

**THE MINUTES OF THE 583RD STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**11 MARCH 2011
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sara Merriman, Commerce Department, Acting Chair
Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D.
Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP
Susan O.W. Jaffe
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President
John Mattioni, Esq.
Daniel Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections
David Schaaf, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Joan Schlotterbeck, Department of Public Property

Jonathan 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
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II

ALSO PRESENT

Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Ignatius Wang, UCI Architects
Larry Taub, Ed.D., Head of School, Pennsylvania School for the Deaf
Vicky DiFederico, Pennsylvania School for the Deaf
Nancy Sullivan, Pennsylvania School for the Deaf
James S. Bishop, Pennsylvania School for the Deaf
Cindy Hamilton, Heritage Consulting
Jack Paruta, Gensler
Robert Brownholtz
Brent Waterman
Richard Maimone, Kieran Timberlake
Marilia Rodrigues, Kieran Timberlake
Andrew Scott, Urban Engineers
Susan Weiler, Olin Studio
Richard Roark, Olin Studio
Nancy Goldenberg, Center City District
Paul Levy, Center City District
Kazi Hassan, Pennoni
Jeremy Colello, Pennoni
Chris Bergerson, Philadelphia Water Department
Jessica Brooks, Philadelphia Water Department
James Campbell, Campbell Thomas Architects
Joe Jancuska, j2a Architects

Audrey Johnson-Thornton, American Women's Heritage Society
Paul Steinke, Reading Terminal Market
Tony Bracali, Friday Architects

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Merriman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Dilworth, Hawkins, Jaffe, Leonard, Mattioni, Quinn, Schaaf, and Schlotterbeck joined her.

MINUTES OF THE 582ND STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Leonard moved to adopt the minutes of the 582nd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 11 February 2011. Ms. Schlotterbeck seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 FEBRUARY 2011

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the applications for 433-41 Chestnut Street, 2002-06 Trenton Avenue, and 2129-31 Locust Street, which are on the Consent Agenda. Ms. Merriman asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments. Ms. Merriman asked if anyone in the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for 433-41 Chestnut Street, 2002-06 Trenton Avenue, and 2129-31 Locust Street. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

100-52 W SCHOOL HOUSE LA

Project: Construct rear addition

Type of Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Pennsylvania School for the Deaf

Applicant: Fon S. Wang, UCI Architects, Inc.

History: 1760, Jacob Knor, master builder, Germantown Academy (Pennsylvania School for the Deaf)

Individual Designation: 6/26/1956

District Designation: None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend in-concept approval, provided the height of the entranceway is lowered and a Phase 1A archeological study is conducted.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the in-concept approval of a rear addition to the main building of the Pennsylvania School for the Deaf, which was formerly Germantown Academy. The Historical Commission reviewed an in-concept application proposing an earlier version of the addition at its December 2010 meeting. At that time, the Commission approved the

addition's location and massing and offered suggestions for revisions to other aspects of the design.

The original school building was constructed in the 1760s and then added to at the rear in 1880 and again in 1904. The original eighteenth-century structure is one of the most historically significant buildings in the city. The proposed addition would connect to the 1904 wing, not the eighteenth-century portion of the building. All three sections of the building are finished in Wissahickon Schist and both the 1880 and 1904 additions were designed in a Colonial Revival style to complement the original Georgian building. The proposed addition would necessitate the removal of a portion of the rear façade of the 1904 wing. The existing Wissahickon Schist cladding stone would be salvaged and reused in the new construction. The proposed addition would have two sections, the main section, which that would connect to the rear façade of the 1904 wing, and a second section, which would link to the rear façade of a 1980s connector addition.

The current application proposes a design that directly responds to the comments offered by the Architectural Committee and Commission during their reviews. The original design was specifically criticized for its fenestration, the ratio of solid to void, and the choice of cladding materials. The applicant has addressed all three elements in the new application. The current design recesses the addition from the corners of the 1904 wing. These setbacks preserve the original massing of the wing. The addition now presents a more solid appearance and it reuses the salvaged Wissahickon stone at the water table only. The rest of the elevation would be clad in stucco. The windows have been made more complementary to the originals, although they are clearly of contemporary design and scale. The addition to the 1980s connector continues the same one-story massing as the main addition. The applicant eliminated the hip roof as originally proposed and replaces it with a shed roof that matches the one over the main addition. The proposed design has been simplified overall and made much more sympathetic to the scale and massing of the 1904 wing as well as the 1980s connector section. The applicant has successfully integrated the Committee's and Commission's comments and guidance received during the earlier reviews.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architect Ignatius Wang and Head of School Larry Taub represented the application. Vicky DiFederico and Nancy Sullivan provided sign language services.

Mr. Wang stated that his firm has revised the plans to incorporate the recommendations and suggestions offered by the Architectural Committee at its recent meeting. He displayed large boards showing the revised plans. He demonstrated that the roof and entrance had been revised as suggested. He stated that they have differentiated the addition to the 1980s building from the addition to the historic building. He noted that they reduced the height of the watertable. He reported that they have adjusted the materials as suggested as well. Ms. Hawkins replied that she was very pleased with the design changes, which respond to the Committee's recommendations. Ms. Hawkins advised Mr. Wang to make one slight adjustment to his design. She suggested that the roof over the entrance should be extended back to engage more clearly with the roof of the addition. She stated that the roof over the entrance looks "stuck on." She suggested a design that would be more "cohesive."

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance addressed the Commission. He stated that the application originally requested an approval in concept. The applicants are now requesting a final approval. He asked the Commission to clarify whether it was considering an in-concept or final approval. Mr. Danta informed the applicants that, if they wanted the Commission to

consider a final approval, they needed to make a request to the Commission. Mr. Wang explained to the Commission that his client would like to begin construction soon to allow for the project to be well underway before the start of the school year in the fall. Ms. Merriman asked the staff if the architectural drawings provide sufficient detail for a final approval. Mr. Danta stated that they do have the level of detail required for a final approval. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the staff could review any additional details for approval. Mr. Gallery disagreed, asserting that the design of the roof over the entrance was more than a detail. He stated that it was a "much more complicated design issue." He advocated for an in-concept approval only. Dr. Taub stated that he was concerned about the timeline. He asked the Commission to allow this project to move forward. Mr. Wang stated that the demolition and excavation must be complete before the start of the school year for the safety of the students. He explained that deaf children are very aware of background noises and vibrations, which impede the ability of the students to communicate. He stated that heavy construction must be complete during the summer. Ms. Hawkins stated that she believes that the staff can successfully review the revised roof for approval.

Mr. Dilworth asked about the implications of requiring an archaeological study. Ms. Hawkins stated that an archaeological study should be undertaken because the site was used as a school as early as the middle of the eighteenth century. Mr. Farnham explained that a Phase 1A typically involves document research only. Through the research, an archaeologist would determine whether there was a likelihood of discovering archaeological artifacts. If the study determined that there was a significant possibility of finding archaeological resources within the construction zone, the staff could refer the matter back to the Commission to determine whether those resources were adequately protected to allow the project to continue. Mr. Wang stated that, owing to the additions on the original school house, he did not anticipate that eighteenth-century archaeological resources had survived. He stated that the history of the site is well documented, allowing for the study to be quickly and easily conducted. Dr. Taub expressed his concerns about the requirement to undertake an archaeological study. He stated that such a study would impact their schedule. Mr. Farnham responded that the staff did not anticipate that the Phase 1A study would lead to additional archaeology because the site had been disturbed significantly in recent years for the construction of the basement entrance and other activities. He informed Mr. Taub that he believes that a Phase 1A study could be undertaken very quickly and relatively inexpensively.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the application with the revised entranceway design as shown to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 11 March 2011, provided the roof over the entranceway is extended back into the shed roof of the addition and a Phase 1A archeological study is conducted, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

433-41 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Construct rooftop addition

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: KHP II Chestnut, LLC

Applicant: Jack Paruta, Gensler & Associates

History: 1907, James H. & John T. Windrim, Lafayette Building

Individual Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the metal panels cladding the addition are a lighter color, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a roof-top addition on the Lafayette Building at the northeast corner of 5th and Chestnut Streets. The Kimpton Hotels recently purchased the building, which it will rehabilitate as a hotel. The rehabilitation of the building has been divided into three phases. Phase One proposed the rehabilitation of the interior, the restoration of the exterior masonry, and the replacement of all windows from the second-floor and up. Phase One was reviewed and approved by the staff. Phase Two proposes the construction of a roof-top addition. Phase Three will propose the rehabilitation of the ground-floor of the building. Phase Three will be submitted at some point in the future and it is not currently under consideration.

Phase Two is the only portion of the rehabilitation under consideration as part of this application. The roof-top addition would be located on the center of the roof of the building. The addition would be one-story. The building has four corner pavilions and a massive parapet. The parapet and pavilions would make the addition nearly invisible. The applicant has submitted sight line studies to show that the addition would be invisible from more than a block away. The staff contends that, even if the addition is somewhat visible, the impact would be negligible. The addition would not be visible from Independence Hall. The new addition would open onto roof-top space. The southwest and northwest corner pavilions would be rehabilitated for lounges. The rehabilitation of the corner pavilions would necessitate the conversion of windows to doors, but the affected areas are not visible from any point at street-level.

ACTION: SEE CONSENT AGENDA

413 S 09TH ST

Project: Legalize windows

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Candace Lane, LLC

Applicant: Bob Brownholtz, Candace Lane LLC

History: 1850

Individual Designation: 1/31/1961

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize aluminum windows that were illegally installed in the front façade of this multi-family building. The staff approved metal windows in the rear of the property, which has very limited visibility from the public-right-of-way. The staff met the property owner on site and walked the property and discussed the scope of alterations that the

staff could approve administratively. The staff specifically discussed the replacement of the windows in the front façade with the property owner and his business partner during that site visit. The staff informed the property owner at that time that the Commission would need to review the metal windows in the front façade for approval. The metal windows have internal snap-on muntins. The original windows for this mid nineteenth-century building would have been wood windows. The metal windows do not replicate the appearance, proportions, or details of the original wood windows.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Developers Robert Brownholtz and Brent Waterman represented the application.

Ms. Merriman asked the applicants if they understood that the Architectural Committee was recommending denial of the application. Mr. Brownholtz stated that they understood the recommendation, but disagreed with it. He claimed that he had photographs of five buildings that are designated as historic and have the same metal windows that he is seeking to legalize. He stated that he received no “correspondence” regarding the front façade. He contended that he spent a large amount of money on the windows at the front and rear. He stated that the windows are very common in the neighborhood. He claimed that it would be a hardship to spend “thousands of dollars” replacing the front windows. He added that he did not intend to circumvent the regulations. He stated that the windows are energy efficient and would last “10 or 20 years” longer than a wood window. He concluded that the building “fits into the neighborhood.” He again stated that “if I had something in writing, I would not have done what we did.”

Ms. Merriman informed the applicants that it is the longstanding policy of the Commission to require that windows are replaced with new windows that replicate the appearance of the historic windows, even when the extant windows are not the historic windows. Ms. Merriman also noted that the applicants have the right to submit a hardship application to legalize the windows. She noted that the staff can advise them outside the Commission meeting. She also noted that the staff could work with the applicants to develop a schedule for the replacement of the windows over time, so that they do not bear the financial burden all at once. She stated that two years might be appropriate. Mr. Brownholtz offered to remove the sash, leaving the frames in place, and replace them with sash with applied grids on the exterior. He stated that these windows would mimic wood windows. Mr. Danta explained that that option had been discussed and rejected at the Architectural Committee meeting. He explained that the replacement windows still include subframes, which were installed within the historic frames. The proposed solution would leave those subframes in place; it would not replicate the appearance of the historic windows.

Mr. Brownholtz asked if he should distribute the photographs of buildings in the neighborhood with similar windows. Ms. Merriman responded that he was free to distribute the photographs until that point when the Commission voted on the question.

Mr. Danta stated that installing the applied muntins on the exterior would bring the windows closer to compliance, but they still would not replicate the original windows or meet the Standards. Ms. Hawkins agreed, stating that the proportion of glass to frame would remain inappropriate. Ms. Jaffe asked if the historic frames were damaged when the subframes were installed. Mr. Danta stated that they were not damaged.

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

1538 GREEN ST

Project: Construct residential building

Type of Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Vadim Shklovsky

Applicant: Vadim Shklovsky

History: undeveloped site

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Non-contributing, 10/11/2000

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee comments that the front door should be coupled with the neighboring door; the construction and attachments of the new entryway and cornice should not adversely impact the existing historic building; full bricks should be used instead of veneer bricks; compatible cladding materials such as cast stone to match marble should be used for lintels and sills; two windows should replace the proposed arched window with balcony at the second-floor front; the structural stability of the existing party wall should be taken into consideration.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a new building on an undeveloped site. The Commission has review-and-comment jurisdiction over this application. The building would be a three-story, single-family, semi-detached dwelling. Decks are proposed for the rear at the second and third floor, as well as on the roof. The roof deck would be accessed via a pilot house. Bay windows and a garage entrance are proposed for the side elevation. The building would be clad in brick veneer. The window and door surrounds would be cast stone or marble, cost depending. The cornice and bays would have a faux wood finish and the entrance and garage doors would have a mahogany finish. An arched opening with balcony is proposed for the second-floor front façade. The floor plans do not correspond to the elevation drawings for the front façade.

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

Ms. Hawkins noted that the applicant did not attend the Architectural Committee meeting. She asserted that the architectural drawings were inadequate to judge the project, owing to conflicts between the elevations and floor plans. She stated that the Architectural Committee prepared a long list of suggestions for the project.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that he wanted to discuss the Commission's review-and-comment authority over new construction in historic districts. He noted that the applicant is not in attendance at this review and did not attend the Architectural Committee meeting. Mr. Gallery contended that the applicant was not in attendance because there is no reason for him to attend. The Commission's comments are non-binding. He can build whatever he wants to build, regardless of the Commission's comments. Mr. Gallery reported that he has advised the Zoning Code Commission to revise the historic preservation ordinance to give the Historical Commission full jurisdiction over new construction in historic districts. He stated that most community organizations with historic districts in their areas agree with that position. He asked the Historical Commission to request that the Zoning Code Commission undertake the change to the code. He stated that it would be a minor change. He concluded that the review-

and-comment provision does not give the Commission adequate authority over new construction in historic districts.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and comment that the front door should be coupled with the neighboring door; the construction and attachments of the new entryway and cornice should not adversely impact the existing historic building; full bricks should be used instead of veneer bricks; compatible cladding materials such as cast stone to match marble should be used for lintels and sills; two windows should replace the proposed arched window with balcony at the second-floor front; the structural stability of the existing party wall should be taken into consideration. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1400 JOHN F KENNEDY BLV

Project: Rehabilitate Dilworth Plaza

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Paul R Levy, Center City District

History: 1970, Vincent Kling, architect, City Hall, Dilworth Plaza

Individual Designation: 5/28/1957

Interior Designation: 11/12/2010, City Council Chambers

District Designation: None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Rehabilitation Standards 2, 4, 5, 9, and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations to Dilworth Plaza, the open space on the west side of City Hall. It proposes alterations at and below grade and will link with a separate project to rehabilitate the below-grade transit stations.

The Historical Commission designated City Hall as historic on 28 May 1957. At that time, the City Hall parcel was smaller than it is today. An arm of Broad Street ran along the west side of City Hall. To compensate for the loss of public space with the construction of the Municipal Services Building, the City vacated the block of Broad Street along City Hall and created a public space extending west from City Hall to 15th Street. Named for Mayor Dilworth, the plaza was designed by architect Vincent Kling and constructed between 1966 and 1974. Although Dilworth Plaza was not part of the site when City Hall was designated, it is now under the Commission's jurisdiction.

The Center City District in partnership with the City and Septa is proposing to alter Dilworth Plaza to overcome a series of chronic problems with the space related to maintenance, circulation, assembly, amenities, drainage, transit access, and disabled access. The application proposes to remove all at- and above-grade structures on the plaza, cover the sunken portion of the plaza, and create a lawn, water feature, glass-covered entrances to the concourse, and a small food service building. The plaza would be regraded and new landscaping and paving would be added.

The Commission approved the project in concept in May 2009. The approval in concept granted approvals to the locations and massings of the lawn, water feature, arced glass entranceways to the concourse level, and the café building with entrance to the transit level at the northern edge of the plaza. At that time, the Commission determined that the 1970s plaza had not achieved its

own historic significance and could be removed as an alteration, not a demolition, in the legal senses of the words.

The current application proposes a detailed design for the new plaza and features that adheres to the location and massing parameters established by the in-concept approval. The entranceways will be arced in elevation and fully glazed, as originally proposed. Except at the entrance openings, the above-grade sections of the entranceways will be bounded by metal railings. The café building with transit entrance will have an exposed steel frame, steel panels, and glazing, some with a ceramic frit. Its arced roof will allude to the arced entranceways. A small elevator enclosure is proposed for the area south of the southern entranceway. The lawn and fountain are proposed as they were in the in-concept application. Paving, benches, bollards, light fixtures, and landscaping are also proposed. The new structures will not impact views of the historic building.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Architects Richard Maimone and Marilia Rodrigues, engineer Andrew Scott, landscape architects Susan Weiler and Richard Roark, and Nancy Goldenberg and Paul Levy of the Center City District represented the application.

Mr. Levy summarized the project. He spoke about how the plaza will connect disparate sections of Center City. He stated that the plaza will draw many users. He provided a brief outline of its history, from the eighteenth-century pumping station to the construction of the plaza in the 1960s and 1970s. He summarized the drawbacks of the extant plaza design, especially as they relate to maintenance, accessibility, and safety. He explained the transit station project being undertaken by Septa. He discussed the designs of the lawn, water feature, glass-covered entrances to the concourse, and café building. He noted that there will be no steps or barriers on the new plaza. The arched glass entrances would be 17 feet tall and 20 feet wide. Mr. Levy discussed the redesigned transit station. He provided information about the landscaping. He noted the new street crossings from the plaza to the north and west. He pointed out the sustainability features that are built into the design, including its reuse of storm water. He displayed views of the café, which would be 3,000 sf and 14 feet tall. He displayed renders to demonstrate that the new structures will not interfere with views of City Hall. He described the seating, including the benches. He commented that he is working with the Planning Commission to enable the design to be continued along the north side of the building. He described the programmable fountain. He pointed out the ability to include an ice rink in winters. He discussed the art program and the signage program. He explained the interpretive programs that will be integrated into the site.

Ms. Merriman asked Mr. Levy to discuss the timeline for the project. Mr. Levy responded that he plans to have construction documents completed by late April, go out to bid in September, begin construction in the fall, and complete the project by the end of 2013. Ms. Schlotterbeck stated that this is the most exciting City Hall project she has been involved with as the Commissioner of the Department of Public Property.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, pursuant to Rehabilitation Standards 2, 4, 5, 9, and 10. Ms. Schlotterbeck seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2002-06 TRENTON AVE

Project: Replace historic paving with storm water management system

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia and Conrail

Applicant: Christopher Bergerson, Philadelphia Water Department

History: 1890, street paving

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Historic Street Paving Thematic Historic District, Contributing, 12/9/1998

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Section 14-2007(7)(k)(.7) of the Philadelphia Code.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reconfigure the street bed, curbs, and sidewalks along the west side of Trenton Avenue between Norris and Berges Streets in the Kensington section of Philadelphia. The granite-block street bed is designated as historic as part of the Historic Street Paving Thematic Historic District. Most of Trenton Avenue is 60 feet in width, but this section flares out from 60 feet in width to 120 feet in width. The flare was added to the street between 1888 and 1904 to accommodate additional railroad tracks. Several sets of railroad tracks ran along Trenton Avenue to a Pennsylvania Railroad depot and yard to the south of Norris Street. The depot and yard are no longer extant.

The west curb line of Trenton Avenue would be relocated, narrowing the street bed to 60 feet, the width of the street to the north of Berges Street. The triangle of land removed from the street bed would be reused as rain garden to manage storm water. It would be one component of a very large Philadelphia Water Department initiative to manage storm water and reduce combined-sewer overflows throughout the city. The historic street paving material removed for the garden would be relaid along Trenton Avenue to repair the cartway, which is in poor condition and includes a large concrete patch that predates the designation.

ACTION: SEE CONSENT AGENDA

2000 BELMONT MANSION DR

Project: Construct banquet facility and linking vestibule

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Joseph Jancuska, j2a Architects

History: 1750

Individual Designation: 6/26/1956

District Designation: None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval,

1. provided the vestibule is a temporary structure with tent-like sides that does not attach to either building or the porch roof;
2. provided the two-tiered roof at the rear banquet addition is replaced with a continuously pitched roof, the windows are extended down to the floor, and the glass spandrels are replaced with a stucco base;
3. provided a Phase IA archaeological study and any other necessary archaeological studies recommended by the Phase IA are undertaken before construction begins; and,
4. provided the tent pad is not legalized;
5. with the staff to review details including the colors, materials, fence, and lighting;
6. pursuant to Standards 2, 8, 9, 10 and the Site and Settings Guidelines.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a revised design for banquet facilities at Belmont Mansion in Fairmount Park. The Historical Commission reviewed and denied an application in January 2011. The City owns the highly significant historic house in Fairmount Park. It is currently managed by the American Women's Heritage Society and operated as a banquet and event facility and the Underground Railroad Museum. The building is one of the country's most significant early mansions. The building was rehabilitated to its mid nineteenth-century appearance about five years ago.

A concrete pad was installed to the south of the mansion several years ago to support a tent that is used for catered events like weddings and corporate affairs. The earlier application proposed removing the concrete pad and tent and erecting a freestanding pavilion to the south of the house. The current application no longer proposes a freestanding pavilion. The concrete pad for the tent would be retained. The Historical Commission's files do not include any record of its approval of this concrete pad, even though it was added many years after Belmont was designated as historic.

The earlier application proposed constructing a large addition to house a banquet room, kitchen, and storage at the rear of the outbuilding that stands to the southwest of the house. The outbuilding, called the cottage complex, was constructed in several campaigns from the eighteenth century to the 1980s. The current application also proposes an addition in the same location, but its design has been significantly revised to include many suggestions offered by the Committee and Commission. Most notably, the new design for the addition includes a pitched, standing-seam metal roof and more glazing.

The earlier application proposed a glazed vestibule that would connect the main house to the even older cottage building and its additions. It would connect to the house under a corner of the porch and extend out from the porch to the rear building. Although there had been a non-historic vestibule at this location at one time, it was removed as part of the recent restoration of the mansion. The current application still proposes the linking vestibule. The vestibule would introduce an asymmetry to the otherwise restored, symmetrical house.

The earlier application proposed a new entrance gate with stone pillars at the driveway. The gate has been deleted from the current application. Like the earlier application, the current application proposes a series of changes to the grounds including repaving the parking area. It should be noted that the site plan, which was based on the earlier design, is no longer accurate, but was included with the current application.

Although the application proposes significant earth disturbing activities for foundations for the new construction, it does not address the question of archaeology. The historical significance of this site warrants archaeological protections. Before any earth is disturbed, a Phase 1A archaeology study should be undertaken to determine the potential impact to archaeological resources. If the study indicates that important resources will be impacted, then additional archaeological investigations should be undertaken.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Mattioni recused owing to his firm's past representation of the American Women's Heritage Society. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Architect Joe Jancuska and Audrey Johnson-Thornton of the American Women's Heritage Society represented the application.

Ms. Merriman asked the applicants whether the current proposal complies with the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Jancuska replied that it completely complies with the recommendation. Ms. Merriman suggested that the Commission comment on the two designs for the roof of the banquet hall addition. Ms. Hawkins explained that the Architectural Committee contended that the two-tiered roof was overly large and brought too much attention to the addition. The Committee preferred a simpler hipped roof. She noted that the upper section of the two-tiered roof would perform no interior function, owing to the need to be able to divide the hall in half with a movable partition wall. At the request of Mr. Schaaf, Mr. Jancuska confirmed the dimensions of the addition.

Ms. Schlotterbeck noted that the City and the Commission have invested both time and money in the restoration of this site. She asked why the Commission would now allow the building to be further removed from its restored state. She asked the applicants whether the City or the catering facility would be responsible for the added utility costs for the enlarged banquet hall. She asked the applicants whether the banquet facility owed any money to the City as required by the lease. Ms. Johnson-Thornton conceded that her organization does owe money to the City. Ms. Schlotterbeck stated that this project would increase the City's costs and noted that the lease holder is not even meeting her current obligations. Ms. Johnson-Thornton stated that she will share the additional costs with the City. Ms. Merriman stated that the issues appear to be outside the purview of the Commission. Ms. Schlotterbeck disagreed, stating that, as the Commissioner of the Department of Public Property, she has an obligation to make the Commission and tax payers aware of the situation. Ms. Johnson-Thornton stated that any money she makes is reinvested back into the site.

Ms. Hawkins asked the architect to confirm that he has withdrawn the vestibule or connector portion of the application. He stated that he had. Mr. Farnham asked the Commission if it would authorize the staff to review for approval a connector as defined by the Architectural Committee. The Commissioners agreed that the staff could review a connector for approval that meets the conditions set by the Architectural Committee.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that any banquet facility added to this site should be an excellent facility. He advocated for approval of the two-tiered roof design because the building with the simple roof would be "dull and uninteresting." He stated that a banquet hall with a flat ceiling in the interior would not be an elegant space. He advocated for an approval of the two-tiered roof design because it would allow for a multi-leveled interior ceiling that would be "much more attractive and much more interesting." Mr. Gallery lobbied for an "elegant and attractive" facility that would be "enticing." Ms. Hawkins stated that the requisite partition that would divide the banquet hall in half would render impossible the ceiling suggested by Mr. Gallery. Mr. Jancuska stated that he would construct a vaulted ceiling regardless of the roof design. Ms. Hawkins rejected Mr. Gallery's suggestion, asserting that the ceiling design would not be based on the roof design.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application:

1. provided the vestibule is a temporary structure with tent-like sides that does not attach to either building or the porch roof;
2. provided the two-tiered roof at the rear banquet addition is replaced with a continuously pitched roof, the windows are extended down to the floor, and the glass spandrels are replaced with a stucco base;

3. provided a Phase IA archaeological study and any other necessary archaeological studies recommended by the Phase IA are undertaken before construction begins; and,
4. provided the tent pad is not legalized;
5. with the staff to review details including the colors, materials, fence, and lighting;
6. pursuant to Standards 2, 8, 9, 10 and the Site and Settings Guidelines.

Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7 to 1. Ms. Schlotterbeck dissented.

2131 ST JAMES ST

Project: Construct rear addition, add vent and skylight

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joyce Frye

Applicant: James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Company

History: 1923, Spencer Roberts, architect, English Village

Individual Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the exhaust fan and duct, but approval of all other aspects of the application, provided the skylight is hipped, not barrel-vaulted, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a single-story, rear addition that would expand an existing addition, filling in the side and rear yard. The addition would house a kitchen. The addition would include a large skylight. The application also proposes installing an exhaust fan for the kitchen range, which would vent through a large square metal duct rising up the rear wall to above the third-story roof. The duct would be visible from Chancellor, Walnut, and 22nd Streets.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Architect James Campbell represented the application.

Ms. Merriman asked the applicant to summarize the need for the large duct and fan. Mr. Campbell stated that his clients would like to be able to vent their kitchen range as far away from the rear façade of the building as possible. He stated that their preferred solution includes a duct running up the rear façade of the building to the roof with the fan on the roof. However, since the Architectural Committee, his clients have agreed to modify their design and locate the exhaust fan on the roof of the one-story kitchen addition, obviating the need for the duct. They have also agreed to the hipped skylight recommended by the Committee. Therefore, the revised application is in agreement with the Committee's recommendation.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the exhaust fan and duct, but approve of all other aspects of the application, provided the skylight is hipped, not barrel-vaulted, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1001-07 S 04TH ST

Project: Legalize signage, modify cross on steeple

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Phat Quang Buddhist Congregation of USA

Applicant: Anh Minh Nguyen, Phat Quang Buddhist Congregation of USA

History: 1869, Emanuel Evangelical Church

Individual Designation: 7/23/1963

District Designation: None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the alteration of the cross, but denial of the legalization of the signs, with the staff to review details of the cross alteration to ensure that it does not create a water infiltration problem, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 5, and 9.

OVERVIEW: The application proposes to legalize two signs that were installed on the church building and to modify the cross at the peak of the steeple. One of the signs is located over the main door, hiding an original decorative frieze with the name of the church in German. The new sign is plastic and is attached with screws. The second sign, facing Washington Avenue, is also plastic, attached with brackets, and covers the bottom of a window. The application proposes altering the cross atop the steeple by cutting off the arms. The cross is not original. Historic photographs of the church show a weathervane where the cross now stands.

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

Ms. Merriman asked the Commissioners to identify appropriate signage locations to allow the staff to review any subsequent sign applications for approval. Mr. Baron noted that a box exists on the building that identifies it as a church. He explained that it could be removed to avoid any confusion about the current use of the building. Mr. Baron also identified places on the building where signs could be installed, including flat, unornamented areas near the main entrance. He also remarked that a freestanding sign could be installed between the building and the sidewalk. Ms. Hawkins agreed that a flat wall sign or freestanding sign could be successfully installed.

Mr. Reuter reported to the Commission that he had brought a law suit on behalf of the Commission against the former owner to compel that owner to undertake roof repairs and other work. He said that those repairs have been undertaken.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve of the alteration of the cross and the installation of signs in appropriate locations as discussed during the review, but deny the legalization of the extant signs, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 5, and 9. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1126-36 ARCH ST

Project: Enlarge mezzanine, construct restrooms, relocate kitchen, alter aisle, add partitions

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Reading Terminal Market

Applicant: Tony Bracali, Friday Architects/Planners, Inc.

History: 1893, Wilson Brothers, architects, Reading Terminal Market

Individual Designation: 2/5/1981

District Designation: None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes several changes to the interior of the Reading Terminal Market. Although the interior of the Reading Terminal Market has not been designated as historic under the Historical Commission's new interiors authority, the Commission was empowered to review proposals to alter the interior of the market by a lease in 1989 and then by a covenant in 1994. The lease has been terminated, but the covenant is still in effect. The application originally proposed a final approval, but was converted by the applicant to an approval in concept at the Architectural Committee meeting.

This application proposes straightening what is called Avenue D, the north-south aisle running along the eastern edge of the market. Currently, Avenue D twists and turns as it runs around the freight elevator area and other obstructions. The application proposes to straighten the aisle by shifting some vendor and storage space and then realigning the walkway.

This application also proposes creating a flexible rental room along Avenue D at the east end of the Center Court. The room would be separated from the public space by a sliding butt-glazed wall. A large sign would be installed over the entrance to the room.

This application also proposes demolishing the inadequate restrooms, which do not meet code, and replacing them with new, larger restrooms. Also, the demonstration kitchen would be relocated.

The application also proposes enlarging a mezzanine area, which currently houses the administrative offices for the market. The current space is not adequate for the market's needs. A conference room would be added at the west end of the mezzanine, extending out over a non-historic vendor space.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Architect Tony Bracali and market manager Paul Steinke represented the application.

Mr. Steinke presented the project to the Commission using large graphic boards. He described the changes to straighten Avenue D, the north-south corridor running along the eastern edge of the market. The restrooms would be moved and enlarged. Large refrigerators would be moved to the basement. A demonstration kitchen and multi-purpose room would be created. An exhibition on the market's history would be created as well. Additional retail space would be created. The mezzanine-level office space would be expanded, adding a conference room over a non-historic vendor space. The new mezzanine area would be clad with materials like the existing mezzanine.

Ms. Merriman asked Mr. Steinke how many new retail stalls would be created. He replied that four to six would be created, depending on how the space was divided. Ms. Merriman asked about the construction timing. Mr. Steinke responded that construction would begin in July and be completed in the late fall. Mr. Schaaf expressed his support for the project.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that he finds the overall plan outstanding. However, he asked the Commission to be clear that the application is in concept; the details and finishes are not being considered for approval, only the overall concept. Mr. Schaaf responded that his motion proffered an in-concept approval; additional clarification is not needed.

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

2029 GREEN ST

Project: Replace rolldown gate

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Matthew Van Wollen

Applicant: Frank Reis, Walnut Tree Construction

History: parking area

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Non-contributing, 10/11/2000

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the garage is divided into two doors that are not smaller than nine feet wide with a 12-inch center pier.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish two metal roll-down gates with central pedestrian door and install one very large metal roll-down gate in their places as part of a conversion of the house at 2031 Green Street from a multi-family to a single-family residence. The lot at 2029 Green serves as a parking area for the house at 2031 Green. The two parcels have separate tax addresses, but are joined on one deed. The double roll-down gates were extant at the time of the district designation in 2000. A review of the zoning folder for this property did not provide evidence of a zoning permit or Streets Department approval for parking on this lot.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. No one represented the application.

Ms. Merriman asked the staff about the implications for the Commission of the potential lack of a zoning permit for parking for this site. Ms. Cote responded that the zoning permit or lack thereof should have no impact on the Commission's decision. The Commission should judge the application on its historic preservation merits. The Department of Licenses & Inspections will ensure that the other prerequisite approvals are in place before a building permit is issued. Mr. Schaaf pointed out that this application proposes a garage door on a main street, not a service alley. Ms. Leonard and Mr. Schaaf asked if the Commission typically approves such applications for such streets. Ms. Cote responded that she is unaware of the Commission approving such a metal roll-down gate for a major street in a historic district. She added that the Commission has approved such gates for service alleys. Mr. Schaaf stated that the scale of the proposed gate is inappropriate. The gate would be as wide as a house. He stated that the existing gates and door have a better scale. Ms. Hawkins reported that the applicant had been concerned about fitting a minivan through the gate. Mr. Baron stated that the Commission should be concerned about the location of the motor operating the gate. Ms. Merriman asked what an appropriate gate would look like at this location. Mr. Farnham stated that the Commission typically would not approve a garage door on a block such as this one. Ignoring that question for the moment, he noted that the Commission has regularly required a simple, understated, painted wood door. Mr. Quinn stated that it would be a very complex process to have this property zoned as a private parking lot. Mr. Quinn suggested that the Commission not approve a gate until the zoning for the parking is in place. Ms. Hawkins and Mr. Baron asserted that the proposed gate does not meet the Commission's standards and guidelines. Mr. Reuter stated that the Commission's approval is one of many prerequisite approvals for a building

permit. He stated that the Commission's approval of this application would not legalize the parking from a zoning perspective. Mr. Mattioni contended that the application is incomplete. It does not describe the project in sufficient detail. Mr. Schaaf asked if the parking would be accessory to the rowhouse to the west. The staff responded that it is a distinct parcel and therefore could not be accessory. Ms. Merriman contended that additional information should be provided. She suggested that the Commission deny the application or approve it with very specific requirements. Mr. Mattioni asked if the Architectural Committee's recommendation provides sufficient parameters for the staff to ensure that the applicants implement it appropriately. Mr. Farnham stated that he finds the Committee's recommendation lacking in detail and suggested that it would be difficult for the staff to ensure that a revised design met the Commission's requirements.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to deny the application. Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

2129-31 LOCUST ST

Owner: 2131 Locust Street Associates

Applicant: Martin Rosenblum

History: 1909 for Alexander Biddle, Charles Barton Keen, architect; 4th floor added, 1930

Designation: 2/8/1995 contributing in the Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District

Project: Alter basement window in front façade into a door

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposed basement entrance, provided the wood, nine-light doors and appropriate railings are installed at both basement entrances and the refurbished window grates are reinstalled, with the staff to review the details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter an original basement window on the front façade of this property facing Locust Street. The applicant claims in his cover letter that the existing entrance to the basement-level apartment must be rehabilitated and that the proposed entrance would serve two purposes: first, to allow continued use of the apartment while the rehabilitation of the existing entrance takes place, and, second, to create a direct entrance to the apartment from the street. The applicant does not specify the rehabilitation work that would be undertaken at the existing entrance. The existing basement window is a six-over-six window. The applicant proposes a door of unspecified design. The material or design has not been specified in the application, except for a description in the cover letter that alludes to some sort of "upper glazing."

ACTION: SEE CONSENT AGENDA

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adjourn at 10:56 a.m. Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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

Standard 8: Archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

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: Not recommended: Installing mechanical or service equipment so that it damages or obscures character-defining features; or is conspicuous from the public right-of-way.

Site Guideline: Recommended: Designing new exterior additions to historic buildings or adjacent new construction which is compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserves the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape.

Site Guideline: Not Recommended: Locating any new construction on the building site in a location which contains important landscape features or open space, for example removing a lawn and walkway and installing a parking lot.

Site Guideline: Not Recommended: Introducing new construction onto the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color, and texture; which destroys historic relationships on the site; or which damages or destroys important landscape features.

Site Guideline: Recommended: Surveying and documenting areas where the terrain will be altered to determine the potential impact to important landscape features or archaeological resources.

Site Guideline: Recommended: Protecting, e.g. preserving in place important archaeological resources.

Site Guideline: Recommended: Planning and carrying out any necessary investigation using professional archaeologists and modern archaeological methods when preservation in place is not feasible.

Setting Guideline: Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving building and landscape features which are important in defining the historic character of the setting. Such features can include roads and streets, furnishings such as lights or benches, vegetation, gardens, and yards, adjacent open space such as fields, parks, commons or woodlands, and important views or visual relationships.

Setting Guideline: Not Recommended: Introducing a new building or landscape feature that is out of scale or otherwise inappropriate to the setting's historic character, e.g., replacing picket fencing with chain link fencing.