

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

**11 APRIL 2008
ROOM 18-022, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
David Amburn
Leslie Benoliel
Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D.
Eileen Evans, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Rosalie Leonard, Office of Council President
John Mattioni, Esq.
Sara Merriman, Department of Commerce
Laura Spina, City Planning Commission
Robert Thomas, AIA
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing & Community Development

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

ALSO PRESENT

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
William Martin, Esq., Fox Rothschild
Michael Lewis, Big Brothers Big Sisters of America
Ann Beha, Ann Beha Architects
Philip Chen, Ann Beha Architects
Ralph Pinkus, Esq.
Joan Cole, Richard M. Cole & Associates
Rick Cole, Richard M. Cole & Associates
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
Paul Wheeling
Jamie Rosalee, Studio Torres
Rachel Schade, Schade & Bolender Architects
Jeff Reinhold, JAR Metropolitan
Jon Langmead
Michael Loonstyn
Carolina Pena, YCH Architects
Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzberg & Ellers
Chuck Breder, Toll Brothers
Robert & Leslie Saltzman
David Hollenberg, University of Pennsylvania
Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch
Poe Leggette
Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzberg & Ellers

Michael Cooley, Provco
Dominic Muscara, Nelson Architects

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Amburn, Benoliel, Dilworth, Evans, Leonard, Mattioni, Merriman, Thomas, and Wilds joined him. Laura Spina represented the City Planning Commission.

MINUTES OF THE 547TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Ms. Merriman suggested corrections on pages 31 and 36 of the minutes of the 547th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the minutes of the 547th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 14 March 2008 as corrected. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

CONTINUANCE REQUEST

Attorney William Martin and Michael Lewis of Big Brothers Big Sisters of America requested that the Commission continue its consideration of the nomination for 228-238 N. 13th Street for one month. Mr. Martin stated that his client, the property owner, is seeking the continuance to allow for the study of the nomination and the staff report. He stated that his client may retain a consultant to review the materials. He explained that Mr. Lewis must present any plan for action to the Board of Big Brothers Big Sisters of America before he can proceed. He reported that the Board will meet soon. Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Martin if he understood that the property would remain under the Commission's jurisdiction during the postponement. Mr. Martin acknowledged that the Commission would retain full jurisdiction during the continuance. Mr. Lewis also acknowledged the Commission's jurisdiction and stated that his organization would not alter the property during the postponement.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to continue the review of the nomination for 228-238 N. 13th Street until the Commission's monthly meeting in May 2008. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 MARCH 2008

David Amburn, Chair

6918-6926 RIDGE AVENUE

Owner: Michael S. Kershaw

Applicant: Dominic Aspite for Wachovia Bank

History: Christopher Ozias House, c. 1805, demolished 2007

Project: Construct bank building

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of Design Two, provided the lintels are modified as noted, a metal roof is substituted over the pediments, and stone clad is added in the pediments.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a branch bank building on a vacant lot at 6918-6926 Ridge Avenue in Roxborough. At its February 2008 meeting, the Historical Commission reviewed two applications related to this site; one application proposed to rescind the designation of the site; and a second application proposed the construction of a bank building. The Historical Commission voted to deny the rescission of its designation of the site. The Commission approved, in concept, the construction of a bank building. At that time, the Commission advised the applicant to revise the design and resubmit it. The applicant now proposes a revised design with two options for the exterior finishes. The revised has the same footprint, massing, and location within the site as the design approved in concept by the Commission. The location of the bank building is roughly the same as the location of the historic house that once stood on that parcel. Design One is clad in Wissahickon schist stone and capped by a prominent stucco band and cornice. The façade openings have metal sun shades with cable attachments. Design Two is entirely clad in Wissahickon Schist Stone and capped by a cornice. The main entrance facing Ridge Avenue is accentuated by an entrance hood, reminiscent of one that adorned the entrance of the residence that was demolished. The sun shades are not included in Design Two.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Attorney Carl Primavera, architect Dominic Muscara, and developer Michael Cooley represented the application.

Messrs. Primavera, Muscara, and Cooley explained that the design had been updated to reflect the suggestions of the Commission and Committee. Mr. Danta suggested that, if the Commission decides to approve the plans, it should find a mechanism to ensure that the legalization of the demolition is not finalized until the bank is constructed according to the approved plans. Mr. Farnham added that it might be prudent for the Commission to condition any legalization on the construction of the approved plan. He asked the Commission to direct the staff on an appropriate permitting process if the new bank is approved today. Mr. Wilds stated that the Commission will retain full jurisdiction over the property if and until it chooses to change the designation status of the property. Ms. Evans noted that the Department of Licenses & Inspections would not issue a building permit for the new construction with the violation for the demolition in place. Mr. Primavera stated that his client would make whatever assurances are necessary regarding the legalization for an approval of the new construction. Mr. Wilds suggested that the demolition and new construction permits should be issued simultaneously. Ms. Evans suggested that the applicants apply for the demolition and new construction building permit on the same application; then the legalization of the demolition would not be finalized until the construction inspections are complete. Mr. Reuter agreed with Ms. Evans and suggested that the Department of Licenses & Inspections issue one permit that conditions the legalization of the demolition on the completion of the new construction.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to legalize the demolition of the historic house, provided the bank is constructed according to the plans labeled as Design Two and the applications for the building permits for the demolition and new construction are made jointly on the same application form. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 1. Ms. Spina abstained.

1918 DIAMOND STREET

Owner/Applicant: Todd Joseph

History: c. 1885, façade altered in late nineteenth century

Project: Legalize front façade alterations

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 6, and 9.

OVERVIEW: This project has a long and complicated history with the Historical Commission. The applicant demolished the rear ell of this row house and started construction of a CMU addition of roughly the same design and footprint as the historic rear ell. This work was performed without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit from the Department of Licenses & Inspections. The applicant submitted a building permit application on 13 June 2007 to legalize this work. This application was rejected by the staff of the Historical Commission as incomplete. The staff then conducted a site visit to gain a better understanding of the work that had been done and advise the applicant on the restoration details of the front façade. The applicant submitted a second building permit application after this meeting, which was also rejected by the staff as incomplete. The Executive Director wrote a letter to the applicant explaining to him the design review process. This letter is dated 28 June 2007. The applicant then submitted shop drawings for windows, which were rejected by the staff as incomplete; at this time, further and clear guidance was given to the applicant in writing in a letter dated 2 July 2007. Finally, the staff approved plans for the reconstructed rear ell and the restoration of the front façade on 27 August 2007. This approval required the review of shop drawings for windows and doors and also masonry samples. The applicant did not fulfill those requirements. The staff conducted a field inspection and noticed non-compliant work on the front façade. On 12 February 2008, the staff requested a violation for façade alterations that did not conform to the approved plans. These changes include the installation of 8-over-8 vinyl windows with snap-on muntins within built-down subframes; glass block in the basement window opening; a metal six-panel front door and a metal security door, both installed within a built down subframe; 1-over-1 vinyl window at ground floor, within a built down subframe, and masonry work without a prerequisite field visit for final approval.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. He informed the Commission that the applicant had been present at the start of today's Commission meeting, but was no longer present. The staff searched the corridors around the meeting room for the applicant, but did not locate him. Mr. Wilds noted for the record that the Commission had sought but not found the applicant. Mr. Wilds also noted that the applicant had disregarded the Commission and ignored its jurisdiction throughout his development project.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 6, and 9. Ms. Spina seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2420 GRAYS FERRY AVENUE

Owner: Toll Naval Associates

Applicant: Chuck Breder, Toll Brothers

History: 1830s, William Strickland, architect

Project: Construct townhouses and condominium block.

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of six townhouse blocks and one condominium building on the rear grounds of the former U.S. Naval Home. The Historical Commission approved the construction of Phase One of this project, which included the restoration of the Biddle Hall and two historic residences and the construction of several blocks of townhouses and a condominium block. The proposed design follows the architectural and design standards established by Phase One. The proposed new construction would not be visible from Grays Ferry Avenue; it would be most visible from the South Street Bridge.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Thomas recused owing to his firm's work at the Naval Home. Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Attorney Brett Feldman and developer Chuck Breder represented the application.

Ms. Spina asked the applicants to explain which elevation in the architectural drawings would face Schuylkill Avenue, the elevation labeled "front" or "rear." Mr. Feldman stated that the "rear" elevation would face Schuylkill Avenue. Ms. Merriman asked the applicants about the height of the Naval Home's perimeter wall at Schuylkill Avenue. Mr. Feldman stated that it is nine or 10 feet tall. Ms. Spina asked about the cladding material proposed for the facades facing Schuylkill Avenue. Mr. Feldman stated that it would be stucco. Ms. Merriman asked about the materials of the rear decks. Mr. Breder stated that they would be constructed of pressure-treated and artificial wood. Mr. Wilds asked the applicants to explain the streetscape of Schuylkill Avenue. Mr. Feldman stated that the former School District building, which had been slated for redevelopment as a condominium building but is now vacant, stands across Schuylkill Avenue across from the Naval Square site. Mr. Mattioni asked the applicants if they had any photographs of the rears of the buildings already constructed at the sites for the Commission's appraisal. Mr. Feldman stated that they had no photographs, but he displayed renderings of the rear of the proposed building. Mr. Wilds asked why the stucco on the rear of the proposed building is light, not brick colored. Mr. Feldman stated that the stucco was designed to match the stucco on Biddle Hall and the other historic buildings on the campus. Mr. Wilds asked if the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission has approved the proposal. Mr. Feldman stated that it had and submitted a letter documenting the approval. Mr. Feldman then displayed photographs of the historic buildings before and after their rehabilitations to demonstrate the benefits provided by his client. Mr. Wilds noted that his client had allowed the buildings to fall into their dilapidated states before the rehabilitations.

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

2052 LOCUST STREET

Owner/ Applicant: Matthew Black

History: c. 1895, contributing to Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District

Project: Legalize vinyl windows

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

OVERVIEW: This proposal seeks to legalize the installation of vinyl windows on the front façade of this rowhouse. The owner claims that he bought the property in this state.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Property owner Matthew Black represented the application.

Mr. Baron stated that he received a call from a window installer, who, at the request of the current owner, inquired whether he could install vinyl windows in this building. He explained to the installer that the windows would not be appropriate. The installer, who did not replace the windows, claims that he explained to current owner that these windows were not appropriate for a building designated as historic. Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Baron when he spoke to the window installer. Mr. Baron answered that he spoke to the installer about one year ago. He added that the designation photograph shows that the building did not have vinyl windows at the time of designation. Mr. Black objected and claimed that he contacted the window installer after he received the violation for the windows. He stated that the windows were installed before he purchased the property in 2003. He stated that he spoke with Mr. Baron about the appropriate windows and window installers. He called potential installers and explored installing the appropriate windows, but discovered that they would be expensive. He provided the Commission with photographs of neighboring properties that have inappropriate windows. Mr. Sherman explained to Mr. Black that, as the property owner, he is responsible for the condition of the building even if he did not install the windows. Mr. Wilds explained to Mr. Black that he inherited the violation condition when he purchased the property even if the violation itself had not yet been issued. Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Black if the property was his residence or an investment property. Mr. Stack replied that it is an investment property. Mr. Wilds noted that the applicant has the right to appeal any decision that the Commission might reach. He also noted that the applicant may file a financial hardship application. Mr. Black asked about the violation. Ms. Evans stated that the violation would stand until the non-compliant condition is corrected. Mr. Baron informed the Commission that several of the neighboring non-compliant properties highlighted by Mr. Black are being corrected. He noted that the owner of the adjacent property is correcting non-compliant windows.

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

512 AND 514 S. 3RD STREET

Owner: Charisma Properties

Applicant: Raymond Rola, AIA

History: 512, constructed as firehouse c. 1855; significant to Society Hill Historic District

514, refaced mid-twentieth century; contributing to Society Hill Historic District

Project: This project calls for reinstalling windows in the façade of 512 S. 3rd and refacing the garage front at 514 with greater fenestration.

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

OVERVIEW: The application proposes converting two adjacent structures for residential use. The first floor of 512 would retain its retail space. An additional floor would be added internally to 514. The window infill would be removed and the new fenestration would restore a sense of the historic windows while using a widened spandrel to conceal the floor level change. A new garage door and windows would be installed at 514.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Architect Raymond Rola represented the application.

The Commissioners agreed that the proposal is appropriate.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

201 S. 34TH STREET

Owner: University of Pennsylvania

Applicant: Richard Russell

History: 1890, Cope & Stewardson architects, additions in 1912, 1966, and 1967
individually designated

Project: Demolition of rear ell and additions, construction of three-story rear addition

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the demolition of the rear ell and non-historic rear additions and the construction of a three-story rear addition. The firm of Cope & Stewardson designed the building for the Foulke Long Institute, an orphanage for daughters of fallen firefighters and Civil War soldiers. It was converted in the early twentieth century for use as a science building for the University of Pennsylvania and eventually for use by the Music Department. The applicants propose the demolition of the c. 1960s accretions and the older rear ell and the restoration of the main block of the building. In August 2006, the Historical Commission voted to "approve the application in concept, provided the addition connects to the main block below the projecting eave, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10."

The current proposal for final approval is very similarly to the proposal that the Commission approved in concept. It varies from the directive of the Commission to attach the new construction under the cornice; rather it cuts through the cornice at certain locations and incorporates the cornice as an interior element in others. The design of the north and south facades has also been changed. The architect has followed suggestions to add more

fenestration to the ground floor of the east façade. The application proposes restoration work to the historic building.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. University architect David Hollenberg and architects Anne Beha and Philip Chen represented the application.

Mr. Hollenberg introduced the Commission to the project. He stated that the State Historic Preservation Officer, Air Force, and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation have all approved the project.

Ms. Beha provided a detailed account of the project. She explained that the historic building will be preserved. She reported that the project will combine the music facilities, which are now in four buildings, into one building. She stated that the design of the addition is based on the historic building. The addition will be clad terra cotta and glass. She is seeking a silver LEED certification for the building. She noted that the east exterior of the historic building will be retained in the interior of the addition. She stated that some of the rear eave and brackets will be retained within the addition.

Mr. Wilds opined that Ms. Beha may not have met the conditions of the approval in concept in full, but certainly captured the spirit of the approval. Mr. Hollenberg agreed and stated that the rear corners of the historic building will be able to be read with the addition in place.

Mr. Mattioni asked the applicants how they would prevent bird problems. Ms. Beha explained that she would use a black netting to keep birds from roosting on the historic building.

Ms. Benoliel asked how the Air Force was involved with the project. Mr. Hollenberg explained that the Air Force has jurisdiction owing to an agreement it reached during a Section 106 review of a proposal it was funding to demolish Smith Hall, a nearby building on the campus. He further explained that the university entered into a memorandum of agreement with several parties including the Air Force during the reviews of the demolition of Smith Hall. All parties of the agreement have approved of the current Music Building project. Mr. Wilds asked about the section of the agreement requiring the university to restore the neighboring Morgan Hall. Mr. Hollenberg stated that the Morgan Building would be restored by 2010. Mr. Wilds remarked that the mechanical equipment on Morgan is unattractive and should be removed.

Mr. Baron asked the applicants if they planned to remove any of the decorative brackets at the eaves. Mr. Chen stated that they would not. All would be retained, but some might be concealed.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Commission's approval in concept. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

4806 TRINITY PLACE

Owner: Phyllis Kaniss and Paul Wheeling

Applicant: Phyllis Kaniss and Paul Wheeling

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

Project: Reroof slate mansard with asphalt shingles

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

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

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

Mr. Wilds recalled a Commission review conducted recently during which the Commission approved an asphalt shingle with ridge rolls in copper for a mansard in Germantown. He asked why the solution in that case was not appropriate in this case. Mr. Baron explained that the situation was very different. In the Germantown case, the historic slate roof had already been lost; the applicant was proposing to replace one asphalt shingle with another. In the current case, the historic slate still exists. An approval of an asphalt shingle would result in the loss of the historic material.

Mr. Wheeling described his continuing efforts to maintain his home. He noted that several of his neighbors have already replaced the historic slate and built-in gutters with inappropriate asphalt shingles that do not have the correct rhythm, dimension, or color. Mr. Wheeling stated that he was proposing an appropriate asphalt shingle that would accurately replicate the historic slate. Other neighbors have installed cheap asphalt shingles that look bad. Mr. Wilds asked him if he is proposing a quality asphalt shingle that would replicate the look of the slate and copper ridge rolls that would replicate the historic ridge rolls. Mr. Wheeling stated that he is. Mr. Sherman asked him if he had considered artificial slate. Mr. Wheeling stated that he had, but that it does not have a proven reliability record; it is also very expensive. Mr. Baron suggested that the Commission should require real slate on the front mansard and allow asphalt shingles on the side. Mr. Baron asserted that the Commission should require a hardship application before allowing the removal of the historic slate. Several Commissioners noted that the historic slate has past the end of its useful life and must be replaced; preserving the historic slate is not an option. The real question is whether to install new slate or asphalt. They rejected the notion of requiring a hardship application for the removal of slate that had outlived its useful life.

Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Wheeling if he has samples of the proposed roofing materials to show to the Commission. Mr. Wheeling stated he that he showed the samples to the Committee, but did not bring them with him for today's review.

Mr. Wilds suggested that the Commission table the application for one month to allow the applicant to provide a sample of the proposed shingle for the Commission's review. Ms. Leonard suggested that the staff determine whether the Commission has reviewed roofing applications for the other properties on the block.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to table the application until the May 2008 Commission meeting. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

106-108 AND 110 GRAPE STREET

Owner: Maximum Properties

Applicant: A. Robert Torres

History: Within the Main Street Manayunk National Historic District; 106-110 Grape Street are contributing, 108 Grape Street is listed an intrusion.

Project: In-Concept – demolish two buildings and construct a four-story building

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Manayunk Ordinance, Section PM-704.2 of the Philadelphia Code.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish two buildings within the Manayunk Historic District. The structure at 106-108 Grape Street is an early twentieth-century one-story brick garage with gabled parapet. It is listed as an intrusion in the National Register Historic District. The building at 110 Grape Street is a three-story row house, constructed in the 1830s, and listed as contributing within the district. The house retains its cornice and storefront moldings at the first story, chimney, and original window frames and sills. The Manayunk ordinance requires the preservation of contributing buildings.

This application proposes to construct a four-story building. The building would be constructed of brick with a center two-story bay and 2-over-2 windows. The first-story would have commercial storefronts. Although the design of the new building is contemporary, the scale is not compatible with contributing buildings in the historic district. The contributing buildings in this area are mainly three-story row houses with brick and stucco facades. The overall massing is out of character in the district.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Attorney Carl Primavera and architect Jaime Rosalee represented the application.

MOTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Manayunk Ordinance, Section PM-704.2 of the Philadelphia Code. Ms. Spina seconded the motion.

Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Primavera to present the legal justification for the demolition a contributing resource in the Manayunk District. Mr. Primavera replied that he believes that the Commission has the discretion and jurisdiction to review and approve the demolition. He asserted that the Commission has reviewed demolition applications for Manayunk on a case-by-case basis in the past. Mr. Reuter quoted from the Manayunk Ordinance, highlighting the wording related to the retention of historic fabric. He stated that the Law Department believes that the Historical Commission has the discretion to determine whether a demolition request is acceptable or not. Mr. Wilds asserted that, although the Commission has jurisdiction, the review standards are not the same as they are in other historic districts. Mr. Reuter stated that the Commission must be guided by the Manayunk Ordinance, but that it has significant discretion in these cases. Mr. Farnham noted that the Manayunk Ordinance does not address demolition directly, but it does require the retention of historic features and fabric. Mr. Sherman asserted that the buildings in question may not retain much historic fabric. Mr. Primavera noted that appeals of Commission decisions for Manayunk properties are heard by the Board of Building Standards. Mr. Reuter corrected him and stated that the appeals are heard by the Board of License & Inspection Review. Mr. Primavera again insisted that the Commission has the discretion to review Manayunk demolition application and opined that the Commission should be guided by the rule of reason rather than the Secretary of the Interior's Standards in such cases.

Mr. Baron explained the National and Philadelphia Register classifications for properties in districts. The National Register inventory classified properties in Manayunk as significant, contributing, linking, and intrusive. The Philadelphia Register inventories use the terms significant, contributing, and non-contributing. He stated that the rowhouse is contributing to the district and is very typical of the district. Mr. Reuter stated that the Commission is charged with preserving the character of the Manayunk district. Mr. Baron stated that the rowhouse contributes to the character of the district.

Mr. Sherman opined that the proposal is not compatible with the scale of the historic streetscape. Mr. Primavera stated that reuse would be complicated.

Mr. Rosalee described the proposed building. The façade material would be brick like buildings in the district. It would be four stories like buildings in the district. It would have bays, two-over-two windows, and a cornice like buildings in the district. He stated that the bays would refer to the garage bays. He stated that the building would house retail space on the first floor and offices above. He stated that the existing building can not be rehabilitated for the proposed program because it is too small for any practical use. He stated that he cannot rebuild on the garage lot because it is too small; he must demolish the house. Neither lot is usable on its own. He noted a structural engineering report that described the condition of the house as deteriorated.

Mr. Wilds suggested that the design could be improved by reducing it by one floor and changing the cladding material from brick to stucco. Mr. Sherman agreed. Mr. Primavera replied that his client would consider a different cladding material, but could not reduce the building by one story. Mr. Primavera stated that there are numerous juxtapositions of short and tall buildings in the area. He also noted that the architect has already reduced the height of the building. Mr. Amburn noted that the Commission had approved a four-story building in Manayunk last month, but under different circumstances. The building was proposed for a different context and did not require any demolition. Ms. Spina asked about the floor-to-floor heights. The architect replied that the floor-to-floor heights would be 12' at the first floor and 10' above. The building would be 55' tall.

Mr. Baron asserted that the Commission had never approved the demolition of a contributing building in Manayunk for the construction of a new building. He noted that the Commission has approved new buildings for vacant lots in Manayunk, but never demolition of a contributing building.

Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Primavera if he had considered submitting a hardship application to justify the demolition. Mr. Primavera claimed that both the financial hardship of retaining the contributing building and its poor condition justified the demolition. Mr. Reuter stated that the Commission could consider a hardship application even though the site was designated under the Manayunk Ordinance. He stated that a refusal to consider a hardship application would call into question the constitutionality of the ordinance.

Mr. Dilworth opined that the rowhouse has a non-historic garage inserted at the ground floor and the second and third floors do not contribute much to the district, while the proposed building reestablished the historical intent of the nineteenth-century streetscape and use. Several Commissioners disagreed. Mr. Dilworth asserted that the new building may, in fact, contribute better to the district than the historic building. Others again disagreed.

Mr. Sherman asked about the current use of the house. Mr. Rosalee stated that it is used for storage by the Manayunk Development Corporation.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance disagreed with Mr. Reuter and claimed that the Commission does not have the authority to consider a hardship application under the Manayunk ordinance. Mr. Gallery asserted that the proposed building would not be compatible with the district. He stated the Manayunk Ordinance is poorly written and confusing for applicants. He suggested that the Commission redesignate Manayunk under the City's historic preservation ordinance. He offered the resources of the Preservation Alliance to aid the Commission with the redesignation.

Mr. Wilds suggested that the Commission deny the proposal as submitted, but approve in concept the garage and encourage the applicant to devise a proposal that retains the contributing three-story building and erects a new building on the garage lot.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION: Mr. Wilds and Ms. Spina withdrew their motion to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Manayunk Ordinance, Section PM-704.2 of the Philadelphia Code.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to deny the application, pursuant to Manayunk Ordinance, Section PM-704.2 of the Philadelphia Code, but to approve in concept the demolition of the non-contributing, three-bay garage at 106-108 Grape Street. Ms. Spina seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 3. Commissioners Dilworth, Mattioni, and Amburn dissented.

1836 GREEN STREET

Owner: 1836 Green LLC

Applicant: Michael Loonstyn

History: c. 1859, mansard added c. 1880, refaced with brownstone c. 1887

Contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/ 2000

Project: Rehabilitate the façade, demolish rear bay, construct four-story addition.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of façade rehabilitation, except for sill restoration and façade patching, and approval of demolition of the rear bay, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9; approval of the installation of synthetic slate on the rear mansard, pursuant to Standard 9; denial of a rear addition, pursuant to Standard 9, denial of stucco installation on the rear façade, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9; denial of synthetic slate installation on front mansard façade pursuant to Standard 2.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes several restorations and alterations to this property. On the front façade, the applicant proposes to install a four-panel wood door, single-pane transom over the front door, 1-over-1 wood windows on the first, second, and the third stories, and 2-over-2 true-divided-light wood windows at the fourth story. Repairs to the brownstone façade and wood cornice are also proposed. This application proposes to replace existing slate on the mansard with synthetic slate. On the rear, the applicant proposes to demolish a bay and construct an addition. The rear bay and shed have been greatly altered. An engineer's report recommends the rear shed be demolished. The new addition would incorporate a paneled-bay design in a tiered plan with decks on the second, third and fourth levels. The entire rear façade would be stuccoed. The fourth-story addition would destroy the cornice line. The staff suggests a three-story addition.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Mattioni recused because his law firm represents the applicant. Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Developer Michael Loonstyn and architect Carolina Peña represented the application.

Ms. Peña explained that she had revised the proposal for the front mansard. She is now proposing to retain the slate on the front slope.

Mr. Wilds asked if the rear of the building is visible to the public. Ms. Peña and Mr. Loonstyn explained that it is minimally visible from 19th Street. Mr. Loonstyn explained his proposal for the rear addition. Ms. Spina asked about the shared fire escape at the rear. Ms. Peña replied that it provides egress from the two adjacent buildings into the rear yard.

Mr. Wilds asked why the staff had recommended against a complete restoration of the front window, where the oriel window had been added and then later removed. He suggested that the staff could and should recommend approval of the work as a restoration. He stated that the partial restoration around the window would appear incomplete. Mr. Baron stated that the evidence of the oriel window, which was added about 1890 and removed before designation, should be preserved. Mr. Loonstyn displayed photographs of the patching done when the oriel window was removed. He stated that the patching was very poorly done with stucco and plywood. He contended that it would be unreasonable to require him to retain this poorly executed patching as evidence of a non-original state of the building. He explained to the Commission that he would like to restore the façade to its original condition. Mr. Wilds agreed.

Mr. Wilds asked why the Architectural Committee had recommend denial of the rear addition. Ms. Sell replied that the Committee recommended denial of the addition because it would destroy the rear cornice and also because of the large, blank stucco facades.

Ms. Spina asked about the plans for the front door. Mr. Baron stated that the staff could review the door details to ensure that the door will be appropriate. Mr. Loonstyn remarked that he would work with the staff to develop an appropriate design for a double-leaf front door.

Justino Navarro of the Spring Garden Community Development Corporation stated that his organization is opposed to any rear addition above the first-floor level. He stated that a taller addition would block the light and air of the neighboring building, which his organization is redeveloping. Ms. Peña explained that the building referred to by Mr. Navarro would not abut the added rear ell, but would be across the six-foot rear yard from the addition. Mr. Dilworth noted that the rears of the buildings face south; the addition would not block any of the sun falling on Mr. Navarro's building. Several Commission members remarked that the light and air is a zoning issue, not a preservation issue. Mr. Loonstyn reported that he would be seeking variances from the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Ms. Evans noted that the balcony at the fourth floor would require a variance.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the façade restoration including the restoration of the sill where the oriel window once was; the demolition of the rear bay and the construction of the revised rear addition as presented today; the installation of synthetic slate on the rear mansard; a double-leaf front door; and brownstone cleaning and patching; with the staff to review details. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

117 N. 15TH STREET

Owner: Jeff Reinhold

Applicant: Rachel S. Schade, AIA

History: 1928, Louis E. Jallade, architect; individually designated 8/6/81

Project: Install new storefront with canopy

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the canopy and the bollards, but approval of the sidewalk lights, concrete sidewalk, and gates, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install an internally-illuminated canopy, storefront doors and glazing wrought iron gates, light columns, bollards and a concrete sidewalk along 15th Street. The canopy would be cantilevered from steel installed at the plane of the recessed storefront windows and would be stabilized by cable supports attached to the limestone. The canopy would be held three inches away from the façade but would obstruct views of the decorative stone work. The storefront would be shifted back six inches and replaced by a black anodized aluminum storefront with the two doors and sidelights. The two wrought iron gates would be placed at the north and south of the building.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Commission. Property owner Jeff Reinhold and architect Rachel Schade represented the application.

Mr. Reinhold informed the Commission that he had spent \$2 million dollars on the restoration of the building. He noted the restoration of the terra cotta and limestone in particular. He is planning a 120-unit apartment complex. He is proposing an illuminated canopy at the front entrance on 15th Street for both signage and weather protection.

Ms. Schade stated that the building did not have a canopy historically. It has had an unsympathetic awning. She contended that the proposed canopy would be sympathetic to the historic building. She stated that it would be fabricated from glass and stainless steel and would include signage. In response to the Architectural Committee's concerns, she has reduced the number of proposed light standards and bollards. Mr. Wilds asked about the reason for the bollards, Ms. Schade stated that the bollards are intended to deter automobile parking on the sidewalk and to promote safety.

Ms. Schade advised the Commission that the canopy would be held 3" away from the building. It would cantilever off the new storefront doors, but not touch the historic building. Ms. Schade noted that the building is 20 stories tall and needs identification as a residential property. She explained that the canopy would be 12' above the sidewalk and would project 6' out from the building, as was allowed by a 1997 permit for an earlier canopy. Ms. Merriman opined that the canopy should be no wider than the frieze that surrounds the doorway. She also opined that the canopy should not be so historic looking, but should clearly be seen as a later addition. Mr. Wilds recalled the Commission's review of the canopy proposed for the Ayer Building on Washington Square. He recalled that the Commission concluded that no canopy was appropriate. He suggested that this canopy be redesigned to be smaller and less historic looking. He claimed that the canopy would look too much like it was original. He suggested limiting the width of the canopy to the width of the doorway. He also states that it should not be allowed to block views of the artistic frieze. Mr. Reinhold stated that a narrowed canopy would not be aesthetically pleasing; canopies on these types of buildings are always wider than the doorways. He stated that views of the ornamental stone work would be minimally obstructed. He stated that this canopy would provide a gateway to the city because it would stand near the exit from I-676. He also asserted that the canopy should be in the style of the building. Mr. Baron

suggested that the canopy could be stabilized by running cables up to the second floor of the façade, above the frieze. The applicants and Commissioners all objected to this proposal. Mr. Thomas approved of the size of the canopy, but not its design.

Mr. Dilworth noted that the Commission had refused to approve signage on or near the Yellin gate on the Packard Building. He asked whether the artistic frieze on this building is equal artistically to the Yellin gate. Several suggested that the frieze's importance does not rival the Yellin gate. Mr. Reinhold again claimed that the canopy would minimally block views of the frieze.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance supported the project. He stated that this building is surrounded by mediocre architecture. He asserted that the context should be taken into account. He contended that this building's contribution is made at the skyline, not at the sidewalk. He also noted that the front façade of this building is very flat and could use some articulation. He opined that the frieze is not as importantly artistically as the works on the Ayer and Packard buildings. He claimed that this canopy is an interpretation of Art Deco, but is not a copy; it will not be mistaken as an original canopy. He concluded that it would be in character with the building. He urged approval.

Ms. Merriman suggested that the number of bollards be reduced.

FAILED MOTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee deny the canopy and the bollards, but approve the sidewalk lights, concrete sidewalk, and gates, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Ms. Spina seconded the motion, which failed by a vote of 2 to 8. Commissioners Amburn, Benoliel, Dilworth, Evans, Leonard, Mattioni, Sherman, Thomas, and Wilds dissented.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to approve the application, provided the number of bollards is reduced to the minimum necessary to keep vehicles off the sidewalk, with the staff to review details. Ms. Evans seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 2. Commissioners Merriman and Spina dissented.

256 S. 3RD STREET

Owner: Gail Newman

Applicant: Richard M. Cole

History: c. 1960; contributing to the Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Construct rear addition, cut new first-floor front window, replace roofing and mansard windows

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the first-floor front window cut, but approval of the addition, rectangular window, patio, glazed door, mansard windows, and metal roofing, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a one-story addition at the rear of the property. The addition would be brick. A brick garden wall is also proposed to enclose a patio off the addition. This application also proposes to replace the existing sloping windows in the mansard with new vertical windows to match, and replace the standing seam metal to match the existing metal on the mansard. Lastly, a new window is proposed to be cut into the front façade at the first floor.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Commission. Property owner and architect Richard Cole and his wife Joan represented the application.

MOTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the first-floor front window cut, but approve the addition, rectangular window, patio, glazed door, mansard windows, and metal roofing, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion.

Ms. Cote informed the Commission that the Society Hill Civic Association provided a letter of support for the project.

Mr. Cole described his property, which has four parking places. He would like to build an addition on the extant terrace and build a new terrace on two of the four parking spaces. He would also like to cut a new window in the first-floor front façade for light and circulation. Mr. Wilds commented that cutting into the façade would significantly change the building, which is part of a group of identical buildings. Mr. Thomas acknowledged the light and air problem, but objected to the major change to one of a group of four identical buildings. Several Commission members suggested replacing the solid front door with a glazed door for added light. Mr. Cole replied that a door with glazing is less appealing. He suggested another solution, a side window in the arched driveway that would provide light and air without altering the front façade. He noted that this plan was also supported by the Society Hill Civic Association. Ms. Evans stated that the side window would require a variance from the Board of Building Standards. Mr. Dilworth stated that the Commission should be clear that the glazed door would not set a precedent, but was a unique response to this unusual circumstance. Mr. Thomas noted that both the Athenaeum and the Historical Society have solid historic doors, but have added non-historic glass doors to increase visibility and openness. He opined that the window in the driveway does not negatively affect the streetscape.

AMENDMENT OF MOTION: Ms. Merriman and Mr. Wilds amended their motion to deny the first-floor front window cut, but approve the remainder of application as well as a new window cut in the side wall within the archway and a glazed front door, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ACTION: The Commission voted unanimously to adopt the amended motion proffered by Ms. Merriman and Mr. Wilds to deny the first-floor front window cut, but approve the remainder of application as well as a new window cut in the side wall within the archway and a glazed front door, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OLD BUSINESS

1636 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: George Bochetto Esq.

Applicant: Carl Primavera, Esq.

History: c 1870; contributing to Rittenhouse Fittler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Add penthouse and deck on mansard

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This project proposes constructing a penthouse with stair and bar as well as a deck on top of the mansard roof of this townhouse. The Committee and Commission have reviewed earlier iterations of this proposal several times and always denied and recommended denial of them. The current application is a revised version of earlier proposals. The penthouse and deck will be visible from several streets. A very visible deck and penthouse on a mansard does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The Architectural Committee reviewed this proposal in February 2008; the review before the Commission was continued from March to April 2008.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Carl Primavera and architect Robert D'Alonzo represented the application.

Mr. Primavera summarized the application. He stated that the design had been revised to comply with the suggestions offered during the earlier reviews.

Mr. D'Alonzo stated that the addition would not be visible from Spruce Street and would be minimally visible from 17th Street. He claimed that pedestrians would, for the most part, not see the addition as they passed by. Ms. Spina disagreed. She stated that this would be a fourth-floor addition, not merely a means to access the roof deck. Mr. Primavera contended that his architect had followed the suggestions proffered by Robert Thomas and Daniel McCoubrey of the Architectural Committee. Mr. Baron strongly disagreed with the applicants' claim that the addition would not be conspicuous. He asserted that it would be highly visible from the public right-of-way. He noted that the church across 17th Street from the building is set back from the street, giving a direct view from Spruce. He stated that it would also be visible from 17th and Delancey Streets. He reminded the Commission that it has even denied decks without stair houses on mansards. He stated that the mansard is a character-defining feature and should not be inappropriately altered. Mr. Wilds agreed that the addition would be visible from three sides. Mr. Primavera asserted that the Commission's rules are "Draconian." Mr. Wilds countered that they are clear. Mr. Primavera stated the addition would be clad in glass. Ms. Spina observed that glass does not automatically disappear; it is usually reflective. Mr. Thomas suggested that it is possible to design a stair house with a landing and bathroom along the party wall that would have minimal visibility and therefore be acceptable. He stated, however, that this proposal does not meet that requirement. He concluded that this proposal is not appropriate because it does not meet the Standards. Mr. Primavera countered that the latest design "had come a long way baby!"

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated the deck and stair house would be extremely visible from the street. He contended that the Commission's policy is clear on additions to mansards. He stated that the glass stair house would be more, not less prominent. He claimed that it would not blend into the background. He urged the Commission to deny the application.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Ms. Spina seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

720 S. FRONT STREET

Owner/ Applicant: Jon Langmead

History: c. 1765; designated 8/30/1967

Project: Construct rear third-floor addition with roof deck

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as submitted, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear third-floor addition with roof deck on this significant eighteenth-century dwelling. The property currently has an access door at the rear of the half gambrel leading onto a deck on the roof of the two-story rear ell; the proposed addition would occupy this space. The addition would be clad in cement board. The cladding would extend up to create parapet walls for a roof deck. The deck would be accessed through an interior spiral stair housed within the new addition. The rear of the property is not visible from any public-right-of-way. However, the proposed roof deck would extend beyond the peak of the half gambrel and would be visible from Front Street. This protruding parapet would alter the massing and spatial relationship of the front façade. The Architectural Committee reviewed this proposal in February 2008; the review before the Commission was continued from March to April 2008.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner John Langmead represented the application.

Mr. Langmead agreed to revise the railing design, making the railing more transparent. He explained that a four-story building stands to the north. He claimed that trees block the view of the home. He asserted that the deck railing would only be able to be seen from the dog park across Front Street, toward I-95. Mr. Wilds suggested a metal railing, which would be more transparent than the proposed wood railing.

ACTION: Mr. Dilworth moved to approve the application, provided the deck has a simple open metal railing at the peak of the roof, with the staff to review details. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1634 PINE STREET, 1637 WAVERLY STREET

Owner: William O'Hara

Applicant: Timothy Kerner

History: non-contributing to Rittenhouse Fittler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Demolish existing garage, construct three-story house

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish an existing garage standing at the rear of 1634 Pine Street, facing Waverly Street. It proposes to construct a three-story house in place of the garage. The garage is classified as non-contributing to the historic district. The new structure would have a brick façade with cast stone window sills and cornice. A garage is

proposed for the first floor. The new garage door would be wood and recessed behind an arched covered entryway. The Architectural Committee reviewed this proposal in February 2008; the review before the Commission was continued from March to April 2008.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Tim Kerner represented the application.

Mr. Kerner stated that a three-story building stood on the site during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. A non-historic, non-contributing garage now stands on the site. Mr. Kerner is proposing a three-story building with garage. Mr. Kerner explained that he has had to revise the design to accommodate a rear accessway that is shared with the property to the east. He described the revised design. Mr. Wilds complimented the design, which solved a complicated problem in an elegant way. Mr. Sherman asked if the neighbor had insisted on the maintenance of the rear accessway. Mr. Kerner acknowledged that the neighbor had insisted, necessitating the revised design.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the revised application as presented at the Commission meeting of 11 April 2008, with the staff to review details. Ms. Evans seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

38-44 N. FRONT STREET

Owner: 38 N. Front Street Associates

Applicant: Rustin Ohler

History: c. 1830; individually designated 1/6/1977; significant in Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Construct roof decks and stair house

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of Decks 1 and 3 and the connecting walkway, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9. Approval of Deck 2 and the stair house, provided a mock-up proves that they are not conspicuous from the public right-of-way.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct three wood roof decks and a stair house. The decks will be interconnected by a series of walkways. Deck 1 would be located on the rear of 42-44 N. Front Street. It would be set back six feet from the rear façade and seven feet from the Cuthbert Street façade. Deck 2 would be located on the rear of 40 N. Front Street. It would be set back five feet from the rear façade. Deck 3 would be located on the main block and pitch of 42-44 N. Front Street. It would be set back 24 feet from the front façade and seven feet from the Cuthbert Street façade. The connecting ramp from Deck 1 to Deck 3 would extend 87 feet and be set back seven feet from the Cuthbert Street façade. The stair house would be set back 24 feet from the Cuthbert Street façade and 31 feet from the rear façade. No information regarding materials or the support structure has been submitted for review. The applicant provided sight-line studies from Cuthbert and Front Streets. However, Decks 1 and 3 and the connecting walkway will be visible from public areas. The Architectural Committee reviewed this proposal in February 2008; the review before the Commission was continued from March to April 2008.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Poe Leggette and architect Rustin Ohler represented the application.

Mr. Ohler stated that a temporary stair house is in place and claimed that it cannot be seen from the street. He also claimed that Deck 3 would not be visible from the street. Ms. Spina asked

how the decks would be supported. She noted that the plans do not include a supporting structure. The decks seem to float in space above the roofs. Mr. Ohler explained that the structure had not yet been designed. He reported that he did not want to pay an engineer to design the structure until he had secured the appropriate approvals. Ms. Spina stated that it was not possible to review the design without the structural details, which will determine the relationship between the roof and decks. Mr. Leggette stated that there are a couple of options for the structural design. He stated that he would commission an engineer to design the structure once he has the requisite approvals in place. Mr. Wilds asked the applicants if the decks would be private. Mr. Leggette stated that they would all be open to all condominium owners.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance claimed that the roofs of these buildings are completely visible from Penn's Landing. He asked the Commission to remember its review of the decks and other rooftop features proposed for the Girard warehouse buildings, which are just south of and very similar to these buildings. He stated that this block of buildings is very prominent; it is the very front of the city.

Mr. Wilds remarked that he thought that Deck 3 would be very visible, but Decks 1 and 2 would be inconspicuous. Mr. Gallery stated that Cuthbert Street is very significant historically. He suggested that Deck 1 would be visible from the street. Mr. Ohler conceded that part of Deck 1 would be visible. Mr. Wilds suggested that the applicants erect a true mock-up to allow the Commission to assess the visibility. Mr. Leggette asked for precise directions from the Commission. Ms. Sell stated that a mock-up would not be accurate until the height of the structure was determined. Mr. Gallery suggested moving the door to the south side of the stair house and reducing the size of Deck 1 to make it inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. Mr. Wilds suggested deleting Deck 3 and the walkway, approving Deck 2 as proposed, and reducing the size of Deck 1 to avoid visibility. He also suggested metal railings instead of wood.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve Decks 1 and 2 and the stairhouse, provided they are reduced in size to be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, but deny Deck 3 and the walkway to it, with the staff to review details. Ms. Evans seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 1:21 p.m., Mr. Sherman moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Evans seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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