

**THE MINUTES OF THE 609TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 10 MAY 2013
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP
JoAnn Jones, Esq., Office of Housing & Community Development
Rosalie Leonard, Esq., Office of City Council President
John Mattioni, Esq.
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Joseph Palantino, Department of Public Property
R. David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Robert Thomas, AIA
Betty Turner, M.A.

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Erin Coté, Historic Preservation Planner II
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II

ALSO PRESENT

JoAnn Greco, PlanPhilly
Anne Fadullon, Dale Corporation
Dave Schultz, DAS Architects
Morris Clarke, DAS Architects
Jacqueline and Adrian Mastrangelo
David Artman, KSK
Christopher Mote, Hidden City Daily
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Caroline Boyce, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Mike Black-Smith
John Trosino, KlingStubbins
George H. Schaeffer, Kimmel Center
Claire Allamby, Philadelphia Orchestra
Elizabeth Barton, Philadelphia Orchestra
Leonard F. Reuter, Esq., Reuter Law Firm LLC
David Orphanides, Esq., David G. Orphanides & Associates, PC
Lee Striar, People's Emergency Center
Scott Haffey, Haffey Homes
Jeremy LeCompte, Harman Deutsch Architects
Gabriel Gottlieb, philadelphiaheights.wordpress.com

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Merriman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Hawkins, Jones, Leonard, Mattioni, Palantino, Schaaf, Thomas, and Turner joined her.

MINUTES OF THE 608TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the minutes of the 608th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 12 April 2013. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 APRIL 2013

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included five applications, 240 S. Broad Street, 138-40 N. Front Street, 138 Race Street, 538-40 Spruce Street, and 3859-61 Lancaster Avenue.. Mr. Sherman asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments. Mr. Sherman asked if the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments.

ACTION: Ms. Jones moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for 240 S. Broad Street, 138-40 N. Front Street, 138 Race Street, 538-40 Spruce Street, and 3859-61 Lancaster Avenue. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 249-53 ARCH ST

Project: Construct rooftop addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jarred Yaron

Applicant: Jarred Yaron, Consequence LLC DBA-Trust

History: 1907; Corn Exchange National Bank & Trust; Seaman's Institute; Newman & Harris, architects

Individual Designation: 1/6/1977

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the stair penthouse is redesigned with a simpler massing, fewer materials, and more neutral colors; provided the signage is attached into masonry joints; provided the planters are removable and have internal drainage; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a rooftop addition and the installations of banners, wall plaques, planters, and an ADA ramp. The building, a former bank, has had many uses through the years. It is currently vacant. Its exterior and portions of its interior are well conserved.

The building is located at the northeast corner of 3rd and Arch Streets. The sidewalks are concrete. The applicant proposes to replace them with bluestone in a regular pattern. The proposed alterations to the facades of the building are minimal. The application proposes to install two wall plaques on the corners of the building, as well as two banners; one banner would face Arch Street, while the second banner would face 3rd Street. The front entrance to the building retains its original doors, which would be maintained. There is a single step at the

entrance, which would be modified with the addition of bilateral ramps to make the entrance ADA accessible. Planters would be placed on the sills of all windows along both 3rd and Arch facades.

The application proposes a rooftop addition. The addition would be located towards the rear of the property away from Arch Street. The addition is broken up into several volumes with different cladding materials. A small addition would be located along 3rd Street. This addition would allow for the creation of a secondary egress stair. It would be clad in metal. A second addition would be located on the eastern side of the building. This addition would house an elevator overrun. It should be noted that this area of the building already has mechanical and penthouse structures above the roof. A deck area would be created in the center of the building. The space would be enclosed by a glass railing and covered by a metal and acrylic panel canopy. The canopy is designed as a separate element from the visible metal-clad stair addition along 3rd Street. The canopy may be visible from 3rd Street, even though it is not shown in the sight line studies. Lastly, an existing mechanical equipment area would be enclosed with a wood slat screen.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architects Dave Schultz and Morris Clarke and consultant Anne Fadullon represented the application.

Mr. Danta stated that the applicant had revised the application since the Architectural Committee meeting in response to the Committee's comments. The applicant distributed revised drawings to the Commissioners.

Mr. Schultz presented the project to the Commissioners, describing the existing building, the proposed alterations, and the new use. He noted that there are two existing stairs that would be extended to provide access to the roof deck. He explained that most of the alterations to the building would be associated with these two stairs. He explained the changes to the front façade, which are limited to banners, plaques, flower boxes and a small ramp. He then focused on the changes made to the design since the Architectural Committee meeting. He described the existing conditions at the roof. He described the revisions made to the design of the western most stair penthouse. He stated that the corner window was divided into two separate traditional openings. He stated that the cladding was changed to lead-coated copper instead of the originally proposed standing-seam copper roof. He noted that the lighter color of the lead-coated copper would be more compatible with the building's limestone. He stated that the horizontal siding at the penthouse was changed to stucco, also in a light neutral color. Mr. Schultz described the changes to the eastern penthouse. He explained that the elevator penthouse would have a stucco finish and an open railing around the new chiller. He displayed images of buildings and pointed to the locations of proposed alterations. Lastly, he presented digital photo-montages that show the visual impact of the alterations on the building. He noted that the penthouse on the east side of the building would not be visible from Arch Street, owing to the matured vegetation that obstructs the view. He also noted that the Arch Street façade would not be altered and that all the roof-top alterations would be completely invisible from in front of the main façade of the building on Arch Street. He described the changes along the western penthouse, which would be visible from 3rd Street. He noted that the lines of the roof of the penthouse were straightened in the revised design to complement the straight lines of the building below, and that the enclosure around the mechanical equipments was changed to stucco according to the Committee's recommendation. He noted that the new color scheme would make these visible alterations more compatible with the building below.

Mr. Mattioni asked how long the project would take to complete. Mr. Schultz answered that it would likely start in the summer and require six months to complete.

Ms. Hawkins thanked the applicants for incorporating all the comments received at the Architectural Committee meeting. Mr. Mattioni also thanked the applicants for a fine presentation.

Mr. Schaaf asked if the double window at the corner of the eastern penthouse was intended to provide natural light down the stair well. Mr. Shultz answered that the window would allow for natural light to penetrate down to the landing inside the stairs. He stated that they believe that patrons would probably use the stairs and they wanted to provide natural light into these stairs. He also noted that the proportions of the windows in the stair penthouse are similar to the proportions of the windows in the building below.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 240 S BROAD ST

Project: Replace front steps with cast stone

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: The Philadelphia Orchestra Association

Applicant: John Trosino, KlingStubbins

History: 1857; Academy of Music; LeBrun & Runge, architects

Individual Designation: 5/28/1957

District Designation: None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the color of the steps matches the color of the Academy's original natural brownstone, not the color of the painted facade, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore the front steps on the Broad Street façade of the Academy of Music. The steps along Locust Street are not included in this application, and would remain as is. The Academy was constructed in 1857. The original design of the steps consisted of four risers and a threshold within each door opening. This original configuration was changed by 1900 with the expansion of the threshold into a landing, thus increasing the risers to five. The steps were likely changed to concrete at this time. The Academy was fully restored in the mid 1950s. The steps were once again replaced at that time. The 1950s intervention increased the number of risers to six and changed their profile with the introduction of a bull-nose detail and ten bronze hand railings. The 1950s steps are cast stone. They have been coated and painted over the years to match the façade of the academy, also painted. These are the steps in place today. They are, however, severely deteriorated and in need of replacement.

The application proposes to replace the steps. The proposed design is a hybrid. It neither proposes to restore the steps to its 1857 original configuration, nor does it propose to replicate the 1950s design. Instead, the proposal would maintain the existing number of risers, six, while reestablishing the sharp corners of the 1857 design, thus eliminating the bull-nose detail. The railings would also be replaced. The number of railings would diminish from ten to five, and their design simplified. The railings would be centered on each doorway.

The application proposes to replace the steps with color-integral cast stone. The original steps were natural brownstone. Natural brownstone steps have not been present since at least 1900, and for over a century the steps of the Academy have been coated or painted concrete. The Commission has approved the replacement of missing historic fabric with substitute materials, specifically the replacement of missing brownstone with cast stone. The Commission reviewed a very similar application in 2004 for another National Historic Landmark on Broad Street, the Union League. At that time the Commission approved the replacement of the steps on the League's monumental staircase with color-integral cast stone. The color of the steps matched the color of the natural brownstone on the League's façade, which is still in its natural state.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 138-40 N FRONT ST

Project: Construct five-story multifamily dwelling

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 512-16 S. Front Street LLP

Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003

Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a five-story building with roof deck and pilot house and six parking bays on the first story. The Commission has plenary jurisdiction over this site; a non-contributing building stood on it at the time of the designation of the district.

The proposed building would be clad in red brick. A four-story, metal-clad, projecting bay would face Front Street. The parking garages and two banks of recessed balconies would face Quarry Street. The windows would be fixed panels and casements in aluminum clad. The roof deck would have a thin horizontal metal rail and a metal-clad pilot house set back from the rooflines.

The rear elevation of this property would be highly visible from Bladen's Court, a courtyard part of Elfreth's Alley, a National Historic Landmark.

In June 2006, the Commission reviewed an application to demolish a non-contributing structure on this lot and construct a building nearly identical to the current proposal. The Commission approved the application, provided the rear metal panels along Bladen's Court are a darker color, with staff to review details.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 1914 SHUNK ST

Project: Replace porch railing

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jacqueline Mastrangelo

Applicant: Jacqueline Mastrangelo

History: 1910; John Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Girard Estate Historic District, Contributing, 11/10/1999

Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace an original wood porch rail. The proposed rail does not match the original in design. The original rail has a curved detail that would not be replicated in the proposal.

The existing portion of the railing is original to the building and a feature of the building noted in the description of building type "L" in the inventory of the Girard Estate Historic District. It should be noted that the entire wooden porch railing was present in the designation photograph taken in 2000. Currently, the west section of the rail and a piece of the north section are missing.

In November 2011, the applicant proposed to replace the rail with a decorative metal rail. The Commission denied the application. Subsequently, the applicant appealed the Commission's decision to the Board of License & Inspection Review. The case was withdrawn in April 2013.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owners Jacqueline and Adrian Mastrangelo represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the staff has obtained three estimates for railings since the Committee meeting. The applicants provided one estimate for approximately \$2000 for a cedar railing that would be produced by Baird Brothers in Ohio. This estimate is for a rail that does not have the decorative upturned ends and that might trap water around the bottom of the spindles. The other two estimates propose railings that would cost approximately \$4000. Kane Millwork proposed one such railing; it would be made of mahogany and be very durable.

Ms. Merriman said that this application raise a difficult question. On the one hand, the original curved railing appears to be a character-defining feature. On the other hand, \$4000 for a relatively small wood porch railing seems very expensive. Ms. Jones and Leonard asked Mr. Baron about repairing the existing railing and perhaps putting a metal reinforcement railing behind it. Mr. Baron explained that the side railing and one third of the front railing have been lost to extreme deterioration. Ms. Hawkins opined that a wood railing, regardless of its design, would be better than a metal railing because of the relationship of solid to void. Mr. Baron explained that this unusual curved wood railing is particular to this type of house in Girard Estate. Most of the original railings in the district are brick with stone copings. The few curved railings are located on nearby houses of the same type. Ms. Merriman asked the applicants if they would be willing to replicate all but the curve of the wood railing. The applicants responded said that they are willing. Mr. Baron pointed out that that is exactly what is proposed in the current application. Mr. Thomas asked if anyone had determined whether the curved shape is available in a vinyl railing. Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission approved replications of railings in alternate materials. Ms. Merriman stated that that option might be acceptable.

The applicants said that they would not install a railing made of vinyl or AZAK because it would not have a satisfactory appearance. Mr. Mastrangelo explained that his house already has metal railings at the second floor as does the neighboring house. He asserted that he is concerned about safety first and then appearance. Ms. Mastrangelo said that they would be happy if the Commission would approve the Baird Brothers railing. Mr. Mastrangelo said that Baird Brothers would replicate the base rail if he provides the information.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the application, with the staff to review details. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 138 RACE ST

Project: Construct a four-story multifamily dwelling

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: 512-16 S. Front Street LLP

Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee commented that the proposed building is generally compatible with the historic district, pursuant to Standard 9, but the first-floor windows could be taller and the front door could be wider to better relate to the scale, proportion, and rhythm of the surrounding historic buildings.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a four-story rowhouse on a vacant lot in the Old City Historic District. The lot is considered to be an Undeveloped Site and the Commission's jurisdiction is Review-and-Comment only. The front façade would be clad in brick and have a traditional fenestration pattern. The front door is set at grade to provide ADA access to the building. The rear elevations, which would not be visible from the public rights-of-way would be clad in stucco with single and paired windows on each floor.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 538-40 SPRUCE ST

Project: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Daniel & Catherine Dumoff

Applicant: Leonard Reuter, The Reuter Law Firm, LLC

History: 1798; John Christian Schnyder House; façade rebuilt at 538, 1968

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Significant, 3/10/1999

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a one-story rear kitchen addition, a three-story rear elevator addition, and a pergola and storage structure at the ground level. The two rowhouses at the corner of 6th and Spruce Streets have been joined as one dwelling. The kitchen addition would have a gabled roof, stucco side walls, and a brick rear wall. The elevator

addition would be clad with stucco. The pergola and storage structure would be constructed of brick and have a gabled roof.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 512 AND 514-16 S FRONT ST

Project: Construct four-story multifamily dwelling

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 512-16 S. Front Street LLP

Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch

History: vacant

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Non-contributing, 3/10/1999

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the garages are eliminated from Front Street; the front doorways are combined and windows added; the third-floor arched windows are redesigned; the fourth floor is distinguished with a materials change and perhaps set back; the fourth-floor windows are aligned to the windows below; and the cornices are redesigned, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a four-story, four-unit residential building and a four-story, two-unit residential building on vacant lots on S. Front Street in the Society Hill Historic District.

The entry for these lots in the inventory of the Society Hill Historic District is flawed and poses a regulatory question for the Commission. The entry for these properties reads "512-16 Vacant lot. Archaeological potential. Non-contributing." When the Historical Commission designated the Society Hill Historic District in 1999, it found that the district satisfied several Criteria for Designation including Criterion i, the archaeology criterion, which stipulates that the resource "has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in pre-history or history." The inventory entry indicates that the Commission believed that these lots had a potential for archaeological resources. Yet, in direct contradiction to the claim about archaeological potential, the Commission classified the lots as Non-contributing; in other words, it found that the site "does not reflect the historical or architectural character of the district as defined in the Commission's designation," to quote the Rules & Regulations. Clearly, if significant archaeological resources related to the district survive at the site, the site would "reflect the historical or architectural character of the district." The entry in the inventory is flawed. If the Commission intended to protect archaeological resources at the site, it should have classified the property as Contributing.

In light of this flaw in the inventory, the Commission must determine whether this site can be considered an Undeveloped Site in the legal sense. If it is an Undeveloped Site, the Commission has Review-and-Comment authority only over it. If it is not an Undeveloped Site, the Commission has plenary jurisdiction over it and could require the developer to take steps to protect the potential archaeological resources. Section 2.23 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations defines an Undeveloped Site as follows:

An undeveloped site is a property within an historic district which is not individually designated, to which the inventory in the historic district nomination attributes no historical, cultural, or archaeological value, and upon which no building or structure

stood at the time of the designation of the historic district. Non-historic foundations and other below-grade constructions; surface parking lots; non-historic parking kiosks and other kiosks, storage sheds, and other impermanent constructions without foundations; and non-historic walls, fences, and gates shall not be construed as buildings or structures for the purposes of this definition.

The inventory entry is contradictory. It attributes the site with “archaeological value” but also states that it “does not reflect the historical or architectural character of the district.”

Section 14-201(14) of the Philadelphia Zoning Code, within which the historic preservation ordinance is located, addresses potentials for ambiguity within the Zoning Code. It states that Where the meaning of a restriction in this Zoning Code is ambiguous and the intent cannot be discerned through the usual rules of statutory construction, the restriction shall be construed in favor of the landowner, provided that the resulting construction does not lead to irrationality in the Zoning Code.

Before the Historical Commission rules on the merits of this application, it must determine whether the site is an Undeveloped Site, or, in other words, whether it will assert Review-and-Comment or plenary jurisdiction over this application.

The Architectural Committee should not seek to answer this question regarding the level of review, but should instead formulate a recommendation to the Commission that could serve for either level of review.

Some quick research indicates that there is a potential for archaeological resources at this site. Map research indicates that a brick rowhouse stood at 512 S. Front Street. The rear portion of the property, which backed up to an alley, was open and is a likely location for a privy pit. Map research indicates that a small brick residential and commercial building stood at the front of the lot at 514-16 S. Front. The middle section of the lot was open and ringed by various light industrial brick and frame buildings. City directories indicate that it was used as a marble yard and cooperage at times in the nineteenth century. A privy pit and other underground resources may exist at the site. Nothing in the quick research indicates that anything unusual or exceptional occurred at these sites. Therefore, while it is likely that archaeological artifacts would be found at the site, it appears unlikely that they would reveal “important information in pre-history or history.”

The designs of the proposed buildings are generally compatible in scale and materials with the historic district, but could be refined to be more compatible. Although several nearby buildings on S. Front Street have front-loaded garages, the proposed garages are not compatible with the district. The garages should be relocated or the number of the garage entrances reduced. The proposed buildings are taller than the surrounding historic buildings. The masses of the proposed buildings should be reduced with the introduction of mansards or other features, making the proposed buildings more compatible with their neighbors. The scale of the very large second-floor front windows is too large and is inappropriate for the district. The windows should be redesigned to respect the scales of windows in nearby residential buildings.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Jeremy LeCompte, attorneys Leonard Reuter and David Orphanides, and developer Scott Haffey represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the applicants have revised the architectural plans to address some of the Committee's concerns including the roof and windows. They have not, however, revised the plan for garage doors on Front Street.

Mr. Reuter addressed the issue of jurisdiction. He said that the Commission should only assert Review-and-Comment authority because the inventory classifies the vacant lots as non-contributing. He conceded that most vacant sites throughout the city, particularly in this area, have archeological potential. He said that there was a rumor that Daniel Pastorius, the founder of Germantown, might have been buried here because he once owned this lot. He said that he thinks, however, that the site would have been disturbed in any case by later development. He passed around atlas information and said that a house dating to about 1860, a twin to the neighboring building that still stands, existed on the site. He said that he did not think that there would be any significant archeological resources on the site. He said that the zoning code makes clear that, when there are any discrepancies in the law, the advantage should accrue to the owner.

Mr. Mattioni said that he thought it was the applicant's responsibility to show that there is no archeological potential on the site. Mr. Reuter responded that there is an ambiguity in the inventory. He asserted that, given the problem with the inventory, it is the Commission's burden to prove that there are resources at the site. Mr. Farnham clarified that the inventory entry for this property is contradictory. On the one hand, it states that the property has archaeological potential. On the other hand, it states that the property does not contribute to the historical significance of the district. However, if it truly has archaeological potential, then it should be classified as contributing, not non-contributing. He stated that the inventory entry for this property is inherently incorrect; in such a case, the benefit should fall to the property owner. He added that this is not the only mistake of its kind in the Society Hill Historic District inventory. Ms. Jones asked how the inventory might be corrected. Mr. Farnham apologized that Mr. Baron had provided the wrong page from the inventory in the Commissioners' meeting packets. He read the correct inventory entry into the record. Answering the question proffered by Ms. Jones, Mr. Farnham stated that the inventory should be amended to remove the inconsistencies. He noted that the Commission could not correct the mistake at this meeting because the correction would require notice to the impacted property owners, review by the Committee on Historic Designation, and an action of the Historical Commission.

MOTION: Ms. Jones moved to find that the Historical Commission's jurisdiction over the properties at 512 and 514-16 S. Front Street is limited to Review-and-Comment jurisdiction only; and to comment favorably on the revised application. Ms. Turner seconded the motion.

Ms. Hawkins remarked that the applicants had corrected several elements of the design, but had retained the garages, which she found particularly troublesome. Mr. Orphanides responded that the Queen Village Neighborhood Association had requested garages during the zoning hearing. He noted the other garages on the block. He noted that the Streets Department had also requested that the garages be separated rather than grouped. Mr. Schaaf stated that the Planning Commission does not support this type of frontloaded garage. He asserted that such garages deaden streets and detract from the experience of the streetscape. Mr. Thomas said that good designs can allow for garages and simultaneously mitigate the blankness on the façade.

Ms. Leonard suggested that the Commission sever the motion on the table and consider each of the two aspects of it separately. Mr. Mattioni agreed with Ms. Leonard's suggestion and the remainder of the Commissioners concurred.

ACTION: By unanimous vote, the Commission adopted Ms. Jones and Ms. Turner's motion to find that the Historical Commission's jurisdiction over the properties at 512 and 514-16 S. Front Street is limited to Review-and-Comment jurisdiction only

FAILED MOTION: By a vote of 2 to 7, the Commission rejected Ms. Jones and Ms. Turner's motion to comment favorably on the revised application. Ms. Hawkins, Leonard, and Turner and Messrs. Mattioni, Palantino, Schaaf, and Thomas dissented.

Mr. Farnham noted that the Commission need not adopt a motion with its comments on the project. Because it does not have plenary jurisdiction, but is merely advisory in this instance, it could simply let the various comments offered by individual Commissioners during the discussion constitute its advice to the applicants.

ADDRESS: 3859-61 LANCASTER AVENUE

Project: Rehabilitate three-story mixed use building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: People's Emergency Center CDC

Applicant: John Gibbons, KSK Architects, Planners, Historians, Inc.

History: 1895; Wright & Prentzel, builders

Individual Designation: 7/5/1984

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of Option Two with the flattened bays, provided the details are revised to better reflect the historic bays, and provided the ramp railing is revised, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: These elaborate mixed-use buildings make up part of a curved complex of buildings along Lancaster Avenue and 39th Street. The buildings have been vacant for several years and have lost metal bays and cornices. They are being renovated by the Peoples Emergency Center, a non-profit agency that serves the neighborhood. The agency and its architects have developed three potential levels of intervention, the choice of which will be dependent on costs and funding. This application proposes what is called the Level Two intervention. All levels would restore the tile roofing, metal cornices, and some windows. An ADA ramp would be installed regardless of chosen level. Level One would retain the stucco patches where the bays have been removed. Level Three would replicate the historic bays accurately. Level Two, which this application proposes, would reconstruct the historic, projecting bays in a flatter configuration. With this scheme, a facsimile of the appearance of the historic bays could be restored, but at much less cost than a true restoration. The staff recognizes that reconstructing the bays in a flattened form does not satisfy a strict reading of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, but questions whether some restoration is better than none at all and suggests that the Committee and Commission determine whether a special exemption is warranted.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMENT ON NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATION

ADDRESS: 2036-40 CECIL B. MOORE AVENUE, MCDOWELL MEMORIAL PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

Owner: Trustees of the Macedonia Free Will Baptist Church

Nominator: Emily T. Cooperman, ARCH Preservation

OVERVIEW: This nomination to the National Register of Historic Places proposes to list the McDowell Memorial Presbyterian Church, located at 2036-40 Cecil B. Moore Avenue. The historic resource is being nominated under Criterion C (Architecture). The nomination contends that the nominated resource embodies distinctive characteristics of exterior materials, massing, plan, and physical relationship to the street typical of Philadelphia churches of its period. It is a notable example of the Richardsonian Romanesque style, a national design idiom, and the distinctive characteristics of the national trend in the 1880s and 1890s toward auditorium-plan churches for Protestant denominations. The nomination also notes the high artistic value of the interior decoration, particularly its remarkable set of Tiffany stained glass windows, including an unusually large and impressive window arch over the pulpit dais, and its architectural carvings. The staff of the Philadelphia Historical Commission reviewed the nomination and finds it complete and satisfactory. The staff finds that the nominated resource meets criterion C (Architecture) and should be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The staff encourages the Commission to endorse this nomination.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the nomination to the Commissioners.

Ms. Jones asked if the congregation was prepared to assume the financial responsibility of maintaining a historic church listed on the historic registry. Mr. Danta noted that the congregation had initiated the nomination of the property. He explained that listing on the National Register is primarily honorary. He explained that, projects for properties listed on the National Register undergo historic preservation reviews only when the projects include a federal involvement, such as federal funding or permitting. Ms. Hawkins explained that listing on the National Register for a religious property opens the door to many funding possibilities, which would not otherwise be available. Mr. Thomas concurred with Ms. Hawkin's comment.

ACTION: The Commission unanimously recommended that 2036-40 Cecil B. Moore Avenue, McDowell Memorial Presbyterian Church, is eligible for and should be listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 10:25 a.m., Ms. Hawkins moved to adjourn. Mr. Thomas 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 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.