

**THE MINUTES OF THE 593RD STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 13 JANUARY 2012
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D.
Dominique Hawkins
Susan Jaffe
JoAnn Jones, Office of Housing & Community Development
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
John Mattioni, Esq.
Daniel Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections
David Schaaf, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Joan Schlotterbeck, Department of Public Property
Robert Thomas, AIA

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

ALSO PRESENT

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Edward Bell, Lawson Bell Architects
Chris Carter, John Milner Architects
Beth Vernick
Pete Porretta, Lighthouse Architecture
William B. Morrin, Esq.
Ed Campbell
Betty Mon, Mon & Associates
Paul Horvat
Anthony Finio
Ralph DiGiodomenico
Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Joanne Phillips, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Matt Cox, Fossil
Sanford Bruck
Matt Caffrey, Milrose Consultants, Inc.

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Dilworth, Hawkins,

Jaffe, Jones, Leonard, Mattioni, Merriman, Quinn, Schaaf, Schlotterbeck, and Thomas joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 592ND STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Jones moved to adopt the minutes of the 592nd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 9 December 2011. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 13 DECEMBER 2011

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

ADDRESS: 2031 WALNUT ST, UNIT 1F

Project: Replace storefront windows, add door and railing

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: B-L-A-C Holding Company

Applicant: Betty Mon, Mon & Associates Consulting

History: 1855; storefront added

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the storefront doors are symmetrical; the railing has straight spindles and does not extend beyond the masonry opening; and the lighting details are provided; with staff to review the details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install new aluminum storefront windows and doors in a non-historic storefront. The building was originally a residence. The ground floor was altered in the middle of the twentieth century, when a storefront was installed at ground floor. The storefront features a recessed entrance with a large display window and a mezzanine level above with jalousie windows.

The application proposes to retain the mid twentieth-century storefront surround and most of the existing knee wall. The application proposes two storefront doors, one at either end of the storefront. The western doorway would replace the recessed doorway and be installed at the plane of the front facade. The installation of the second doorway, at the east, would necessitate the removal of a small section of the knee wall. The door at the east would be slightly smaller than the door at the west, producing a strangely asymmetric configuration.

The new casements windows would replace a large plate glass window at the ground level and jalousie windows at the mezzanine level. A hammered aluminum railing would be installed in front of the mezzanine-level casements. The hammered aluminum railing at the mezzanine level would extend beyond the mezzanine level window opening and attach to the face of the surround. The pickets of the railing would be curved, not straight.

The application also proposes a string of LED lights above the storefront, but no details have been submitted.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Pete Porretta, property owner Beth Vernick, and expediter Betty Mon represented the application.

Mr. Porretta stated that they would like the Commission to consider three elements. Mr. Porretta pointed out an existing Fire Department connection (FDC) exists on the sidewalk, which would prevent the second door from being the same width as the principal door. He asked the Commission to consider approving a smaller second door. It would be expensive to move the FDC. Mr. Porretta also explained that the proposed LED light would be installed under the cornice of the storefront surround and would not be visible. He requested that the light be approved. He lastly stated that they would like to install a railing that has a slight curve, rather than a straight railing, as recommended by the Architectural Committee.

Mr. Thomas asked what would impede the relocation of the Fire Department connection to allow for the two doors to match. Mr. Porretta answered that such an expensive project would place a financial hardship on the owner. Mr. Sherman asked if the existence of an FDC so near a door violated any building codes. Mr. Porretta explained that having a wider door so close to an existing FDC violated required ADA clearance for the door.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the Architectural Committee had several concerns. She stated that she was pleased to see the applicant comply with some of its recommendations. She stated, however, that the LED lighting strip would not serve a practical purpose. Mr. Porretta explained that the light would provide a pleasant glow on the storefront. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee would prefer the doors to be symmetrical. Mr. Porretta agreed with the desire for symmetry, but he objected to forcing the owner to relocate an FDC at a great expense for a couple of inches difference, which would not have a great visual impact. He also noted that the majority of pedestrians would not notice the size differential unless they were architects or design professionals. Mr. Sherman asked why the transoms over each door did not match. Mr. Porretta stated that it was a drafting error and that both transoms could be of equal height.

Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Porretta if he would be amenable to having the railing curve within the masonry opening without protruding beyond the plane of the wall. Mr. Porretta answered that having the curve limited to within the masonry opening would be awkward. He asked if a one or two-inch extension beyond the plane of the wall would be permissible. He stated that this would make the curve more graceful and more appealing than a straight railing. He clarified that this request was purely an aesthetic preference and that, in his opinion, a straight railing looked too institutional. He reiterated that a two-inch extension beyond the plane of the façade would be sufficient.

Mr. Dilworth asked if there was historic precedent for straight spindles versus curved. He also asked why a narrower door would make the storefront less symmetrical, when the existing storefront only has one door and is therefore not at all symmetrical. Ms. Hawkins explained that the original application proposed a railing that attached to the outside face of the storefront. She explained that the building is very symmetrical and the upper stories are very symmetrical. Mr. Dilworth noted that the applicant is increasing the symmetry, even if it is not perfect symmetry. Mr. Thomas noted that the original ground floor to the townhouse was not symmetrical. It had a door and two windows. He agreed with Mr. Dilworth's observation. Mr. Thomas stated that the storefront alterations do not propose to restore anything that existed historically, and that, in his opinion, the proposal meets Standard 9.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to approve the application, provided the transoms above the storefront doors are the same height, the railing at the mezzanine does not extend beyond the window opening, and the balusters of the railing do not project more than one inch beyond the plane of the façade of the storefront, with the staff to review details.

Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 11 to 1. Ms. Hawkins dissented.

ADDRESS: 1807 DELANCEY PL

Project: Install roof deck and stairhouse

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Richard Vague

Applicant: Christina H. Carter, John Milner Architects

History: 1864; façade replaced

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a mock-up demonstrates that the deck and railing as well as the new HVAC equipment would not be conspicuous from the public right-of-way, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck and stair enclosure. The stair enclosure would be constructed of metal and glass above the existing stair well in place of an existing skylight. They would be located in the middle of the building, away from both facades. The stair would be extended to the roof to allow access to the roof deck. The deck would be constructed of wood and metal with metal cable railings.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Christina Carter represented the application.

Mr. Danta presented photographs of the mock-up he inspected in the field. He stated that the railing would not be visible from Delancey Place.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the proposed material for the screen. Ms. Carter answered that it would be wood.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the application, provided a mock-up demonstrates that the deck and railing as well as the new HVAC equipment would not be conspicuous from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 3424 W QUEEN LA

Project: Replace front doors

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Edward G. Campbell

Applicant: Edward G. Campbell

History: 1930

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Tudor East Falls Historic District, Contributing, 10/9/2009

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the main entry doors on the front façade of this house. The doors, which are original to the house, are unusual double-leaf doors with glass panes over panels. Other, similar houses in the development have the same doors, indicating that they are original to the construction of the house.

The application provides insufficient documentation to determine whether the proposed doors would replicate the historic doors. For example, the manufacturer's information submitted with the application does not show the new jamb details or the dimensions of the proposed door versus the dimensions of the existing doors. The manufacturer's information notes that the doors are "available in virtually any size," but it does not indicate the sized proposed.

The new doors should replicate the materials, dimensions, and configurations of the existing doors. The replacement should not be a single door, which would necessitate partially infilling the opening or the installation of sidelights, either of which would clearly deviate from the original design. The doors should be replaced in kind with new double doors.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Edward Campbell represented the application.

Mr. Campbell read a written statement to the Commission. Mr. Campbell expressed his frustration with the review process. He objected to historic designation of properties. He defined the Historical Commission review as arbitrary and capricious. Mr. Campbell stated that the Commission staff has failed in convincing him that the existing doors are original. He noted that several carpenters had confirmed that the doors are not original to the house. He stated that he would like to install a "Tudor Style" door, but that Mr. Danta refused to approve it. Mr. Danta provided the Commissioners with a photograph of a pressed-metal door with a leaded-glass insert, which the applicant had previously proposed. He asserted that it was not compatible with the historic house in question. Mr. Sherman explained that a metal door would not be appropriate for this house. He stated that the metal door would have certainly not have been installed in the house at the time of construction.

Mr. Campbell claimed that replacing the doors as the Commission prescribed would cost \$8,000. He stated that he did not come to the meeting to try to convince the Commissioners, since he was certain that the Commissioners had already decided against his proposal. Mr. Thomas stated that he would like to hear what Mr. Campbell had to say and that he had not made up his mind. Mr. Campbell reiterated that the proposed pressed-metal door is of a Tudor Style. He stated that he did not comprehend why the metal door would not be appropriate, since it was a Tudor Style door. Mr. Thomas explained that the question is not whether the proposed door is Tudor or not, but whether it is appropriate to the subject house. Mr. Thomas stated that

the double-leaf doors appear to be original and that those doors are the appropriate doors, because they are the original design, regardless of how one describes their style.

Ms. Merriman stated that the Commission has a financial hardship process that would allow the approval of non-compatible alterations if the installation of the correct doors was a burden on the applicant. Mr. Campbell stated that he runs a small business and could not afford to take the time to go through that process. He stated that the Commission is doing a disservice to the property owners of W. Queen Lane. He stated that he does not like the existing doors, and proposes to install a door that is Tudor. Mr. Schaaf stated that the proposed door that Mr. Campbell refers to as “Tudor” is not a “Tudor” door. He explained that the existing double-leaf doors have the same scale and pattern as the windows above them in the second floor of the house. Mr. Schaaf, a registered architect, stated that he lives in a very similar house in Mount Airy and that he is certain that the existing double-leaf door is original to the construction of the house.

Mr. Sherman pointed out that the applicant had proposed a double-leaf door that would replicate the existing doors. The door that he is arguing for is not even the door he proposed in his application. Ms. Hawkins stated that the proposed wood French doors would probably be acceptable, but that the Committee did not have information on the frame details or other aspects. She reiterated that the proposed doors would meet the Standards and also address the concerns of the property owner. Mr. Sherman asked Mr. Campbell if he would be willing to installing the doors he proposed in his application. Mr. Campbell stated that he would, if he had no other alternative. Mr. Thomas stated that the wood doors proposed by the applicant could be approved, provided they fit the opening, with the staff to review details.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to approve the proposed doors, provided they are sized to fit the existing opening, with the staff to review details. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 110 ROXBOROUGH AVE

Project: Legalize rear additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Paul Horvat

Applicant: Paul Horvat

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Manayunk Historic District, Contributing, 12/14/1983

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the first and second-floor additions; denial of the third-floor addition and the implied deck; and approval of a gable roof dormer on the rear slope of the main roof no wider than five feet with single or double window in place of the extent dormer addition, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize alterations to the rear of a mid nineteenth-century house in the Main Street Manayunk Historic District. The Historical Commission approved interior demolition and alterations in March and April 2010. The owner exceeded those permits, demolishing a rear one-story addition and constructing a two-story rear addition in its place. At the same time, most of the rear slope of the main roof was demolished and a very large dormer was constructed. The dormer, which is really a third-floor addition, includes a

door out to the roof of the second-floor rear addition. The architectural drawings submitted with the application do not call for a roof deck, but it is very likely that a roof deck is intended for the location. A roof deck is noted in the application filed with the Department of Licenses & Inspections. Also, the Department will not allow a door out to a roof that does not have a code-compliant railing.

Because the property is located near the corner of Roxborough Avenue and Cresson Street, the rear of the building is clearly visible from Cresson Street. The subject property is the second one in from the corner. The rears of all the properties in this row have been significantly altered, but the rooflines are generally intact.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Historical Commission. Developer Paul Horvat and architect Ian Smith represented the application.

Mr. Horvat clarified that the second-floor addition was a reconstruction of an existing second floor with a higher ceiling. The ground-floor addition was also reconstructed. The new work was limited to the third floor. He acknowledged that he exceeded his permit. He stated that he does not have any desire to put a deck on the roof of the second-floor addition. He stated that the door that leads to the roof of the second floor is for greater light and not for access. He stated that other homes in the area have rear alterations and that the rear alterations make the homes more livable. He stated that the intent for the third-floor addition was to include a second bathroom. He explained that the area is improving with increasing property values and as such the buyers for these houses require amenities in these properties.

Mr. Thomas stated that the Commission has looked at many similar applications. He asked if the third-floor addition required the demolition of a historic dormer. Mr. Horvat stated that no dormer was demolished. Mr. Thomas stated that in such cases, a dormer-like-addition that stays below the ridge of the roof has been approved before. Mr. Thomas clarified that, if the application had been reviewed before construction, then the Commission may have requested small changes, but that the overall construction is in keeping with previous approvals by the Commission. Ms. Hawkins stated that the applicant should have followed the procedure and the addition should have been reviewed before construction. Ms. Hawkins objected to the approval of such a large dormer addition on the back slope of the roof.

Mr. Sherman stated that he was convinced that a roof deck on the roof of the second floor would be constructed at some point in the future. Mr. Horvat stated that, if a deck is the sticking point, he would be willing to eliminate the existing door that provides access to the roof. Mr. Thomas stated that a roof deck on the second floor would not be detrimental to this property, and would improve the livability of the property. He stated that he would be comfortable with a deck, but would like the staff to review the details of this deck. Mr. Thomas stated that the owner has improved the rear of the property, but has done nothing to the front façade. He stated that front door and windows are not original and do not match the style of the house. He suggested that the owner should restore the front in exchange for approval for approval of the illegal rear alterations. Mr. Horvat stated that he was planning to replace the front door and windows as part of the rehabilitation of the property. Mr. Thomas stated that he would be willing to make a motion to legalize the rear alterations in exchange for the restoration of the front façade.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to legalize the alterations at the rear, provided the front façade including the front door and windows are restored, with the staff to review details. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 11 to 1. Ms. Hawkins opposed.

ADDRESS: 223 MONROE ST

Project: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Lisa Miclette Pappo

Applicant: Edward Bell, Lawson Bell Architects

History: 1745

Individual Designation: 2/26/1957, 6/24/1958

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 a modified Plan B, provided that any brick removed from the rear wall would be limited to the area between the western wall of the building and the eastern jamb of the existing stair window and provided that the original rear cornice is preserved as much as possible, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a second-floor addition on an existing twentieth-century, rear, one-story addition. The building was constructed in the middle of the eighteenth century, before the Revolutionary War, and is largely intact. It is an extremely rare and important survivor. The addition would stand on top of the extant one-story addition and attach to the rear of the historic building at the second-story level. The rear addition would be visible only from a private driveway that leads to a parking area. The addition would necessitate cutting a four-foot-wide hole in the intact historic rear façade. The application proposes two alternate designs. In Plan A, the addition would attach into the roof of the building above the rear cornice; it would require removing a section of the historic brick wall and rear cornice. In Plan B, the addition would attach to the historic building below the cornice, but would still require removing a section of the historic brick wall and dismantling and reconstructing the cornice.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Edward Bell represented the application.

Mr. Baron suggested that the staff should review the details when developed by the architect, especially for the cornice reconstruction. Ms. Hawkins agreed. She stated that the revised application satisfied the requirements of the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 13 January 2012. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 932 IRVING ST

Project: Construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Anthony Finio

Applicant: Anthony Finio

History: 1830

Individual Designation: 11/24/1959

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that a mock-up demonstrates that the deck will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and provided that the chimney does not require alteration, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roof Guidelines.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck on a rear addition of this early nineteenth-century rowhouse. The rear addition itself has not yet been built, but it has already been approved. The historic house is three stories tall with a half gable roof; the rear addition is also three stories tall with a half gable. The deck would be located on the rear roof, behind the peak of the roof. The railing would rise above the ridge line. The roof deck might be minimally visible from the public right-of-way. It will be accessed from a stair at the rear, which will not be visible to the public.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owners Anthony Finio and Ralph DiGiodomenico represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that Erin Cote of the staff reviewed a mock-up. He displayed photographs from that review. He stated that approximately 16 inches of the railing would be visible above the ridge line of the roof. He suggested that the deck could be set further back on the addition to reduce the visibility. Mr. Thomas asked how close the deck would be to the ridge line as currently proposed. Mr. Finio explained that the deck would be about 18 inches behind the ridge line. Mr. Thomas opined that that degree of visibility was acceptable. Ms. Hawkins suggested a metal railing. She also opined that the chimney should not be modified for the deck. Mr. Finio stated that they would not alter the chimney, but might need to add to the metal flue.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the application, provided the railing is metal and the chimney is not altered, with the staff to review details. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 206 S 03RD ST

Project: Legalize vinyl windows and door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Anthony J. LaRocco

Applicant: Anthony J. LaRocco

History: 1830; façade replaced, c. 1910; storefront, after 1957

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the storefront door and window; but denial of the vinyl windows in the bay, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize a storefront window and door and vinyl windows in a second and third-story bay.

In the 1999 designation photograph, the building had a 16-light storefront window, a 9-light, two-paneled door, and six-over-six wood double-hung windows in the second and third-story bay. A historic photograph from 1957 shows one-over-one, double-hung windows in the bay. This was likely the original window configuration when the bay was constructed about 1910.

In 2008, the staff observed exterior façade alterations that included the installation of a single-light storefront window, full-glass door, and awning at the first story and vinyl windows in the second and third-story bay. The Historical Commission and the Department of Licenses & Inspections had not approved or permitted the work. A violation was subsequently issued.

The application requests legalization of the storefront window and door and the upper-story windows only at this time. The current application does not address the awning.

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

Ms. Sell distributed and read an email from the applicant, which stated that he was unable to attend the Architectural Committee and Commission meetings, because he resides in Singapore. The applicant stated in the email that, if the Commission denies the application for legalization, he requests that he be provided with time to comply and replace the windows after his return to the United States in April 2013. He suggested that he could replace the windows in about June 2013. The applicant also stated in the email that he has required the tenant to provide proof that the appropriate permits were obtained for the awning or he will have it removed. The Commissioners agreed that, even if they denied the application outright, the applicant could make the corrections on the schedule he suggested.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the storefront door and window; but deny the vinyl windows in the bay, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1616-26 WALNUT ST

Project: Alter storefront, install signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Metro Commercial Real Estate

Applicant: Thomas Howell, Howell Belanger Castelli Architects

History: 1929; 1616 Walnut Street Building; Tilden, Register & Pepper, architects

Individual Designation: 1/7/1982

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a metal bar, called a “canopy” or a “brow” within a storefront window and over a door. The bar over the door would include metal signage reading “FOSSIL” and be halo lit from behind. The canopy and signage would fit within the openings and be bolted into the masonry.

The storefront in question is one of two, which flank the main entrance to the building. They boast decorative Deco motifs that typify the late 1920s. Both storefronts were constructed as commercial spaces. The storefront window in question appears to be original. Its twin to the west has been slightly altered but retains most of its original features.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Historical Commission. Attorneys Michael Sklaroff and Joanne Phillips, designer Matt Cox, property owner Sanford Bruck, and permit expediter Matt Caffrey represented the application.

Mr. Farnham corrected the Architectural Committee minute for the review of this project, stating that the word “interrupted” on page 15, sixth line up from the bottom, should be deleted. He explained that he listened to the audio recording of the meeting Architectural Committee and determined that John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance had not spoken out of order and had not interrupted the discussion. He stated that he would like to change the minute to read, “Mr. Gallery asked Mr. Farnham.” He apologized to Mr. Gallery for the mistake and stated that the minute will be changed to read appropriately.

Mr. Sklaroff objected to image included in the staff Powerpoint presentation showing proposed signage that had been discussed with the staff prior to the submission of the application, but that was not part of the application. He clarified that the application does not include any interior signage or the wall medallion. He asserted that the image was not part of the application and was distracting. He clarified that their application proposes the brow over the window and door and related Fossil sign only. The staff removed the image from the screen and apologized for the mistake.

Mr. Sklaroff distributed drawings of the building and proposed signage to the Commission members. He stated that it is important to note for the record that the Architectural Committee vote was three to two. Three members opposed the application; two supported it. He explained that the owner of the building is not a stranger to preservation and cited examples of other buildings with which this owner has been involved including the Land Title Building, Robert Morris Building, and Alden Park, which are listed on the National Register and protected by façade easements. He directed the Commission members to a drawing of the building at 1616 Walnut Street. He described the building as Art Deco with a strong presence on Walnut Street.

He explained that the purpose of the proposed signage is to brand a national retailer, which wishes to relocate its Philadelphia headquarters to Walnut Street and invest \$500,000 on interior improvements. He explained that the retailer is willing to sign the lease if it can obtain an approval for the branding signage.

Mr. Cox, the sign designer, explained that they initially proposed the standard signage package that Fossil has on all of their locations. It was a full brow that ran the entire span of the storefront with the “Fossil” logo resting on it. He added that this type of signage has been installed on all Fossil locations established within the last five years. He explained that they have several store and mall locations and that this design ties the various location types together. In working with the landlord, he explained, they found that the ownership did not want the signage to protrude beyond the storefront. He described that, as a compromise, the signage was redesigned and recessed into the niches of the window and the door. He described how the signage is broken up by the gap between the storefront window and door, but is still visually connected. In addition to branding concerns, he explained that the proposed signage would connect the door and window, directing customers to the entrance. He stated that, after several site visits, Fossil executives found it difficult to associate the door with the large window because the two are so removed from one another. He concluded that the store needs this signage in order to have a presence on Walnut Street.

Mr. Sklaroff noted that the elevation of the building has an extraordinary verticality. He addressed concerns expressed by members of the Architectural Committee that the horizontal elements would interfere with this verticality. He argued that the impact is extremely minimal and contended that the building would maintain its verticality. He asserted that the proposal complies with Standard 9: there is no damage to historic fabric. He stated that the brow and signage will be removed when a new tenant takes over the property in the future. He stated that they also reduced the width of the brow and pulled it away from the window to expose the transom bar. Mr. Cox explained that, after consultations with the staff, they compromised and pulled both the brow and signage away from the façade. He explained that the brow would be a floating bar, exposing the original transom bar with the rosettes. He stated that, in typical applications, the brow attaches directly onto the façade, but they modified the design to keep it two inches from the storefront to allow one to see the original storefront details.

Mr. Sklaroff contended that this application proposes a low-impact alteration that will bring a major retailer to Walnut Street. He stated the company currently has a kiosk location in Liberty Place and this location will bring the company to the Walnut Street corridor. He directed the Commission to John Cluver’s statement from the Architectural Committee minute: “The proposal is minimal, respectful, and compatible.” He stated that the building owner and Fossil’s designer have worked with the staff to create signage that is indeed minimal, respectful, and compatible with the building. He asked for the Commission’s support of the proposal.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she voted with the majority in opposition at the Committee meeting. She explained that the Committee did not find the location of the sign over the door in front of the vertical carved elements of the original building to be appropriate. She stated that one of the conclusions reached by the Committee was that the location of the “Fossil” section of the sign was being driven by the brow, but could be lowered to the flat panel over the door, where it would not visually obstruct the views of the fluted cast stonework.

Mr. Cox explained that the main purpose of the brow was to connect the door and the window, which are disconnected. He argued that it is difficult to see a connection between the two when

looking at the entire storefront. He stated that the letters are only eight inches deep and would allow plenty of room to view the relief that runs up the channel in the building.

Mr. Sklaroff claimed that the installation of the proposed brow and sign would occlude .09% of historic fabric on a façade, which has a total area of 16,500 square feet. He argued that the proposal is minimal, respectful, and compatible. He acknowledged that there are other signage options, but that this branding proposal is modest, fair, and reasonable.

Ms. Merriman asked how close the Fossil sign over the door would be to the stone behind it. Mr. Cox responded that the recess in the façade of the building is 12 inches deep, the brow is 10 inches wide, and the lettering is eight inches wide. He stated that the brow would be located two inches out from the façade; the lettering would be four inches out from the facade. Ms. Merriman asked if it would be possible to reduce the width of the brow over the door to the width of the lettering. Mr. Cox agreed that the brow could be reduced to eight inches, leaving four inches of free space behind the brow.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance asked the Commission for its help. He explained that the Preservation Alliance has an easement on this building. He stated that it must review this application, just as the Commission does. He stated that he needs the Commission's help to reach a compromise with the property owner. He stated that, when the Alliance holds an easement and the Commission also has jurisdiction, the Alliance seeks to coordinate with the Commission and reach the same conclusion. He suggested that the Alliance and Commission usually reach the same conclusion. He recalled a few occasions when that was not the case and noted that the Alliance has usually been able to work with the developers to make modifications to satisfy both the Commission and Alliance. He stated that they have not been able to do that in this case. He stated that an easement is a legally binding restriction that the owners made on the property to retain it in its historic character. He added that the easement that the Alliance holds on this property is specific about signs. He explained that it requires that any signage will be consistent with the historic and architectural character of the building. He contended that the majority of the Commission's and Alliance's experts have concluded that the proposed brow and sign are not consistent with the character of the building. He clarified that the Alliance has not received an official submission from the owners regarding this proposal. Mr. Gallery stated that the Alliance will not approve the application that was submitted to the application.

It does not comply with the terms of the easement. He suggested that an approval by the Commission would likely result in months of legal action. He stated that the Alliance would like to see something positive happen with this retail space. He asked the Commission to remand the application back to the Architectural Committee so that, with the Committee and staff's help, they can identify a solution that everyone can support. He claimed that the Alliance is trying to be as flexible as it can be within the easement restraints. He advised that the Commission could table the application and refer it back to Architectural Committee or it could support the Architectural Committee's recommendation and deny it. He disagreed with the applicants' assertion that there is no significant impact on the historic fabric of the building. He argued that "no significant impact" is not the primary criteria for the Commission's review. He cited the Rules & Regulations that require the Commission shall be guided by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He advised that the Commission also has discretion and is not limited to strictly applying the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, but when discretion is exercised, it must be done according to the authority granted by the City Council. He warned that it is not a personal view, but rather based on the authority that the City Council has bestowed. He stated that the City Council clearly stated in section 14-1005.6e of the new zoning code, which delineates the

criteria the Commission must use in addition to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He asserted that not one of the review criteria directs the Commission to facilitate leases with tenants. Mr. Gallery then opined that the application is incomplete. He stated that there is third sign proposed for the exterior of the building, but it is not shown on the application materials. He stated the applicant testified at the Architectural Committee of the intent to seek a staff approval for an oval sign that would be installed near the door. He opined that the omission of this sign is misleading and renders application incomplete. He claimed that his reason for requesting that the application be referred back to the Architectural Committee is to avoid the months of legal action that may result if the application is approved today. He asked the Commission for help to find solution that all parties can support.

Mr. Dilworth asked Mr. Gallery if the extant signage advertising Max Studio, which currently occupies the space that Fossil would move into, was approved by the Alliance under the easement. Mr. Gallery responded that there was no evidence in their files to indicate that the owner ever applied for Alliance approval of the Max Studio signage.

Ms. Jones asked Mr. Gallery what the easement requires with respect to signage. Mr. Gallery stated that the easement requires signs to be consistent with the historic character of the building. He described the sign announcing the building's address as in the historic character of the building. He stated it must be consistent in terms of graphic design and lettering. He opined that the proposed signage is not. He explained that the building is perfectly symmetrical and all of the original historical signs were also symmetrical. He stated that there were never signs in the windows or anything obstructing the fluting over the door. He added that the conditions are all specifically defined in the easement, to which the owner agreed.

Mr. Dilworth stated that, a few years ago, the Commission approved an Art Deco awning for the Metropolitan Apartments on 15th Street, a review at which Mr. Gallery testified. He stated that those awnings, while in keeping with the style of the building, covered some architectural detail on the façade. He asked Mr. Gallery, as a comparative case, for his opinion on that review. Mr. Gallery responded that from an easement perspective the cases are not at all comparable. He stated that he objects not only to the Fossil sign, but also to the brow, which covers architectural details. He stated that there is a power of two uninterrupted, symmetrical windows. He argued that that example is not comparable or relevant.

Mr. Thomas agreed with the Architectural Committee's recommendation that the proposal does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He stated that he has looked carefully at World Heritage zones and other historic districts, where storefronts are branded with corporate identities, and determined that the storefronts nevertheless maintain the historic integrity. He stated that Mr. Gallery has proposed a reasonable option to negotiate an appropriate design with the Architectural Committee that will maintain Fossil's branding and also be compatible with the building. He agreed that the percentage of historic fabric covered by the signage is not expository. He stated that the symmetry would be lost and significant architectural elements obscured at street level. He opined that, if the proposed signage was proposed for an upper story, it would be less in appropriate. He stated that symmetry is important and believes there is a solution that could be developed with the staff and Committee. Ms. Merriman stated that process with the staff and Committee has already taken place and did not produce a design acceptable to all. She observed that the Commission is empowered as the decision-making body. She stated that this proposal was presented to the Committee, where it was subject to ample discussion. She explained that remanding it would only delay everyone for another 30 to 60 days.

Mr. Mattioni asked the applicant to explain why the oval sign by the door, shown in a photo-rendering in the packet, is not part of the current application. Mr. Sklaroff clarified that they are not asking for its approval in this application. Mr. Cox explained that there were many versions of the proposal discussed at the beginning of this process. He stated that there were many options reviewed internally with the landlord. He explained that the image with the oval plaque must be an old image that was reviewed by the landlord and shown to the staff. He asserted that the oval plaque was not part of the current final submission.

Mr. Sklaroff stated that private agreements, whether zoning restrictions or façade easements, are not within the jurisdiction of the Historical Commission. He stated that the Commission has an important mission, which is regulatory. He contended that it is improper for Mr. Gallery to recommend remanding the application to the Committee because it would deprive his client of his due process for the purpose of leveraging arguments about a façade easement. He opined that a fair reading of the easement is that the ownership is free to make signage decisions as long as they do not materially affect or alter the appearance of the property. He asserted that the proposal is not a material change. He stated that it does not make sense that Mr. Gallery did not know about the other signage, given that the headquarters of the Preservation Alliance is located in the building. He asserted that the proposal is minimal, respectful, and compatible. He acknowledged that there may be valid arguments on both sides of the issue. He asserted that they have responded to the staff's suggestions and made changes based on those suggestions. He argued that, if his client is delayed 30 to 60 days, he will lose the tenant. He asserted that the project would not result in any material adverse effect on history fabric. He stated he was surprised by the Architectural Committee's recommendation because it has recommended approval of far more dramatic alterations, removals, and occlusions of historic fabric. He acknowledged that the proposal is not perfect, but it is minimal, respectful, and compatible.

Mr. Schaaf addressed Mr. Gallery's claim that the proposal would compromise the symmetry of the windows. He stated that this building is very large and is situated on a street that is perceived while walking. Mr. Schaaf opined that it is difficult for a pedestrian to conceive of the entrances and windows of the building together at the street level because the distance between them is so large. He opined that, if one window is altered, it will have no effect on the other.

Mr. Farnham apologized to the applicant for including the image with the oval sign and interior signage in the Commission's packet of meeting materials. He asserted that it should not have been included as it was not part of the official application to the Commission. He explained that it was a version that had been shown to the staff in an early meeting, before the submission of the application, when the applicant was seeking advice. He advised the Commission that the current application does not propose any signage behind the glass. He added that the Commission would not have jurisdiction over it anyway, because it would be an interior alteration. He affirmed that the image's inclusion was an oversight by the staff. He explained that there are many versions of this design on which the staff commented before it was submitted to the Commission. He also noted that the storefront window to the west is not the identical twin of the window in question, but rather a fraternal twin. He explained that it was sympathetically altered many years ago and it is not identical. He contended that the symmetry was lost at that time. The Commission should not base its decision on a perceived loss of symmetry.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she is concerned that the brow might become a permanent fixture. She compared the brow to an awning and concluded that an awning is more temporary. Mr. Cox

confirmed that Fossil always removes its branding signage when its leaves a location. He assured Ms. Hawkins that the brow and other signage would be removed when Fossil left the space.

FAILED MOTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to deny the brow at the storefront window, but to approve the Fossil sign over the door, provided the depth of the brow at the door is reduced to the depth of the lettering on it and provided that the brow and lettering are lowered to the height of the unornamented stone panel directly above the door. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which failed by a vote of 4 to 8. Commissioners Dilworth, Leonard, Mattioni, Merriman, Quinn, Schaaf, Schlotterbeck, and Sherman dissented.

ACTION: Ms. Schlotterbeck moved to approve the application as presented at the Historical Commission's meeting of 13 January 2012, provided the brows at the window and door are reduced in depth an additional two inches, leaving a four-inch gap between the brows and the face of the building, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 4. Commissioners Hawkins, Jaffe, Jones, and Thomas dissented.

ADDRESS: 2038 SPRING GARDEN ST

Project: Legalize mechanical equipment

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Artisides Pappas

Applicant: Artisides Pappas

History: 1875

Individual Designation: 5/1/1975

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

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of HVAC condensers and conduit mounted to the first and second-story side wall of this building. The condensers are highly visible as the side of the building stands on 21st Street.

In August 2011, the staff observed the HVAC units installed without the approval of the Historical Commission or a permit from the Department of Licenses & Inspections. A violation was subsequently issued.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Artisides Pappas and attorney William B. Morrin represented the application.

Mr. Morrin apologized for not attending the Architectural Committee meeting. He stated that he did not receive the notice of the meeting. He stated that Mr. Pappas purchased the building in 1974 and was unaware that it had been designated in 1975. He explained that there are two floors with two apartments on each floor. He explained that, in February 2009 at the request of his tenants, he removed the window air conditioning units and installed the Mitsubishi units that are outside and attached to the wall. He stated that no building permits were required. He claimed that they are similar in size to the window units and are next to the windows instead of in the windows. He claimed he did not know he needed the Commission's approval. He stated that he thought that the units would not be an eyesore because they are the same size as the

window units and quieter and do not drip or rust. He opined that window units can be unattractive. He claimed that these units are designed to be more attractive than window units. He explained that there was no code requirement to provide air conditioning for tenants when the building was constructed. He stated that the code now requires air conditioning and he believed that these units are better than window units.

Ms. Merriman explained that these alterations are highly visible, disturb historic fabric, and there is no precedent for the Commission to approve an intrusion like the one suggested in this proposal. She acknowledged that it will be difficult to retrofit central air conditioning into a building of this age with tenants inside. She opined that the window units are a better option because they are temporary and are easily inserted and removed based on the weather. She asserted that the Commission's jurisdiction is clear and this is not something the Commission would approve. She suggested that the remedy is removal and masonry repair with the staff to review the details.

Mr. Morrin claimed that many tenants leave the window units in all year and opined that they look worse than the wall units. He stated that tenants would like to open their windows for fresh air and are unable to do so with window units. He claimed that there are no other alternatives for air conditioning in this building. He asked the Commission for suggestions for air conditioning. Mr. Sherman recommended retrofitting the building with central air conditioning. Mr. Morrin stated that he may submit a financial hardship application because the owner does not have the funds to install central air conditioning.

Mr. Thomas stated that the installation of wall units is not appropriate because this is a street façade. He explained that the Commission has not approved wall HVAC units on street facades in the Spring Garden Historic District. Any that exist predate designation. He stated that the equipment should be removed and the holes repaired. He acknowledged that the applicant could submit a financial hardship application. He stated that, in his experience as an architect, a type of roof unit may be a solution. He stated that he has seen many systems that do not require ductwork, but utilize a chilling system on the roof with copper lines that run through the building. He added that not only are the wall units intrusive, but so is the associated wiring and piping. He asserted that this does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and he voiced his agreement with the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

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

COMMENT ON NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATION

WAYNE JUNCTION HISTORIC DISTRICT

Nominator: Philadelphia City Planning Commission, Community Planning Division

Owners: Various

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has submitted a National Register nomination to the Philadelphia Historical Commission for its review and comment. PHMC is charged with implementing federal historic preservation regulations in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, including overseeing the National Register of Historic Places in the state. PHMC reviews all such nominations before forwarding them to the National Park Service for action. As part of the process, PHMC must solicit comments on every National

Register nomination from the appropriate local government. The Philadelphia Historical Commission speaks on behalf of the City of Philadelphia in historic preservation matters including the review of National Register nominations. Under federal regulation, the local government not only must provide comments, but must also provide a forum for public comment on nominations. Such a forum is provided during the Philadelphia Historical Commission's meetings.

This nomination to the National Register of Historic Places proposes to list an area of four city blocks (roughly twelve acres) as a historic district. The district is proposed owing to its significance with the industrial heritage of Philadelphia and the nation. The proposed district is centered around Wayne Junction Train Station in the lower Germantown/Nicetown area of Philadelphia. The proposed district would be listed under Criterion A for Industry, as well as Criterion C for Architecture.

The proposed district contains fifteen contributing structures, and two non-contributing structures. All of the fifteen contributing structures have a direct connection to the industrial nature of the district and all of these contributing structures housed manufacturing activities. The two non-contributing buildings are service stations that did not house the manufacturing of goods, and as such, do not relate to the significance of the district. Most of the buildings are low-rise structures of industrial design, although two structures are noteworthy examples of specific architectural styles. These are the Wayne Junction Train Station, designed by Wilson Brothers in 1901 in a refined Renaissance Revival Style, and the Max Levy Autograph Building constructed in 1902 in the Beaux Arts Style.

This area of lower Germantown/Nicetown developed as an industrial enclave owing to the presence of the Philadelphia & Reading Railroad lines and after 1883 the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. Although industrial development in Germantown started as early as the 1830s, this early industrial development relied on proximity to water sources, thus it tended to congregate near rivers or creeks. The Wayne Junction industrial enclave developed because of the railroads not hydro-driven power. The earliest structure in the proposed district dates to 1884. The period of significance begins in 1884 and ends in 1950. Most of the contributing structures have additions and alterations; these alterations, however, do not diminish the structures' historic integrity and most were built within the period of significance. The proposed district is a very well preserved and cohesive industrial enclave. The proposed boundaries retain all of the historic structures that were present by the end of the period of significance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The Philadelphia Historical Commission staff reviewed the nomination and concurs that the proposed district meets both Criterion A for industry and Criterion C for architecture and merits listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The staff encourages the Commission to recommend the designation of this district as proposed to the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the nomination. Mr. Danta pointed out some minor mistakes in the nomination, but stated that, aside from those minor mistakes, the nomination was complete and well made.

Ms. Jones stated that she was very pleased to see this nomination. She noted that "religion" was included as one of the criterion and she was puzzled by this inclusion. Mr. Farnham stated that this inclusion was a typographic mistake. He clarified that the nomination had been prepared by interns of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission. Mr. Thomas stated that the two buildings on the Wayne Junction station would be preserved and restored.

The Commission unanimously commented that the Wayne Junction Historic District should be designated to the National Register of Historic Places.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adjourn at 11:31 a.m. 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 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.