

**THE MINUTES OF THE 656TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**THURSDAY, 13 APRIL 2017
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
BOB THOMAS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Robert Thomas, AIA, chair
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D.
Michael Fink, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Antonio Fiol-Silva, AICP, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C
Steven Hartner, Department of Public Property
Melissa Long, Division of Housing & Community Development
John Mattioni, Esq.
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Rachel Royer, LEED AP BD+C
R. David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
H. Ahada Stanford, Ph.D., Commerce Department
Betty Turner, M.A.

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Broadbent, Historic Preservation Planner II
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner III
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

Timothy Kerner, Terra Studio LLC
Parker Gordon
Samuel Weiner
Michael Gordon
Tim Smith
David Cross
Nicholas Melisiotis
Chip Roller, WICA
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Maryellen Wikoff, Jacobs
Carolina Pena, YCH Architects
Isaacson
Michael Schade, AOS Architects
Ruthie Embree, AOS Architects
Kevin Aires, BLTa
Dale You
Ian Toner, Toner Architects
Janet Anderson, WICA
Robert Powers, Powers & Co.
Jeff Allegretti, WICA
Maria Straw
Aaron Wunsch, University of Pennsylvania

Oscar Beisert, Keeping Society of Philadelphia
Phillippa Campbell, CCRA
Kathy Dowdell
Elizabeth Stegner, University City Historical Society
Venise Whitaker
Neil Sklaroff, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Leonardo Diaz, Jacobs
Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Ballard Spahr
David Gest, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Stuart Rosenberg, SGRA
Anton Michels
Fred Baumert, Keast & Hood
James Bush, JB Studio Architects
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Brett Peanasky, Klehr Harrison
Dione Hosler, BLTa
Tom Farrell, Core Asset Management
Dave Fisher, Core Asset Management
Brian Mann, Omnia
Liz Spikol, Mid-Atlantic Media
George Thomas, Civic Visions
Ben Leech
Parker Gordon
Nnadozie Ibeh, Temple University
Tom McCreesh, Temple University
Diana Breslin-Knudsen, Temple University
William O'Brien
David Barnes
Jim Barnes
Vaughan Piccolo, WICA

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Thomas called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Commissioners Cooperman, Cooperman, Fink, Fiol-Silva, Hartner, Long, Mattioni, McCoubrey, Royer, Schaaf, Stanford, and Turner joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 655TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to adopt the minutes of the 655th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 10 March 2017. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

REQUESTS TO CONTINUE NOMINATION REVIEWS

ADDRESS: 401-11 S BROAD ST

Name of Resource: Gershman Y, Young Men's & Young Women's Hebrew Association

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: University of the Arts

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 401-11 S. Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 401-11 S. Broad Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J. The nomination asserts that the impressive Georgian Revival building was the first center built jointly by formerly independent chapters of the Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Associations and that numerous prominent figures were involved in the planning and construction of the building. The nomination further argues that the property, designed by architects Frank E. Hahn and S. Brian Baylinson in consultation with Paul Phillippe Cret, reflects more than nine decades of Jewish social, cultural, and educational heritage.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Long recused, owing to her husband's employment at the law firm representing the property owner. Mr. Farnham presented the continuance request to the Historical Commission. Attorney Michael Sklaroff represented the property owner.

Mr. Sklaroff explained that the property owner had previously been granted a 90-day continuance. During that time, he continued, the owner invited representatives of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia to meet with structural engineer Fred Baumert and tour the building to observe the interior. He stated that it was a good meeting and that he had hoped to find common ground on the nomination. Specifically, Mr. Sklaroff expressed a desire to correct an error in the nomination for the record and asserted that the nomination represented the building as being in good condition, when in fact, he argued, the building is in very poor condition. With a trained eye, in observing the building from the exterior, he continued, one can see serious structural issues, which he claimed continue on the interior. Mr. Sklaroff indicated that he and the Preservation Alliance have no path forward to correct the nomination. Had a more nuanced nomination been made, he argued, it would have emphasized the site's cultural history and would have been more objective about the building's architecture. He requested a 30-day continuance, noting that he would return to the Commission to correct elements of the nomination. He argued that the nomination fails to accurately portray the building's structure. He stated that the building does not have a reinforced concrete structure, as the nomination claims, adding that the Gershman Y is a different kind of building that is very susceptible to observable wear and tear. He encouraged members of the Preservation Alliance to join him and noted that he would return with a team of experts to make a case that the nomination needs to be more focused and more accurate.

Mr. Thomas thanked Mr. Sklaroff and asked for comments from the Commissioners and the public. Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance explained that the Alliance submitted the nomination in July 2016 and that the Committee on Historic Designation reviewed it and unanimously recommended it for designation at the Committee's December 2016 meeting. The Preservation Alliance, he added, did not object to the owner's request for a 90-day continuance.

He noted that those 90 days have expired. On 1 February 2017, Mr. Steinke reflected, he and several of the Alliance's board members, who are experts in historic structures, were offered a tour of the building, as Mr. Sklaroff indicated. Mr. Steinke asserted that nothing he or the board members saw that day would cause them to agree with Mr. Sklaroff's contention that the Alliance's nomination is somehow in error by characterizing the building as being in good condition. With the expiration of the 90-day continuance and the passage of more than two months since the tour, Mr. Steinke requested that the Historical Commission consider the nomination and unanimous recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation at its current meeting. He disagreed with Mr. Sklaroff's request for an additional 30-day continuance.

Mr. Sklaroff responded that, if the experts on the Preservation Alliance's board still found the building to be in good condition following their tour, he would like it to be stated on the record. He asserted that the nominated building remains under the Commission's protection and that "nothing bad will happen." He restated his request for a 30-day continuance, adding that at the end of the 30 days, he will return to the Commission to discuss the nomination's errors with regard to the building's condition, as well as the fact that its construction is incorrectly identified in the nomination as being reinforced concrete, which it is not. The building, Mr. Sklaroff claimed, is steel-frame with masonry cladding, built in the 1920s. He noted that the building's history is not just visible at the exterior but is also held in the "guts" of the building. He then explained that Regents Street's Disease is a technical term used to describe serious structural issues related to steel-frame buildings with masonry cladding, such as the Gershman Y, that were constructed in the 1920s. Mr. Sklaroff argued that the Preservation Alliance failed to call the issue to the attention of the Commission in the nomination, but contended that it was just an innocent oversight. He stated that he and his team have spent significant time investigating the structure and believe the nomination, and ultimately designation, should be informed by the actual condition of the building. Under the Commission's regulations, he continued, the staff and Commission are empowered to correct the nomination. He reiterated that the request is only for a 30-day continuance, at the end of which he will return with a report. He again assured the Commission that "nothing bad will happen" in the interim and asked for the Commission's indulgence in granting his request.

Mr. Steinke responded that the nomination asks whether the building is a city landmark and deserves designation and commented that many people aware of the nomination have been surprised that the Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Association building was not already designated. To the eyes of most, he continued, it is a landmark that deserves designation. He argued that the nomination stands on its own regarding its significance and stated that he hopes the Commission agrees. Mr. Steinke contended that another 30 days would not change what he believes is an obvious fact, that the building is a landmark worthy of inclusion in the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Mattioni stated that the argument surrounding the nomination centers on clarifying some of the details explaining or describing the property rather than its potential designation. With agreement that the property is worthy of designation, he asked Mr. Steinke what harm would be caused if a 30-day continuance were granted and the property owner could clarify points in the nomination that he believes should be clarified and corrected. He then added that at the end of the 30 days, it appears as though it would be a foregone conclusion that the building would be deemed worthy of designation. Mr. Mattioni asked Mr. Steinke why he is objecting to Mr. Sklaroff's continuance request.

Mr. Steinke replied that his objection results from the completion of the previous 90-day continuance, which he indicated should have been enough time for the owner to make any

necessary arguments or corrections. He reiterated that if the building is found worthy of designation based on the arguments made in the nomination, he would like to see the building added to the Philadelphia Register so that any future repairs, alterations, or other changes will come under the Historical Commission's purview. He asked why, if the Commission agrees on the building's significance, would it not designate the property at the current meeting, since a 90-day continuance had already been granted.

Mr. Mattioni responded that, if the nomination does contain the type of errors that the owner's representative suggests, which would have an impact on any future application for alterations, it would be important to correct the record so a proper description of the building exists. He again asked Mr. Steinke why he opposes the property owner's 30-day continuance request. Mr. Steinke answered that he does not concur that the nomination is in error, stating that he believes the nomination accurately describes the building and that the Commission should vote on whether to designate. The Committee on Historic Designation, he reiterated, unanimously determined that the building belongs on the Philadelphia Register.

In speaking to Mr. Steinke, Mr. Fiol-Silva noted that on page 2, the nomination states that the building is a four-story, reinforced concrete, masonry-clad structure. Mr. Steinke deferred to Ben Leech, who authored the nomination. Mr. Mattioni interjected that the Commission is considering a continuance request and not making a decision on the nomination's merits. He objected to presenting any evidence on the nomination's merits and noted that the nomination appears later on the agenda, should the continuance request not be granted and the merits need to be discussed at that time.

Mr. Thomas clarified that the building is currently under the protection of the Commission and that no building permit can be obtained and no alteration or other work can be undertaken without the approval of the Historical Commission. After reading the nomination, he continued, he had no question that the building is eligible for listing. Mr. Thomas suggested that, if any technical questions exist, they could be resolved at no additional risk to the building, adding that he could not imagine the property not being placed on the Register. He then elaborated that the owner is requesting that details of the nomination be evaluated, but that he is not questioning the general nomination. Mr. Thomas opined that, if the question pertained to whether the building was eligible to be placed on the Register, the Commission would likely vote at the present meeting. To give the property owner 30 days, he continued, to work on technical details and present new information, rather than challenging the nomination of the building, is a reasonable request, given that owner is the property's steward.

Mr. Fiol-Silva returned to his earlier comment, noting that his question regarding the technical aspects of the nomination is relevant, because, if corrections are needed, the nomination should be corrected to reflect the actual condition. Ms. Cooperman responded that the Commission will evaluate any expert report on its merits as well. Mr. Fiol-Silva replied that, if any portion of the nomination is incorrect, there is no harm in allowing it to be corrected before the Commission acts on it. Mr. Mattioni remarked that he had suggested the need to correct the nomination in his earlier comment. Ms. Cooperman added that it is the Commission's convention to grant continuance requests from property owners when the buildings are not under threat. Mr. Thomas reiterated that the building is currently under the Commission's jurisdiction and added that the building's condition has no bearing on whether the property is worthy of designation. If Independence Hall were found to have structural cracks or termite damage, he opined, it would not be removed from the Register.

Mr. Fiol-Silva clarified that he is not disputing those claims, but argued for “rigor,” emphasizing that any incorrect information should be corrected before the Commission acts. Ms. Cooperman explained that her comment relates to “rigor,” in that any expert report would need to be evaluated on its merits as well. Mr. Fiol-Silva agreed.

Mr. Leech asked whether any discrepancies in the building description should be corrected immediately and if the question of correctness relates solely to whether or not the building is reinforced concrete. Mr. Mattioni again interjected that the Commission has before it a request for a continuance and suggested that Mr. Leech’s attempt to delve into the merits of the nomination is inappropriate.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to continue the review of the nomination for 401-11 S. Broad Street to the May 2017 Historical Commission meeting. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance approached the table and remarked to Mr. Mattioni that Mr. Leech was asked a question directly. He asserted that Mr. Leech was not trying to force his way into the merits of the nomination. Mr. Mattioni countered that Mr. Leech was indeed forcing the issue and stated that a motion has been made, seconded, and carried. Mr. Thomas informed Mr. Grossi that his statement was out of order.

Mr. Thomas elaborated that a continuance has been granted for 30 days and that the nomination will be reviewed at the Commission’s 12 May 2017 meeting. Given the work that has already been completed, he added, 30 days should prove sufficient for the property owner to provide written materials that can be reviewed by the Commission members and public prior to the meeting.

2117 E YORK ST

Name of Resource: Weisbrod & Hess Brewery

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Autowerkstatt LLC

Nominator: Andrew Fearon

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2117 E. York Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the former Weisbrod & Hess Brewery loading room, condenser and storage/boiler, and the wash house buildings, constructed between 1890 and 1899, are significant under Criteria for Designation A, C, D, E, and J. The nomination contends that the buildings are significant as part of the formerly much-larger Weisbrod & Hess Brewery complex, as well as for their association with Christian Hess, a prominent citizen in the German-American communities in Philadelphia and Atlantic City, NJ. The nomination also argues that the buildings are architecturally significant as representative designs of the Rundbogenstil style, which was used for German-owned breweries in Philadelphia and across the United States. Under Criterion E, the nomination contends that the property is significant as a work of German-American architect Adam C. Wagner, who designed more than 50 breweries during his lifetime.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the continuance request to the Historical Commission. Owner Anton Michels represented the property.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to continue the review of the nomination for 2117 E. York Street to the July 2017 Historical Commission meeting. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 MARCH 2017

Dan McCoubrey, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Thomas introduced the consent agenda, which included applications for 423 Catharine Street, 1511 and 1513 Lombard Street, and 858 N. Broad Street. Mr. Thomas asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. None were offered. Mr. Thomas asked if anyone in the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. None were offered.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 423 Catharine Street, 1511 and 1513 Lombard Street, and 858 N. Broad Street. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 2410 CYPRESS ST

Proposal: Construct two-story rooftop addition; reface building

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Parker Gordon

Applicant: Timothy Kerner, Terra Studio LLC

History: 1970

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Non-contributing, 2/8/1995

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the glass railings are changed to metal railings, and no mechanical units are placed on the pilot house roof, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story rooftop addition with deck and pilot house, and construct a two-story angled bay on the rear of this non-contributing residence in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District. The front entrance of the building is accessed via a walkway from Delancey Place, and is not visible from the public right-of-way. The existing garage entrance would be widened and a new garage door with glass would be installed. The addition would be clad in fiber cement panels with a deck and glass railing. A small deck with glass railing is proposed for the top of the new projecting bay. This block of Cypress Street is an alley-like street with numerous garages.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Timothy Kerner and property owner Parker Gordon represented the application.

Ms. Broadbent explained that the application has been revised since the review by the Architectural Committee so that mechanical units are no longer proposed for the roof of the pilot house. Mr. Kerner stated that he wishes to use glass railings because they are more in keeping with the architectural style of the proposed construction, the neighbors are in support of them,

and they would provide a safer environment for Mr. Gordon's two cats. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the Committee discussed how metal railings are traditionally found on buildings of this scale and use; however, it was not necessarily a strongly-advocated position by the Committee for this specific application. He opined that glass railings could be acceptable, owing to the architectural style of the building, but noted that the Committee is typically concerned about reflectivity of glass railings. Mr. Kerner responded that the façade where the glass railing is proposed faces north. The sun will not reflect off the railing. Mr. Fiol-Silva commented that the addition is an improvement to the building, and there is no need to use a traditional element on a modern addition.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised design as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting on 13 April 2017 with the glass railing. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1733 SPRING GARDEN ST

Proposal: Construct ADA ramp, decks, and pilot house; install HVAC equipment

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1733 Spring Garden LLC

Applicant: Dale You

History: 1875

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the ADA ramp; approval of the concept of exhaust fans on the rear addition, provided they are made as discreet as possible; denial of the roof decks and pilot house; denial of the rooftop mechanical equipment as proposed, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an ADA ramp, two roof decks with pilot house, and install HVAC equipment on this corner property. The ADA ramp would be located at the side of the property and would be concealed by an existing brick wall. A new entrance for the ramp would be cut into an existing non-historic addition. In September of 2015, the Commission approved an elevator for this building which required a new entrance at this addition, after a proposed ADA ramp, which terminated substantially higher than the current proposed ramp, was recommended for denial by the Committee. The proposed roof decks and pilot house are located on mansard roofs. Mechanical units are proposed for both the upper and lower roof, located just outside of the roof deck perimeter, close to the edges of the roofs. At the first-floor rear of the building, two kitchen exhaust fans are proposed.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Dale You and architect Carolina Pena represented the application.

Ms. Broadbent explained that the application has been revised since the review by the Architectural Committee. The roof decks and pilot house were removed, the mechanical units on the roof were moved closer to the party wall, and the applicant has agreed to make the kitchen fans as discreet as possible. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the Committee had a question about the kitchen fans, but that the revised drawing clarifies that one is an intake louver and one is an exhaust fan.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised design as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting on 13 April 2017. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2223 MOUNT VERNON ST

Proposal: Construct roof deck and pilot house

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2223 Mount Vernon LLC

Applicant: Michael Gordon

History: 1875

Individual Designation: 12/5/1974

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

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the deck on the main block, but approval of a deck on the rear ell, provided the pilot house is sloped following the angle of the stairs, and the railing is painted metal, pursuant to the Roofs Guidelines; and denial of the sliding door and balcony at the third-floor rear bay window.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a pilot house and roof deck on the main block of this Spring Garden property. The proposed pilot house was revised following the Architectural Committee meeting to follow the slope of the stairs. The pilot house would be clad in a horizontal vinyl siding. Following the Architectural Committee review, the proposed deck is pulled back an additional two feet from the originally-proposed eight feet from the front façade, and set in four feet from the east side wall. The deck would feature a vertical metal picket railing.

The application also proposes to cut a sliding door into the masonry wall of the rear wall and to construct a deck on the roof of a second-story bay at the rear. The rear of the property is visible from N. 23rd Street. There is one existing double-hung window opening.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Michael Gordon and architect Brian Mann represented the application.

Ms. DiPasquale noted that she reviewed a mock-up of the deck railing, but not the pilot house. The mock-up is not visible from the street.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that the Commission typically prefers that decks be restricted to the rear ell, and asked why Mr. Gordon was unable to do so. Mr. Gordon responded that it is somewhat of a personal preference, but also that placing the deck on the rear ell would involve a more costly and invasive construction with roof reinforcement. Ms. DiPasquale clarified that the rear ell roof is sloped considerably, whereas the main block roof is relatively flat. Mr. Thomas asked whether the applicant has provided any sight-line drawings. He noted that the majority of the surrounding buildings are three-stories. With the set-backs, he doubted that the deck would be visible from the street. Ms. DiPasquale reiterated that the mock-up of the railing was completely invisible from the street. Ms. Cooperman noted that a mock-up of the pilot house had not been done. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the pilot house is set back fairly far, along the line of the main block and the rear ell, the intersection of which is not visible from the street. Mr. Thomas noted that the section on drawing A-5 shows the pilot house sloping along what would be the sight-line, so the impact should be minimal.

Mr. McCoubrey expressed his continued opposition to the installation of double-glass siding doors in the visible rear elevation of the second floor, replacing the single double-hung window. Mr. Thomas attempted to orient himself to the property. Ms. DiPasquale presented a photograph of the rear of the property showing the visibility of the property from N. 23rd Street. Mr. Mann noted that there are less sensitive balconies that have been placed on bays along the rears of the neighboring properties. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff believes that those were constructed prior to designation.

Mr. Fiol-Silva questioned whether it would be more appropriate to lower the sill of the existing window and install a single door onto a small balcony over the bay. He opined that a simple black metal railing would be inconspicuous. Mr. Thomas opined that visibility of the rear from the street is fairly minimal. Ms. Cooperman suggested that the work would really need to be nearly undetectable. Mr. Thomas agreed that a wood framed, full-glass door in an opening that retained the existing width and the existing lintel would be nearly undetectable. He noted that that would also allow more light and ventilation, though he acknowledged that that was not the Historical Commission's purview. Mr. Fiol-Silva stressed that no glass railing should be installed. Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Gordon to clarify the material and finish of the proposed railing. Mr. Gordon stated that the railing would be a simple, black, metal picket railing. Mr. McCoubrey stressed that the minimal visibility from the street is what would make that option viable for him. Ms. Cooperman agreed, noting that one of the issues with the adjacent balcony that predates designation is that it is constructed of wood and expands beyond the footprint of the bay itself.

Mr. Thomas opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application, provided the door to the deck on the bay is wood, the sill is lowered but the window width is retained for the door, and the railing is no more than minimally visible and the pilot house is not visible from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1523-25 N FRONT ST

Proposal: Legalize skylights; install glazed entrance

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1511 N Front Street Associates

Applicant: Hilary Regan

History: 1849, Second Associate Presbyterian Church, Third United Presbyterian Church

Individual Designation: 7/10/2015

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the skylights, provided a film or coating is applied to them to reduce reflectivity, with the staff to review details; denial of the door as presented, with the suggestion that a glazed system more in keeping with the proportions of the original doors may be acceptable.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of 20 of skylights in the gable roof of this former church building. Considerable rehabilitation work is underway, including the replacement of windows and interior alterations, which were approved at the staff level. While the Historical Commission staff approved the replacement of the roofing material, skylights were installed during construction without the Historical Commission's review or approval. The skylights are not visible from directly in front of the building, but are visible from various locations along N. Front Street.

The application also proposes to install a modern glazed entry system. The doorway was significantly altered prior to designation with the installation of a steel beam across the opening. The applicant does not propose to remove the grandfathered steel beam or infill above, but does propose a new window and door system below the beam. The system would feature glazing within metal panels that do not fully replicate the configuration of the historic doors in materials or dimensions. The Historical Commission staff previously approved an entry scheme with large wood doors that more closely replicate the original doors that could be pinned open as needed, with a secondary glazed system behind to allow for the desired light.

Following the Architectural Committee meeting, the application was revised to reconfigure the proposed entry to have more vertically-oriented panels, and to apply a neutral glass film to the skylights.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Developer Roland Kassis and architect James Bush represented the application.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that the Committee felt that, although the skylights were installed without approval, they are low-profile skylights and are minimally-visible from head-on and as the properties adjacent are developed, will become completely invisible from the street. He noted that the skylights have been carefully placed to avoid rafters in the roof. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the revised entry door reflects the comments of the Committee that the glazing proportions should be more similar to the original door paneling, and opined that that has been achieved with the revised design.

Mr. Fiol-Silva asked for clarification about the meaning of "legalizing" the skylights. He asked whether that meant they had been installed without permission, which Mr. Thomas confirmed. Mr. Fiol-Silva stated that, although he often tells his employees that it is better to ask forgiveness than permission, it is very disturbing that this happened. Mr. Thomas responded

that, if one applies through the Department of Licenses & Inspections to legalize work, an extra fee is charged. He noted that that is the punishment, and that it is the Historical Commission's job to look at whether the work meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Mr. Thomas noted that, although these skylights appear to have been installed in an appropriate way, the Historical Commission could compel the property owner change or reverse the work done.

Mr. Fiol-Silva also expressed concern about the design of the glass door, noting that it seems extremely out of character with the historic photograph. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the Architectural Committee felt that the change of use in the building and the need to allow light into the space is so fundamental and important, and that putting a glazed system in was an opportunity to do that. He also noted that the existing opening is not the original opening. Mr. Fiol-Silva opined that what is particularly simple and elegant in the historic photograph is that the original doors went the full height of the opening. He suggested that the glazing be extended all the way to the top of the opening. Mr. McCoubrey responded that a large beam was installed across the door opening before designation; the Historical Commission must accept the beam as a grandfathered condition. Mr. Fiol-Silva opined that the proposed door is jarring. Mr. Kassis reiterated that there is a major beam spanning the original opening. Mr. Fiol-Silva responded that he understands that, and has dealt with similar situations through the use of spandrel glass. Mr. Bush responded that in order to put spandrel glass all the way to the top of the opening, they would have to put the glass proud of the façade. In order to keep it recessed, he explained, the steel beam would need to remain. Mr. Fiol-Silva suggested carrying the vertical lines of the door through the panel above the beam.

Mr. Thomas commented that churches can be difficult to reuse, and that sometimes there need to be compromises when it comes to reviewing work to former churches.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application with the revised design for the doorway glazing system, provided a film is installed on the skylights to reduce glare from them, with the staff to review details. Ms. Long seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1600-06 CHRISTIAN ST

Proposal: Replace stained glass windows

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: MLK Real Estate Associates

Applicant: Christopher Stromberg, S2 Design

History: 1906, Watson & Huckel, architect, First African Baptist Church

Individual Designation: 10/9/2015

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the applicant seeks slimmer window elements, the storm windows are glass not Plexiglas, and the stained glass windows at the second-floor level of the towers on Christian Street are retained, with the staff to details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the majority of the stained glass windows of this former church building with operable, clear glass windows. The proposed windows are aluminum-clad double-hungs in a matte black finish. The Gothic arched windows will feature fixed Gothic arched transoms above the double-hungs. The application proposes to retain the

existing primary windows on both the Christian and 16th Street elevations and to install new custom storm windows in place of the existing plexiglass storms.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Nicholas Melisiotis represented the application.

Mr. Thomas asked about the new use of the property. Mr. Melisiotis responded that it will be used as a 14,000 square foot daycare facility.

Mr. Thomas questioned the apparent heaviness of the window frames. Mr. Melisiotis responded that there are two components of the windows. The first is the existing wood frame that will be retained. He noted that the new window will be placed up against the existing wooden frame, and explained that the majority of the width shown in the rendering is the existing wood frame. Mr. McCoubrey clarified that the three inches of wood trim that is shown in the drawings is the existing frame. Mr. Melisiotis confirmed this, noting that the frames will be restored and repainted. Mr. McCoubrey clarified that the new sash would be the one and one half inches shown on the drawings. Mr. Melisiotis confirmed this.

Mr. Thomas opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised design as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting on 13 April 2017. Ms. Royer seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 423 CATHARINE ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition with roof deck

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Cole & Arianna Lewko

Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects

History: 1832

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the addition remains below the eave line of the existing roof, that the dormer width is maintained, and that the door is created by lowering the sill, and that the railing of the rear deck turns back at the side walls a minimum of 4 feet from the rear wall.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear two-story addition with roof deck. The two-and-a-half story house, built in 1832, retains its original configuration, which includes the main block with a gabled roof and a small rear ell. The addition, which would be visible from Fulton Street, would extend approximately 19 feet from the existing rear wall of the main block; the existing rear wall of the main block and two walls of the existing rear ell would be demolished. Only the east or party wall of the rear ell would be retained. The rear of the building is currently stuccoed, and the addition would be similarly stuccoed. Wood six-over-six double-hung sash windows are proposed at the addition. The roof slope would not be altered, but the existing rear dormer would be cut down to allow for deck access. In May 2007, the Commission approved a smaller rear addition provided that segments of the walls to be demolished were

retained as indicators of the historic walls. That application proposed to demolish parts of the ell's west wall but to retain its rear wall.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 1511 LOMBARD ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition and deck; restore façade

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1511 Lombard Street LLC

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg, SgRA Architecture, PC

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the mechanical equipment and stairhouse are not visible from Lombard Street, with the staff to review details and a mock-up, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore the front façade of this rowhouse by removing a non-historic parapet and reconstructing the historic cornice, the marble stoop, and doorway. At the rear, the application proposes significant changes to a rear ell that has been modified from its historic condition with stucco and a large non-historic window in the gable. This rear ell is visible to the public from Addison and Hicks Street, which are small alleys. The proposed changes include removing parts of the side wall and roof of the ell and constructing an addition beside and above the ell. The addition will not subsume the entirety of the rear ell, but will leave exposed the northernmost section of the historic ell. A deck and pilot house would be constructed on top of the addition to the ell. The deck and pilot house would not be visible from Lombard Street.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 1513 LOMBARD ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition and deck; reconstruct façade

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1513 Lombard Street LLC

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg, SgRA Architecture, PC

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted 4 to 2 to recommend denial of the removal of the existing brick façade, but approval of an application with the restoration of the existing façade, provided the mechanical equipment and stairhouse are not visible from Lombard Street, with the staff to review details and a mock-up, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Pentz dissented.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reconstruct the front façade of this rowhouse by removing the front wall and reconstructing the brick wall, historic cornice, marble stoop, and doorway. The building has lost about 30% of its façade because it had a two-story bay added

about 1900, removed in the mid 20th century and in-filled with non-matching brick. At the rear, the application proposes significant changes to a rear ell that has been modified from its historic condition with stucco and a large non-historic window in the gable. This rear ell is visible to the public from Addison and Hicks Street, which are small alleys. The proposed changes include removing parts of the side wall and roof of the ell and constructing an addition beside and above the ell. The addition will not subsume the entirety of the rear ell, but will leave exposed the northernmost section of the historic ell. A deck and pilot house would be constructed on top of the addition to the ell. The deck and pilot house would not be visible from Lombard Street.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 352 N 16TH ST

Proposal: Construct rooftop addition; restore façade; replace windows; install canopy

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Ivy Callowhill Property, LLC

Applicant: Dione Hosler, BLT Architects

History: 1908, Watson & Huckel, architect, C.C. Knight & Co., Middishade Clothing Factory

Individual Designation: 4/29/1987

District Designation: None

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, provided:

- the canopy on Callowhill Street is redesigned to fit within the masonry opening;
- the entries on 16th and Callowhill Streets are either single doors of a reasonable width with sidelights and glass design or double doors with either a modern glass design or a more traditional design under a traditional full width transom; and,
- the rooftop additions are not increased in height.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate this former factory building from an office use to a residential use. The application proposes a modest rooftop penthouse to serve as a function room for the building. The windows will be replaced with new aluminum units to match the original designs. The application includes no details regarding brick moldings or other details. The plans indicate that the cornice, parapet, and southernmost entry portal on the 16th Street façade will be restored; however, few details are provided. A wide metal canopy is proposed at the entrance on Callowhill Street. It would span and cover the architectural ornament at the doorway.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architects Kevin Aires and Dione Hosler represented the application.

Mr. Baron stated that the revised drawing now concurs with the Architectural Committee's recommendation, showing the canopy within the masonry opening and double doors with more traditional stiles and rails. Mr. McCoubrey concurred with the staff opinion that this satisfies the requirements of the Committee. Mr. Fiol-Silva asked about the step at the front door. Mr. Aires said that they may be proposing a ramp to reach the entry. Mr. Fiol-Silva asked about a planter shown in the rendering and a possible railing. Mr. Baron said that the ramp and the railing are not part of the application as they are not shown in the elevations drawings. Mr. McCoubrey said that any ramp would need to be reviewed as a separate application. Mr. Aires said that they are also considering raising the sidewalk to avoid any ramp, but that it has not been fully designed. Mr. Fiol-Silva said that he is a "hater of sloped sidewalks" that are too sloped.

He also suggested that the canopy could be enlarged to make a more gracious entrance. Mr. Aires said that they will make the sidewalk level but remove the step. He said that they reduced the size of the canopy to address the concerns of the Architectural Committee and historic tax credit reviewers. Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that the entryway includes impressive architectural ornament that should not be obscured by a larger canopy as Mr. Fiol-Silva suggests.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application with the revisions to the doors and canopy as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting on 13 April 2017, with the staff to review details. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 858 N BROAD ST

Proposal: Install signage, mechanical equipment, and ramp, rehabilitate façade

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Holy Ghost I LP

Applicant: Michael Schade, AOS Architects

History: 1908, William H. McElfatrick, architect, Metropolitan Opera House

Individual Designation: 6/29/1971

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 parapet wall is reconstructed at the north and east façades to hide the mechanical equipment and the sign in the area near the ladies room removed, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate this former opera house for use as a music venue. The Philadelphia Opera House was originally developed by Oscar Hammerstein. Over the years it has also served as a movie theater, sports venue, and most recently as a church. The building has deteriorated, losing its cornice, parapet, balustrades and areas of its original cream-colored brick cladding. The developer seeks to restore many of these lost features. The cornice but not original parapet would be restored. Balustrades would be restored at the inset balconies. Additional metal railings would be installed behind the balustrades to meet the building code. Doors, windows, and storefronts will also be recreated from historic photographs and evidence found on the building. The application proposes to recreate some very large signs including a rooftop sign and a three-story high corner blade sign that were installed on the building in the 1930s. Non-historic signage including LED sign boards is also proposed. The application also proposes some new elements including rooftop cooling towers and a ramp at the rear or west façade.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 1801-35 N BROAD ST

Proposal: Construct additions and bridge

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Temple University

Applicant: Thomas McCreesh, Temple University

History: 1870, Park Mall houses, Temple University

Individual Designation: 9/24/1986

District Designation: Park Mall Historic District, Contributing, 11/14/1990

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted 4 to 1 to recommend denial of the bridge portion of the application, but unanimously to recommend approval of the remainder of the application, provided no mechanical equipment is installed on the roof of the new addition, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Cluver voted against the recommendation of denial of the bridge.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter a building on Liacouras Walk on the campus of Temple University. The building is located within the Park Mall Historic District. The building began life in the 1870s as a row of large townhouses. Temple University began to acquire townhouses in the 1920s as its campus expanded and adaptively reused them for school purposes until early in this century. In 2004, Temple University claimed that it had outgrown the townhouses and the Historical Commission approved the demolitions of all but the front facades of the townhouses under its financial hardship provision and the construction of an institutional building behind the facades. The building constructed behind the facades is one story taller than the historic facades and extends north of the historic facades into what had been an open lot.

Temple University now contends that it has outgrown the building constructed a decade ago and now seeks to enlarge it and connect it with a bridge to a building across Liacouras Walk for the Fox School of Business. The application proposes to construct a second story above the historic facades, a large addition at the north in place of a non-historic portion of the building, and a bridge extending to a nearby building across the sidewalk to the east. The staff reviewed a mock-up of the rooftop addition and determined that such an addition would be conspicuous from Liacouras Walk and surrounding streets.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Attorney Neil Sklaroff, architects Leonardo Diaz and Mary Ellen Wikoff, preservation consultant George Thomas, and Temple University administrators Nnadozie Ibeh, Tom McCreesh, and Diana Breslin-Knudsen represented the application.

Mr. Sklaroff opened by explaining the many development projects currently ongoing at Temple. He said that the success and growth of the Fox School of Business was the impetus for this application. He pointed out the letter from the Dean of the Business School and a packet of photographs of bridges on college campuses. He also distributed copies of minutes of the Historical Commission's decision approving a bridge at the Law School at University of Pennsylvania. He noted that the Law School bridge emerges from an ornamented, historic window opening in the historic building; the proposed bridge would extend from a non-historic building to a non-historic addition.

Mr. Diaz and Ms. Wikoff displayed a Powerpoint presentation on the project. Mr. Diaz said that the existing rooftop addition will be re-clad in terra-cotta and a sixth floor added that will help to hide the mechanical units of a building on Broad Street. He explained how the new structure to

the north will reference the architecture found on the rowhouses in the spacing of the vertical and horizontal divisions of the mullions. The bridge, he explained, would attach to the proposed addition at the northern end of the historic row. The addition would be set back from the street face.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Ms. Knudsen to explain that it is not the intent of Temple University to reduce the vibrancy of Liacouras Walk, but rather add to it. Ms. Knudsen explained that the School is celebrating its centennial and intends to have block parties and to add vibrancy to this part of the campus. Mr. Fiol-Silva said that he has real concerns about the bridge and thought that it should really be a tunnel. He said that, if the Commission were to approve a bridge, it should be lightened by removing the cornice-like feature and using non-reflective “Apple” glass. Mr. Sklaroff responded that they would be happy to specify that they would use non-reflective glass. He introduced Mr. McCreesh to discuss the issues of building a tunnel. Mr. McCreesh said that he is in charge of regulatory compliance and special projects for Temple University. He stated that he has had talks with the Water Department about issues on Liacouras Walk. He explained that there are two 36” water mains running down this block about four feet below the surface. The Water Department holds an easement and will not allow a tunnel to be built within that easement. He rejected as infeasible Mr. Fiol-Silva’s suggestion to replace the bridge with a tunnel.

Mr. Thomas noted that the bridge is designed to resemble the surrounding buildings with the horizontal cornice connecting the various pieces. He suggested that a compromise could be reached by removing the cornice and making a more transparent bridge. He opined that people would be seen crossing the bridge and they would act as eyes on the street. He opined that the bridge is high enough above the walkway that it would not be conspicuous from the walkway. He cited examples of high bridges on South Street and at the Cira Center. Mr. Ibeh reiterated that they are not trying to reduce pedestrian traffic on Liacouras Walk and asserted that this bridge would not take away from the pedestrian use of the walkway. Mr. Thomas asked for a motion.

ACTION: Mr. Fiol-Silva moved to approve all of the application except the bridge. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 6 to 5. Ms. Turner and Stanford and Messrs. Thomas, Mattioni, and Fink dissented.

Mr. Sklaroff asked that the Commission members reconsider their vote, given the seriousness of the University’s concerns and needs and with the agreement that they would design a lighter looking bridge. Mr. Farnham asked the Commissioners whether the motion that they just approved was intended to deny the bridge or remain silent on the bridge. Mr. Fiol-Silva responded that it was his intent was to deny the bridge. Mr. Farnham suggested that the Commissioners correct the ambiguity. Mr. Mattioni said that he had concerns about the validity of the vote because Mr. Thomas did not ask for public comment. Mr. Thomas then asked for public comment.

Oscar Beisert said that he had been monitoring online student comments about the bridge and that they were mostly negative. He said that students thought that the bridge was unnecessary, would take pedestrians off the walkway, and block views of the historic buildings. He added that there is so little protected in this area and Temple has demolished so much historic fabric that the Commission should treat what is protected with real care. Mr. Mattioni objected to comments about Temple’s preservation efforts or lack thereof and Mr. Thomas said that the Commission uses the same standard of review for all historic resources.

Ms. Royer asked if it would be possible to review a redesigned bridge. Mr. Sklaroff replied that Temple would be pleased to have the Commission vote on the additions and address the bridge separately. Mr. Fiol-Silva stated that he feels strongly about the inappropriateness of the bridge, but also about the needs of the University. He said that perhaps the applicant could redesign the bridge and it could be reviewed again to see if the new design sufficiently allays the concerns of the Committee and Commission. He would be open to making a new motion to approve other elements except the bridge, denying the bridge as presented, but being open to considering the bridge separately. Mr. Thomas said the Commission has routinely denied aspects of applications but then reviewed revised designs at subsequent meetings. Mr. Sklaroff expressed a concern about potential delays resulting from an entirely new application. He asked for an approval of the additions, but no action on the bridge element. He said: "We don't want to start over." Ms. Cooperman suggested a remand of the bridge portion of the application back to the Architecture Committee and Commission.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance said that, just as the small bridge over a loading dock at Penn is taken as a precedent for this bridge, an approval of this larger bridge will be cited anytime any other institution owning two separate but functionally connected buildings wishes to connect them with a bridge. Ms. Cooperman said that this is a very different context from the example at Penn and she does not consider that bridge a precedent for this one. However, she agreed that the Commission is always setting precedent. Mr. Thomas observed that that is why it is always so important to provide reasons for every action. Mr. Mattioni said that the examples of bridges that Mr. Sklaroff provided were hardly precedent from his standpoint. He said they were ugly, unlike this one.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to approve the additions and to remand a version of the bridge redesigned to comply with the Historical Commission's comments to the Architectural Committee and then the Historical Commission for an additional review. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL HARDSHIP, 3 APRIL 2017

Bob Thomas, Chair

ADDRESS: 1100-02 N DELAWARE AVE

Proposal: Construct rooftop addition, claim of financial hardship

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Core Realty, Inc.

Applicant: James Savard, Core Realty, Inc.

History: 1921, A. Raymond Raff, builder, Edward Corner Marine Merchandise Warehouse

Individual Designation: 10/9/2015

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application without a finding of hardship, but approval in concept of the application with a finding of hardship, pursuant to Standard 9 and Section 14-1005(5) of the preservation ordinance.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL HARDSHIP RECOMMENDATION: Mr. McCoubrey moved that the Committee on Financial Hardship recommend to the Historical Commission that the application demonstrates that, owing to the structural deficiencies resulting from termite damage, the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may reasonably be adapted without

the addition, therefore, the hardship exemption should be granted to allow for an addition, pursuant to Section 14-1005(5) of the preservation ordinance. Ms. Royer seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story addition on a three-story industrial building. The application seeks to justify the construction of the addition that would be highly conspicuous and therefore does not satisfy preservation standards with the claim that the building's condition is so severely compromised that it cannot be feasibly rehabilitated without the income that will be derived from the large addition.

The historic building was designated in October 2015, after the applicant revealed plans to demolish the building. It has been vacant for an extended period of time and suffers from extensive termite damage to its wood structure. As a result, the exterior brick walls are failing; the compromised wood structure is no longer tying the brick walls together and the walls are pulling away from one another. Temporary bracing has been installed around the entire structure to support the exterior walls.

The application proposes to rebuild the internal structure and reattach the restored brick walls to it. It also proposes to construct a three-story addition atop the restored building. The owner claims that the added income from the additional floors will defray the cost of the expensive structural work. Section 14-1005(5) of the preservation ordinance indicates that the Historical Commission may consider "financial hardship" when reviewing a building permit application for alteration. Section 9.4 of the Rules & Regulations likewise indicates that an applicant may justify an alteration that does not satisfy the standard review criteria with a substantiated claim of financial hardship. The Rules & Regulations indicate that an applicant seeking a hardship exemption for an alteration must demonstrate that the property cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may reasonably be adapted and, to do so, has an obligation to explore potential reuses for it. The application includes 10-year pro formas for a mixed-use retail and residential renovation with and without the proposed addition. Without the addition, the project will result in a -\$943,480 net value created and an internal rate of return of 3.96%. With the addition, the project will result in a \$320,343 net value created and an internal rate of return of 14.41%.

The application seeks final approval, but the architectural plans are not detailed. The staff suggests that the Committees and Commission consider the hardship petition as a request for final approval, but the architectural segment of the application as a review in concept, meaning that, if the hardship exemption is granted, the project would be reviewed a second time from an architectural perspective once the design is further developed.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Developers Tom Farrell and Dave Fisher represented the application.

Mr. Thomas explained that the damage to the building was well documented and the Committee on Financial Hardship determined that the addition was necessary to subsidize the restoration of the historic building. Mr. Mattioni suggested that the Committee consider the hardship question and the architectural design separately.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to find that the application demonstrates that, owing to the structural deficiencies resulting from termite damage, the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may reasonably be adapted without the addition, to grant the hardship exemption to allow for an addition, pursuant to Section 14-1005(5). Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance asked if the hardship motion that was just passed was specifically tied to the addition, or if it might also be used to approve complete demolition. Mr. Baron confirmed that Mr. Mattioni's motion was tied to the addition.

Mr. Fiol-Silva commented that the materials of the new addition will be very important. While he agrees that a neutral color is probably a good idea, he opined that the addition should not be designed by committee. He suggested that the architect should look at high quality materials that have something of a patina to them.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to the rooftop addition in concept, pursuant to the hardship exemption. Ms. Turner seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 559 RIGHTER ST

Name of Resource: Amos Barnes House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: James & Grace Barnes

Nominator: Staff of the Historical Commission

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 559 Righter Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and I.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 559 Righter Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that property is significant under Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and I. The nomination contends that the Gothic Revival building is an example of the ornamental farm house made popular by American landscape gardener Andrew Jackson Downing's *Cottage Residences*, which popularized Victorian Cottage styles in the mid to late nineteenth century, satisfying Criteria C and D. The nomination further contends that the building is associated with the lives of individuals significant in the past, satisfying Criterion A. Finally, owing to its location at the crest of the ridge along a Native American trail, which became an early turnpike, the nomination argues that the large, primarily open site is likely to yield information important in pre-history and history, satisfying Criterion I.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. Attorney William O'Brien represented the property owner.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the Historical Commission has increasingly been asked to designate properties, not for their historic qualities, but for issues more related to urban planning and zoning. This house is a case in point. For more than a century, the Barnes family has maintained this home and operated under the assumption that the property would be an economic investment that, when necessary, would be available as a resource to pay for the family's needs. The setting has transformed from a country road to a commercial street. These changes have marooned 559 Righter Street, making it a building out of place in its current setting. This matter should never have reached the Commission, by considering the issues of setting, the Planning Commission's designated change to commercial zoning, as well as the loss of the building's integrity. It should have been evident to both the nominator and the

Committee on Historic Designation that the property is not worthy. The property owner should not be burdened with additional costs and loss of value that designation would impose. When the Committee dismissed the family's objections to the nomination, Dr. George Thomas, a well-known architectural historian, was asked to investigate the appropriateness of the building for designation. A quantitative report has been provided to show the impact of designation on the Barnes family. Mr. O'Brien concluded that the Commission will have all of the information necessary during this review to exercise judgment and vote against designation.

Mr. Thomas, the above-referenced architectural historian, stated that the critical issue is that this is a building not as presented, and anybody who has any knowledge of architecture of this period should be able to understand the extent of alterations. What remains is the cornice. Everything else has been altered or removed. It is a "Cheshire Cat" building, meaning that all that now exists is the smile. The building has one anomaly after another, including unexplained stucco panels and bits of stucco on the building. The rubble stone building was covered with stucco and then whitewash. All over it, one can see bits of stucco remaining from the stucco coating. This was a house with a big side porch that had windows that opened all the way down to porch level. The side porch is gone, the floor-to-ceiling windows are gone, and the building is drastically changed. The fact that the nomination does not go into detail about this is a significant issue. The upper window, described as Gothic in the nomination, was a rectangular window that was infilled. Windows throughout the building have been replaced. What remains is a volume, some window openings, and a wood cornice. Mr. Thomas displayed a rendering of what he believed the building originally looked like, claiming that the windows would have been two-over-two double-hung windows.

Mr. Thomas continued that the building is of relatively minor interest that might be part of a historic district, but any potential district has been lost. Across the street is a bank. Across the intersection is an exterminator and City Councilman's office. Across the other street is a frozen custard stand. The setting has changed dramatically. Instead of a house in a suburban neighborhood, Ridge Avenue is a highway, which is almost entirely commercial and is no longer a pleasant suburb.

Mr. Thomas proceeded to apply the National Register criteria for designation to this nomination for listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. When one looks at integrity, every single aspect of the seven aspects has been entirely altered, he claimed. The original site has been reduced, which meant that a side porch was removed; the building itself is not a particularly good example of a design type; the setting has been transformed from rural to commercial; the materials are almost entirely gone; the workmanship is gone; the sense of feeling has been disrupted; and there is no historic figure of significance. Buildings in the immediate vicinity are better options for designation. The individuals listed in nomination are not significant. Amos Barnes did have an architectural career, but he is not a particularly important architect. Frances Druck was trained as a doctor, but she was an artificial flower maker for most of her life. Another issue is that just because a person is an architect, it does not mean the building that person lives in is particularly important. The National Register indicates that a property is ineligible if its only justification is that it was owned or used by a person who was a member of a profession. It is ineligible if the association has no scholarly research that is of any consequence. Amos Barnes designed the Plays & Players Theater, and a church around the corner, which are better options for designation if one wishes to nominate a building associated with him. Frances Druck was a doctor who wanted to be cremated. Part of her will gives her house in Center City to her niece. Just because she lived in the subject building, does not mean it is of any consequence. Regarding archaeology, the plaque out front states that there was a march through the area, but the plaque belonged at another property across the street. The

Barnes family brought it to their site many years after it was placed, but it has nothing to do with the site. More critically, the National Register indicates that the property has to have been the site of a significant event, for which research indicates that there is likely evidence of some sort of archaeological material. None of that work has been done. On every one of these National Register criteria, this building should not be designated. This is a building that is deeply compromised, has lost all of its integrity, is the surviving remnant of a property that has been systematically altered, and has lost value because of evolving changes of the community from rural to commercial. The Commission offers to take whatever commercial value there is in the process of designating it, which is inequitable and inappropriate in every way.

David Barnes, the grandson of Amos Barnes and attorney-in-fact for his mother, Grace Barnes, the property owner, stated that no one came out to do a site survey or to ask questions; therefore, nobody did any research. The family is confused by the process and timing of it. Something does not sit right. About two years ago, some “newsy neighbors” approached his father and asked if he would like to have his house listed on the Philadelphia Register. His father said no. Later, they tried again. Then, about a year ago, David Barnes himself was asked by the neighbors if he would be willing to speak to his parents about historic designation. He responded that it was not his house, and his parents do not wish to have the house historically designated. The nomination must have taken about two years to put together, and over the summer, his father passed away, and the nomination showed up right after his passing. Therefore the nomination was being worked on behind his parents’ back, being “slapped together” and then “shoved down” his mother’s throat as soon as his father passed away. Therefore the whole nomination is suspect, and the motivation behind it is not pure. These neighbors pushed this forward because they think they know best. No one came out to the house and no one asked about the history. People assume it is historic because of the plaque in the front yard, but the plaque belongs across the street. His father stole the plaque from across the street when the tavern was torn down, and put it in the front yard. No one is alive now that would remember that, so everyone assumes it is historic because of the plaque.

Mr. Barnes described the Barnes family history. Amos Barnes was born in 1867, bought 559 Righter Street in 1899, was married and had nine children living in the house. His first wife died around 1914. In 1924 or before, he was working on a job at Temple University Hospital, where he met David Barnes’s grandmother. She was born in 1901, so there was quite an age difference. They got married in 1924, and with nine children already living in the house, he added onto the rear in the 1930s and changed the upstairs into apartments for his children. He then had several additional children. During the Great Depression, Amos Barnes had financial trouble, so he sold off a corner and built a house on it to sell so he could make money to pay the taxes so he could keep his home. Amos Barnes passed away in 1953. Amos’s wife continued to live in the house until her death in 1977. The house then sat in limbo until 1983, at which time David Barnes’s father, James Barnes, bought out the estate of his brothers, sold his house in the suburbs, and moved back into his boyhood home, because he wanted to keep the house in the family. In 2004, when David Barnes and his son were stationed together in Iraq, James Barnes sold his houses in Cape May to put all of his money into 559 Righter Street because it needed repairs. James and Grace Barnes put everything they owned into the house for the sole purpose of being able to use the home for their long-term care when they got old, and to take care of their grandchildren and associated education expenses. James and Grace Barnes took care of the property for their family, not to make it a neighborhood monument. The Committee on Historic Designation is putting a burden on the Barnes family. Many members of the Barnes family are veterans who have served this country. Mr. Barnes questioned what they fought for, asking if it was so that someone could steal away their property. He concluded that the whole thing is suspect. Mr. O’Brien asked about the current use of the building. Mr. Barnes responded

that there is a downstairs and three apartments upstairs. Mr. O'Brien asked if the plumbing has been updated since his grandfather's work in the 1930s. Mr. Barnes responded that it has not been updated.

Mr. O'Brien discussed the economic impact of historic designation. He stated that the Philadelphia Code does not compel the Commission to take economic considerations into account in its deliberations. If the property is designated, the courts will look at the economic impact on the family. How the Commission chooses to consider the information is certainly its prerogative. The Philadelphia City Planning Commission published its Lower Northwest District Plan. On page 84 of that plan, it shows this five corner intersection. Three parcels are zoned for commercial, while two others, this being one, are designated by the Planning Commission to be changed from residential to commercial. He asked what value that commercial designation will have, and provided a zoning plan that showed a code-conforming CA-1 development of this parcel. It would have a code-compliant 46 parking spaces to support a new three-story medical office building, for which a rendering was also provided. The proposed medical office building is code-compliant in height if the parcel is changed to commercial zoning. An economic and sales value report for the property was also provided. The sales comparisons ranged from \$75 per square foot to over \$1,600 per square foot. Page 16 of the valuation report concludes that, based on comparable properties, the fair market rental value of this proposed medical office building would be between \$30 and \$33 per square foot. It would produce a triple net annual rental income of \$396,900 year. Assuming an A commercial tenant, at a 6.5 cap, it would produce a value for that finished product of over \$6 million. If instead it was a series of offices that are not an A tenant, that would produce a value of about \$4.9 million. The TD Bank across the street was sold to a New York investment company for \$4.5 million. At a 24 percent value to the finished product, between the A tenant and the C tenant, one has a development value, as it sits, between \$1.2 million and \$1.45 million. That is what that site is worth with commercial zoning. If the property was zoned CMX-2, it would allow 78 apartments on this site, assuming a green roof. No parking spaces are required. All that is required is a 30-foot deep retail space on the first floor. Whether it is CA-1 with an office use with accessory parking, or it is CMX-2 with 78 apartments, the development value of this site is substantial. Mr. O'Brien concluded that the Commission needs to take into consideration what historic designation will strip from this family if the zoning is changed as he suggested it should be.

Commissioner Thomas asked for public comment. Paul Steinke, Executive Director of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, thanked the staff for preparing this nomination. He stated that the Alliance supports the nomination, and commented that these are the buildings that give Philadelphia its character. He commented that it is a tribute to the Barnes family that it is a survivor of another era, and the fact that it has been altered and adapted should not be held against it, but rather the Barnes family should be praised for that. The Alliance spends a lot of time encouraging people to adaptively reuse buildings for new uses while retaining the historic character. The building still reads as a rural cottage from the nineteenth century, despite changes to the original material. He suggested that the upstairs apartments are retained, and the first floor is put into use as a law office or medical clinic. He commented that too many of these buildings have already been lost for uses like a McDonalds or Dunkin Donuts, and this is an opportunity for the Commission to follow the recommendation of its staff and Committee and designate the building as historic.

Janet Anderson, President of Wissahickon Interested Citizens Association, commented that this building is the heart of the Wissahickon, and the neighbors do not want to lose it. She asked why the family says that it loves the home, but is willing to demolish it and put up a medical office building to make money.

Aaron Wunsch commented that buildings change, and it does not make them insignificant. The Commission is not mandated to preserve only the most pristine examples of a particular building type, because by that measure, buildings like Wyck or the Physick House would be de-certified, along with any individually listed buildings in places like Society Hill, that are not associated with famous individuals. It is not a precedent that the Commission should set. The argument about a change in context is the same argument presented for 81-95 Fairmount Avenue, and should be taken with the large grain of salt it deserves.

Jeffrey Allegretti, Zoning Chair for Wissahickon Interested Citizens Association, commented that previous comments by Mr. O'Brien regarding zoning were incorrect. The property is not zoned commercial. It is zoned RSD-1, the most restrictive residential zoning, which was done as part of the remapping that occurred in 2016. Because of that, all of the earlier arguments about what is possible under commercial zoning are all speculative because they require that the Zoning Board would grant a variance. Therefore that value does not exist until that variance is granted. Mr. Allegretti commented that Mr. Thomas described this as an isolated property in a sea of commercial properties. He directed the Commission's attention to a zoning map for the area, which was provided to the Commission at the start of the meeting. He described the property as actually being lost in a sea of residential because unlike the Upper Ridge, most of the Lower Ridge is residential. He estimated the surrounding area to be approximately 70 percent residential. He commented that Mr. Thomas's zoning map showed only the intersection, but an honest image would pull back and show that it is actually part of a larger context of residential properties. He commented that context is important, and what was said previously by Mr. O'Brien and Mr. Thomas was incorrect. In terms of value, the neighborhood has a robust single-family market. He referenced 145 Sumac Street, which was saved from demolition, renovated, and listed for \$600,000. He commented that there cannot be an economic hardship if there is already a robust market for single-family use.

Oscar Beisert asked if the staff called out this property in its district plan memorandum for the Planning Commission. Mr. Farnham explained that the building was identified in the district plan, but the Parcel Explorer software which the staff uses to identify addresses provided the wrong address for the parcel. He summarized that the building is in the preservation memorandum that was provided to the Planning Commission, but under an incorrect address. Mr. Beisert commented that this building is in many ways just as important being on this corner as it would be on a more suburban street. He noted that the nomination form mentions a Levering as being associated with the property, which was a very important family to this area of the city. He suggested that the building is perfectly situated to receive a large addition off the rear, and noted that it sits on a large lot that could be developed. The historic house does not need to be demolished for the property to be used to financial advantage. He summarized that this house represents the development and history of the area, and to not designate would be to erase that representation of the area's history.

Kathy Dowdell commented that the Commission should focus on whether or not the building meets one or more Criteria for Designation. The economic arguments are important, but that is why the Commission has a Committee on Financial Hardship. She commented that it is unfair to be considering economic arguments when no one else has had an opportunity to see any of the economic data. It may seem to some to be a cumbersome process, but it is the fair process to engage the public. Committees exist for a reason, and attention to the process could result in more focused meetings and a better public process.

Vaughan Piccolo, Secretary of Wissahickon Interested Citizens Association, commented that Lower Ridge is lined with stately residential properties, and so it does fit with the context of that section of Ridge Avenue. The neighborhood just went through a very long planning process and was remapped with a lot of community input, with the goal of saving houses just like this one.

Mr. Mattioni commented that alterations are relevant if they have destroyed enough of the historic fabric that what remains does not fit a necessary set of criteria, so Mr. Thomas's testimony is relevant. He opined that the discussion regarding financial issues was not relevant to the designation issue. He commented that, in some cases, there is a question whether enough changes have occurred to a structure that it would be inappropriate to designate it. He opined that he was not convinced that it is the case here, even if one accepts everything that Mr. Thomas has said.

Mr. Farnham stated that the staff would like to refute several claims made by Mr. Thomas, the property owner's preservation consultant. He noted that the staff completed significant research, both for the nomination and owing to the claims made in Mr. Thomas's report. He stated that the staff is aware that the building was covered with stucco because an 1856 insurance survey for the building describes it as a new rubble stone building "rough cast," with rough cast meaning stucco with aggregate. Mr. Farnham explained that stucco is a sacrificial material, and one can generally assume that the stucco on any historic building is not original, but has been replaced. The missing stucco on this building could easily be replaced. Mr. Farnham then asserted that the rubble stone façade of the building is original. Mr. Thomas essentially contends that it is not historic fabric. Mr. Farnham then corrected Mr. Thomas, stating that the evidence clearly shows that the building never had a side porch on the Hermit Lane, as Mr. Thomas has asserted. The 1856 insurance survey clearly shows a porch spanning the front of the building, but not the side. Likewise, numerous historic maps depict the building and front porch, but none show a side porch. There is no evidence that this building had a side porch at any point in its history. Likewise, the claim by Mr. Thomas that the first-floor side windows once extended to the floor to meet the porch, but were later infilled is incorrect. Regarding the triangular window that is centered at the top of the front façade, Mr. Thomas claimed that the stucco patch there indicates that the window was originally rectangular and was subsequently changed. Again, that is an untrue claim, Mr. Farnham asserted. The 1856 insurance survey includes a drawing of the window that clearly shows its configuration. The window sash has been changed, but the original window opening remains. The staff believes that the various stucco patches on the building are there because when the overall stucco was removed, parts of the building were revealed that either were not aesthetically satisfying, or could not easily be waterproofed. The stucco patches may hide wood infill. The staff agrees that original windows have been replaced, but that is the case with almost every building the Commission designates.

Mr. Farnham continued that Mr. Thomas made claims about the satisfaction of the criteria, but interestingly used the National Register criteria rather than the Criteria for Designation used for listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination proposes designation to the Philadelphia Register, not the National Register. Mr. Farnham explained that there are some significant differences between the Philadelphia Register and National Register criteria. Philadelphia Register Criterion A allows for significance owing to individuals associated with the property. Mr. Thomas discussed the lives of people who occupied the house, and made claims that they are relatively insignificant. The staff agrees that Amos Barnes is a relatively minor architect, but what really qualifies this building to satisfy Criterion A is its "significant character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City." This is a building that was built at a very particular moment in time, in the 1850s, as Roxborough and other outlying parts of the City were changing from rural areas to suburban areas. The staff

provided to the Commissioners a series of advertisements in which the house in question was being advertised for rent in the 1850s. An 1856 advertisement for this house describes it as a “fancy new cottage.” This advertisement is targeted at the city dweller, who was looking to escape the city and enjoy the suburban experience. The advertisements target the city dweller with a new kind of residence, a suburban residence. The advertisements specifically mention the new modes of transportation connecting the city and suburb. One advertisement mentions a ten-minute walk from the railroad. It is a very important moment in the history of Roxborough. Additional advertisements refer to the house as a “handsome country residence.” The advertisements are part of the evidence that this house is characteristic of a particular moment in the development of the history as these outlying areas transitioned from rural to suburban areas. The property clearly satisfies Criterion A. Regarding Criterion I for archaeological potential, again the language between the Philadelphia Register and National Register differs. The local ordinance reads that the site “has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in pre-history or history.” The nomination makes claims that it may be likely to yield such information for several reasons. The plaque in the front yard is evidence for this assertion. Mr. Barnes and Mr. Thomas have claimed that plaque was moved from another site to this site and that the claims regarding historical significance made on the plaque are not pertinent to this particular site. On the contrary, the staff located a newspaper article documenting the placement of the plaque in 1927; the article explicitly states that the plaque was placed at the property of Amos Barnes at Hermit Lane and Ridge Avenue, the property in question, in 1927. Mr. Schaaf commented that the foundation of the former Plow Tavern makes up part of the retaining wall of the custard stand across the street. Ms. Cooperman commented that it is understood that archaeological finds are not easily contained to the boundaries of one parcel.

Mr. Farnham commented that designation is a two-step process. First, the Commission must determine whether or not a property satisfies one or more Criteria for Designation. If it does, the Commission has the discretion to designate or not. The ordinance says the Commission “may” designate. The Commission can take into consideration the economic and other arguments made against designation, but it does not necessarily have to take them into consideration. The Historical Commission has full discretion, once it has determined that a property satisfies one or more of the Criteria for Designation.

Mr. Farnham referenced the Penn Central case, a landmark case in historic preservation in which the United States Supreme Court concluded that the government may designate and regulate properties for historic preservation, as long as that regulation allows the property to retain some value. Preservation regulation may legally prevent an owner from achieving the highest and best use. Mr. O’Brien has asserted that you should allow his client to extract the maximum value from this property. He made no argument made today about what value the property would have with this house on it, in its current condition. Unless the argument is that the designation automatically forces the value of the property to zero, the Commission can legally and constitutionally designate and regulate this property.

Ms. Cooperman asked for clarification regarding a section of the 1856 insurance survey. Ms. Broadbent clarified that the insurance survey clearly states that the building had six-over-six double-hung windows in 1856, rather than the two-over-two double-hung windows that Mr. Thomas claimed in his report. Additionally, Mr. Thomas’s report states that the current porch is not original to the building. The staff does not disagree with that statement; however, the existing porch was designed by Amos Barnes soon after he purchased the building, along with the side bay, which Mr. Thomas also denigrates as not original. These modifications tie Amos Barnes to the physical building.

Mr. Thomas responded that he was pleased that his report stimulated additional research, but that the core information provided in the report is accurate. The building was stuccoed. The porch was changed. The first-floor windows are infilled at the bottoms. The building did go through these changes. There may have been a Gothic window on the front, but at some later time there must have been a square window because there is a stucco patch. The nomination does not go into detail regarding these changes. Other than Levering, there is no one of any consequence associated with this property. He stated that his argument remains that the building does not represent what the nomination says it represents. The issue that the Commission is facing is an almost complete lack of standards when it comes to designating a building. He referenced a recently designated building further up Ridge Avenue that is covered in aluminum siding, stating that he has “no clue” how that building got designated. He once again voiced his opposition to the designation of 81-95 Fairmount Avenue. He stated that he is deeply concerned that the Commission has forgotten the critical word that is the signifier of everything it designates, which is “significant.” It has to present in some way or another what the significance is. The National Register criteria should be understood and be part of the designation process. He reiterated that this is a modern commercial area with some houses around it.

Mr. O'Brien offered a rebuttal to several comments. He stated that he does not disagree that the building is the kind of building that gives Philadelphia its character. But being quaint is not what this meeting is about. He stated that it is a quaint house, but it does not meet the requirements for historic designation. He stated that Mr. Allegretti misrepresented what Mr. O'Brien said earlier. Mr. O'Brien's representation was that the Planning Commission designated this property for commercial use in its Lower Northwest Plan. Mr. O'Brien conceded that the current zoning is residential, not commercial. In terms of value, Mr. O'Brien stated that he will take for truth what Mr. Allegretti said about another residential property that sold for \$600,000 after renovation. That would put the value of this property when designated around \$200,000 because it needs a large amount of work. He agreed that economic considerations are not part of the designation statute, but if the Commission chooses to designate, it is relevant on appeal. The Commission needs to have an appreciation that, if there is a weak nomination, and the result of that nomination is a confiscation of \$1 million in value, it is not the kind of precedent the Commission wants to put before the court. Right now there is no requirement for the City to compensate takings in the context of designations. This is not a commercial outfit as the New York case Mr. Farnham mentioned. This is different. He stated that he has been practicing real estate in Philadelphia for over 34 years, and has done a lot of subdivisions. Examples were provided including subdivisions for families to provide money to purchase properties down the shore, or for educational needs, or to settle a divorce. Conversely, the Barnes family did the opposite. David Barnes previously stated that his father sold his house in Cape May to get funds to preserve 559 Righter Street. The Barnes family has pooled its resources to maintain what is now out of sorts with its surroundings. He referenced prior comments about Lower Ridge, but stated that this is not Lower Ridge, but rather Lower Ridge is everything below it. Mr. O'Brien stated that he is not an architect, but he does appreciate the importance of history in Philadelphia, both culturally and economically. He explained that, as a young man, he got the building at 1923 Spruce Street individually listed on the historic register. For 25 years, he has been the chairman of Chamounix Mansion, his office of 32 years is in a historic district on Main Street, and his house of 24 years is in a National Register historic district. He stated that he is not present to criticize the Commission or to denigrate the purpose and mission of designation. But this property does not meet the Criteria for Designation. It is quaint and it is unique in this community. There is no other property owned by a family with 29,000 square feet on Ridge Avenue. The Barnes family has pooled its resources to keep this property, not for the public benefit, but for their needs. If they need to subdivide, or do something, they need to be able to

do that. He stated that they are not here to tear it down. The nomination does not demonstrate that the property meets the Criteria, Mr. O'Brien concluded.

ACTION: Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 559 Righter Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and I and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 6 to 4. Commissioners Stanford, Mattioni, Fink, and Hartner dissented. Mr. Fiol-Silva abstained.

DISCUSSION OF HISTORIC DISTRICT DESIGNATION PROGRAM

Mr. Farnham stated that he wanted to take this opportunity to provide the Commission with the status of the historic district designation program and to obtain feedback from the Commission and the public regarding the program. He explained that the proposed budget for the Historical Commission for the fiscal year starting on July 1 includes funding for two additional staff members. With the addition to the staff, the Commission will be able to undertake more work, including perhaps more designations of historic districts. Mr. Farnham stated that he wanted the Commission's direction with regard to potential addition to the staff. He stated that he wanted to provide the Commission with an update regarding historic district nominations awaiting review. Mr. Farnham reported that the Historical Commission recently received a nomination for a historic district at Jeweler's Row from the Preservation Alliance. He stated that the Alliance is anxious for the Commission to begin to process it. He stated that the Historical Commission has one historic district in the review process. The Historical Commission notified property owners about the proposed Overbrook Farms Historic District on 30 September 2011 and then tabled the nomination at the request of several parties on 9 December 2011. He noted that the Commission is reviewing applications for properties in the Overbrook Farms Historic District, but should complete the review. He stated that the ordinance and Rules & Regulations provide no timelines for designations; nominations may sit for a while. Mr. Farnham reported that he has received correspondence recently indicating that there is a desire among some Overbrook Farms residents to restart the review. He stated that the Philadelphia Register currently includes 16 historic districts. The most recent was the 420 Row district, designated earlier this year. Mr. Farnham noted that, before the 420 Row, the Commission most recently designated four historic districts in 2009 and 2010. He explained that the Commission has four nomination awaiting processing, the French Village, prepared by interns and submitted in the summer of 2009, Washington Square West, a large proposed district submitted in spring 2010, Wayne Junction, submitted in the summer of 2010, and finally Jewelers' Row, which was submitted very recently. Mr. Farnham then discussed two proposed districts that have been mentioned by advocates at Historical Commission meetings lately, Penn Knox/Wister, which was submitted in the 1990s, and Spruce Hill, which was submitted in December 1987 and July 2002. Mr. Farnham stated that both of the nominations were abandoned before he was appointed director in 2005. He explained that property owners were never notified of reviews of those nominations. The reviews were never initiated, so the nominations cannot be tabled as some have recently claimed. He explained that the nominations could be resurrected, but would need to be rewritten at this point. He noted that both propose the designations of very large areas. He stated that the trend has been toward smaller, better-defined districts in the last decade or so. He observed that other district nominations may be in the works. He suggested that the Commission does not need to provide the staff with direction today, but should start a discussion about district designation that may extend over several months until the budget is finalized and the new staff hired. Mr. Farnham noted that the Historical Commission approved four districts in 2009 and 2010. The Commission approved 2,123 permit applications in 2016, a 21% increase over 2015 and a 93% increase over 2009, without any changes in staffing. The 2017 permit application

approval numbers for 2017 are slightly ahead of those for 2016. The staff has not changed since 2009. The Historical Commission is exactly the same size as it was in 2009, yet it is reviewing twice as many building permit applications. In fact, the staff has been essentially flat since the late 1980s. These numbers explain why the Commission was able to designate four historic districts in 2009 and 2010, but only one very small district since that time. Owing to the recession, the Commission had some excess capacity to devote to district designation. He concluded that the Commission has designated historic districts in cycles that mirror exactly the real estate cycles. Mr. Farnham again asked for the Commission's direction with regard to processing historic district nominations. He also pointed out that the Commission had received a letter from Suzanna Barucco on the topic; it was distributed to the Commission members at the start of the meeting.

Mr. Thomas noted that the staff has been conducting surveys for historic resources as part of the City Planning Commission's district planning process. Mr. Farnham described the district planning process. He also noted that the City has applied to the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission for a grant to hire a consultant to define a methodology for surveying the city for historic resources. Mr. Farnham then informed the Commission that the City would be making an exciting announcement on historic preservation shortly. The initiative that will be announced will include an exploration of best practices in the surveying of historic resources. Mr. Thomas suggested that the Historical Commission should consider inclusion of some National Register resources on the local Register. He suggested, for example, that the Commission should evaluate the Wayne Junction National Register Historic District as part of the evaluation of the local district nomination. Mr. Farnham noted that Kim Broadbent prepared both the local and National Wayne Junction nominations before joining the Historical Commission's staff. He opined that the proposed district is small enough that the staff could process it, if so directed by the Commission. He asked the Commission to direct the staff on prioritizing the processing of the pending historic district nominations. He suggested that the current staff was not sufficiently large to address the larger districts like Overbrook Farms and Washington Square West. Ms. Cooperman stated that the Commission should consider staffing, significance, threat, and availability of adequate information as the primary criteria for making decisions about prioritization of district processing. Ms. Cooperman noted that Washington Square West is an area of the city that is highly significant and under threat. She acknowledged, however, that the proposed district is very large and would require significant resources to designate and regulate. Mr. Mattioni suggested that the Commission take into account the date of the submission of the nomination. He stated that the Commission must respect the efforts that were made by nominators. He contended that date of submission must be a criterion. Recently submitted district nominations should not be prioritized over older nominations. Ms. Turner suggested looking at the Phila2035 Plan and related district plans and prioritizing those proposed districts that coordinate best with the plans. She also suggested leveraging other City resources and information. Mr. Thomas stated that developers like predictability, but dislike unexpected regulatory changes. He noted that the establishment of the Rittenhouse Fidler district provided predictability with regard to historic preservation regulation and did not stifle development. Mr. Thomas stated that there is a real need to ensure that zoning and preservation regulations are compatible. Mr. Thomas acknowledged that the Commission must respect the efforts of nominators and prioritize nominations that have been in the queue longer, but he also observed that the Commission must consider threat as well. He noted that there are no imminent threats to the French Village. However, Fabric Row and the Italian Market may be threatened. Mr. Fiol-Silva stated that zoning and historic preservation must align. He stated that rigor is important. The Commission must be rigorous. Mr. Fiol-Silva stated that the Commission must consider a historic district on North Broad Street, where important historic resources are truly threatened. He stated that the Commission needs a structure, a clarity, a priority, and a

strategy. Ms. Turner noted that the city needs a historic preservation plan. She stated that the city's many historical and other societies like the Preservation Alliance should provide more support to the Historical Commission. Mr. Thomas agreed with Ms. Turner. Mr. Fiol-Silva suggested that the Commission hold a workshop to discuss how it sets its priorities. Mr. Thomas noted that the City has a conservation district program that should be coordinated with the historic district program. He concluded that the greatest challenge is the lack of adequate resources at the Historical Commission. He noted that the problem cannot be solved with volunteers alone because volunteers need to be supervised. Mr. Thomas concluded that the Commission needs to think about how to allocate the new resources that it may be getting and, then, to think about the impact new designations will have on the building permit review workload. He suggested that the Commission might form a special committee to consider the order in which the Commission would process historic district nominations. Ms. Stanford agreed that the Commission needs to find a way to prioritize.

Ms. Cooperman suggested implementing the suggestion offered by Mr. Thomas to form a committee of Commission members to consider the order in which the Commission would process historic district nominations. Mr. Thomas asked if the meetings would need to be public meetings. Mr. Farnham responded that small groups of Commissioners can meet privately, but cannot make final decisions regarding regulatory matters.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance informed the Commissioners that he has a two-o'clock meeting in University City and would like an opportunity to address the Commission before he leaves for his meeting. He thanked the Commission for holding the discussion. He noted that his constituents are anxious about all of the development projects taking place in the city. Mr. Steinke stated that he would like to find a way to get the support of the Mayor for historic preservation. He criticized the City Council for focusing on zoning issues and ignoring preservation issues during the Department of Planning & Development budget hearing before the Council's Committee of the Whole. He suggested that the City Council should not have devoted the entire hearing to affordable housing and parking, but should have discussed historic preservation as well. He noted that affordable housing is a valid issue, but parking is not. "Preservation did not come up once. Part of this is getting City Council and our Mayor to embrace this with the same level of priority that we all give it." Mr. Steinke "put in a heartfelt plug" for the proposed Jewelers' Row Historic District. He claimed that the area is the most threatened of those on the list. He asked the Commission to prioritize that proposed district. Ms. Turner stated that she believes that the Mayor and City Council are prioritizing historic preservation. She stated that the proposed increased budget is evidence of that support. She stated that she sees that the City is improving its operations. The Historical Commission can take advantage of these improvements and collaborate more closely with other City agencies. Ms. Stanford agreed.

Ms. Long excused herself from meeting. At 1:26 p.m., Mr. Thomas stated that the meeting was adjourned because the Commission no longer had a quorum of members at the table.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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.

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.

CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION

§ 14-1004(1) Criteria for Designation.

A building, complex of buildings, structure, site, object, or district may be designated for preservation if it:

- (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;
- (b) Is associated with an event of importance to the history of the City, Commonwealth or Nation;
- (c) Reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style;
- (d) Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style or engineering specimen;
- (e) Is the work of a designer, architect, landscape architect or designer, or professional engineer whose work has significantly influenced the historical, architectural, economic, social, or cultural development of the City, Commonwealth, or nation;
- (f) Contains elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant innovation;
- (g) Is part of or related to a square, park, or other distinctive area that should be preserved according to a historic, cultural, or architectural motif;
- (h) Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristic, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community, or City;
- (i) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in pre-history or history; or
- (j) Exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social, or historical heritage of the community.