET

Owner: David Rosenberg

Applicant: Tuval Shlomo

History: 1889

Designation: Contributing to Diamond Street Historic District, 1/29/1986

Proposal: Replace door, basement windows, and brickmold, reset windows in opening, legalize windows and masonry repairs

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, particularly the brownstone repair.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the correction and partial legalization of work to this rowhouse. The former owners sought a permit to demolish and rebuild the façade of this rowhouse. The staff approved that application with the stipulation that the applicant submit shop drawings for the door and windows and masonry samples for the brownstone repair for review by the staff. The details and samples were never submitted. Incorrect windows and a door were installed and the masonry was inappropriately repaired. The applicant proposes to install a new, appropriate door and reset the windows in their appropriate locations in the openings, and install the correct brick molding. The basement slider windows would be removed and correct six-pane windows installed. The applicant seeks to legalize the clad windows and masonry work.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Property owner David Rosenberg and contractor Tuval Shlomo represented the application.

Mr. Sherman asked the applicants if they agreed with the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Rosenberg answered that he did agree with it.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, with the staff to review details, particularly the brownstone repair. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

2132 SAINT JAMES STREET

Owner: Dennis J. Cogan

Applicant: Caryl Cogan

History: c. 1926

Designation: Significant in the Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Legalize vinyl windows

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize vinyl windows on the front façade of this townhouse in the English Village. The windows in question are the second and third-floor windows. The third-floor windows were changed from an original casement design to double hung windows. The Historical Commission requested a violation in 2003 and again in 2006.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Caryl Cogan represented the application.

Ms. Cogan stated that she replaced the second and third-floor windows after the designation, but was unaware that the Historical Commission needed to review the replacement windows. She stated they were replaced quickly owing to water infiltration from the neighboring property, which is poorly maintained. The neighboring property continues to be poorly maintained. She stated that she was concerned that only vinyl windows would survive the infiltrating water. She claimed that she did not receive the initial violation in 2003. She claimed that she did not receive a violation until 2009. She contended that her property is most attractive on the block. She rejected the notion of removing the vinyl windows and replacing them with historically appropriate windows. She claimed that only the vinyl would withstand the harsh conditions. Wood windows would fail quickly. She concluded that the vinyl windows did not detract from the appearance of her house.

Mr. Wilds asked Ms. Cogan to explain how water from her neighbor was damaging her windows. Ms. Cogan responded that her house shares a wall with the neighbor's. Water gets into the wall through cracks in the neighbor's façade and infiltrates her house. The water from the neighbor caused her windows to rot. She stated that she has asked the neighbor to fix the problem, but the neighbor has not. Mr. Wilds pointed out that the third-floor window stands several feet above where the two houses connect. He asked how the water ran uphill from the neighbor's wall to the window. Ms. Cogan claimed that the water is pushed up to the window by wind. The Commissioners expressed their doubts about Ms. Cogan's claims.

Upon questioning, Ms. Cogan admitted knowing that the house was designated as historic when she replaced the windows. Mr. Wilds noted that she may have had options beyond wood, true-divided-light windows. Mr. Wilds stated that windows are available that both replicate the historic appearance and are very durable. Mr. Wilds asked Ms. Cogan if replacing the current windows would constitute an unnecessary hardship. Ms. Cogan stated that she was not making any

hardship claim. Ms. Cogan claimed that the Commission could not prove that the original windows were casement windows. She stated that they may have been double-hung windows, like the ones she installed. Mr. Wilds stated that the Commission has photographs of the development as constructed and also when it was designated as historic. Both show casements. He stated that Ms. Cogan's building had the original casement windows at the time of designation. Mr. Wilds advised her that, if she had sought the proper approval and permit, the staff would have assisted her with the selection of the appropriate windows.

Ms. Cogan stated the property is currently for sale. She objected to the idea of spending money to replace adequate windows. She contended that only vinyl will withstand the water infiltration. Mr. Wilds advised her that she should disclose the information about the violation to potential buyers prior to any sale. He suggested that she correct the violation now.

William Graham of Councilman Rizzo's office provided a letter from the Councilman supporting the legalization.

Mr. Wilds stated that the Historical Commission has invested significant time in the preservation of the English Village. He stated that the Commission should hold this applicant to the same standards as her neighbors.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 13 to 0. Ms. Leonard abstained.

415 S. CROSKEY STREET

Owner/Applicant: Joel Frisch

History: c. 1870

Designation: contributing to Rittenhouse Fittler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: legalize windows, security gate, transom

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Gutterman moved that the Architectural Committee recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. Evans seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of vinyl windows, metal security gate, and transom. The staff approved an application for interior work and window replacement at the rear of the building, but the owner exceeded the scope of the permitted work. Although the approved drawings originally noted the replacement of the basement windows and a security door, the applicant deleted them from the drawings, withdrawing all work to the front facade from the review. The staff later discovered that the storm door, transom, and basement windows had been replaced. The first and second-story windows at the front façade were also replaced with vinyl units since designation without a permit.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Property owner Joel Frisch represented the application.

Mr. Thomas pointed out that the City Certification issued to this property owner at the time of purchase specifically indicates that the property is designated as historic and states that all proposals for alterations must be reviewed for approval by the Historical Commission. Therefore, the applicant was apprised of the Commission's jurisdiction at the time of purchase. Mr. Wilds pointed out that the applicant was also aware of the Commission's jurisdiction

because he had received the Commission's approval for interior work only, but then exceeded that approval and undertook work to the exterior.

Mr. Frisch stated he had purchased the property in 2009. He met with Mr. Baron to discuss interior work. He had no plans for exterior work at that time. During construction, the contractors broke the security door and basement jalousie windows and then replaced them. They also discovered that the transom was rotted and replaced it. He claimed that he did not replace the windows other than the basement windows. Mr. Frisch stated that he would replace the basement windows with historically appropriate windows. However, he objected to replacing the four front windows. He claimed that they were in place when he bought the building. He offered to replace them with historically appropriate windows when they wear out, but not now. He requested the legalization of the transom and front windows.

Mr. Baron stated that the front window frames were capped with aluminum at one time as noted in the applicant's inspection report, but the capping is now gone. He contended that the capping was likely removed when the vinyl windows were installed. Mr. Wilds noted that the designation photographs show wood windows. Mr. Frisch stated that they are vinyl and capped, but were in place when he purchased the building.

Mr. Sherman stated that the applicant knew of the jurisdiction and procedures and yet altered the exterior without the necessary approval. He noted that the Commission just denied a legalization request during the previous review. He stated that the Commission should be consistent. Mr. Frisch objected to replacing windows that he did not install. Mr. Sherman stated that the Commission cannot legalize illegal work merely because the ownership has changed. If it did, it would be impossible to enforce the preservation ordinance. Mr. Wilds concurred with Mr. Sherman and advocated for a denial. He stated that he sympathized with the applicant, but, as the owner, he must take responsibility for the building. He suggested that Mr. Frisch could seek compensation from the former owner. Mr. Frisch said the former owner is deceased.

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

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adjourn at 11:16 a.m. Mr. Wilson seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

Standard 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: 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.