

**THE MINUTES OF THE 568TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**11 DECEMBER 2009
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
David Amburn
Leslie Benoliel
Richardson Dilworth, Ph.D.
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President
John Mattioni, Esq.
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Robert Murray, Department of Public Property
Daniel Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Laura Spina, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Robert Thomas

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

Leonard Reuter, Esq., Assistant City Solicitor

ALSO PRESENT

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Carey Jackson Yonce, Firmarchitecture
David Brawer, Brawer & Hauptman
The Reverend Christine Ritter, Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania
Joseph Powell, Buell Kratzner Powell
Jackie Buhn
Mark Bottin
Christine Kimmel, Esq.
Dan Grossman, Temple 2000
Alan Razak
Sean Solomon
Charlotte Brown
James L. Brown, IV
J. Leroy Brown, V
Joyce Smith
Randy Stenfield
Mike Burch
Yvette Burch
Lorraine Gomez
Jonathan Broh, JKR Partners
Ben Weinraub
Sara Dodger
Ryan Lohbauer, Stanev Potts

Joe Sorrentino, Vitetta
Robert Koochagian, O'Donnell & Naccarato

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Commissioners Amburn, Benoliel, Dilworth, Leonard, Mattioni, Merriman, Murray, Quinn, Spina, and Thomas joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 567TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Leonard moved to adopt the minutes of the 567th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 13 November 2009. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 10 NOVEMBER 2009

Richardson Dilworth, Chair

PARKSIDE HISTORIC DISTRICT

Owner: Various, 110 properties

Nominator: The Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia and the Parkside Historic Preservation Corporation

Proposal: Nomination for district designation

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the proposed Parkside Historic District as defined in the nomination satisfies Criteria for Designation a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, and j, and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places with the revisions to the nomination suggested by the Committee on Historic Designation. The Committee also voted to recommend that the Commission evaluate additional research conducted by the staff on the surrounding areas and determine whether the district should be expanded to include 4000-block of Parkside Avenue and the south side of the 4200-block of Viola Street.

OVERVIEW: The Parkside Historic District represents a unique German community in Philadelphia, built between 1890 and 1900, bordering Fairmount Park, across from Memorial Hall, on land once part of the Centennial Exposition. The original development of the Historic District was possible with the suburbanization of the area with the extension of the suburban transit system in the 1890s. Within the Historic District boundaries, elaborate row houses and apartment buildings were constructed primarily by Philadelphia's brewers and merchants of German descent, and developers associated with the German community. The resulting buildings are of an architectural style reminiscent of their German heritage, with recessed front porches, providing an urban response to suburbanization, and deviated greatly from the usual brick row house development in other parts of Philadelphia.

The Parkside Historic District meets nine criteria outlined in the Philadelphia Code, Section 14-2007(5) (a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, j). Parkside has significant character, interest and value as part of the development and heritage of the city; is associated with the suburbanization of the area following the Centennial Exposition; reflects the environment in an era characterized by distinctive architectural styles; and embodies distinguishing characteristics of those styles. It is the work of several notable architects of the period including Willis G. Hale, (active 1870-1907), Frederick Newman (active 1880-1910), Angus Wade (active 1875-1910) and H.E. Flower (active 1890-1902) whose work significantly influenced the historical and architectural development of the city. The Historic District contains elements of design, detail, materials or

craftsmanship which represent a significant innovation in the Flemish interpretation of the row house; is related to Memorial Hall and Fairmount Park, a distinctive area which should be preserved according to an historic, cultural or architectural motif; owing to its unique location and singular physical characteristics, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community and city; and exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social or historical heritage of Philadelphia's German community.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Côté presented the nomination to the Commission.

Mr. Dilworth explained that several owners of properties outside but adjacent to the proposed Parkside Historic District advocated for the inclusions of their properties in the district at the Committee on Historic Designation's meeting. He stated that the Committee requested that the staff conduct research on these properties to determine whether they warranted designation. Mr. Sherman asked Mr. Farnham if the Commission could designate a larger district than initially proposed. Mr. Farnham responded that the Commission could amend the nomination and enlarge the district, but it could not designate a larger district today. He explained that the historic preservation ordinance requires the Commission to inform every property owner in a proposed historic district of the Commission's consideration of the district at least 60 days in advance of the first public meeting. The owners of the properties in the expansion areas had not been officially notified of any consideration for designation. Therefore, the Commission could not legally designate their properties.

Ms. Cote displayed a Powerpoint presentation on the district and restated that Committee on Historic Designation's recommendation. She explained that the staff had researched the history and architecture of the adjacent areas proposed for inclusion within the historic district and concluded that they do not share a common history with the area proposed for designation in the nomination. She stated that they outlying areas are very different architecturally. The statement of significance in the current nomination could not be applied to these areas. She stated that the staff recommends against incorporating the outlying areas into the proposed district.

Sean Solomon, the owner of 4255 Viola Street, recalled that he had purchased his property 11 years ago. At the time of purchase, it was abandoned and in need of repair. He has been restoring to its original nineteenth-century grandeur. He advocated for the designation of the district.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance explained that his organization and the Parkside Historic Preservation Corporation jointly prepared the nomination. He expressed his gratitude to James Brown IV, the head of the Corporation, and his family for their work to preserve Parkside. He stated the boundaries as proposed make sense from historical and architectural perspectives. He offered the assistance of the Preservation Alliance to assess the outlying areas to determine if they warranted designation as a part of this district or as a separate district. He urged the Commission to designate the district as proposed.

James Brown IV urged the Commission to designate the district as proposed. He recalled the effort to list the neighborhood on the National Register and noted the community support for preservation. He thanked the Commission for its efforts.

Lorraine Gomez, the head of the neighborhood association on the 4200 block of Viola Street, advocated for the inclusion of the outlying areas in the historic district.

Mr. Farnham offered to work with the Preservation Alliance and the outlying community to determine whether the district should be enlarged or an additional district created. However, he advised the Commission to consider designating the district as proposed today rather than delaying any designation for an investigation of the outlying areas.

Ms. Spina expressed her support for the designation of the district, but opined that the nomination is of a lesser quality. She noted that the statement of significance is little more than a lengthy quotation of the National Register statement, which, itself, is poorly researched and written. She suggested that the Commission designate the district, but require better nominations in the future.

ACTION: Ms. Spina moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation, find that the proposed Parkside Historic District as defined in the nomination satisfies Criteria for Designation a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, and j, and designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, with the revisions to the nomination suggested by the Committee on Historic Designation. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 NOVEMBER 2009

David Amburn, Chair

7 LOCK STREET

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Michael Lewandowski and Joseph Powell

History: c. 1970

Classified as an Intrusion in the National Register Historic District inventory for the Main Street Manayunk Historic District, designated by ordinance in 1983

Project: Construct sewer basin with headhouse, performing arts center, landscape grounds

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to PM-704.2.7.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to redevelop a portion of Venice Island in Manayunk. The property is owned by the City of Philadelphia. A Department of Recreation facility with non-historic features including a pool, sports facilities, parking lots, and an amphitheater currently occupies the site. They are classified as an Intrusion in the National Register Historic District inventory, the inventory the Commission uses because it did not designate the district under the historic preservation ordinance. A classification of intrusion is equivalent to the Commission's classification of non-contributing. The project involves constructing a sewer basin, which will capture and hold overflows during major storms. Currently, the raw sewage overflows are discharged into the Schuylkill River. The City has been ordered by the federal Environmental Protection Agency to construct the facility. The recreation facility will be demolished and reconstructed as part of the project. The new recreation center will include a performing arts center, athletic facilities, and a spray park. Also, public parking, which is currently located at the south end of the island and is important to the local business community, will be reconfigured. The site is located in the Main Street Manayunk Historic District and subject to the Manayunk review standards, not the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Engineer Mark Bottin and architect Joseph Powell represented the application.

Mr. Baron reported that the Commission had received a letter from the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum advocating for a full archaeological study of the construction site. He explained to the Commission that its authority in the Main Street Manayunk area is rather limited and may not include the jurisdiction to require an archaeological study. The historic district was created by City Council under the property maintenance code and was really devised as a means to control the development of bars and restaurants along Main Street, not as a general purpose historic preservation tool. Mr. Sherman suggested that the applicants confer with the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum regardless of the Commission's legal authority. Mr. Bottin stated that he would confer with the group. He also stated that they would consider undertaking a Phase 1A archaeological study.

Messrs. Bottin and Powell displayed a Powerpoint presentation of the project. They explained the need for the facility, which will prevent the discharge of sewage into the river during rain events. They stated that the federal Environmental Protection Agency is requiring the City to undertake the project. They provided an overview of the new recreation facilities including the spray ground and performing arts center. They discussed the signage, materials, and other aspects of the project. They explained that the pump house will have a green roof, but not the performing arts center.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance asked the applicants why the Department of Recreation is not putting a green roof on the performing arts center. Mr. Bottin explained that the Department of Recreation does not want to commit to maintaining a green roof.

Mr. Sherman asked the applicants to provide an overview of the construction schedule. Mr. Bottin replied that they will likely advertise for bids in January and begin construction in the spring or summer of 2010. Mr. Mattioni asked if it will be a complicated construction project. Mr. Bottin stated that the Water Department is adept at undertaking complex infrastructure projects. This project is fairly complicated, but not too complicated.

Ms. Benoliel asked who will manage the recreation facilities. Mr. Bottin responded that the Department of Recreation and the Manayunk Development Corporation will manage the site.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to approve the application. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1723 RACE STREET

Owner: Cathedral of Sts. Peter & Paul

Applicant: Robert Koochagian

History: c. 1846-64, Napoleon Le Brun and John Notman, architects

Designation: 5/28/1957

Project: Install new windows

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposed aluminum windows in the dark brown finish, provided the chapel casement windows match the existing windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 4 and 6.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the replacement of windows throughout the Cathedral Basilica of Sts. Peter & Paul. The application proposes the replacement of windows at three primary locations; the windows at the dome, the windows at the nave and transept, and lastly the windows at the Sacristy and Chapel of Our Lady of the Blessed Sacrament. The windows at the transept and nave are wood windows with exterior copper cladding. These windows protect stained glass windows that illuminate the interior of the basilica. The current windows have an operable center panel. The age of these windows is unknown. It is also not known whether the existing copper cladding is an early twentieth-century alteration to original mid nineteenth-century wood windows, or if the entire units date from the early twentieth-century, presumably when the dome and drum were redressed in copper (c. 1928). The windows in the dome also protect interior stained glass windows. These windows also have operable middle panels. However, they are all non-functional today. The nave/transept windows and dome windows have similar proportions and detailing. The sacristy and chapel windows are located in a newer portion of the basilica that dates to the 1950s. The windows at that location are steel casements. The steel casements are painted, while the nave and dome windows have a typical green copper oxide finish.

The applicant proposes an aluminum extruded unit as a replacement. The units will be factory finished in a dark bronze finish. The general contractor engaged Vitetta to conduct a survey of the existing windows and a comparison of the existing conditions to the shop drawings of the proposed units. The report is very complete and helpful in the review of the nave and dome windows, since those are typical and of little variation. However, it is not as complete at the chapel. The report compares just one casement type at this location and excludes the more character defining large casements with side-lights and arched transoms that are found along the north wall of the chapel. The proposed units for the nave and the dome would be nearly identical to the existing. However, the Vitetta report raises a point of concern on these units. The existing windows have operable center panels to allow for the ventilation of the space between the exterior window and the interior stained glass. The proposed replacement units will be fixed and will not allow for ventilation of this space. This change may cause deterioration of the stained glass windows. The proposed units at the chapel do not match the muntin configuration for at least two of the casement types. The application does not include enough information to review the arched-top casements. Lastly, the Vitetta report notes that the proposed aluminum units will not create a galvanic reaction to the copper present in the building owing to their factory finish.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Robert Koochagian and Joseph Sorrentino represented the application.

Ms. Spina asked if the ventilation issue raised in the Vitetta report had been resolved. Mr. Sorrentino stated that the stained glass consultant from Beyer Studios reviewed the matter and assured them that the windows are adequately ventilated.

ACTION: Ms. Spina moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application with the proposed aluminum windows in the dark brown finish, provided the chapel casement windows match the existing windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 4 and 6. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2000 N. BROAD STREET

Owner/ Applicant: Daniel Grossmann

History: 1895, Willis Gaylord Hale, architect, John Stafford

Designated: 4/30/1986

Project: Remove deteriorated carved reliefs, patch brownstone

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided rectified photographs of the entire porch are taken and deposited at the Commission; rubber molds of the existing pieces are made before the paint is removed; plaster positives are made from the molds and stored on site; and all large fragments removed during the scaling are retained on site for a future restoration, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter the brownstone stoop of this mansion. The applicant currently has a permit to repair other brownstone on the base of the building. The stoop was covered in carved brownstone decoration including a cartouche and floral designs. Water trapped by several paint coats has destroyed much of this carving. The applicant proposes to remove the paint and with it the remainder of the carving. The stoop would be repaired to a smooth finish without the carved details using a brown mortar.

The staff does not recommend approval of the proposal as submitted because of the removal of historic fabric and design. Instead, it recommends creating molds of the remnants of the existing floral design and reinstalling these as well as recreating the cartouche in the proposed material. This does not include creating conjectural designs that have no basis in documentation. The work could be completed at a later phase based on an agreed upon time table.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Daniel Grossman represented the application.

Mr. Danta explained that the remnants of the ornament on the entranceway are preserved in paint only. The brownstone ornament under the paint has eroded and is now only sand. The record of the ornament will be lost when the paint is removed. Mr. Grossman stated that he is seeking to improve the appearance of the front entranceway. The ornament on the entranceway has been lost. He would like to remove the inappropriate paint and improve the overall appearance of the front of the building. Mr. Grossman agreed to attempt to make molds from the paint remnants, but noted that the process may not be successful, owing to the degraded condition of the stone. Mr. Danta stated that the molds and rectified photographs may provide the information necessary for a complete restoration in the future. However, he agreed with Mr. Grossman that the experiment may not be successful.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided rectified photographs of the entire porch are taken and deposited at the Commission; rubber molds of the existing pieces are made before the paint is removed; plaster positives are made from the molds and stored on site; and all large fragments removed during the scaling are retained on site

for a future restoration, with the staff to review details. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1326-28 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: 1326 Chestnut Street Associates; Barzilay Development

Applicant: Jonathan Broh, JKR Partners

History: Keystone National Bank, 1887, extended to Sansom Street, 1891, Willis Hale, architect storefront altered c. 1900, c. 1920, c. 1940, c. 1960

Designation: Individually designated, 12/6/1973

Project: Rehabilitate building for hotel; replace storefront, add roof deck

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application with the exception of the design of the storefront and rehabilitation plan for the stair tower on Chestnut Street.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate the former Keystone National Bank building as a hotel. The first-floor space on Chestnut would be developed as a restaurant. The building has been underutilized and poorly maintained for many years.

The building was designed by famed architect Willis Hale and constructed in 1887 for the Keystone National Bank. The original building fronted on Chestnut Street and ran south along Juniper Street to about Drury Lane. The bank failed in 1891 and its leaders were jailed. Real estate tycoon William Weightman, an in-law and patron of the architect Hale, purchased the property in 1891 and renamed it the Hale Building. In the early 1890s, Hale added to and extended the building to south to Sansom Street in the same style.

The storefront on Chestnut Street, which has served as a barometer of prevailing taste, has been replaced numerous times. The building originally had a rusticated stone, arched entranceway with gable at Chestnut Street. This entrance was appropriate for the bank, but not for its later retail uses. The original entranceway was removed and replaced with a one-story, balustraded, Beaux-Arts storefront about 1900 by Hale when he built the Garrick Theater to the west for Weightman. The Garrick was stylistically related of the Hale Building and created an ensemble with the central turret linking the two buildings. The c. 1900 storefront was removed and replaced with a two-story, Renaissance storefront with tile roof about 1920. The c. 1920 storefront was removed and replaced with a streamlined, Art Moderne storefront matching the neighboring Woolworth Building when the Garrick was demolished about 1940. The c. 1940 storefront was removed and replaced with a Modern storefront with Googie style sign about 1960. Although altered, the c. 1960 storefront remains in place today.

At Chestnut Street, the application proposes to remove the c. 1960 storefront, preserve any original masonry behind it, and add a simple bronze and glass storefront system. Missing masonry would be replaced. The shape and windows but not the rusticated masonry of a cylindrical section to the west would be restored. Windows would be replaced and signage added. Drawings A3.1 and A3.2 document this section of the proposal. The Commission should authorize the staff to inspect the site after the demolition of the existing non-historic storefront to ensure that all original material behind it is preserved and restored.

The first to third-floor masonry of the northernmost bay on Juniper was lost to the storefront alterations. The arched masonry opening would be recreated and windows added. The watertable of this bay would be glazed rather than reconstructed in masonry to allow light and visibility into the restaurant space. The sill of the large window would be recreated and new windows installed. Drawing A3.3 documents this section of the proposal.

The entrance to the hotel would be located on Juniper Street at Drury Lane. The entrance would be located at a pedimented opening, which is currently infilled. New doors with transoms and a glass canopy shaped like the pediment would be installed. Other infilled openings would be reopened and fenestrated. Vents and louvers would be removed. New windows would be installed and existing windows would be repaired. The masonry would be cleaned and repointed. Drawings A3.4, A3.4E, and A5.1 document this section of the proposal.

On the Sansom Street façade, a fire escape, metal doors, and louvers would be removed. Windows would be repaired. New windows and doors would be installed. The masonry would be cleaned and repointed. Drawings A3.5 and A3.5E document this section of the proposal.

At the roof, a deck with retractable glass roof would be added at the south. A lobby with restrooms would be constructed to the west of the existing elevator penthouse. A pilot house for the emergency stair would be constructed at the southwest corner of the roof. A conical roof at the northwest corner of the building was demolished years ago; a standing-seam metal shed roof would be added where the conical roof once was. The rooftop additions would be inconspicuous owing to the height of the building, narrowness of the streets, and number of tall, neighboring buildings. Drawings A1.9, A1.9E, A3.6, A3.7A, A3.7B, A3.8A, A3.8B and A3.9 document this section of the proposal.

The state's Bureau for Historic Preservation and the National Park Service reviewed this project, which is seeking federal tax credits, requested and received revisions for compliance with the Standards, and then approved the project. Letters documenting the approvals are attached to the drawings.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jonathan Broh and developer Ben Weinraub represented the application.

Mr. Broh stated he is working closely with state's Bureau for Historic Preservation and the National Park Service, which are reviewing the project for tax credits. He explained that the design for the front façade is based on discussions with the state's tax credit reviewer, who required revisions from the design originally proposed. He also explained that he did not have a photograph of the 1900 storefront until the day of the Architectural Committee meeting. Mr. Farnham noted that he had not discovered the photograph until the evening before the meeting. Mr. Broh stated that the photograph provides important guidance for the design of a new storefront that is compatible with the historic building. He explained that the current proposal was designed before this photograph was known. The proposed storefront is limited in size. It does not engage with the upper floors or turret. He explained that the state reviewer dissuaded him from designing a larger storefront because it might have blocked views of existing historic fabric surviving under the current Modern storefront. He stated that it is his intention to retain all historic fabric discovered under the non-historic storefront. He also stated that the rendering of the restored turret is not entirely accurate. It is shown as smooth, but would, in fact, have a rusticated finish like the historic finish. Ms. Spina asked Mr. Broh to verify his intention to replicate the historic rustication on the turret. Mr. Broh stated that he would match the rustication found under the Value Plus storefront, once it is removed.

Ms. Spina asked Mr. Broh to verify that the building would have a vestibule at Chestnut Street behind the plane of the front façade of the building. He stated that it would. She then asked why, if it has a vestibule, it also needs the projecting glass box. Mr. Broh answered that the projecting glass box is both a canopy and signage for the business. He added that the projecting glass box can only be 5'-6" deep, which is not deep enough for an accessible vestibule. Therefore, the

vestibule must be located in the interior of the building. Mr. Sherman asked if the proposed glass box extends out beyond the point of the historic storefront. Mr. Broh said that it does not. Ms. Spina asked if the box would extend up above the sills of the second-floor windows. Mr. Broh stated that it would not.

Mr. Thomas contended that the proposed glass storefront should be revised to be more compatible with the historic building. He stated that he was not advocating for a reproduction of the historic storefront, but for a storefront or a more compatible material and color. Mr. Merriman agreed. Mr. Broh noted that the many entrances for this building were always designed in a contemporary style. He asserted that a contemporary storefront would be compatible and appropriate. Mr. Thomas stated that he is delighted in general by the project. Mr. Sherman stated that the roof of the storefront could be greened and accessible.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that this is a wonderful project that will restore a very significant building. Mr. Gallery stated that he strongly supports the Architectural Committee's recommendation. He asserted that the Chestnut Street portion of the design should be reconsidered. He noted that he was not requesting a restoration. He suggested that the 1900 photograph, which was recently discovered, offers design advice. He asserted that the proposed storefront is not compatible with the building. He urged the applicant to reconsider the design of the storefront area.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application with the exception of the design of the storefront and rehabilitation plan for the stair tower on Chestnut Street. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

6008 WAYNE AVENUE, ST. PETER'S CHURCH

Owner: Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania

Applicant: Christine Ritter

History: 1873, G. W. Hewitt of Furness & Hewitt, architect

Designated: 11/30/1965

Project: Remove Bishop White stained glass window and relocate to Church House

Project: Remove all other stained glass windows except rose window

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 2.

OVERVIEW: Earlier this year, the Historical Commission legalized the removal of four stained glass windows from St. Peter's Church on Wayne Avenue in Germantown. The Commission legalized the removal because the windows by Violet Oakley and the Tiffany Studio were of great artistic and historical significance, because their security could not be guaranteed in situ, and because the windows will be held in perpetuity by the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, where they will be interpreted and displayed. The sales agreement between the Diocese and the Academy stipulates that they will be held in perpetuity; the Diocese signed over its right to enforce the agreement to the City.

The current applications propose to remove the remaining stained glass windows in the church, excepting the rose window, and install clear plate glass in their places. The original frames would remain and clear glass installed in them. One application proposes the removal of the Bishop White window and its reinstallation in the Church House at 240 S. 4th Street in Philadelphia. Bishop White was the first Bishop of the Diocese of Pennsylvania (1787-1836). The second application proposes to remove the remaining stained glass windows in the church

and store them at the Beyer Studio. They would be reused in other religious buildings or sold on the open market. The application claims that they must be removed because they are at risk of theft or vandalism in their current locations.

The staff contends that, although the windows have no overriding artistic or historical significance, as did the four windows already removed, they are character-defining features that should be retained and protected in place. Their removal would defy all historic preservation standards and would set a very negative precedent.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. The Reverend Christine Ritter and attorney Chris Kimmel represented the application.

MOTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the applications, pursuant to Standard 2. Ms. Spina seconded the motion.

Ms. Kimmel summarized the Commission's earlier legalization of the removal of the four windows. She explained that the Diocese has marketed this property but has not identified a buyer. She stated that the property will not be reused for religious purposes. She claimed that the potential buyers do not want the windows; "no one is interested in these windows." She stated that it would cost \$6 million to restore the windows. She contended that potential buyers for the property are "walking away" because of the windows. She stated that the Diocese wants to preserve the windows by removing them and storing them at Beyers Studio. She claimed that they cannot be preserved at the property. She asserted that the stained glass windows are at risk in the building; they may be vandalized or stolen. She again stated that no buyer would be interested in the windows or in retaining them in place. She stated that the Diocese would remove the windows and make them available to the public by selling them. She claimed that by removing the windows the Diocese would protect the public's interest in them. Ms. Kimmel stated that the Diocese had submitted two separate applications, one for the removal of the Bishop White window and one for the removal of the remainder of the windows, but the Commission consolidated the applications into one. She asserted that the circumstances of the two applications are different and they should not be combined.

Mr. Sherman asked Mr. Farnham to summarize the earlier application, which he did. Mr. Farnham explained that the earlier case was very different from the current case. He reported that the Commission had approved the removal of the windows to the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts because that option offered the best means to both protect and provide public access to the artistically significant windows. He noted that, in the earlier case, the Commission decided that the artistic value of the windows exceeded the architectural and historical value that would have been maintained by retaining the windows in situ. Such an argument is not being made and cannot be made in this case. He asked the Commission to look carefully at the differences between the earlier application and these applications. He stated that the argument being made in this case, that no buyer would be interested in maintaining the windows in place, is not and never has been sufficient to justify the removal of character-defining historic fabric from an historic building. He noted that the applicants have hinted at a financial hardship argument, but he asserted that they have not provided a basis for a finding of hardship. He suggested that the Commission advise the applicants that they have the right to submit a hardship application, but he cautioned the Commission not to base a decision on a hardship finding today. Mr. Farnham concurred with Ms. Kimmel that the Diocese had submitted two separate building permit application forms and that the applications had been listed together on the agenda. He stated that the Commission should act on the applications separately. Mr. Farnham explained that he had asked the applicants during the Architectural Committee

meeting whether the removal of these windows was in any way related to the desanctification of the church or the practice of their religion. They responded that the church was already desanctified and the removal of the windows was unrelated to religious practice. He stated that, in conclusion, he does not believe that an argument has been made to support an approval of the removal of the windows, with the possible exception of the Bishop White window.

Ms. Kimmel stated that the Bishop White window has historical significance for the Diocese, which has a collection of Bishop White “remembrances” at the Church House. The church’s Standing Committee would like to move it to a place of honor. The Reverend Ritter stated that the Bishop White window is very important to the church.

Mr. Sherman asked whether the windows under discussion today had been considered when the Commission approved the legalizations of the removals of the Violet Oakley and Tiffany windows. Mr. Farnham stated that, at that time, no application had been made regarding the current windows and therefore no decision was rendered. Ms. Kimmel noted that the Architectural Committee had asked about those windows during the earlier review and the Diocese had responded that it intended to remove them at a later date. The Diocese had also prepared an inventory of them.

Mr. Murray asked about vandalism and theft. Ms. Kimmel said that there have been incidents of vandalism. She noted that there is Plexiglass in place over the windows. The Reverend Ritter stated that she recently had one of the windows boarded up.

Mr. Dilworth asked why the staff had suggested protecting the windows with Plexiglass. He claimed that the Plexiglass would obscure the windows and remove them from the public’s view. He also noted that, if this application proposed an alteration to a non-historic balcony facing a service alley, it would be approved. Mr. Farnham responded that the staff was not proposing that the windows be obscured, but only that they are protected.

Ms. Spina stated that she is of two minds regarding the Bishop White window, but is opposed to the removal of the others. She asked why the applicants had not proposed to remove the rose window. Ms. Kimmel stated that it is well preserved and high enough above the ground to escape the vandalism. It would also be very difficult to remove. Mr. Sherman said that the continued “erosion” of this building with removals of historic fabric is “death by one thousand cuts.” The Reverend Ritter stated that the windows should be removed because they are all by Paul Bellano and form a “collection.”

Ms. Merriman asserted that the Commission should not approve the removal of the windows until it can evaluate an application for their removal in the context of a larger adaptive reuse application. She cautioned that the Commission should not approve their removal without being able to first determine that the adaptive reuse depends on their removal. Ms. Leonard and Mr. Thomas concurred with Ms. Merriman’s assessment. Ms. Leonard stated that an approval at this point would set a dangerous precedent. Mr. Thomas stated that the removal would not comply with the Standards. He suggested that the application should be presented by the new buyer, who may be able to present facts about the impact of retention and removal.

Mr. Dilworth moved to split the motion into two separate motions. Mr. Farnham noted that there is a motion already on the table, which could only be amended with the concurrence of the Commissioner who made the motion and her second. Ms. Merriman and Ms. Spina refused to amend their motion as Mr. Dilworth suggested. Mr. Sherman rejected his motion as out of order.

Mr. Mattioni stated that the windows are part of the designated exterior of the building and deserve the Commission's protection.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION: Mses. Merriman and Spina withdrew their motion to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the applications, pursuant to Standard 2.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance advised the Commission not to take any action that implied that stained glass windows are not part of the exteriors of buildings. He asserted that stained glass windows are exterior features. He also advised the Commission not to consider the removal of these windows as a demolition. He suggested that a financial hardship application was not appropriate in this instance. Mr. Gallery suggested a compromise, such as retaining some of the windows. He also suggested that the Commission should signal to potential buyers that it would consider a later application from a new owner to remove some or all of the windows as part of a larger adaptation of the building for a new use. Mr. Gallery stated that he does think that there are some good arguments for the removal of the Bishop White window, provided it is retained in the public domain.

Mr. Farnham responded that no one had used the word "demolition" during the review until Mr. Gallery. He asserted that no one was suggesting that the removal of these windows should be deemed a demolition, as Mr. Gallery had implied. He stated that the staff had not advocated for the submission of a financial hardship application, but had only advised the applicants of their right to file a hardship application after they stated that it would cost \$6 million to restore the windows. He also noted that the historic preservation ordinance allows the Commission to approve alterations that do not comply with the Standards if it finds that the resource cannot be feasibly adaptively reused without the alteration.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to deny the application proposing to remove all of the stained glass windows except the Bishop White window, pursuant to Standard 2. Ms. Spina seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 10 to 1. Mr. Dilworth dissented.

Mr. Dilworth moved to approve the removal of the Bishop White window. No one seconded the motion.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to deny the application proposing to remove the Bishop White window, pursuant to Standard 2. Ms. Spina seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 10 to 1. Mr. Dilworth dissented.

1935 SPRING GARDEN STREET

Owner: Dan Kilpatrick

Applicant: Dan Kilpatrick

History: c. 1975; Contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District, 2000

Project: Demolish rear addition, construct garage (In Concept)

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend final approval, provided the fenestration in the door in the bay is divided to match the pane sizes of the adjacent windows, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a non-historic one-story rear addition and construct a one-story two-car garage to the rear property line. The garage addition would be parged in stucco. The drawings state that the garage door will be steel, but the garage door specifications indicate a wood fiber composite material. A Trex deck is proposed for the roof of the addition. Access to the deck would be provided from a door cut down from the middle window of the rear bay. No other work is proposed for the rear bay.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Commission. The applicant had notified the staff that she was unable to attend the review. Ms. Cote explained that the Architectural Committee recommended final approval even though the application proposed an in-concept review.

Ms. Spina stated that she opposed the changes at the rear because they would change the spatial characteristics of the rear of this building. Mr. Sherman explained that the houses in this area have rear parking pads without fences or walls.

Mr. Thomas suggested that windows in the garage door would promote a livelier streetscape. Ms. Cote stated that the applicant prefers a paneled door without windows. Mr. Thomas objected to a blank wall, but stated that panels would be acceptable.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to approve the application, provided the fenestration in the door in the bay is divided to match the pane sizes of the adjacent windows and the garage door is paneled, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 10 to 1. Ms. Spina dissented.

1201 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: Oddfellows c/o Equitable Owner Steven Savitz

Applicant: Ryan Lohbauer

History: 1906 by Watson & Huckel, architects

Project: Install roof deck

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a mock-up of the deck proves that the deck would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of a roof deck and extension of a stair tower. The deck would be set back about nine feet from the rear north elevation and two to three feet from the east elevation. It would be constructed of wood planks and steel rail.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Ryan Lohbauer represented the application.

The Commissioners agreed that the deck would be acceptable if it is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

ACTION: Ms. Spina moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided a mock-up of the deck proves that the deck would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

3500 POWELTON AVENUE

Owner: Courts-UCAL LLC

Applicant: David Brawer, Brawer & Hauptman Architects

History: 1902, Willis Hale, architect

Designated: 3/2/1978

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the enclosure of an open gated carriageway in a large early-twentieth-century apartment complex. The metal gates at the front of the carriageway would be replaced with glass automatic sliding doors. A new free-standing awning would replace the one currently at the carriageway.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Architect David Brawer represented the application.

Ms. Spina asked Mr. Brawer if he intended to retain the existing brick floor in the carriageway. Mr. Brawer explained that the brick would be retained and reused, but that the elevation of the floor would be raised approximately six inches.

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

2500 SPRING GARDEN STREET, BOATHOUSE # 4

Owner: Pennsylvania Barge Club

Applicant: Paul Zebrowski, CYMA Builders & Construction Managers

History: 1892, Louis Hickman, architect; addition, 1912, Charles Schermerhorn, architect

Designation: Individually designated, 1/5/1984; National Historic Landmark

Proposal: Addition of a ramp

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

OVERVIEW: The application proposes the construction of a ramp for handicap accessibility along the Kelly Drive façade of the boathouse. The applicant has stated that building the ramp along the side of the building would hinder movement of the boats which are stored there. The staff recommends looking at the possibility of building the ramp into the porch or adding a lift at the side of the porch as the proposed ramp would greatly alter the appearance of the main façade.

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

Mr. Thomas stated that the proposed ramp was not appropriate from an historic preservation perspective. However, he contended that the building could be made accessible without sacrificing historic preservation standards. He remarked that a lift might appropriately provide the needed accessibility. He stated that the owners should not seek a variance from the accessibility requirement, but should develop an appropriate means of providing access to the historically significant building. He referred the owners to National Park Service Preservation Brief 32.

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

OLD BUSINESS

2404 DELANCEY PLACE

Owner: Alan Razak and Jacqueline Buhn

Applicant: Carey Jackson Yonce

History: c. 1890

Project: Install windows and doors, stucco side and rear facades, alter and add deck to non-historic garage

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application, provided the stucco applied to the main house is not scored, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to modify a garage and install a garage roof deck and doors, windows, balconies, and stucco. In September 2006, the Commission reviewed a similar application to rebuild the garage, remove the fire escape, install windows, doors, balconies, and cut new openings on the rear elevation. The Commission approved the proposal as submitted, with the staff to review details. The work was never undertaken.

This application now proposes to install a garage roof deck and raise an existing garden wall. This application also proposes alterations including the installation of doors and windows within existing openings, a third-story balcony, a second-story railing, and scored stucco over the entire south and west brick elevations. The fire escape would be retained.

The Commission reviewed this application at its November 2009 meeting and tabled it to allow the applicants to provide additional information.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Architect Carey Yonce represented the application.

Mr. Sherman asked Mr. Yonce to explain the relation of the windows to the new façade plane once the stucco is installed. Mr. Yonce answered that the older windows will be retained in place and will therefore be further recessed from the plane of the facade, whereas the new windows will be installed to correspond to the new façade position. Eventually, the old windows will be replaced; at that time, the replacements will be installed at the correct plane.

Mr. Sherman observed that the application proposes two options for the south wall. One option would start the stucco 13" back from the quoins at the southeast corner to preserve and not cover them in stucco. The second option would start the stucco 14' from the corner, leaving the front section of the existing brick exposed. Mr. Yonce added that the setback was based on

interior conditions. He noted that the channels will be installed in mortar joints, allowing the stucco to be removed in the future without damage to the wall. Mr. Sherman asked why the insulation was not installed in the interior. Mr. Yonce stated that adding the insulation in the interior would reduce the interior space and disrupt the trim. He also noted that the brick wall is in poor condition and requires weatherproofing. Mr. Thomas observed that it is better to have the masonry mass inside the insulation rather than outside it. Mr. Thomas stated that the texture and color of the stucco will determine whether it is unobtrusive or not.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided the stucco applied to the main house is not scored, with the staff to review details. Mr. Quinn seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 10 to 1. Ms. Spina dissented.

DISCUSSION OF AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES & REGULATIONS

Mr. Farnham presented an overview of the process of revising the Commission's Rules & Regulations. He explained that the Commission began the public process of revising its Rules & Regulations to incorporate new procedures and policies for the designation and regulation of interiors in July 2009, just days after Mayor Nutter signed the interiors amendment of the historic preservation ordinance into law. In addition to the July discussion, the Commission reviewed drafts of new and revised Rules & Regulations at its September, October, and November 2009 meetings. He noted that the public was included at every step of the process.

Mr. Farnham reported that, at its 13 November 2009 meeting, the Historical Commission reviewed a draft version of the proposed Rules & Regulations and directed the staff to prepare final amendments for review and potential action at today's meeting. The amendments were drafted and distributed to the Commission and all interested parties last week in preparation for this meeting. The revisions to the Rules & Regulations made after the 13 November 2009 meeting were summarized in a memorandum, which was also distributed to the Commission and interested parties. The versions of the draft Rules & Regulations were also posted throughout the process on the Commission's website.

Mr. Farnham observed that most of the revisions made since the 13 November 2009 meeting are very minor, involving slight changes in wording for clarity. The other revisions are relatively minor. A three-day deadline for the submission of supplementary application material was added at the Preservation Alliance's suggestion and the Commission's direction. The overview of the Review-and-Comment jurisdiction was rewritten for greater clarity, again at the Preservation Alliance's suggestion and the Commission's direction.

Mr. Farnham reminded the Commission that, to approve the revised Rules & Regulations, at least 10 Commissioners must vote in favor of the document. If it is approved, the revised Rules & Regulations will be reviewed by the Law Department for legality. If approved by the Law Department, the document will be sent to the Department of Records, which will solicit public opinion on the document for 30 days. If anyone requests an additional hearing on the document, the Commission will conduct that hearing at a subsequent Commission meeting. If not, the Rules & Regulations will become effective at the end of the 30 days.

Mr. Sherman asked if any Commissioner or member of the public had final comments on the Rules & Regulations.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance thanked the staff and Mr. Reuter for their hard work in amending the Rules & Regulations. He congratulated the Commission for maintaining its schedule and heartedly endorsed the draft before the Commission.

ACTION: Ms. Spina moved to amend the Rules & Regulations, replacing the current text, which was revised on 23 March 2009, with the text presented to the Commission at its meeting of 11 December 2009. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon a motion proffered by Ms. Merriman and seconded by Ms. Spina, the Commission voted unanimously to adjourn at 11:40 a.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

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

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

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

Standard 7: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damages to historic materials will not be used.

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

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

PM-704.2.7 Design: Additions, alterations, and new construction shall be designed so as to be compatible in scale, building materials, and texture, with contributing buildings in the historic district.