

**THE MINUTES OF THE 578TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**8 OCTOBER 2010
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
Richard Dilworth, III, Ph.D.
Dominique Hawkins, AIA, LEED AP
Susan O.W. Jaffe
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President
John Mattioni, Esq.
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Daniel Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections
David Schaaf, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Joan Schlotterbeck, Department of Public Property
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing & Community Development
Miles Wilson

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Preservation Planner III
Erin Cote, Preservation Planner II
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II

ALSO PRESENT

John Kasky, Esq., Braverman & Kasky
Terri Martin
Collette Kinane
David Rogoff
Ed Panek, Logan Square Neighborhood Association
Jessica Youngblood
Gary Bromley, Bromley Investment Group
Gene March, O'Donnell & Naccarato
Margaret Lester
Lynn Alpert
Nyasha B. Hayes
Latishia Allen
Sara Rogers
Samantha Driscoll
David Hollenberg, University of Pennsylvania, University Architect
Matt McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll
Jeff Wyant, Wyant Architects
James Pearlstein, Pearl Properties
Reed Slogoff, Esq., Pearl Properties
William Martin, Esq., Fox Rothschild
Robert Powers, Powers & Company
Logan Ferguson, Powers & Company

Guy Gindhart, Pearl Properties
Kate Morgan
Nathaniel Rogers
Rachel Hildebrandt
Lee Barrett
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance
David Schultz, DSA Architects
Morris Clarke, DSA Architects
Paul Giegerich, 1200 Chestnut

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Dilworth, Hawkins, Jaffe, Leonard, Mattioni, Merriman, Quinn, Schaaf, Schlotterbeck, Wilds, and Wilson joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 577TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the minutes of the 577th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 10 September 2010. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 21 SEPTEMBER 2010

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham presented the Consent Agenda to the Commission. Mr. Sherman asked if any Commissioners or members of the public wished to comment on the Consent Agenda. No one commented.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee for 100 Market Street. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

407 N. 20TH STREET

Owner: PIDC Granary Partners, L.P.

Applicant: Reed Slogoff, Pearl Properties

History: grain elevator, constructed by Reading Railroad in 1925

Designation: individually designated, 8/6/1981

Project: Rehabilitate building for mixed use

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate a grain elevator for commercial and residential use. The building is currently unoccupied. From the 1970s until recently, it was used as a nightclub and then as an architectural office and residence.

The granary would be rehabilitated and incorporated into mixed-use project that would include a large commercial and residential building on 19th and Callowhill Streets and a parking and valet area along Shamokin Street, a small street running between 20th to 19th Streets. Only the granary building itself is designated; the vacant land on which the other building and parking would be constructed is not designated and not subject to the Commission's review.

The granary building would house commercial space at the first and second floors and residential space at the upper floors. A parking garage would be created at the basement level. The grain silos at the middle floors would not be altered or used.

A pedestrian bridge would be constructed across Shamokin Street at the second-floor level, linking the east or rear façade of the granary building to the new building, which would provide amenities for the residents of both buildings. The bridge would be a simple metal and glass structure.

New windows to match the historic windows would be installed throughout the granary. In many locations, infill would be removed from historic window openings and new windows installed. Infill and non-historic windows would be removed at the base of the north façade, along the railroad tracks, and new storefront systems for the retail space and louvers for the parking garage installed. Along 20th Street, infill and non-historic windows and doors would be removed and glass and aluminum storefront systems with signage installed. At the ground floor of the south façade, infill and non-historic windows would be removed and new windows would be installed; the new windows would be slightly taller than the historic windows to provide light to the second-floor level. Non-historic steps and paving would be removed and an ADA ramp installed along the south façade to provide access to the storefronts on 20th Street. New window openings would be cut at the upper floors of the middle bay of the south façade, where two balconies would be removed. Solarium structures at the upper floors, which were approved by the Historical Commission, would be removed and new, similar structures added. Railings for terraces would be added at the second floor and replaced at the upper floors. Garage and loading dock doors would be replaced at the east façade. The masonry cladding would be repaired and recoated. Mechanical equipment would be added at the north, where huge grain transporting machines once stood.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. Developers Reed Slogoff and Jim Pearlstein, attorney William Martin, architect Guy Gindhart, and historic consultant Bob Powers represented the application.

Mr. Farnham explained that the Architectural Committee reviewed the application and decided that the proposal satisfies the Standards in general. However, the Committee contended that some details were lacking and suggested that it should review additional details before any final approval. The Committee suggested that it, not the staff, should review the bridge, storefront, solarium, railing, flashing, window, mullion, and other details. Therefore, Mr. Farnham reported, the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept, not final approval. Mr. Farnham explained that, after the Committee voted to recommend approval in concept, one Committee member questioned the legality of converting the application for final approval to one for approval in concept without the consent of the applicant, who had neither agreed nor disagreed with the conversion. Mr. Farnham stated that the ordinance requires the Commission to act on every application within 60 days or the application is deemed approved. If the Commission does not act on the application for final approval by approving, denying, or tabling it, but does approve an application in concept, one could argue that the Commission has not acted and the application would be deemed approved after 60 days. To avoid that problem, Mr.

Farnham suggested that the Commission hear the applicant's presentation and determine if the requisite level of detail has been provided for a final approval. He observed that, if the applicant has provided the requisite detail, the Commission can grant the final approval. If the applicant has not, then the Commission can ask the applicant to voluntarily convert the application to an in concept application, avoiding the 60-day problem, or the Commission can deny the application altogether.

Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Farnham to elaborate on the elements of the application that lacked the requisite detail. Mr. Farnham stated that the question would be better answered by Ms. Hawkins, the chair of the Committee. Ms. Hawkins stated that the original application did not include any interior floors plans, but only included a small-scale site plan for the granary and new building. She noted that the applicants have submitted floor plans since the Committee meeting, but the plans are also small in scale. She stated that the applicants argued for exterior changes based on interior restrictions, but then did not document those interior restrictions.

Mr. Sherman asked the applicants to present their project to the Commission. Mr. Martin stated that his clients are seeking final approval, not approval in concept. He asked the Commission to consider granting a final approval to the project. Mr. Martin explained that the building in question is an antiquated grain elevator that dates to a time when the area north of Logan Square was industrial. He stated that his clients are seeking to adaptively reuse the former industrial building for residential and retail use for a neighborhood that has significantly changed. He stated that, to reuse the building, it must be altered. He also noted that the building has been altered many times. Most of the alterations his clients are proposing are for sections of the building that have already been altered, in some cases many times. He also explained that his clients had initially proposed a much more ambitious project, a multi-story addition on the roof. After receiving comments from neighbors and preservationists, they abandoned those plans and are now proposing a project that clearly satisfies all preservation standards. Mr. Martin stated that his clients have had extensive discussions with the Commission's staff as well as the Architectural Committee. He added that they would gladly continue to consult on the remaining open issues. He concluded that this project is ready to move forward now. With the necessary approvals, construction can begin in the spring of 2011. He stated that this project will bring jobs and investment to the city.

Mr. Slogoff stated that he and his partner have extensive experience developing historic buildings in the city. He showed a Powerpoint presentation including the plans and photographs. He pointed out the pedestrian bridge linking the new and old buildings. He pointed out the retail spaces and the ADA ramp. He explained that the mid section of the building, where the silos are located, is unusable. He pointed out the location for the mechanical equipment. He showed photographs and discussed the many alterations to the building. Mr. Slogoff showed the plans for the building. He noted that they have worked closely with the Logan Square Neighborhood Association, which will speak to the Commission in favor of the project.

Ms. Jaffe asked the applicants about the proposed use of the upper floors of the granary. Mr. Slogoff stated that those floors would be converted to 12 apartments. He added that the conversion would require minor alterations to the exterior. He stated that those alterations are detailed in the architectural plans.

Ms. Merriman asked the applicants to explain why their development schedule will not allow for an approval in concept at this point in time. Mr. Slogoff stated that the project must be granted final approval today in order to obtain a building permit in time to begin construction in early 2011. Ms. Merriman asked about the design documentation schedule. Mr. Slogoff stated that

they want to commence with the development of construction documents, but cannot move to that stage without the Commission's approval. Mr. Martin stated that an in-concept approval is not binding on the Commission; his clients cannot make the investment necessary to move the project forward without the commitment of a final approval. For example, the lending commitments cannot be finalized without a final approval. The developers cannot proceed to construction document development, which will require a significant monetary investment, without a final approval. The lenders will not allow it. Ms. Merriman asked if "funding is in place" for the project. Mr. Slogoff stated that the project is very large and complicated and the funding is not a simple matter. He stated that the project is funded. Mr. Martin stated that the lenders are requiring all City approvals before they can proceed to full construction document development. Mr. Slogoff stated that he would work with the staff on the minor details such as flashing.

Mr. Wilds asked the developers to discuss those areas of the design that concerned the Committee. Mr. Slogoff displayed a rendering of the bridge. He explained that the bridge would require the removal of some material between structural piers at the second-floor level. Mr. Pearlstein added that the impact of the bridge on the historic building is completely defined. The size and location of the cut in the façade are fully specified. Some of the materials choices and aesthetic aspects of the bridge have not yet been determined, but they will not impact the designated building. The only change to the designated building is the cut for the bridge and the addition of some structure around the cut, all of which is specified on the drawings. Mr. Sherman cautioned the Commission that it has no jurisdiction over the new construction. Mr. Farnham observed that, as an addition to the historic building, the bridge does fall within the Commission's purview. However, he suggested that the Commission limit its comments on the bridge to its impact on the historic building. He reminded the Commission that it exerted plenary jurisdiction over an addition of the 1100-block of Locust about one year ago, even though the addition itself stood on a site that was not designated. However, the addition connected to a designated building. Mr. Wilds stated that he believes that the bridge connects at the appropriate location on the granary. He also stated that he believes that the bridge should be of a contemporary design, so as not to confuse it with the historic building. Mr. Slogoff showed the elevation drawing with the cut for the bridge delineated. He also showed a rendering of the bridge.

Ms. Schlotterbeck asked about the impact of the project on the railroad right-of-way. She noted that the City uses the right-of-way for the nearby police station. Mr. Slogoff stated that the project would have no impact on the railroad right-of-way. Several Commissioners asked about Shamokin Street. Mr. Slogoff stated that it is an open, public street. He noted that they are working with the Streets and Water Departments and other City agencies to ensure that the street is treated appropriately. For example, the bridge will be constructed high enough above the street bed to allow fire trucks to pass under it.

Ms. Hawkins observed that the rendering of the bridge shown at the Committee meeting and the rendering shown today differ significantly. Ms. Hawkins stated that that was evidence that the design is in flux. Mr. Slogoff responded that the bridge design changed between the meetings in response to the Committee's concerns. Mr. Wilds observed that the bridge had a flat roof, but now has a sloped roof. Mr. Wilds asked about the plan for the bridge. Mr. Slogoff stated that the bridge would have a metal roof. Mr. Wilds asked the applicants if they would be willing to accept an approval in concept and then return next month for a final approval. Mr. Martin objected, stating that his clients need a final approval to overcome the uncertainty in the project.

Mr. Sherman asked the developers to identify their current location on the project development schedule. Mr. Pearlstein stated that they are a couple months into the design development

phase. They are working on construction drawings as they prepare to seek a building permit. Blackney Hayes Architects is working on the construction drawings for the new building. He asked the Commission to remember that they plan to invest an enormous amount of money into the granary, which will only produce a retail space and 12 apartments. He stated that the historic building is very difficult and expensive to reuse. Mr. Wilds stated that he is still confused by the explanation regarding the need for a final approval today. Mr. Slogoff stated that the project is very complicated and the Commission's approval is needed at this point to ensure that the project is feasible and to justify the investment in final construction drawings. Mr. Martin stated that, for example, they need the approval before Councilman Clarke can introduce an ordinance to authorize the construction of the bridge over the public street. Mr. Slogoff agreed, stating that they must have the final approval now, before they can proceed with other aspects of the project. Ms. Hawkins asked if the applicants would accept a final approval today for the bridge, but only an approval in concept for the remainder of the application. She asserted that the other aspects of the project were not sufficiently detailed to allow for a final approval. Mr. Farnham contended that the bridge was the least well detailed of the various aspects of the project. He suggested that the Commission might grant a final approval to the bulk of the project and in-concept approval to the bridge. He explained that the open issues with the granary itself, the design of replacement windows, storefronts, railings, flashing, mechanical equipment, and other relatively minor details are exactly the types of details that the staff routinely reviews. Whether a storefront is set back in an opening to create a reveal, whether a railing is glass or metal and set within or behind the parapet are exactly the design review problems that the staff is equipped to solve. He stated that many of the aspects of the design that are not finalized are aspects that the staff could review for approval at the staff level without the Commission's involvement. Mr. Farnham agreed that the bridge is not well defined in the current documentation. He asked the applicants if they could move the project forward with a final approval for all but the bridge and an approval in concept for the bridge. Mr. Sherman asked the applicants to continue with their presentation before they answer the questions. Mr. Wilds asked if the elevation drawings showing the changes to the exterior of the building had been provided to the Committee. Mr. Slogoff replied that they were provided to the Committee. The only supplements were the interior plans and the rendering of the bridge. Mr. Slogoff stated that they would also like a final approval now to allow them to move forward with the repair of the exterior skin of the building, which is spalling and creating some safety hazards. Ms. Merriman asked Mr. Farnham about the deadline for submissions for the next round of reviews. Mr. Farnham stated that the deadline for submissions is next Tuesday, 12 October 2010, four days from now. Mr. Sherman asked if a final approval of everything but the bridge would move the project along. Mr. Pearlstein stated that they need an assurance on the bridge. The bridge is the means to access the upper residential units. Mr. Wilds asked the staff and attorney if it would be possible to grant final approval to the bridge, but require both the staff and the Architectural Committee to review the details. Mr. Martin stated that that condition would be acceptable. Mr. Farnham observed that the Commission has conditioned approvals on the Architectural Committee's review of details. He noted the case of 10 Rittenhouse, during which the Committee reviewed the design for the storefronts along 18th and Sansom Streets. Mr. Sherman remarked that this solution would allow the process to move forward and still provide an opportunity for the Architectural Committee to review the design. Ms. Merriman asked how disagreements are mediated in a situation such as this. Mr. Farnham explained that, if the applicants and the Committee could not come to a consensus, then the application could be forwarded to the Commission for arbitration.

Ed Panek, chair of the Zoning Committee of the Logan Square Neighborhood Association, stated that his organization supports this project. He asked that the Commission grant it final approval. He contended that the project is "totally consistent and respectful of the historic

significance of the granary” and consistent with the neighborhood development plan, which was devised in collaboration with the City Planning Commission. He stated that the project will provide great benefits for the neighborhood.

Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Alliance supports a final approval of the project. He thanked the developers for their respect for the historic building and the process. He submitted a letter of support from John Gallery, the executive director of the Alliance, who was unable to attend the meeting owing to a scheduling conflict.

Mr. Wilds stated that he would move to approve the application, with the Architectural Committee to review the details. He observed that the developers could appeal to the Historical Commission if they were unable to come to a consensus with the Committee. Mr. Mattioni contended that the staff could review all details except those for the bridge. Mr. Wilds stated that he was convinced that the Committee should be involved in the review of all of the details. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee agreed with the applicants’ proposal in general, but wanted to review the details. Mr. Mattioni stated that he was confident that the staff could review the details. Mr. Farnham thanked Mr. Mattioni for his vote of confidence and remarked that he believed that either path for the review of the details, the Committee or the staff, would be satisfactory.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the application as submitted, with the Architectural Committee to review details including those for the bridge, storefronts, solaria, flashing, and windows. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1200-02 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: Ches 12 Partners, LP

Applicant: Morris Clarke

History: 1915, Horace Trumbauer, architect

Designation: individually designated, 9/9/2006

Proposal: Construct rooftop additions

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval with a translucent glass screen wall held back 18 inches from the side wall instead of a green screen, provided the front elevator penthouse is restudied to determine whether its height can be reduced, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes converting this former bank building into a billiard parlor and a facility for banquets and other functions. A retractable, greenhouse-like room is proposed for the roof. The roof would open and close, allowing it to be used as an indoor or outdoor space. An existing elevator penthouse at the front or north of the building would be enlarged and a second elevator and stair penthouse would be built at the south end of the building. The new rooftop structures would be minimally visible from 12th Street and perhaps from Chestnut Street. A screen would be added along the eastern edge of the roof to shield neighboring buildings from sounds and views.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architects Dave Schultz and Morris Clark, attorney Ron Patterson, and developer Paul Giegerich represented the application.

Mr. Patterson explained that the Beneficial Mutual Savings Bank vacated this building, which had served as its headquarters, in 1999. Beneficial attached a deed restriction to the property preventing its future use as a bank. Mr. Patterson stated that the building is in very good condition; its historic interior spaces are intact. He stated that the current zoning would allow for a much larger building on this site. He stated that they are not applying for a larger building, but for a rather modest addition on the rooftop. He stated that the building would be used for a high-end billiard parlor. He commented that the rooftop design includes a screen to protect the near neighbors from the sights and sounds of the rooftop area. The rooftop area would have a retractable roof.

Mr. Schultz provided a summary of the project. He stated that, although the building is large, it has a relatively small interior space. The bank hall has a 55-foot ceiling. He stated that many have considered reusing the building since it was vacated in 1999, but no one has developed a feasible project owing to the small interior space and other limitations. He stated that they need to develop the rooftop space to make the project profitable. He showed current photographs and sightline studies for the building. He asserted that the rooftop addition would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. He reported that the rehabilitation would retain the important historic interiors. He noted that the historic interiors will be accessible to the public. He showed photographs of the rooftop and the existing mechanical penthouse. He showed plans of the rooftop addition with translucent screen. He stated that the design satisfies historic preservation standards; it is compatible with but differentiated from the historic building. He pointed out the proposed addition to the existing elevator penthouse at the front of the building and the proposed stair and elevator penthouse at the rear. They will be built in tan brick to match the extant brick. He stated that he will reduce the height of the front elevator penthouse if possible. He stated that he is showing the worst case scenario in the architectural drawings. Depending on the elevator selected, he may be able to reduce the height of the penthouse. He stated that the glass penthouse will have a roof that opens and closes. It will be setback from the front façade. It will be minimally visible from the street. He reported that the building will not be altered below the cornice line. The stone will be cleaned and the windows will be refurbished, but nothing will be removed or added. He showed the design for the acoustic screen, which will block sound from leaving the rooftop area. He stated that it will be translucent; it will allow light in, but will block views into the space from nearby buildings. Mr. Schultz stated that his client will seek historic tax credits for the project. Therefore, the plans were devised to satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

Mr. Schaaf asked if the outer, translucent wall was needed. He suggested that the inner wall, the wall of the greenhouse structure, could be designed to block sound and views. Ms. Merriman responded that the walls of the greenhouse along with the roof retract. The outer wall is needed to block views and sound when the greenhouse is retracted. Mr. Schultz agreed and stated that both walls are needed.

Mr. Schultz displayed computer-generated mock-ups of the proposed rooftop structures. He contended that the structures would be inconspicuous from the street. He also stated that he is investigating the front elevator design and will reduce the height of the penthouse if possible.

Ms. Merriman stated that she is very excited about this project. She stated that this is a very important building on a neglected section of Chestnut Street. She congratulated the applicants for proposing a project that preserves the historic building and improves the street. Ms. Hawkins agreed and reported that the Architectural Committee was also excited by and fully supports this project. She stated that the presentation of the project was very thoughtful. Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants to confirm that the roof in front of the greenhouse would not be occupied. Mr.

Schultz confirmed that it would not be used. She asked the architect to confirm that there would be no alterations to the monumental front entrance. Mr. Schultz stated that the front façade would not be altered. Ms. Hawkins asked what alternatives the applicants would pursue if the retractable greenhouse system is deemed infeasible. Mr. Schultz stated that they intend to construct the greenhouse. Mr. Patterson added that the outer translucent wall would not change, even if the greenhouse wall design did change. Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants if they stood by their earlier statement that they would not place any new mechanical equipment on the open roof, but would install it all in the mechanical penthouse. Mr. Schultz stated that they had no plans to install mechanical equipment on the open roof. He stated that he understood that, if they changed any aspect of their design, then they would need to seek a new approval.

John Kasky, an attorney, stated that he represents several residents in the White Building, a condominium building across 12th Street from the property in question. Mr. Kasky contradicted Mr. Patterson's claim that a deed restriction prevented the building from being used as a bank. He stated that the restriction will eventually expire. Mr. Wilds cautioned Mr. Kasky that the Historical Commission has no jurisdiction over use, but only has jurisdiction over the appearance of the exterior envelope of the building. He suggested that Mr. Kasky's concerns would be better addressed in the zoning realm. Mr. Kasky stated that there is no permanent ban on the use of the building as a bank. Mr. Kasky claimed that the proposed use does not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He cited a New Additions Guidelines from the Standards:

Not Recommended: Expanding the size of the historic building by constructing a new addition when the new use could be met by altering non-character defining interior spaces.

Mr. Kasky stated that the applicants are proposing a bar with billiards tables that accommodate up to 847 people. He stated that the interior, without the rooftop addition, would accommodate 600 people. He contended that the architectural plans show a bar, not a restaurant. He stated that a bar for 600 people is large enough. He objected to the rooftop addition because it would accommodate another 250 people, which he claimed was too many. He stated that proposal stipulates 17 billiard tables. If one assumes five people per table, then a maximum of 85 people will be playing billiards. The remaining 520 people inside will be doing nothing but drinking, he claimed. He asked why the establishment needed another 250 people drinking on the roof. He distributed a copy of Mr. Giegerich's Facebook page. Mr. Kasky claimed that no sound, light, or shadow studies of the addition to the roof have been conducted. He stated that he was present for the first sound study and claimed that the building failed it when the mechanical equipment on the roof was switched on. He questioned why people support this project. He claimed that the Washington Square West Civic Association opposes the project. He stated that this is nothing more than a proposal for the biggest bar in Philadelphia. He claimed that this is a "money grab." He stated that the rooftop addition was unnecessary.

Lee Barrett, a resident of the White Building, spoke in opposition to the project. He asked if there would be live music on the roof deck. Mr. Sherman asked him to address the preservation merits of the project, not the noise or use. Mr. Barrett stated that the roof top additions would not be visible from the ground, but they would be visible from tall buildings. He asked the Commissioners if they wanted to live near an 800-person party facility. It would create a residential dead zone. He stated that no one wants to live in Old City south of Market Street because of the bars. He asked the Commission to reject a bar in this neighborhood.

Mr. Kasky distributed information about the proposed occupant load for the building. Mr. Sherman stated that the occupancy was outside the Commission's jurisdiction. Mr. Kasky claimed that the information was germane because it shows that the building can support a use without the rooftop addition. He claimed that the proposed use was a "non-recommended use" according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Mr. Wilds explained to Mr. Kasky that the Commission's ordinance directs that the Commission must be "guided by" the Standards. The Standards are not absolute. Mr. Wilds stated that this building would be difficult to adaptively reuse. He stated that he is glad that someone has found a feasible reuse. Mr. Wilds noted that this is a very busy, commercial area. This use is not out of place on this commercial section of Chestnut Street.

Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Alliance is supportive of this project. He remarked that the Alliance appreciates that the new owner will treat the designated exterior as well as the historic interiors appropriately. He asserted that the proposed use is compatible with the historic building. He stated that the rooftop addition will allow the rehabilitation of an important historic building with limited interior space. He contended that the proposed alterations satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He stated that the preservation Alliance urges the Commission to approve the proposal.

Mr. Farnham discussed the application of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards to this project. He stated that the Commission does not cite Standard 1 because it relates to use and the Commission has no jurisdiction over use. Standard 1 reads:

A property will be used as it was historically or given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

Mr. Farnham cautioned the Commission against citing any Standard or Guideline that is predicated on use because the Commission has no jurisdiction over use. He stated that two Standards are applicable in this case, Standards 9 and 10, which read:

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.

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.

Mr. Farnham stated that, in the staff's opinion, this proposal satisfies both Standards. It is differentiated yet compatible and would not result in the destruction of any historic resources. He added that, if it was removed in the future, the form and integrity of the building would be unimpaired. He explained that one of the Roofs Guidelines in the Standards is directly on point and should be applied. It states:

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.

Mr. Farnham contended that the rooftop additions would be inconspicuous for the public right-of-way and would not damage or obscure character-defining features. He noted that one of the interested parties, a resident of the White Building, stated that the rooftop additions would not

be visible from the street, but would be visible from surrounding buildings. He advised the Commission to consider the impact of the proposed additions from the street, not from private perspectives. The Commission is charged with protecting public access to historic resources. Mr. Kasky again stated that the rooftop addition is not required for the new use. Mr. Sherman cautioned Mr. Kasky not to speak out of order and observed that the Commission cannot make determinations about use.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 11 to 0. Ms. Jaffe abstained.

2012-14 LOCUST STREET

Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

Applicant: Gene March, O'Donnell & Naccorato

History: c. 1835

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

Proposal: Legalize aluminum windows and shutters

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposed dormer restoration, with the staff to review details; denial of the legalization of the inappropriate windows and shutters, pursuant to Standard 6.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of aluminum-clad windows and the removing or covering of the historic clamshell frames. The new frames do not match the historic ones. The new dormer window is a square-head window; it does not replicate the original arched-head window. Inappropriate shutters have been installed at all front-façade windows. The application proposes to restore the dormer to its original appearance in exchange for legalizing the remainder of the work.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Gene March represented the application.

Mr. Wilds noted that there are no church-state issues raised by this property. It is a rowhouse owned by the Archdiocese, but not used for the practice of religion. Mr. Wilds contended that there are no reasons for not upholding the Standards at this property. He asked Mr. March to present his case. Mr. March stated that the windows are of a high quality. He stated that the parish was aware of the Commission's jurisdiction over the nearby church building, but not this building. He explained that the parish was attempting to improve the appearance of the building. He stated that the windows are wood with an aluminum cladding. They are very high quality windows. He added that the windows were very expensive. The parish would like to retain them. Mr. March offered to restore the dormer window, installing the appropriate arched-top window. He also offered to restore the doorway to its historic appearance; the doorway had been altered before designation. Mr. Wilds asked if the parish owned the building at the time of designation. Mr. March stated that he did not know, but assumed that the parish did own it at the time of designation. Mr. Baron confirmed that the non-historic door and doorway were in place at the time of designation.

Ms. Hawkins agreed with the applicant that the new windows are of a very high quality that duplicates the original configuration and profiles, if not materials. Ms. Hawkins stated that this is not a typical request to legalize inappropriate vinyl windows. She stated that the Committee approved of the compromise, but did not feel that it was within its authority to recommend

adoption of the compromise. However, she contended that the Commission could accept the compromise.

Mr. Wilds asked if the first-floor windows should be six-over-one or six-over-six double-hungs. Mr. Baron stated that the six-over-six was appropriate. Mr. Baron explained that the windows are installed in the wrong plane in the openings. They are set too far forward. He stated that it would be an expensive task to move them back to the correct plane. He observed that the Commission could get more benefit at a lower cost with the doorway. Resetting the windows would be expensive, but have a minor visual impact. Fixing the doorway would be relatively inexpensive and would have a significant visual impact. Mr. Baron concluded that the dormer and doorway would be restored and the shutters removed. Mr. Mattioni noted that the owner is not required to fix the doorway. Mr. Baron agreed, but stated that the owner is proposing the restoration of the doorway as mitigation for the illegal windows.

ACTION: Ms. Leonard moved to approve the compromise plan, which includes legalizing the windows in exchange for the restoration of the dormer and doorway and the removal of the shutters, with the staff to review details. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

135 S. 18TH STREET

Owner: 135 S. 18th Street Associates L.P.

Applicant: Joanne Phillips Esq.

History: 1913, McIlvaine & Roberts, architects

Designation: Contributing to Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Proposal: Alter masonry, add storefront windows, door, and awnings

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the three proposed designs, but approval of a revised design that retains a 12 to 18-inch limestone pier at the northern edge of the limestone cladding in question, shifts the remaining limestone cladding to the south, creating a doorway separate from the storefront, and includes separate awnings over each of the keystones and the doorway, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: The application proposes to modify several ground floor commercial spaces to house a restaurant. Originally the ground floor was entirely residential and had residential-scale punched openings which are still reflected in the voussoir and keystone stonework over the former window openings. A storefront and a door were cut into the original stonework prior to designation. This application proposes to move a remaining piece of the original wall to the south into the area of a door opening. This would allow the consolidation of interior areas to create a larger glazed storefront and the relocation of a door for a preferred circulation pattern in the restaurant. By removing the right jamb of one of the original windows, however, it further removes the building from its original residential character and creates the impression that this heavy building sits on a base of glass.

The application proposes a new frame around the storefront that would project out several inches from the stone. Awnings would be installed above the windows. The applicants have shown several alternate designs for treating the stonework above the storefront area. The preferred design would hide the stonework with opaque glazed panels. The second alternate would cover the stonework with clear glass and the third alternate would leave the stonework exposed.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Attorney Matt McClure, restaurateur David Fields, and architect Jeff Wyant represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the applicants had revised the design to comply with the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. McClure stated that his client agreed with the Architectural Committee's recommendation and revised the plan to comply with it. Ms. Hawkins stated that she is very pleased with the revised drawings, which comply with the Committee's advice. She stated that the masonry had been reworked to meet the Committee's suggestions and the awnings had been divided into separate units as the Committee had advised. She suggested narrowing the awning over the entrance slightly, to differentiate it from those over the windows.

Mr. Schaaf asked about a door in the storefront. Mr. Fields replied that Mr. Schaaf was mistaking a solid panel for a door. It is not a door. It will be a solid panel matching the rest of the storefront system and will stand in front of an existing structural column. Mr. Schaaf asked why the applicants were not proposing new stone for the pier in the center of the storefront window. Mr. McClure explained that they are not proposing to add any new masonry, but only to shift original masonry from one location to another. Mr. McClure also stated that the addition of a masonry pier at the location of the solid panel as suggested by Mr. Schaaf would not constitute a restoration. It would not replicate an historic jamb location. Mr. Wilds suggested that the Commissioners resist the temptation to serve as architect and instead consider the advice of the Committee. Ms. Hawkins observed that one cannot base a restoration at the storefront level on the windows above, as Mr. Schaaf had done. The first and second-floors will not align one another. She rejected Mr. Schaaf's suggestion. She stated that cladding that pier in stone would be a false representation of history. Mr. Baron assured Mr. Schaaf that the staff would work with the applicant to identify an appropriate cladding for the pier. Mr. McClure stated that he would propose an opaque glass to clad the pier.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the revised architectural plans presented to the Historical Commission on 8 October 2010, with the staff to review details. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

332 S. 24TH STREET

Owner: Judy Wicks

Applicant: Tina Geary

History: c. 1840, refaced c. 1960

Designation: Contributing to Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Construct roof deck

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a mock up of the deck proves that it will be inconspicuous from public rights of ways, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck over the back slope of the main roof and flat roof over the rear ell of this property. The deck will have planters, an air conditioning unit, and a pergola, further increasing its massing on the roof. The deck would be visible from Panama Street and likely visible from Fitler Square.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Judy Wicks represented the application.

Mr. Wilds asked if the pergola would be visible from the Fidler Square. Mr. Danta noted that the pergola would be visible, given that the top portion of the air conditioning unit is currently visible. Ms. Merriman stated that she would not be opposed to the proposed alteration because it would not be any more visible than the existing air conditioning unit on the roof. Ms. Hawkins asked Ms. Wicks if the revised design meets her goals. Ms. Wicks stated that the revised design would not be as “pretty” as the design initially proposed, but she added that she was willing to comply with the Committee’s recommendation.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to approve the revised proposal as presented to the Commission on 8 October 2010, with the staff to review the details. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 11 to 1. Mr. Wilds dissented.

161-63 N. 3RD STREET

Owner/Applicant: Linda Hwang

History: nineteenth-century granite sidewalks

Designation: individually designated, 12/31/1984

Significant to Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Legalize alterations to granite sidewalks

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize incising grooves into nineteenth-century granite sidewalks that surround this corner property. The downspout troughs were also altered. The owner claims that she has been sued several times and hopes the grooves will prevent further slip and fall legal actions against her property.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Linda Hwang represented the application.

Ms. Merriman asked if the alteration could be reversed. Mr. Schaaf stated that it cannot be reversed, but that the sidewalks could have been altered in a non-destructive manner without removing so much historic fabric to achieve the same traction. The finish could have been altered to give more traction. He also stated that the grooves are very consistent with the ways in which these sidewalks were altered historically for more traction. Mr. Wilds asked if there was a difference in cost between incising the grooves, as was done, and applying a torched finish, which would have provided traction without removing so much stone. Mr. Schaaf stated he did not know the cost differential. Ms. Hawkins stated that the alteration could not be reversed because much more historic fabric would have to be removed to create a new even surface.

Ms. Merriman asked whether the Commission has ever worked with property owners to educate them about the best treatments for historic sidewalks. Mr. Baron stated that sidewalks have never been specifically addressed with an education and outreach effort. Mr. Wilds noted that the Old City Historic District Handbook highlights the historic significance of the sidewalks. Mr. Farnham noted that the handbook does not address appropriate treatments for altering them. He stated that the staff could work on an educational pamphlet for property owners with such historic sidewalks. Mr. Mattioni inquired whether these grooves are actually effective. Ms. Hawkins answered that they are initially, but that the grooves wear with time. She asserted that a flame-finish is more effective and a much more compatible alteration. Mr. Mattioni acknowledged that the sidewalks can be very slippery.

Ms. Wang stated that the alteration was done for the safety of the pedestrians. She also noted the legal actions she has faced owing to the slippery condition of the sidewalks. She contended that she considered the grooves to be appropriate based on what she encountered at neighboring properties.

Ms. Leonard asked if this legalization would set a precedent for future applications. Ms. Merriman asserted that, in her opinion, it would not and that the staff should educate property owners to avoid similar legalizations in the future.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the application to legalize the sidewalk alterations. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

100 MARKET STREET

Owner: Rag #, Inc.

Applicant: Frank Rapisarda, Tackett Architects

History: 1886

Designation: Individually designated, 1976; contributing to the Old City Historic District, 2003

Project: Rehabilitate storefront, install awnings, and remove sign

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the awnings at the upper floors; approval of all other aspects of the application, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert this vacant building into a restaurant and apartments. Café windows and signage are proposed for the storefronts. The Commission previously approved similar café windows and signage. Awnings are proposed over second through fourth-story windows of the façade; they would cover Queen Anne multi-paned windows on the fourth-story. An existing neon sign that reads “Bar Grill” would be removed.

ACTION: See the Consent Agenda.

1718-20 NORTH STREET

Owner: Don Doyle

Applicant: Michael Loonstyn

History: c. 1926

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

Project: Construct new building

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story twin building with roof decks. The façade would be made of brick with four-over-four wood windows, second-story Juliet balconies, four-paneled, single-leaf doors, and a first-story garage. The rear elevation would be clad in stucco with balconies and casement windows. The side elevations would be clad in scored stucco with modern horizontal windows. The staff recommends that more compatible windows be installed in the side elevations.

In July 2010, the Commission reviewed an application to demolish an existing garage that was classified as Contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District, and construct a three-story building in its place. The applicant had neither claimed nor provided the documentation to

support a claim that the building could not be adaptively reused or that its demolition was necessary in the public interest. Rear sections of the building had collapsed and the Department of Licenses & Inspections had cited the building for Unsafe conditions, but the applicant had not claimed that the Department was requiring the demolition of the building to abate the Unsafe conditions. The Historical Commission voted to deny the application, pursuant to Section 14-2007(7)(j) of the historic preservation ordinance.

On 23 July 2010, the Department of Licenses and Inspections cited the garage as Imminently Dangerous. Per the memorandum of agreement with the Department, the staff approved a permit application for its demolition on 18 August 2010. The building has been demolished.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Historical Commission. Developer Michael Loonstyn represented the application.

Mr. Loonstyn explained that his architect revised the design since the Architectural Committee meeting. The side windows have been removed. Mr. Wilds asked about the central carriage doorway. Mr. Loonstyn explained that there is a garage behind the door with four interior parking spaces. Mr. Wilds asked about the arrangement of the windows and doors at the first floor, which he characterized as awkward. Mr. Loonstyn explained that the design is based on a historic carriage house on the street. He stated that the community organization compelled him to use this design. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee objected to the transom over the garage door. She asserted that such a configuration would not have been used historically. Mr. Loonstyn responded that liked the transom over the garage door because it would provide natural light to the garage. Ms. Hawkins again stated that the transom over garage door is an awkward and non-historic configuration. She also stated that the flanking door and window combinations at the first floor are awkward. She suggested a door and sidelight combination or other design combination with more appropriate proportions and rhythms. The door and window are too close to one another, she contended. Mr. Loonstyn stated that his architect had adjusted the spacing between the window and door. He also stated that he would be willing to eliminate the transom. He explained that he cannot eliminate the door and window combination entirely because the neighborhood association is forcing him to use it. He commented that the neighborhood association is very forceful and will not accept deviations from its designs. Ms. Jaffe asked if anything had changed from the earlier design other than the elimination of the side windows. He replied that nothing else had changed. Mr. Wilds asked if Mr. Loonstyn had considered a door and window combination that was symmetrical with the window with balcony at the second floor. Mr. Loonstyn replied that he had not. He stated that he was proposing the design documented in the drawings. Ms. Hawkins stated that the windows at the first floor look "orphaned" because they are set so low in the façade. She again suggested that the window and door should be enclosed in one opening. Mr. Loonstyn agreed to make that adjustment with his architect and present a revised design to the staff. Ms. Hawkins stated that a door and sidelight combination that was equal in width and aligned to the balcony above would provide the most light.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised design presented to the Historical Commission on 8 October 2010, provided the transom over the garage door is eliminated and the first-floor door-window combinations are converted to doors with single or paired sidelights and transoms that are no wider than the balconies above them, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

569 N. 20TH STREET

Owner: Bromley Investment Group

Applicant: Andy Barreras

History: c. 1886

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

Project: Construct rear addition

ARCHITECTURE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the addition is set back a minimum of four inches from the side facade, the lower cornice is maintained, and the main cornice returns and continues over the addition.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a third-floor rear addition on top of a two-story rear portion of the building. The addition would be clad in stucco and the roofline would be flush with the existing building roofline. The proposed windows would be wood to match the historic windows.

In July 2010, the Commission reviewed a similar application to construct a rear addition; however, the roofline was proposed to be higher than the existing building roofline. The drawings provided did not include a rear elevation or plans. The Commission voted to deny the application, owing to incompleteness and pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Historical Commission. Andy Barreras, the contractor, represented the application.

Mr. Sherman asked Mr. Barreras if he accepted the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Mr. Barreras stated that he will provide a four-inch setback from the historic façade for the addition and will revise the cornices as recommended. Mr. Sherman asked him if he has plans for the front façade restoration. Mr. Barreras stated that he is working with neighborhood's zoning committee on a restoration and will submit plans to the Commission when the design is complete. Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Barreras to confirm that he will retain the brick cornice. He stated that he would retain the cornice. Mr. Schaaf asked Mr. Barreras how he would drain water from the roof. Mr. Barreras replied that the drain will run through the building.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided the addition is set back a minimum of four inches from the side facade, the lower cornice is maintained, and the main cornice returns and continues over the addition. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adjourn at 11:32 a.m. Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 1: A property will be used as it was historically or given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

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

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

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

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

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