

**THE MINUTES OF THE 623RD STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 11 JULY 2014
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman Jr., chair
Ralph DiPietro, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Anuj Gupta, Esq.
Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP
JoAnn Jones, Esq., Office of Housing & Community Development
John Mattioni, Esq.
Thomas McDade, Depart of Public Property
Sara Merriman, vice chair, Commerce Department
R. David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Robert Thomas, AIA
Betty Turner, M.A.

Jonathan E. Farnham, Executive Director
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Broadbent, Historic Preservation Planner I
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

Jessica Baumert, The Woodlands
Claire Donato, MBTA
Rich Thom, Richard Thom, AIA
Matt McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Kurt Blorstad, Baywood Hotels
Brett Webber, SPG3
Richard Gelber, SPG3
Harry K. Schwartz, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Patrick Campbell
David Whipple, Assimilation Design Lab
Jim Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Co.
Frank Gould
Vesna Hess
Tuval Shlomo
Ryan Shaw, Plan Philly
Inga Saffron, Inquirer

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman, the chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners DiPietro, Gupta, Hawkins, Jones, Mattioni, McDade, Merriman, Schaaf, Thomas, and Turner joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 622ND STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the minutes of the 622nd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 13 June 2014. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 JUNE 2014

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included applications for the following addresses: 208, 210, and 212 Vine Street and 207, 209, and 211 New Street; 1916 Delancey Place; and 3900 Woodland Avenue. Mr. Sherman asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments. Mr. Sherman asked if the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one asked any questions.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 208, 210, and 212 Vine Street and 207, 209, and 211 New Street; 1916 Delancey Place; and 3900 Woodland Avenue. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 228-38 N 13TH ST

Project: Construct nine-story addition on building

Review Requested: In Concept

Owner: Foundation for BBBSA

Applicant: Matthew McClure, Ballard Spahr, LLP

History: 1946; Warner Brothers Film Distribution Center; William Harold Lee, architect

Individual Designation: 5/9/2008

District Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes in concept to construct an addition on the two-story building at 228-38 N. 13th Street, which would be converted from offices to a hotel. The building is bounded by 13th Street at the east, Florist Street at the south, Clarion Street at the west, and a private alley at the north. It has a flat roof with small penthouse at the northwest corner. The east and south facades as well as a return on the north façade are finely finished. The west and north facades are utilitarian. There is an open loading dock and parking area at the rear or west.

The Art Moderne building was constructed in 1946 as the Warner Brothers Film Exchange Building and served as a warehouse and distribution center for copies of movie reels until the

1950s, when the movie studio system collapsed. After the collapse, the building was occupied by an insurance company, film production company, and non-profit organization. The Historical Commission individually designated the property in 2008 for its architectural and historical significance. The interior is not designated and not under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction.

The in-concept application proposes to restore the character-defining street facades and add signage and a canopy. The application originally proposed a nine-story addition for the hotel, but, based on the comments of several Architectural Committee members, who suggested replacing the stout nine-story addition with a taller, more slender, more vertically-oriented addition set farther back on the building, the application now proposes a 12-story addition.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. Attorney Matt McClure, hotel developer Kurt Blorstad, and architects Bret Webber and Richard Gelber represented the application.

Mr. Farnham stated that he had distributed to the Commissioners revised application materials as well as copies of two letters each from the Preservation Alliance and Howard Haas regarding the application.

Mr. McClure introduced himself and Baywood Hotels, his client. He stated that he can now announce the flag for the hotel; it will be a Marriott AC, the European flag for Marriott. It will be the first in Philadelphia and one of the first in the United States. He claimed that securing this hotel is significant for Philadelphia.

Mr. McClure explained that the building in question is 67 years old, is two stories, and contains 15,000 square feet of space. Built for Warner Brothers, the building was used by the film studio for only nine years. The building was used for warehousing and distributing films. After its short time as a warehouse for films, it was converted to Class C office space for various businesses. A non-profit was its longest occupant, for about 30 years. Mr. McClure described the location of the building and then pointed out the many surface parking lots surrounding the site, which he contended demonstrate that the area is in need of economic development. He noted that, with the expanded convention center one block south, the best chance to redevelop this site is as a hotel. Mr. McClure contended that few buildings can appropriately serve as a podium for an addition, but this one does. He noted that the staff and some members of the Architectural Committee agreed. He stated that, given its location, configuration, and relative historic significance, a large addition can be appropriate. He noted that the ordinance, at Section 14-1005(6)(e)(.2), authorizes the Commission to take relative historic significance into account when reviewing alteration applications. He suggested that this building may have significance, but it does not have great significance. Mr. McClure reported that his team presented the design to the Architectural Committee and received good constructive criticism. He stated that his team "went back to the drawing board" to revise the design based on the Committee members' criticism. He summarized that the Committee members suggested that the addition should be pulled farther back from the 13th and Florist Street facades of the historic building. He noted that Committee members Stein, McCoubrey, and D'Alessandro all suggested making the addition taller and more slender. He stated that they received similar advice from the Preservation Alliance, which suggested a taller, narrower addition than the one they originally proposed. He reported that his team has been meeting with the Alliance for about one month. He stated that they redesigned the addition in response to the various comments including those of the Alliance. He remarked that he received a letter last night from the Alliance, after about one

month of meeting, in which the Alliance now claims that proposal must be reviewed as a demolition. He highlighted the fact that the Alliance's earlier letter and comments indicated that the addition should be revised to be taller and narrower, but the Alliance never suggested the project would constitute a demolition in the legal sense until it issued the letter yesterday. Mr. McClure stated that he would like to have the architect present the revised plans for the hotel and then he would like to discuss the nomination and the question of demolition. He observed that the staff has not qualified this project as a demolition. He added that this building will be redeveloped as a LEED Gold building and will take advantage of FAR bonuses.

Mr. Webber, the architect, stated that his client has experience with both new construction and adaptive reuse. He stated that AC Hotels is a distinct, new brand. It was founded in Spain and has hotels in Spain, Portugal, France, and Italy. The company presents a high-end, urban, modern sensibility. He stated that the hotel company sought out this building because of its Modern appearance; the "architecture is symbiotic with the brand." He stated that he appreciates the building's play of horizontal and vertical as well as its asymmetry. He pointed out the windows and the metal work on the building. Mr. Webber stated that they would restore the 13th Street façade, the return on the north façade, and the south or Florist Street façade. He noted that they would remove the exterior storm windows. Mr. Webber explained that those elevations are primary facades with character-defining features. The remainder of the north facade and the west façade are secondary facades. He displayed photographs of the building. He stated that they would repair, clean, and repoint the primary facades. The existing sign would be replaced with a new sign for the hotel in the same materials and style. A clear, glazed canopy would be inserted within the existing door opening. He showed photographs of the existing site and noted the alley at the north and parking and loading at the west. Mr. Webber then displayed interior plans and explained that the first two floors will be used primarily as public spaces including a reception area, lounge and breakfast room. The second floor will include meeting rooms and a fitness center. A pool would be constructed above the new loading and trash addition at the north. The revised plan would have 12 guest rooms per floor. The initial plan called for 15 rooms per floor. The mechanical equipment would be located at the roof and would be enclosed. The roof would be a green roof. He stated that the revised design is intended to respond to the comments of the Architectural Committee members who supported the project. He stated that they moved the addition back away from the primary east and south facades and also revised the cladding material for the addition to give it more commonality with the historic building. He stated that they retained the double-loaded corridor, but accentuated the verticality of the northern half of the addition, which relates to the verticality of the northern end of the primary façade, and the horizontality of the southern half of the addition, which relates to the southern end of the primary façade as well as the curve onto Florist Street. The materials are now cement composite panels and terra cotta profiles. The windows will have clear glazing and powder-coated aluminum frames. Mr. Webber displayed plan and elevation drawings showing the outline of the originally proposed building against the currently proposed building, demonstrating the revisions undertaken to comply with the suggestions of the Architectural Committee members. He stated that the larger expanses of glazing on the southern end of the addition were intended to lighten that part of the building, in reaction to the curved corner of the historic building. He pointed out the relationship between the dark brick, "bookend" section of the original building and the northern section of the addition. He showed an image of the west façade and discussed the loading and parking. Mr. Webber stated that the application package fully documents the proposed restoration and renovation of the historic section of the building. He concluded that the revised design of the addition is both differentiated from and compatible with the historic building.

Mr. McClure distributed copies of the nomination for the property to the Commission members. He displayed photographs of all facades of the building. He stated that he would address the letter commenting on the project issued by the Preservation Alliance yesterday afternoon. He noted that Richard Thom originally submitted the nomination for the property; after Mr. Thom withdrew it, the Alliance resubmitted it. Mr. McClure acknowledged that the Commission did designate the property, but did so by “acquiescence,” despite some questions by the chair of the Committee on Historic Designation regarding whether the building had any real significance. He noted that the Alliance is now suggesting that this project entails a demolition in the legal sense. He stated that differentiations between alteration and demolition must be made on a case-by-case basis and are highly dependent on the particular building in question. He asserted that the Commission’s determinations of the significant and insignificant elements of this building must be guided by the adopted nomination, which defines how and why this building has the significance to merit designation. Mr. McClure read the definition of demolition in the historic preservation ordinance and observed that anything that is not a demolition is inherently considered an alteration under the ordinance. When determining whether a proposal constitutes a demolition, the Commission has considered whether the project would entail the removal or damaging any character-defining features. He noted that a project at the Divine Lorraine serves as a valuable precedent. He noted that the Commission approved the demolition of the six-story back building at the Divine Lorraine as an alteration because it determined that the subsidiary building did not constitute a character-defining feature of the property. He noted that the Commission did not require the submission of a nomination to consider a designation during the first decades of its existence, but has required nominations more recently. He reported that the Commission adopted a nomination when it designated this property. That nomination defines those aspects of the building that the Commission considered character-defining when it designated the property. He stated that the nomination is the “blueprint” for the Commission’s regulation of the property. The nomination, which the Commission adopted, explains how and why the Commission considers the building to be important. Mr. McClure referred the Commissioners to the copies of the nomination for the property, which he distributed earlier. He explained that the section marked with the blue tab is the Description, which identifies the character-defining features of the building. The red tab marks the corresponding photographs. He contended that the nomination clearly indicates that the character-defining features of the building are the 13th Street façade, the Florist Street façade, and the return from 13th Street on the north façade. Mr. McClure stated that his design team used the nomination as a guide as they designed the project to ensure that they protected and preserved the character-defining features. The yellow tab marks the section of the nomination regarding the secondary facades. He stated that the rear façade is a plain, utilitarian façade that does not have the cornice or fenestration of the primary facades. It is a typical mid twentieth-century, light-industrial façade that has no significance. The north façade likewise has no character-defining features. It is not in the Art Moderne style. It is a generic warehouse façade that does not reflect the significance of the building as stated in the nomination. The nomination barely notes the west façade, calling it a loading area, and does not even include a photograph of the north façade. The entire nomination is devoted to the primary facades. The nomination explains exactly how the Commission designated the property, what it considered significant and not significant. The ordinance defines demolition as the raising of a building in whole or significant part. The removal of insignificant parts must be considered an alteration, not a demolition. Mr. McClure noted that the Preservation Alliance’s first letter on the project, dated 23 June 2014, agreed with this assessment when it stated that “the application correctly identifies the building’s main character-defining features.” Mr. McClure concluded that the Commission should consider this project an alteration, not a demolition, should consider the relative significance of this building,

and should approve this project, which is good for both the building and the city. He stated that he looks forward to the Commission's comments on this in-concept application.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the applicant has implemented several of the recommendations for revisions offered by the Architectural Committee. She observed that several of her colleagues on the Architectural Committee supported the notion of a large addition on the building, but contended that she was opposed to placement of a large structure on this two-story building. She referred to Standard 9 and asserted that the addition must be compatible in massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the integrity of the historic building. She also noted the Roofs Guideline suggest that additions should be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and should not damage character-defining features. She opined that the Commission should determine whether the proposal complies generally with Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline before it considers the details of the design. Ms. Hawkins reminded the Commission of the recent approval of a very large tower on the Lit Brothers building. She stated that that design complied with the standards because, although conspicuous, the Lit building is comprised of several different buildings joined together and, when seen from the front, the tower will look like it is behind and not on the Market Street section of the building. In this case, the addition will look like it is on and not behind the historic building. Ms. Hawkins acknowledged that this property is located in an "economically challenged" area and observed that it probably will require an addition for a financially-feasible reuse. She observed that the revised design includes more rooms than the initial design.

Mr. Sherman asked the applicants to explain how the addition would be constructed. He asked them to detail how the new structure would be inserted into the existing building. Mr. Webber stated that the structure of the addition would extend through the northwest part of the building to the basement. The character-defining facades and the structure supporting them would be retained. New floors would be inserted in the building because the awkward, multiple floor levels within the building cannot be retained. The addition would be new construction within the footprint of the building. Mr. Webber displayed several drawings and photographs showing where the new construction would be inserted within the existing building. He stressed that all of the character-defining features of the historic building would be retained. Mr. Schaaf asked about the size of the addition. Mr. Webber stated that it has a 6,000 sf floorplate with a 60-foot-wide bay. The addition is 12 stories tall. Mr. Schaaf asked about the setback. Mr. Webber replied that the addition is set back 20 feet from the front façade and is about 110 feet deep. Mr. McClure added that very few historic buildings can successfully serve as a podium for a large addition, but this is one that can. He noted that the Lits tower approval, which was mentioned earlier, is another example. He stated that the National Products building project, which the Commission approved in several versions, may be the best example. In that case, the Commission approved the construction of a large residential addition on a building with a two-story Modernist façade. He noted that the current project includes a much large setback than the setback included in the National Products project. Mr. McClure then reminded the Commission that several in the preservation community had recommended using the Modernist Sidney Hillman Medical Center building as a podium for a large residential tower addition when a developer proposed to demolish it a few years ago. He again stated that this building can be successfully used as a podium for a large addition and yet retain its character and significance as a historic building. He noted that the Preservation Alliance had agreed with that assertion until it issued its letter yesterday, reversing opinion. Mr. McClure addressed Ms. Hawkins' question about the addition of rooms with the redesign following the Architectural Committee meeting. He stated that, with the redesign from a short, fatter addition to a taller, more slender addition, the addition became less efficient and less economical. The rooms were added to

make the more slender addition requested by the Architectural Committee financially feasible. Ms. Hawkins stated that she was not implying that the rooms were added out of greed. She also noted that the Preservation Alliance does not speak for the entirety of the preservation community, but only a segment of it. She asked Mr. McClure to avoid conflating the Preservation Alliance with the preservation community.

Ms. Merriman stated that she approves of the revisions made to the design. She contended that the revised design complies with Standard 9. She stated that the increased setback of the addition, the improvement in the cladding materials, and the slenderness of the addition all allow the addition to be differentiated from yet compatible with the historic building. She stated that this proposal offers to bring a beneficial use to this challenged building and neighborhood.

Mr. Thomas stated that he agreed with Ms. Merriman. He stated that the revisions have significantly improved the design. Mr. Thomas stated that this building has very strange proportions for a two-story office building. It has a very large footprint for its height and is therefore conducive to a large addition. He noted that most two-story buildings of this era in Philadelphia, which have much smaller footprints, would not be conducive to large additions. However, this particular building, owing to its unusual configuration, can successfully accept a large addition. Mr. Thomas noted that this area of the city was a “creepy place” because it suffered from massive disinvestment. He observed that the large number of surface parking lots in the area is indicative of the area’s economic situation. He stated that one could pursue a hardship application for the demolition of this building. He noted, however, that the hardship route was not required for this application because the unusual configuration of this building allows for an appropriate, large addition. He noted that, when travelling north up 13th Street, the historic building will retain its character and significance because of the “generous” setback of the addition. He asserted that the historic building and the addition will work together but be visually separate. The addition will appear like it stands on another property to the viewer on 13th Street. He stated that the design and materials choices all work very well together. He stated that the nomination correctly identifies the character-defining features and contended that the secondary facades are not significant and can be altered. He concluded that the design, as modified, does satisfy the Standards. Mr. Sherman concurred that the revised design is “a vast improvement” over the original design. Mr. Mattioni observed that he had reservations about the tower addition to the Lits Brothers building, but opined that he has no such reservations in this case. He stated that the revised design is appropriate for the historic building.

Harry Schwartz, the chair of the Preservation Alliance’s Advocacy Committee, referred to the letter submitted one day earlier by the Alliance. He advocated for denial of the application because he contended that the application proposes demolition and therefore must be reviewed as such. He objected to the applicants’ claim that there is precedent for approvals of projects of this nature. He asserted that the Commission is not bound by precedent because every case is unique and must be judged on its merits. He stated that the project will require the removal of parts of two of the four exterior walls. He remarked that the walls to be removed may or may not be character-defining, but then contended that whether they are character-defining is not the appropriate test to determine whether the proposed work is a demolition or alteration. He contended that removing any two walls of any historic building is inherently a demolition. He stated that this application should be reviewed under the demolition procedures. Mr. Schwartz declared that it is “almost always a bad idea” to place a tower on the roof of a historic building. He claimed that the proposed tower does not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, but acknowledged that the Commission is only required to be guided by the Standards. He urged the Commission not to approve the application in concept.

Richard Thom, an architect, stated that he worked on this building for 15 years including a study of the “challenging” accessibility problems in the building. He stated that the building is in good condition. He stated that this project would constitute a facadectomy. He contended that the designation includes all four walls, the roof, and the grounds. He stated that considerable fabric would be removed from the building, regardless of whether the elements are character-defining or contributing elements. He stated that this will not be the same building when the project is completed. He stated that this application should be reviewed as a hardship application. The review is being rushed. He objected to Mr. McClure’s employment of the National Products building as an example of a project like this one that the Commission has approved. He stated that, in the National Products case, the Modernist façade was applied to older buildings behind it. In this case, the Art Moderne façade is part of the building behind it. He observed that the addition is too large for the building. It will be “incongruous.” He stated that this project does not satisfy Standard 9. He noted that the architects have done “an excellent job” revising the design that was presented to the Architectural Committee, but the concept is inherently flawed. Mr. Webber disagreed with Mr. Thom, contending that the addition is appropriate in this particular case because of the unique configuration and particular style of the designated building. He stated that the addition is in the spirit of Modern architecture. Ms. Hawkins disagreed with Mr. Webber, stating that this building was not designed to be the base of a high-rise building.

Mr. McClure observed that Mr. Thom and the Preservation Alliance object to this project because, they claim, it will result in the loss of significant historic fabric. However, Mr. Thom and the Preservation Alliance authored the nomination, which the Commission adopted, and which defines precisely what is and is not significant about this building. The parts of the building proposed for removal are not identified in the nomination as significant or character-defining and therefore, by definition, cannot be considered razing or destruction in significant part, as the ordinance defines demolition. The nomination governs the regulation of the property. He disagreed with the characterization that they are proposing to demolish two of the four walls. He stated that there is ample precedent for approvals of such applications as alterations. Mr. McClure concluded that the proposed addition satisfies the Standards and should be approved in concept.

Ms. Jones observed that this is an in-concept application. It is not an application for final approval. Therefore, it must be reviewed by the Architectural Committee and Commission for final approval during a subsequent round of reviews before a building permit can be issued. Mr. Sherman confirmed her observation. He noted that, if the Commission grants final approval at a subsequent meeting, then the applicants would be cleared for a building permit without additional Historical Commission reviews, except perhaps the staff’s review of details. Mr. Farnham agreed.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to approve in concept the revised application as presented the Historical Commission at its meeting of 11 July 2014, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 10 to 1. Ms. Hawkins dissented.

ADDRESS: 208, 210, AND 212 VINE ST, 207, 209, AND 211 NEW ST

Project: Construct four-story addition on rear garages; restore facades; construct stair tower

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: John Stortz

Applicant: Eve Parrot, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects

History:

208 Vine, 1780, Contributing; 210 Vine, 1885, Contributing; 212 Vine, 1760, Contributing
207 New, 1940, Non-contributing; 209 and 211 New, 1925, Contributing

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided no masonry openings on the Vine Street buildings are modified except at the stair tower; that the dormers are retained and repaired; and that samples of stucco are removed at the three Vine Street buildings for review, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the renovation of the three buildings facing Vine Street and the construction of a large addition on garage or light industrial buildings at the rear of the site, facing New Street. This application is a revision of an application that was presented to the Architectural Committee in May 2014, but withdrawn before the June 2014 meeting of the Historical Commission.

The Vine Street facades would be restored. The plans indicate two decks on the rear ells of the Vine Street buildings. A new stair tower would be built behind two Vine Street properties in an area that was originally open but later infilled with industrial structures.

The application proposes the construction of a four-story addition on top of the garage-like structures facing New Street, which connect to the rears of the Vine Street structures. The building to the east on New Street is classified as non-contributing in the district inventory, while the building to the west is classified as contributing. In fact, both of these structures are really interconnected appendages of the older buildings on Vine Street. The inventory mistook them for independent structures. The facades of the garage-like structures would be retained. At the building to the east, the roll-down garage door would be replaced by a glazed entry and a new garage entrance would be inserted into its longer, east-facing facade. Above the garages, the addition would be clad in stucco and have punched openings with small-pane industrial windows. The design has been revised since the last review to call out lintels and sills at the windows and more detail for a cornice as well as the transition between the garage and the new structure above. The small windows above the garage have been removed as suggested by the Architectural Committee.

Although the application indicates that the Vine Street facades would be restored, the plans lack details of this work.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 1916 DELANCEY PL

Project: Reconstruct roof, add deck with pilothouse

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mark Naples

Applicant: Hyon Kang, KCA Design Associates, LLC

History: 1925

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that a mock up shows that no portion of the railing or pilot house is visible from Delancey Place, that the rear railing is pulled back from the parapet wall, and that the mechanical equipment is not visible from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the removal of the existing roof structure and installation of a new roof deck with pilot house. The application proposes the reframing of the roof because the existing roof would be unable to support the loads required by code for a deck. The new roof framing would also be lower than the existing roof, making the proposed deck and pilot house less visible from 19th Street. The proposed roof deck railing would be set back five feet from the front façade, and would be constructed of black metal. The proposed pilot house would be clad in stucco, with an asphalt shingle roof.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 2426 PINE ST

Project: Construct rear addition with roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Patrick and Shanley Campbell

Applicant: Patrick Campbell

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application as presented, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This revised application proposes to construct a three-story rear addition with pilot house, balcony and roof deck, and restore the front façade with new windows, entrance door and steps.

The original proposal, reviewed by the Architectural Committee, included a fourth floor penthouse that rose above the rear roofline. The revised proposal in front of you today reflects comments of the Architectural Committee and shows a pilot house in place of a penthouse, and condensing units at the rear of the roof, hidden from public view by parapet walls. The proposed rear addition would involve the removal of an existing one-story rear addition and historic rear wall, but would retain the existing rear cornice and would not change the existing roof. The proposed rear addition would be partially visible from 25th Street, outside the historic district, but not from Pine Street, and would have a stucco exterior. A small rear balcony with metal railing is proposed for the second story of the addition.

Restoration of the front façade, including new windows, entrance door and steps is included in this application, the details of which can be reviewed by the staff.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect David Whipple and homeowner Patrick Campbell represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the revised application satisfies the comments of the Architectural Committee.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application as presented at the Historical Commission's meeting of 11 July 2014, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 316 S 21ST ST

Project: Add bay window

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: William & Vesna Hozack

Applicant: James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Co. Architects

History: 1860; mansard added 1880s; refaced 1949; rehabbed 1994 by Otto Sperr

Individual Designation: None

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

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story bay on the second and third floor of the 21st Street elevation on this rowhouse in Rittenhouse Square. An application for a bay addition was reviewed by the Architectural Committee at its May 2014 meeting, but was withdrawn before a review by the Historical Commission. The previously-proposed bay was clad in brick and would have required the alteration of the existing historic cornice. This revised application reflects the Architectural Committee's comments proffered at the May meeting, and is now wood and does not require alteration of the cornice.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Jim Campbell, and owners William Hozack and Vesna Hess-Hozack represented the application.

Mr. Campbell pointed out that the staff recommended approval of this proposal, but the Architectural Committee recommended denial. He stated that he understood that the Committee was primarily concerned that an approval would set a negative precedent. He stated that the proposal does not destroy any historic fabric. He informed the Commission that the building has underwent significant changes during the twentieth century. He stated that the 21st Street façade was changed and looks nothing like its former appearance, which would have been something like the building at 320 S. 21st Street. He stated that the building at 320 has the entrance on 21st Street, with a stone base, traditionally-sized windows, and stone lintels and sills. He stated that the building in question was refaced in the middle of the last century, while the cornice and mansard were retained. He stated that, based on the Architectural Committee's comments during a review of an earlier iteration of the design, he is now proposing to differentiate the old from the new by using wood for the bay, not brick. He contended that the

proposed bay would be compatible with the bays that are seen throughout the district. He stated that they propose to maintain the historic cornice. He stated that he hoped the Commission would see this as a compatible change to a drastically altered façade.

Ms. Merriman stated that, having seen the alterations to this building over the years, she thinks that this revised bay is perfectly compatible with the historic district and with the other alterations to this building.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 10 to 1. Ms. Hawkins dissented.

ADDRESS: 3900 WOODLAND AVE

Project: Install ramp

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: The Woodlands Cemetery Company

Applicant: Claire Donato, Mark B. Thompson Associates LLC

History: 1742; Woodlands, Estate of Andrew Hamilton; expanded 1770-1790

Individual Designation: 6/26/1956

District Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes exterior alterations to the terrace structure on the north side of the Woodlands and its underlying brick arched cryptoporticus passage. The application proposes structural repairs that will allow for the removal of the temporary shoring which currently provides the means of support for the terrace, as well as the rehabilitation of the terrace surface treatments and improvements to the building drainage. Additionally, the application also proposes a new walkway along the east side of the building to improve drainage and expose window sills and sash that have been partially buried below grade, as well as provide ADA access to the cryptoporticus and basement. Further, the application proposes site utility improvements including a new sewer connection to the Philadelphia Water Department sewer located within a right-of-way on the property.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 10:12 a.m., Ms. Jones moved to adjourn. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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.