THE MINUTES OF THE 576TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

13 AUGUST 2010
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR

PRESENT
Sam Sherman, Chair
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
Robert Thomas, AIA
Miles Wilson

Randal Baron, Preservation Planner III
Erin Cote, Preservation Planner II
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II

ALSO PRESENT
Dawn Tancredi, Esq., Mattioni, Ltd.
Nathan Flanigan
Betty Mon, Mon & Associates
Dawn DiDonato, Esq.
Michael Young
Laurie Aker
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance
Haleh Kadkhoda
Kenneth Johnson
Frank Kakos, Frank Kakos Architects
David Frank
Tim Kerner, Terra Studio

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

MINUTES OF THE 575TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the minutes of the 575th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 9 July 2010. Ms. Schlotterbeck seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 JULY 2010

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

Mr. Baron presented the Consent Agenda to the Commission. Mr. Baron asked if any Commissioners or members of the public wished to comment on the Consent Agenda. Ms. Hawkins requested that the application for 200 Market Street be removed from the consent agenda and placed on the regular agenda to allow for discussion.

> **ACTION:** Ms. Leonard moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for 2137 St. James Street, 1827 Delancey Street, 2140 Green Street, and 122-24 S. 18th Street. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

221 PINE STREET

Owner: Ning Yu
Applicant: Betty Mon
History: c. 1813-24; new façade, c. 1970
Designation: Contributing to Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999
Project: Demolish and reconstruct portion of rear ell
ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the addition, provided that there are no modifications to the roof of the historic portion of the rear ell and the roof deck railing is transparent, with the staff to review the details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to retain a portion of the historic rear ell, to demolish the remainder as well as an extension of the ell built sometime between 1910 and 1922, and to construct a new extension. The extension would be the full width of the lot and two stories high with a parapet and roof deck. A stair tower, roof modification, and parapet are proposed for the historic portion of the rear ell to provide access to the roof deck. The application mentions dormer restoration, window replacement and roof repair, but provides no details. The windows in the historic portion of the rear ell should be six-over-six double-hung sash windows.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Historical Commission. Expediter Betty Mon represented the application.

Ms. Mon stated that her client supports the Architectural Committee's recommendation. The Commissioners agreed that the recommendation was appropriate.

> **ACTION**: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the addition, provided that there are no modifications to the roof of the historic portion of the rear ell and the roof deck railing is transparent, with the staff to

review the details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Schlotterbeck seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2137 ST. JAMES STREET
Owner: Heather and Michael Ascher
Applicant: Tim Kerner
History: 1923, Spencer Roberts, architect
Designation: Significant to Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995
Project: Replace windows
ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace windows at the rear of the property that are visible from the public right-of-way. Rather than restore the windows with the 7-¼" wide center post as they were originally and still are at a neighboring property, the applicant proposes a 3" wide center post.

ACTION: See the Consent Agenda.

1827 DELANCEY PLACE
Owner: Brian & Shirley Sharkey
Applicant: Dominic Aspite
History: 1901, Charles Barton Keen, architect
Designation: Significant to the Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995
Project: Reconstruct roof decks and pilothouse
ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to expand the pilothouse and alter and reconstruct the roof decks. A pergola is proposed, which would be minimally visible from 19th Street down the rear alley. All other proposed work would not be visible from a public right-of-way.

ACTION: See the Consent Agenda.

1502-04 GREEN STREET
Owner: Michael Loonstyn
Applicant: Michael Loonstyn
Designation: non-contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000
Project: Construct infill building
ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and owing to incompleteness.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an infill building in the Spring Garden Historic District. The building would have a stone base on the first floor, while the upper floors would be brick. Two-story bays and French doors with Juliet balconies are proposed for the second and third floors. The staff suggests that the transom windows be eliminated and the French doors be

full height with the lintels to align with the neighboring buildings and the balconies to be in the same plane of the building. The staff also suggests double-leaf doors at the main entrances.

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

Mr. Loonstyn stated that the Commission's jurisdiction is review & comment only in this case, as there was no structure at the time of designation on this property. He noted he does not own the entire parcel but only the first 80 feet from the front lot line. He stated that at there are only four steps and cinderblock wall on the property. He stated that he purchased the first nine of 21 parking spaces at the rear lot, which is deeded as two separate properties. Mr. Schaaf asked the staff to comment on whether the Commission has plenary jurisdiction or review & comment jurisdiction in this case. Ms. Cote explained that staff considers this a developed parcel subject to full review owing to the walls and garden and the garage wall along the rear of the property on Brandywine Street.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she agreed with the comments of the Architectural Committee. She stated that this is inappropriate for this block. She objected to the bays and balconies. Mr. Loonstyn stated that he tried to replicate the neighboring buildings on the first floor by using stone, and would gladly make the windows smaller and replicate the doors as well, but would like to keep the bay and Juliet balcony as it adds to the design and sets these buildings apart. He stated that his architect, John Bushnell, is sympathetic to the character of the area.

Mr. Thomas stated that he thought the buildings as designed fit in the neighborhood, noting that although the original rowhouses are very uniform, the area is punctuated with buildings that were modified over time. Some of those have bay windows. He said that this design respects the cornice line and fits with other elements of the block. He stated that having something different identifies these as new buildings. He stated that he agreed with the staff recommendation and opined that these building would be good neighbors in the district.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the French doors with balconies and the bay windows are the design features that conflict with the surrounding historic district. She suggested a compromise; the design should be revised to include the bays or the balconies, but not both. She also questioned the alignment of the windows at the fourth floor. Mr. Schaaf agreed with a compromise, but stated that, if the fourth floor windows were moved, then the windows over the bay would be strangely positioned. Mr. Thomas stated that the cornice line and the stone on the first floor make this design compatible, but the other design elements indicate that the building is contemporary, not historic.

> **ACTION:** Ms. Merriman moved to approve the application as submitted, with the staff to review details. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 2. Mses. Hawkins and Jaffe dissented.

100 N. 17TH STREET
Owner: 1701 LP Partners
Applicant: Robert Snow, Agoos Lovera Architects
History: 6-story structure, 1914, Ballinger & Perrot for Methodist Church; 8-story addition, 1921
Designation: individually designated, 1/7/1982
Project: Rehabilitate building and add canopy
ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details including storefront and door details and a mockup of the rooftop HVAC equipment, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate this former office building to create 111 apartment units. An entrance canopy would be added. Storefronts would be rebuilt. HVAC equipment and a stair house would be added at the roof.

The Historical Commission reviewed a similar project to convert this building into a hotel in 2008. At that time the "Historical Commission voted to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the upper roof penthouses, owing to incompleteness, and the storefront details; and to approve the remainder of the application with the following revisions: the lower roof mechanical screen and railing are painted a neutral color, and the terra-cotta sill lips are repaired up to the 6th floor break."

The current application differs from the previous application in several ways. The applicant has provided drawings showing both the earlier and current designs to facilitate the review. The extensive mechanical equipment and screening at the 4th floor roof have been eliminated as has the elevator tower. The stair house proposed for the main roof has been reduced in size and shifted to a less visible area. However, the HVAC unit on the roof has been increased in size by a third and shifted closer to the edge of the building on 17th Street. Two doors previously proposed to be changed to windows at the first floor will remain doors and will be replaced in wood. The storefronts will be replaced with new storefronts with a single sheet of plate glass. A new glass and stainless steel canopy is now proposed for the main entrance of the building on 17th Street to provide shelter for the residents of the building.

For the details of the storefronts, which were not previously approved, the applicants showed a molding detail which will be applied to the storefront to create the appearance of the historic details. The Committee thought that the size and location of the rooftop HVAC would be appropriate but recommended a site visit to view a mockup of the HVAC equipment to determine that it would be inconspicuous. The applicants removed the canopy from the application at the Committee meeting.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Historical Commission. Developer Ashley MacCrory and architects Ted Agoos and Adam Jeckel represented the application.

The Commissioners discussed the application and decided that the Architectural Committee's recommendation was appropriate.

> **ACTION:** Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, with the staff to review details including storefront and door details and a mockup of the rooftop HVAC equipment, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

200 MARKET STREET
Owner: Sandra Schwalb & Andrew M. Ullman, Trustees of the Joan & Bruce Loyd Trusts
Applicant: Raymond Brogden, architect
History: unknown
Designation: Non-contributing to Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003
Project: Rehabilitate building and construct rooftop addition with deck
ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Commission's July 2010 approval in concept and Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate and add to this building for restaurant use. The Historical Commission has reviewed versions of this application several times and has approved it in concept twice and for final approval once. The latest revision of the plans proposes minor amendments to the overall scheme to add a second-floor addition and deck. The building would be clad in stucco at the first floor and metal panels at the second floor. The Commission reviewed a rendering of this plan at its July 2010 meeting and approved it in concept. The latest plan complies with the many suggestions proffered by the Committee and Commission.

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

Mr. Brogden displayed revised architectural drawings that were consistent with the architectural rendering preferred by the Committee. Ms. Hawkins asked the applicant to confirm that the drawings were now consistent with the rendering. Mr. Brogden stated that they were now consistent with the rendering.

> **ACTION:** Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Commission's July 2010 approval in concept and Standard 9. Ms. Schlotterbeck seconded the motion, which passed unanimously

2140 GREEN STREET
Owner: Michael Young
Applicant: Frank Kakos
History: c. 1854 by Edward R. Parry, builder
Designation: individually designated, 11/2/1972
Contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000
Project: Rear addition
ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations to the rear façade and restoration of a missing feature on the front façade. The rear of the property faces a service alley lined with garages and back yard walls. The proposed rear alterations include the demolition of the non-historic rear façade. Currently, the rear façade cantilevers out over the ground floor. The applicant proposes to demolish the cantilevered section and align the rear façade with the plane of the ground floor. The applicant proposes to construct a deck over an existing parking deck area. This alteration is

consistent with neighboring properties. Nearly every property along this block has rear decks over parking garages. The applicant also proposes enlarging or creating window openings in the east elevation of the rear ell facing the side yard. These windows are not visible from the public right-of-way. The application includes a third-floor addition. This addition would be located over the rear ell and connect to the main block of the house. The addition would be slightly taller than the main block of the house. However, this height difference would not be discernable from Green Street. The addition would open onto a roof-top deck with glass railing and a small green roof. The public would not be able to see much, if any, of these alterations from the rear service alley.

The south side of this block of Green Street has front gardens enclosed by wrought iron fences. The gardens are found in front of a row that occupies most of the block. This particular property is part of that row. The applicant proposes to restore the missing front garden. The extant fences are not all identical, but they share some common elements, such as cast iron posts and either hair pin or pickets with finials. The applicant proposes to install a similar fence that would follow the pattern already established on the block. The dimensions of the garden would match those of the neighboring houses.

ACTION: See the Consent Agenda.

22 S. 3RD STREET
Owner: 22 S. 3rd Street Associates
Applicant: Nathan Flanigan
History: 1837, William Strickland, architect
Designation: individually designated, 4/30/1957
Significant to the Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003
Project: Illuminate façade
ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of recessed light fixtures in the porch ceiling, but denial of the gooseneck fixtures at the pediment, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install light fixtures to illuminate the façade of this former bank building. The façade is clad in marble. However, the ceiling over the porch is plaster over lathe, not marble. The applicant proposes exterior light fixtures that would be attached to the roof, not the marble of the pediment. The gooseneck fixtures would extend out over the pediment and then downward. In addition, the applicant proposes fixtures for the ceiling over the porch. The conduit would be concealed above the ceiling and only the fixtures would extend out of the ceiling. An unsympathetic exposed electrical conduit that runs the entire width of the façade above the ground-floor would be removed.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Historical Commission. Nathan Flanigan represented the application.

Mr. Danta distributed photographs of the mock up showing the illumination as proposed over the pediment and porch. Mr. Flanigan offered clarifications about the two night time photographs he distributed. He explained that, in reality, there would not be as much contrast at night as implied by the photograph. Ms. Merriman agreed with the Committee that the LED lighting and recessed lighting would be preferable to the gooseneck fixtures. Mr. Flanigan stated that the owner

wanted to illuminate the roof line. He contended that the gooseneck lights were a good solution. He added that there would not be any damage to the masonry with the proposed installation. Mr. Schaaf argued that the light should be distributed uniformly across the pediment, not spotty, as proposed. Mr. Danta clarified that the Architectural Committee had recommended LED lighting just inside the pediment. He said that the LED lights would not light the outline but only the inside of the pediment.

Mr. Sherman asked if the building across the street could be used to mount lights to project illumination onto the building, much like that at City Hall. Mr. Flanigan replied that there is a parking lot across the street and building to the north is private. He conceded that he had not explored the question, but posited that obtaining permission to use them to illuminate this property would be unlikely. Mr. Baron suggested sidewalk lighting that would project upward or pole lights mounted on the sidewalk in front of the building.

> **ACTION:** Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the recessed light fixtures in the porch ceiling, but deny the gooseneck fixtures at the pediment, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

122-24 S. 18TH STREET
Owner: Leroy E. Keene Real Estate
Applicant: Richard Stokes
History: 1898, Cope & Stewardson, architects
Designation: Significant to Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District, 2/8/1995
Project: Exterior alterations.
ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the second-floor windows in the front bay of the corner building replicate the original curved windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes minor exterior alterations to the facades of two buildings at the corner of 18th and Sansom Streets. Although originally two separate buildings, they have since been internally connected. The prospective tenant would occupy the ground and second floors of both buildings.

The corner building was altered with a storefront in the 1910s or early 1920s. The storefronts have been altered several times in the recent past and only retain their historic transoms. The applicant proposes to install operable double-hung windows in place of the existing non-historic plate glass. The transoms would remain in place. A lantern-like internally-illuminated sign would be hung over the corner entrance. The design of the sign has not been finalized. The applicant also proposes to replicate the same storefront design on a non-historic storefront along the Sansom Street elevation of the same corner building. The second-floor windows would be replaced. The existing windows are not original.

The applicant also proposes some minor exterior alterations to the neighboring building to the north. The proposed changes are limited to the ground floor only. The existing highly-carved oak door is original. The applicant proposes to refinish it. The storefront currently has illegal windows, which are highly inappropriate. The applicant proposes to install sympathetic

casements in the center with flanking fixed windows. A decorative railing would be installed in the center. The existing transom, which is original, would remain.

ACTION: See the Consent Agenda.

304 NEW STREET
Applicant: Kenneth Johnson
Owner: Ron David Mahlah
History: c. 1820
Designation: Contributing to the Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003
Project: Demolish and install roof deck
ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the railing is recessed two feet from the façade, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish an existing roof deck and install a copper roof and new roof deck. The existing deck has a tiled floor and metal picket rail that extends to the edge of the roofline. It was installed prior to designation as part of complete rehabilitation of the building that included significant alterations to the roof. The proposed deck would have a composite wood floor and the existing railing would be reinstalled in its original location.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Commission. Kenneth Johnson represented the application.

Mr. Johnson stated that he concurs with the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. The Commissions discussed the application and decided that the Architectural Committee's recommendation was appropriate.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided the railing is recessed two feet from the façade, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1531 – 35 LOCUST STREET, E.W. CLARK & CO. BANK BUILDING
Applicant: Dominic Aspite
Owner: Sherbert Victor, VDM LLP
History: 1928; Zantzinger, Borie & Medary, architects
Designation: individually designated, 4/18/1990
Project: Install ADA ramp
ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a concrete ADA ramp with metal handrail at the northern entrance on the 16th Street side of this building. The ramp would extend 19 feet along the façade.

The E.W. Clark & Co. Bank Building was designed by the noted architectural firm of Zantzinger, Borie & Medary and constructed in 1928. It is one of Philadelphia's few high style Art Deco buildings and is situated on a prominent corner; both the Locust Street and 16th Street elevations are main facades. The proposed removal of original fabric and alteration of spatial relationships on the facades of this building is inappropriate. There is currently a defunct and boarded ATM machine kiosk in the southernmost bay of the 16th Street elevation, where historic fabric was previously removed. The staff suggests exploring other options for ADA accessibility, perhaps utilizing the altered ATM opening.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Mattioni recused, citing his firm's involvement with the application.

Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Commission. Attorney Dawn Tancredi and architect Mathew Piotrowski represented the application.

Ms. Tancredi distributed a letter from her firm and reports from an architect and engineer. She read the letter, dated 13 August 2010, into the record.

Mr. Piotrowski distributed revised drawings that showed three possible options for an exterior ramp as well as the interior conditions. He explained that there is a combination of structural elements that prevents an interior ramp. Mr. Piotrowski described the floor at the proposed location at northern 16th Street entrance as made of steel beams and concrete. The beams run along the outside wall of the building and would need to be cut at a 90 degree angle to allow the floor to be lowered for a ramp. He explained that there is a utility room with a sub-basement also made of beams and concrete under the crawlspace below the floor. He stated that the floor would never take the load if the beams above were cut. He stated that the exterior wall would not be braced property, making an interior ramp in this location infeasible. He added that rearranging the two sets of stairs in this location would be difficult to do in order to achieve a legal means of egress. Mr. Piotrowski explained that at the main entrance on the Locust Street elevation has a different structural grid, but is also made of beams and concrete. He stated that there is no way to cut out the floor and reinforce the outside walls. He added that any rooms under this space would become unusable because the head room would be eliminated. He concluded that the ramp cannot be installed inside the building.

Mr. Piotrowski presented a revised version of the ramp in response to some suggestions from the Architectural Committee to reduce impact to the sidewalk. He explained that he reversed the swing of the door, which would allow for a smaller landing and, consequently, a lesser impact on the sidewalk. Mr. Thomas stated that the new ramp plan still shows a 5'-3" landing. Mr. Piotrowski clarified that the landing remains at 5'-3", but the older version showed the ramp running further along the 16th Street elevation. He stated that 5'-3" is the ADA minimum width for landings.

Ms. Hawkins opined that this is a large ramp and asked if the applicant explored the possibility of a lift. Mr. Piotrowski responded that he did communicate with the State agency that oversees ADA compliance and was told that a lift would require a variance, which would be difficult to obtain. Mr. Thomas, who once headed a local ADA compliance board, responded that, in extreme situations like this, with the appropriate documentation, the Department of Labor & Industry would grant a variance. He stated that the proposed entrance is not the principal entrance and therefore the volume of people using it would be limited. He opined that a variance could be granted in this situation.

Ms. Hawkins suggested that the applicants revisit the ATM location and explore the installation of an interior lift. Mr. Piotrowski stated that the beams and floor would still need to be cut even if a lift were installed on the interior. Ms. Hawkins agreed, but stated that the area would be smaller. She added that this option was not explored by the engineer. She stated that ADA access near the main entrance is encouraged under ADA regulations.

Ms. Tancredi noted that the engineer's report does indicate that the ATM location flooring is a continuous system; each span is dependent on adjacent spans for structural integrity. Therefore, one area is not isolated. Ms. Hawkins acknowledged the engineer's claim, but contended that floors are often modified. Mr. Piotrowski stated that this alteration would render the toilet room on the lower level unusable. Ms. Hawkins reiterated that all alternatives have not been fully explored as recommended by the Architectural Committee. She suggested that the other alternatives proposed today should be explored.

Mr. Thomas suggested lowering the floor by 11 inches and installing a 5'-5" hydraulic landing with steps within the area of the steel beams. Mr. Piotrowski responded that code would not permit a platform as part of a main egress and that the platform would need to be doubled in length. Mr. Thomas suggested a chair lift installed in the egress area. He explained that the lift would only travel two steps and would be less intrusive structurally. Mr. Piotrowski stated that the engineer's report recommends against cutting the beam running parallel to the wall. Mr. Thomas suggested the installation of two columns at the cut. He stated that his firm has cut through main beams in the past.

Mr. Thomas asked the applicant if anyone has communicated with the Streets Department about the sidewalk encroachment. Mr. Piotrowski stated that he had not. Ms. Merriman stated that the PATCO station is nearby and that this is one of the few blocks in the city that has a peak pedestrian count of 3,000 to 4,000 people per hour, which is a very high traffic count. Mr. Thomas recommended to the architect that he read the National Park Service Preservation Brief titled "Making Historic Buildings Accessible." He explained that there are good options to deal with ADA accessibility. He added that, if an exterior ramp is the only option, then the architect should to look at the solutions at the Academy of Music and the Pennsylvania Hospital buildings, both of which have compatible exterior ramps. Upon Ms. Merriman's request, Mr. Thomas described his expertise in the field as a preservation architect as well as the former chair of the City of Philadelphia Accessibility Board for 12 years. He noted that he wants to be helpful and make this project work.

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

OLD BUSINESS

668 N. 19TH STREET
Applicant: Dan Grover
Owner: Haleh Kadkhoda
History: 1895
Designation: Contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000
Project: Legalize replacement of deck and porch flooring and structure
ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the legalization of the work to the deck and balconies, provided the illegal windows are replaced with historically appropriate windows, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the demolition and construction of a roof deck and two rear balconies. The previous roof deck was situated on the main block of the building and was present at the time of designation. The deck was demolished and reconstructed and two rear balconies were rebuilt without an approved building permit application by the Historical Commission or permit by the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

The staff met with the applicant on-site during the reconstruction and informed him of the Commission's jurisdiction and requisite permit. The work continued and is now complete.

In 2005, the owner also installed vinyl windows without permit and applied to the Commission for legalization. The Commission denied the legalization. The applicant subsequently appealed to the Board of License & Inspection Review. The Board affirmed the City and the windows remain in violation.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Commission. Attorney Dawn DiDonato represented the application.

Ms. DiDonato thanked the Commission for granting two continuances, which were requested owing to owner's pregnancy. She also apologized for a misunderstanding by the owner. She explained that the owner was repairing the decks and thought that she would not need the Commission's approval for the work. Ms. DiDonato requested that the Commission adopt the Architectural Committee recommendation. She explained that two rear decks were repaired and roof deck was reduced by 14 inches so as not to overhang the building. She asked the Commission to consider the work as a repair because the new deck stayed within the footprint of the original deck location. She opined that all other homes in the area have roof decks. She distributed photographs of nearby decks.

Ms. DiDonato requested that the Commission consider allowing her client to alter the illegal windows to make them more appropriate by widening the sash and applying paint to simulate historic windows. She suggested that one window be treated in this manner and reviewed by Commission's staff for approval. Mr. Baron stated that this building had multi-paned Queen Anne style windows that were replaced with vinyl windows. He stated that paint will not substitute the original character of the historic windows.

Mr. Sherman referred to a photograph taken in March 2010 labeled "work in progress" and noted that the contractor is rebuilding the roof deck in the photograph. He asked when the

homeowner was made aware of the Commission's jurisdiction. Mr. Baron stated that he was the photographer and that he spoke to the contractor at that time and explained that he needed a permit. Mr. Baron stated the contractor responded that he was unaware of the need for a permit, but he would inform the owner of the requirement. Ms. DiDonato stated that the contractor did inform the owner, whom he told that he would obtain the permit. Mr. Baron stated that the contractor applied for a permit after the work was complete. Ms. DiDonato countered that the contractor applied for a permit when he was notified by the Commission staff. Mr. Sherman stated that, if he applied for a permit, then he would have been directed by the Department of Licenses & Inspections to the Historical Commission for review. Mr. Baron claimed that the contractor did not seek the Commission's approval for the deck until at least one month after being notified of the Commission's jurisdiction.

Mr. Sherman clarified that "repair" means minor maintenance work and stated that this work is a full reconstruction. Mr. Quinn, who represents the Department of Licenses & Inspections, stated that a permit is required for virtually all alterations or repairs to a structure like this, with the exception of minor repairs, regardless of the property's historic designation status. Mr. Baron added that the new deck was constructed of a different material. Mr. Sherman explained that it is the owner's responsibility to ensure that the proper permits are obtained. Ms. DiDonato stated that the owner hired the contractor to do a repair and that the old base structure exists. Therefore, the work could be viewed as a repair.

Ms. DiDonato asked if the Commission would consider the replacement of two windows per year until completed. Replacing any more would be a hardship. She noted that the newborn child has prevented her client from returning to work and her husband recently opened his own law firm. Ms. Sell advised the applicant of the Commission's financial hardship process.

> **ACTION:** Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the legalization of the work to the deck and balconies, provided the illegal windows are replaced with historically appropriate windows, with the staff to review details. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

725 WALNUT STREET
Owner: 725 Walnut Street Real Estate Investors
Applicant: Frank Conlin
History: c. 1865
Designation: contributing to Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999
Project: Legalize replacement of storefronts
ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the storefronts, provided they are painted to match the rest of the wood trim of the building, but denial of the projecting plastic box sign, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the replacement of two storefronts that were installed without the Commission's approval. The proportions of the new storefront elements are awkward and their stained finish causes them to stand out from the building. Also, the photographs show a projecting plastic box sign, which the Commission did not review or approve.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Historical Commission. Property owner Frank Conlin represented the application.

Mr. Conlin stated that he has significant experience with historic buildings. He noted that he has worked with the Commission in the past and has done other historic preservation projects, like the Brewery Condominiums and Apartments. He stated that his partner, Gene Lefever, did the Schnellenburg and the Cosmopolitan. He stated that they do not take historic preservation lightly. He stated there are three good tenants in this property, who are now experiencing difficult financial times. He stated the storefronts that were removed dated to the 1970s. He stated that he tried to help the tenants by installing the new storefronts for them. He opined that the storefronts were meant to stand out to attract business. He stated that the storefronts cost $30,000. He installed the storefronts expeditiously for the tenants and planned to have them legalized afterwards. Mr. Conlin claimed that he did not receive the letter and that is why he was not in attendance at the Architectural Committee.

Mr. Sherman asked if Mr. Conlin installed the storefront without a permit even though he knew the property was historic. Mr. Conlin stated that he did, but he explained that he was attempting to help the tenants. Mr. Sherman stated that Mr. Conlin's motivation is appreciated, but his failure to comply with procedure is not.

Mr. Conlin stated that the Architectural Committee recommended that he could retain the storefronts. Mr. Sherman clarified that they recommended approval of the storefronts, provided they are painted, and denial of the blade sign. Mr. Conlin stated that the blade sign was installed without his consent by a tenant and should not be there. Mr. Conlin stated that his concern is the provision regarding the painting of the storefronts. Mr. Conlin presented posters displaying photographs of historic buildings with stained doors with black trim. He pointed to the property across the street from his property, which has the proposed painting scheme. Mr. Conlin stated that it is his understanding that the Commission does not regulate the color of trim and leaves color choice to the owner. He added the 1970s doors that were removed were not historic.

Ms. Schlotterbeck asked the applicant if it was his practice to undertake the work first and then seek legalization. Mr. Conlin stated that this is the only case. Mr. Conlin stated that his tenants were pleading and in dire need. He felt that the existing storefronts were a handicap to his tenants. Ms. Schlotterbeck stated that the Committee recommended approval, but is asking that the storefronts be painted. Mr. Conlin stated that he believes that there are other historic buildings that have black trim with stained doors. He stated that the existing black trim is higher up on the building, at the second floor and up.

Mr. Conlin stated that Mr. Baron had visited the restaurant in his building and had commented that that the storefront replacement was executed nicely. He added that Mr. Baron did advise him that the Commission would need to review the work and might require revisions to it. Mr. Conlin noted that he had worked very hard with Mr. Baron on a project around the corner from this property.

Ms. Hawkins stated that, given the applicant's experience, the fact that the tenants had been asking for this for some time, and the fact that the applicant knew that the building was historic, and the fact that the owner knew that any modifications required the Commission's review, she concluded that the applicant's failure to follow the procedure was distressing. She also added

that the recommendation of the Architectural Committee, approval with painting, was not onerous.

Mr. Conlin objected.

> **ACTION:** Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and legalize the storefronts, provided they are painted to match the rest of the wood trim of the building, but deny the projecting plastic box sign, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Mr. Quinn seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

COMMENT ON NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATION

RITTENHOUSE NATIONAL REGISTER HISTORIC DISTRICT

Owners: Various
Nominator: Powers & Company,
Proposal: Amend Boundary

OVERVIEW: This nomination to the National Register proposes to expand the Rittenhouse Historic District, as listed on the National Register in 1983. The expansion would include four blocks along Sansom Street just north of the Square proper. All of the buildings included in the proposed expanded area are listed in the local Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District as listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places in 1995. Nearly all of the buildings within the proposed expanded area contribute to the local historic district and some are classified as "significant" works of architecture; for example, the superb Chateausque house at 131 S. 18th Street. The staff reviewed the application for the proposed expansion and concludes that the proposed area meets all the criteria for which the district was listed on the National Register. The staff recommends that the Commission endorse this application and send a positive recommendation to the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the boundary amendment to the Commission for comment.

> **ACTION:** The Commission voted unanimously to recommend to the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission that it approve the proposed amendment to the boundary of the Rittenhouse National Register Historic District.

ADJOURNMENT

> **ACTION:** Ms. Hawkins moved to adjourn at 10:38 a.m. Ms. Leonard 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 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.