

**THE MINUTES OF THE 622ND STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 13 JUNE 2014
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman Jr., chair
Ralph DiPietro, Department of Licenses & Inspections
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, vice chair, Commerce Department
R. David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Betty Turner, M.A.

Jonathan E. Farnham, Executive Director
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Broadbent, Historic Preservation Planner I
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

Joseph Kury, Varenhorst
Michael Cole
Plato Marinakos, Plato Studio
Carmen Patrascu
Doug Mooney, Philadelphia Archaeological Forum
Jed Levin, Philadelphia Archaeological Forum
Jonathan Stavin, PMC Property Group
Stephen Varenhorst, Varenhorst
Harry S. Murray, Campbell Thomas & Co.
Ryan Debski, SGRA
Alvin Holm, AIA
James Unkefer, Digsau
Nick Musser, Digsau
Brian Johnston, Johnston Design Studio
Brett Webber, Brett Webber Architects PC
Katherine Dowdell
George V. Baker, Baker Architects
Kevin Towey, Eimer Design
Lorna Katz Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association
Nancy Bastian, Cecil Baker & Partners
Cecil Baker, Cecil Baker & Partners
Allan Domb, Allan Domb Real Estate
Stuart Rosenberg, SGRA
Dan Shapiro
E.J. Messersmith, EJM, Inc.

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman, the chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners DiPietro, Hawkins, Jones, Leonard, Mattioni, Merriman, Schaaf, and Turner joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 621ST STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the minutes of the 621st Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 9 May 2014. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 MAY 2014

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included applications for the following addresses: 111 S. Independence E Mall, Unit A; 513 Spruce Street; 414 S. Camac Street; 420 Wood Street; and 1708 Delancey Place. 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 asked any questions.

ACTION: Mr. Jones moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 111 S. Independence E Mall, Unit A; 513 Spruce Street; 414 S. Camac Street; 420 Wood Street; and 1708 Delancey Place. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 250 N CHRIS COLUMBUS BLV

Project: Construct apartment building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1 Water Street Associates Owner LP c/o PMC Property Group, Inc.

Applicant: Joseph Kury, Varenhorst PC

History: vacant lot; building demolished

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a qualified archaeologist reviews and, if necessary, updates the 2006 archaeological study to reflect the current project including the locations of the foundation pilings, and provided the archaeological monitoring and reporting recommended by the archaeological study are implemented, pursuant to Standards 8 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of an apartment building at 250 N. Christopher Columbus Boulevard, on a vacant site north of the Philadelphia anchorage of the Ben Franklin Bridge. The site is located in the Old City Historic District. A non-contributing building stood on the site at the time of the designation of the district in 2003. It was demolished several years ago with the Commission's approval. Owing to the building that stood on the site at the time of designation, the Commission has full jurisdiction over this project, even though the

site is currently a vacant lot. The site is bounded on east by Christopher Columbus Boulevard; on the south by Summer Street and the bridge anchorage; on the west by Water Street and Interstate 95; and on the north by Vine Street. A utility easement, which cannot be built upon, runs east-west across the site at its northern edge along Vine Street. Although the 200 block of Water Street, which borders this property on the west, is paved with Belgian block, it is not designated as historic as part of the Historic Street Paving Thematic District.

In 2005, the Commission approved the demolition of the non-contributing building and the construction of a 30-story, 345-foot-tall building, provided a Phase 1 Archeological Study was performed prior to the start of construction (see attached minutes). The non-contributing building was demolished and the archaeological study was performed, but the 30-story building was not constructed.

In 2012, the Commission approved the construction of an 11-story, 134' tall building, provided the archaeological monitoring recommended in the 2006 report is undertaken, pursuant to Standard 9 (see attached minutes). The 11-story building was not constructed.

The proposed building would be composed of two sections, the shorter to the south and the taller to the north. The shorter would be 13 stories and about 145' tall. The taller would be 16 stories and 197'-7" to the highest point. The bridge anchorage to the south is approximately 160' tall. The proposed building would include 261 apartments and 74 parking spaces. The first floor would include lobby, bicycle storage, and fitness spaces. The building would be clad in white or light-colored metal panels and spandrel and clear glass. The garage would be hidden behind green screens. The building is set back from and above Columbus Boulevard because of flood-plain restrictions.

The site is located in an area with very high archaeological potential. The remains of a seventeenth-century shipyard were discovered just to the north of this site, on the north side of Vine Street, during an archaeological excavation in the 1980s. The 2006 archaeological study of this site presented conclusions and recommendations that were based not only on the conditions at the site but also on the proposed building, especially its foundation system. That study recommended that an archaeological team monitor the drilling that was proposed for the construction of the support pilings for the foundation system. It also recommended the submission of a report on this monitoring to the Commission. A qualified archaeologist should review and, if necessary, update the conclusions and recommendations in the 2006 archaeological study to reflect the current construction proposal, especially its foundation system.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. Developer Jonathan Stavin and architects Stephen Varenhorst and Joseph Kury represented the application.

Mr. Varenhorst summarized the project for the Commissioners using a Powerpoint presentation. He displayed photographs of the site and plans for the site and building. He explained that the building is massed and located to allow for views of the bridge from the nearby highways and streets and to allow for views of the river from the building. He also explained that the height of the building was also determined by the zoning for the site. Mr. Stavin added that the development team has reviewed the records of the Commission's earlier reviews and has met extensively with the community. He asserted that the design is intended to preserve views of the bridge. The angled nature of the taller section of the building is intended to facilitate views of the

bridge. He noted that the proposed building occupies much less of the site than did the two earlier, approved building designs. He stated that the disturbance of the site would be minimal. He reported that they are not excavating at the site, but are adding six feet of fill. He noted that the proposed building will require fewer foundation footers than did the earlier approved projects. He asked the Commission to waive the archaeological requirement recommended by the staff and Architectural Committee and required as part of the previous two approvals. Referring to the letter from the River's Edge community group, Mr. Stavin offered to consider contributing to the restoration of Wood Street in Belgian block. Mr. Varenhorst reviewed the building plans for the Commissioners. He emphasized the ways in which the design facilitates the views of the bridge.

Mr. Sherman asked about the uses of the spaces on the first floor of the building. He asked if it included retail. Mr. Varenhorst explained that the first floor includes amenities for the residents such as a gym, but no retail. He stated that retail was not feasible at this site, in part because the grade at the building is five feet above the street. Mr. Sherman noted that the master plan for the waterfront encourages mixed uses and retail. He asked about the parking. Mr. Stavin stated that there will be 75 parking spaces all at ground level. The previously approved projects had many more parking spaces. Mr. Stavin stated that retail does not appear to be feasible at this site at the present, but they would consider it in the future. He noted that the Delaware River Waterfront Corporation has issued a letter supporting the project. He added that the Registered Community Organization supports the project. He observed that the first-floor spaces will be active. In response to Mr. Sherman's question, Mr. Stavin stated that the building will have one parking spot for every three units. Mr. Stavin summarized that the community expressed three concerns about the earlier designs. They asserted that the earlier buildings would have had too much parking, would have blocked views of the bridge, and would have been clad in cheap materials. He asserted that the current design addresses those three concerns.

Ms. Jones asked the applicants to explain why they objected to the archaeological requirement. She asked them to explain what impacts archaeological monitoring might have on the budget and schedule of the project. Mr. Stavin stated that the fact that the two earlier projects for the site failed indicates that construction at this site is challenging economically. The projected rents are very low. He reported that they have reduced the extent of the foundations by 30% from the previous project. He claimed that the archaeological requirement would impact their schedule for the project. He stated that they hoped to begin construction at the end of July. He noted that the company that did the earlier archaeological report is no longer in business. Mr. Schaaf asked the staff to comment on the archaeological study prepared in 2006. Mr. Farnham stated that the recommendations from the 2006 archaeological study were included with the application materials provided to the Commissioners. He summarized that the report recommended that a qualified archaeologist monitor and document the auger bit drilling for the foundation system and then submit a report to the Commission on the drilling. Mr. Farnham noted that two archaeologists were in attendance at the meeting and would like to speak to the issue. Mr. Schaaf noted that the remains of an early shipyard were discovered to the north of this site. He contended that this site likely holds significant archaeological resources. Mr. Farnham agreed with him. Mr. Farnham stated that this project will not require significant excavation, for example for a subterranean parking garage. In fact, fill will be added to the site. The foundation system will have a limited impact on the site. However, the drilling for the foundation system could potentially disturb some archaeological resources. Mr. Farnham explained that the staff and Architectural Committee have recommended that the Commission require the applicant to retain an archaeologist to review the 2006 report, update it based on current construction scheme, and then implement the recommendations regarding monitoring

and reporting. Mr. Farnham stated that the proposed archeological project is rather limited and should not impose a burden on the applicant. Ms. Merriman stated that she finds the archaeological recommendation appears to be “a perfectly reasonable approach.” Mr. Sherman asked Mr. Farnham to explain the steps an archaeologist would take in this case to preserve resources at the site. Mr. Farnham responded that an archaeologist would review the construction plans to ensure that they best preserved resources at the site, would monitor the drilling for the foundation, and would report on the construction and any resources encountered to the Commission. Mr. Stavin asked if the Historical Commission or City of Philadelphia would pay the archaeologist’s fees. Ms. Merriman responded that the developer would be responsible for any costs associated with the archaeology. Mr. Mattioni asked the applicants to comment on the current foundation system in relation to the systems for the previously approved projects. Mr. Varenhorst replied that the footprint of the current proposal is 16,000 sf smaller than the previously approved project. He stated that the current project will have a significantly smaller impact on the site than earlier projects. Mr. Mattioni asked the applicants if they could provide an exact number of pilings that they would be drilling. Mr. Varenhorst replied that the engineer is still designing the structural system. He estimated that each column shown on the plan would require two or three pilings. He explained that the auger has a hollow core through which concrete can be pumped. The auger drills a whole about 14” to 18” in diameter and then inserts concrete in the hole when it is extracted, creating the piling. Mr. Mattioni observed that the auger would likely destroy any archaeological resources it encountered.

Doug Mooney, an archaeologist and the president of the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum, and Jed Levin, an archaeologist and a member of the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum, addressed the Commission. Mr. Mooney stated that he concurred with the staff that this site has a great potential for archaeological resources. He stated that his organization does not agree with the conclusions of the 2006 archaeological report. He stated that examining the materials that are brought up by the auger drilling is not an accepted method of archaeological analysis. He stated that, to determine what exists underground, one must excavate test pits. To determine how this project will impact resources, one must review details plans for the construction. He observed that the auger borings are not the only activity that will potentially impact archaeological resources. He noted that pilings typically support grade beams, which can also have subsurface impacts. Pile caps also have an impact. Utility lines also can impact resources. He questioned where and how the fill would be applied. He stated that they absolutely agree with the staff’s recommendation that a qualified archaeologist should review the construction plans for this particular development and revise the recommendations to protect resources accordingly. Mr. Levin stated that there is a standard three-step methodology for archaeology in such situations that is widely accepted and practiced throughout the country. Phase I is the background study limited to documentary research and preliminary testing. He stated that that step has been completed for this site. If the site does have potential for archaeological resources, then Phase II is undertaken, in which the nature, extent, and significance of the potential resources is determined through initial excavation. If Phase II indicates that the project will impact resources, then Phase III is undertaken, in which the resources that will be impacted by the construction are excavated and documented. Mr. Levin explained that not all projects require all three phases. He stated that, in this case, only the Phase I has been completed. There is not yet an evidentiary base to decide that monitoring of the borings alone is sufficient to protect resources. He assured the developer that this sort of archaeology is routinely undertaken and is not time or cost prohibitive. He stated that such steps are necessary to protect our irreplaceable cultural heritage. Once this site is gone, it is gone forever.

Mr. Varenhorst countered the claims of the archaeologists, asserting that the site has already been significantly disturbed by construction activity. He claimed that these construction activities would not have any more impact on the site than those that took place in the later nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Mr. Mooney agreed that the construction that has taken place on the site disturbed earlier archaeological artifacts. He explained, however, that many resources likely survived that earlier work. He noted that similar, later buildings stood on the adjacent site to the north of Vine Street, yet an early shipyard was discovered just a few feet below the surface. Mr. Levin stated that a qualified archaeologist can undertake an analysis and determine whether anything of archaeological value would be placed at risk by the proposed construction. He concluded that there are many examples of valuable archaeological finds at sites in Philadelphia that had later development. Mr. Mooney explained that such an analysis will allow the archaeologist to make recommendations that will allow the foundation design to be adjusted to avoid resources.

Mr. Sherman observed that developers need predictability. He asked whether the archaeological resources could be protected in such a way that the developer knows the costs in time and money at the start. He noted that the process as described appears open-ended. Mr. Levin responded that an archaeological analysis would not be open-ended, but would be tightly focused on the areas impacted by the construction. The Phase II in-ground testing would target the spots where the pilings and other disturbances would take place. In something significant was found, then the plans could be revised to avoid the location or the resource could be documented and then destroyed. Such work is focused and targeted and does occur at development sites routinely without halting development.

Mr. Sherman asked the applicants to comment on the impacts such an archaeological study might have on their schedule. Mr. Stavin stated that they hope to have their permitting work with all agencies completed by the end of July. He stated that, if the Commission requires archaeological monitoring, their schedule will not be adversely impacted. Mr. Stavin repeated that the Commission has twice approved projects for the site. He then read from the Phase I report and contended that it claims that no significant resources survive at the site because of a fire and other events. He claimed that the construction of the Ben Franklin Bridge and I-95 disturbed the site in ways that the site to the north with the archaeological features was not. He asserted that they have tried to preserve the important historic feature of the site, the views to the bridge. He commented that the real estate market is cyclical and claimed that the project must move forward now or it will not be successful. He added that they cannot build on a 52-foot-wide strip at the north end of the site because of the utilities that occupy it. Mr. Mooney countered that there is disturbance on every site in Philadelphia, but artifacts survive. He contended that there is 300 years of history in the ground at the site in question. Mr. Mooney stated that he is working on archaeology related to I-95 in Fishtown currently and he contended that artifacts at this survived the construction of the highway. He also noted that this site was not disturbed for the construction of the bridge; the report notes that buildings stood on the site during the construction of the bridge. He concluded that there is a very high likelihood of significant archaeological resources at this site.

Ms. Hawkins asked the archaeologists to put a price tag and timeline on the process they are recommending. Mr. Mooney stated that he could not put a price on the project because he is not under contract and has not reviewed the plans. Ms. Hawkins asked for a “ballpark” number. He declined to offer one. He suggested that the developer contract with a qualified archaeologist, who can review the existing report and provide an accurate estimate for any additional work that needs to be undertaken. Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Farnham to explain what recourse the

developer might have if the Commission required the developer to contract with an archaeologist to update the report and recommendations and then found that the recommendations were onerous to undertake. Mr. Farnham responded that the developer could submit an application to the Commission requesting that it excuse him from undertaking some or all of the archaeological requirements mandated by the revised report. Mr. Sherman stated that the developer is concerned about cost and time. Mr. Stavin observed that his company discovered that the Historical Commission holds jurisdiction over the site late in their process. He said that they were surprised to learn that the Commission had jurisdiction over a vacant parcel. Mr. Sherman commented that the former owner of the property was fully aware of the Commission's jurisdiction over the property and, in fact, proposed a project for the property to the Commission. Mr. Stavin stated that the former owner did not disclose the Commission's jurisdiction. Mr. Sherman noted that, including the project presented today, the Commission has reviewed three projects for this site.

Ms. Jones asked Mr. Farnham about the cost of the 2006 report. Mr. Farnham replied that the earlier developer did not disclose the cost of the report. He added that archaeological studies are routinely required by state and federal authorities for development projects in Philadelphia. He opined that the costs and timeframes for such studies are not onerous. Archaeologists working in this realm are adept at fitting their work into tight design and construction schedules and can work seamlessly within development projects. He stated that such reports cost tens of thousands of dollars and may add days or weeks to a construction schedule, but not months. Mr. Levin agreed and stated that the cost of a Phase II can range from less than to more than \$10,000. He noted that this project would not be a large or complex project and would therefore cost toward the lower end of the range. He stated that it would certainly not cost \$100,000, but providing an exact number is not possible at this point. Mr. Mooney added that having an archaeologist review the prior work would be inexpensive and quick. The work of reviewing and updating the existing report could be completed in weeks.

Mr. Sherman asked the applicants about their permitting progress. Mr. Stavin stated that the project is in by-right with regard to zoning. The Planning Commission and Central Delaware Waterfront Corporation both support the project. The Registered Community Organization supports the project. The Community Design Review will complete its process on 1 July. He stated that they will seek the final building permit in July, once they have the approval of the Water Department. Mr. Sherman suggested that the applicants could engage an archaeologist now so that they would have satisfied any archaeology requirements by the time that they are ready to apply for the building permit. Mr. Stavin stated that he was willing to have an archaeologist review the report and update its recommendations based on the construction project currently proposed. He stated that the current project is smaller in scope than the 2006 project on which this report is based. Ms. Hawkins stated that she is frustrated by this discussion, given that the developer knew or should have known about the archaeological requirements that were imposed on earlier projects for this site and were discussed at the Architectural Committee meeting more than two weeks ago. She asserted that the applicants should have at least obtained an estimate for the recommended work from an archaeologist. Mr. Stavin responded that he attempted to contact the company that wrote the original report, but found that they have gone out of business. He stated that he would be willing to undertake the work required of the earlier projects at this site, but he asked the Commission not to expand upon the work it required of the earlier applicants. Mr. Stavin contended that an archaeology requirement could stop this project. He claimed that the financial feasibility of the project is "marginal." He also claimed that the earlier developer of this site "lost his shirt." He asserted that

this project would have a positive economic impact on the city and would further the City's goals for the waterfront.

Mr. Mattioni asked about the extent of the Commission's authority to protect archaeological resources at the site. He noted that he was involved with the permitting process for Sugarhouse Casino and commented that the archaeology at that site was extensive, expensive, and time consuming. Mr. Farnham responded that he too was involved with the Sugarhouse Casino review, as a consulting party. He contended that the Historical Commission has its full authority to protect archaeological resources at this site. He explained that the Old City Historic District was designated in part for its archaeological potential. The Criterion for Designation related to archaeology, Criterion J, was cited in the district nomination and the Commission may deny or condition approvals for projects to protect archaeological resources. He asserted that it was legal and appropriate for the Commission to require archaeological reporting and monitoring to protect archaeological resources, even if such reporting and monitoring had a financial impact on the project. He stated that such requirements would be analogous to requiring a developer to reduce the height of a proposed building to ensure that it was compatible with a historic district. The Commission may make decisions that require property owners to protect historic resources, even if those decisions have financial impacts on the owners. Mr. Farnham remarked that he believes that the Commission can protect archaeological resources at this site without rendering this project infeasible.

ACTION: Ms Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided a qualified archaeologist reviews and, if necessary, updates the 2006 archaeological study to reflect the current project including the locations of the foundation pilings, and provided the archaeological monitoring and reporting recommended by the archaeological study are implemented, pursuant to Standards 8 and 9. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 313-25 RACE ST, UNIT PARK

Project: Construct seven-story, multi-family residential building

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: 313 Race Associates, LP

Applicant: Kevin Towey, Eimer Design

History: parking lot

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

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

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee voted to comment that the overall height of the building along Race Street should be reduced, the number of colors on the exterior should be reduced and the palette simplified, the number of bays on the Race Street façade should be reduced, the balconies on the west façade should be redesigned, perhaps recessed, the ground floor along Race Street should be redesigned to have the scale and rhythm of the nearby historic storefronts, and the mechanical equipment should not be visible from the street.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a seven-story, multi-family residential building with terrace on the north side of the 300-block of Race Street in the Old City Historic District. The property extends north from Race to the south side of Florist Street. The property was

vacant at the time of the designation of the Old City Historic District and is currently used as a surface parking lot. The wall and fence surrounding the lot are non-historic. The lot satisfies the Historical Commission's definition of an undeveloped site and, therefore, its jurisdiction over the new construction is Review-and-Comment only.

The building would be seven stories and 90 feet tall. Four and five-story loft buildings stood on the site historically. Parking would be located at the basement level and accessed from the rear at Florist Street, a service alley that runs along the approach to the Ben Franklin Bridge. The terrace would be located at the seventh-floor level at the center of the building. Mechanical equipment would be located on the roof, hidden behind the parapet. The upper front and rear façades and returns would be clad in fiber cement panels. The side facades would be clad in EIFS, a synthetic stucco. The front façade would stand at the sidewalk line. The front and rear ground-floor facades would be clad in stone panels. The ground floor of the front façade would be mostly glazed. Above the ground floor, the front façade would include two asymmetrical projecting glazed bays to break down the massing. The light color of the building would correspond to the white buildings to the west, historic fire and police stations rehabilitated for residential use by the same developer.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Kevin Towey and developer Donn Clendenon represented the application.

Mr. Towey explained that, after the Architectural Committee meeting, the Zoning Board of Adjustment reviewed the project and required a reduction in height from seven stories to five. He stated that they have revised their plans to reflect the Board's decision and he distributed revised architectural drawings to the Commission showing a five-story version of the building. He noted that the height was the primary concern of the Architectural Committee. He explained that the color scheme is based on the colors of the adjacent fire and police stations, which the developer also owns. He stated that he would also address the Committee's comments about materials and scale. He stated that he cannot remove the bays, as the Committee recommended, because the narrow site offers little square footage. The bays provide more room, which is needed. Regarding the suggestions about the first-floor front, he stated that the building would address the sidewalk well; it would be activated and appear almost like a hotel lobby. Ms. Hawkins stated that the first-floor front comment related to the rhythm of the façade at the ground floor. She noted that the column at the midpoint of the front is pulled back behind the glass, giving the front a very long, unbroken feel. She suggested engaging the column with the window to provide a more appropriate scale and rhythm to the window. Ms. Leonard asked if the mechanical equipment on the roof can be seen from the street. Mr. Towey responded that it cannot. Ms. Hawkins thanked Mr. Towey for reducing the height to five stories.

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to adopt the comment of the Architectural Committee and comment that the overall height of the building along Race Street should be reduced, the number of colors on the exterior should be reduced and the palette simplified, the number of bays on the Race Street façade should be reduced, the balconies on the west façade should be redesigned, perhaps recessed, the ground floor along Race Street should be redesigned to have the scale and rhythm of the nearby historic storefronts, and the mechanical equipment should not be visible from the street. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 111 S INDEPENDENCE E ML, UNIT A

Project: Insert door in window opening; replace wall with railing

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Bourse Mall Associates, LP

Applicant: Robert Gilberg, Bourse Mall Associates, LP

History: 1893; Philadelphia Bourse Building; Hewitt Brothers, architects

Individual Designation: 1/26/1971

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

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@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 convert an existing window along the 5th Street façade of the Bourse building into a new set of glazed, double doors with metal trim to match existing. The new entry, located in the first bay to the south of the main entrance, will mirror the location of an existing door within the bay to the north of the entrance. The proposed work will not require the demolition of any historic fabric, but will include the demolition of a partial height concrete wall and lower level canopy. The application proposes to construct a new entry landing paved in brick and bluestone to match the existing plaza, and to install a new metal guardrail along the entry landing and at the location of the demolished partial height concrete wall.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 319 S 02ND ST, UNIT 6B

Project: Construct ADA ramp

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Carl Brown

Applicant: Carl Brown

History: 1970; Louis Sauer, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an ADA-accessible ramp into a private residence. The proposed ramp is of concrete construction, and rises 17 inches above the sidewalk. The existing concrete steps would be moved forward approximately one and a half feet to meet the new ramp. The ramp is designed to fit between existing entry steps to adjoining properties and to extend out from the front wall of the building no further than the line of planters along this block S. 02nd Street.

While this block of development exhibits a regular pattern of higher Unit A doors separated from lower Unit B doors by brick planters, the staff does not feel that the construction of the proposed ramp will disrupt the understanding of the block as a whole, nor will it damage significant historic fabric.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect E.J. Messersmith represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins summarized that the Architectural Committee's had questioned whether the front door to the building is the only possible location for the ramp; whether the proposed ramp and landing were code compliant; and whether the ramp would be reversible and accommodate existing weep holes at the wall. Mr. Messersmith conceded that, dimensionally, it is impossible to construct a code-compliant ramp in the space available. He observed that, within the space, he is able to build a ramp that has a rise of 1:10, while the code requirement is 1:12. He noted that he would need to obtain some sort of exemption from the code, based on the fact that it is a residential structure and the owner's primary residence, and that there is only a small difference between the required rise and the rise that is possible within the space. He explained that the owner is prepared to purchase a motorized wheelchair that would have no difficulty navigating the proposed landing area. Ms. Hawkins asked whether there is another entrance to the property, to which Mr. Messersmith clarified that there is not.

Mr. Sherman commented that his primary concern was the reversibility of the ramp, and whether a future owner would be able to remove the ramp without causing any damage to the façade of the house. Mr. Messersmith replied that the ramp would be reversible, as the details show it is separated from the wall by a caulk joint. He noted that the ramp could be built and removed without disturbing the building.

Ms. Hawkins asked whether the swing of the door would be modified. Mr. Messersmith replied that the door currently swings in and would therefore not need to be modified.

Mr. Schaaf questioned whether, since the applicant will be using a motorized wheelchair, the proposed aluminum handrail attached to the building would be necessary. Mr. Messersmith replied that the handrail was included to help comply with the code. Mr. Sherman noted that the applicant almost certainly would have to put a railing along the exterior portion of the ramp. Ms. Hawkins noted that, by adding another railing, which most likely would have to have pickets owing to the drop, in reality the ramp would be more obtrusive than that which is proposed. Mr. DiPietro noted that, with accessibility issues, a state variance is required, as the City's Department of Licenses & Inspections lost the authority to approve such variances several years ago. Mr. Sherman noted that he has been through that process, and that the waiver comes from the State Department of Labor & Industry, not from the Department of Licenses & Inspections.

Mr. Sherman stated that he understands the importance of the homeowner being able to stay in his home, but is concerned that an approval is not yet appropriate because there are many unknowns with this ramp proposal. He reiterated that the reversibility of the ramp is also important. Mr. Messersmith asked whether a caulk joint was or was not sufficient to satisfy the request for reversibility. Lorna Katz-Lawson of the Society Hill Civic Association noted that the idea of reversibility came up at her organization's review of this proposal, and her organization decided that it would support a ramp that is reversible. Ms. Katz asked why a lift, which would take up less space, could not be used in place of the ramp. Mr. Sherman responded that lifts are typically less attractive than ramps.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to approve a ramp that is acceptable to all regulatory agencies with jurisdiction over accessibility matters, provided any railings are minimal and compatible with the district, with the staff to review details. Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 513 SPRUCE ST

Project: Construct fourth-floor addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: D. Dragomir & C. Patrascu

Applicant: Robert Thomas, Campbell Thomas & Company Architecture

History: 1850

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

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

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

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

OVERVIEW: This application seeks in-concept approval for the construction of a fourth-floor addition to an existing three-story rear ell. The existing residence is mid-block, three stories in height, and the main block spans the full width of the lot, with a narrower rear extension. The proposed addition starts approximately 17 feet from the front façade on Spruce, and will sit primarily over the lower, rear ell. The proposed addition would not be visible from Spruce Street. Behind the property is a private, gated alley, to the north of which is a private driveway, sometimes known as Manning Walk. The proposed addition would, however, be visible from approximately an 80-foot stretch of S. 5th Street. The proposed addition would be clad in stucco, with fiberglass shingle roofing. The roof of the existing rear ell would be leveled out from its current sloped configuration, and a corbelled brick cornice added along the perimeter. An existing chimney would also be raised and covered with a stucco finish.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 2225 PINE ST

Project: Replace one-story rear addition with three-story addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jennifer Boyle & John Tondera

Applicant: Brian Johnston, Johnston Design Studio, Inc.

History: 1860; refaced 1938

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the central panel between the third-floor windows is eliminated, the second-floor mullion is widened, and windows include sills, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a non-historic one-story rear kitchen addition and construct a three-story addition in its place. This addition would span full width of the house and lot. Like the rears of all of the houses in this immediate vicinity, the rear wall of this house has been significantly altered. It is stuccoed and has non-historic windows in non-historic openings. Also, the property includes a garage at the rear along Panama Street, which would block some views of the addition. The addition would be parged in stucco and include aluminum-clad doors and windows detailed with Azek trim and panels.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Brian Johnston represented the application.

Ms. Cote informed the Commission that the design was revised after the Architectural Committee meeting. She pointed to the architectural drawings stating that that the central panel at the third-floor windows had been removed and the central mullion at the second-floor windows had been widened. Ms. Hawkins stated the revised drawings comply with the recommendations of the Architectural Committee.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 13 June 2014. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously

ADDRESS: 1711 PORTER ST

Project: Remove siding at front bay & porch; replace rear porch with one-story addition; install vinyl windows; alter windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joseph Pungitore

Applicant: Susan Uhl, Landmark Architectural Design

History: 1906; John Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the standing-seam roof on the bay; approval of the window opening alterations; approval of a vinyl window in the basement window opening, but denial of the other proposed vinyl windows; and approval of the addition, provided the side windows are designed with traditional, historical proportions, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to make various alterations to this twin in the Girard Estate Historic District. The roof of the bay on the front elevation originally had slate shingles. This application proposes to install a standing-seam metal roof on the bay. This application also proposes to alter a window opening, cut a new window opening, and install six-over-one vinyl windows. It proposes to install a vinyl basement window. A one-story addition is proposed for the rear of the property. This would require the removal of the existing porch. The addition would be parged in stucco and have metal-clad windows and doors.

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

Ms. Cote informed the Commission that the design was revised after the Architectural Committee meeting. She pointed to the revised architectural drawings, stating that that they include a slate-shape asphalt shingle, metal-clad windows, and more appropriate window configurations at the new addition. Ms. Hawkins stated the revised drawings comply with the recommendations of the Architectural Committee.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 13 June 2014. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously

ADDRESS: 414 S CAMAC ST

Project: Add dormer; construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: William Marsh

Applicant: Anthony Miksitz, Anthony Miksitz, Architect

History: 1825

Individual Designation: 2/28/1961

District Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a third-story shed dormer addition. It also proposes to remove an existing rear CMU wall and wood frame roof and construct a one-story addition on its foundations. This one-story rear addition would not be visible from the public right-of-way. The dormer addition would be visible, but inconspicuous. Although none of the houses in this row had dormers originally, all but two, including this one, now have dormers. Some of the dormers were added before designation; others were added with the Commission's approval. For example, the Commission approved a similar application for a dormer addition at 421 S. Iseminger Street, which was by the same builder, in 2002.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 420 WOOD ST

Project: Construct four-story single-family residence

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Nguyen Thuc

Applicant: Plato Marinakos, Plato Studio

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented that the proposed building is generally compatible with the historic district, but could be improved with the implementation of the Committee's suggestions.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a single-family residence on a vacant lot at the corner of 5th and Wood Streets, within the boundaries of the Old City Historic District. The exceptionally narrow parcel was vacant at the time of designation. The proposed building would be four stories in height plus an additional five feet of raised bays at the roof. Materials would include brick veneer on the facades, with aluminum tan Hardie panel clad projecting bays on 5th Street, which run from the second floor to the roof. The staff worked with the applicant prior to submission, which resulted in a rear yard and fenestration changes on the Wood Street façade.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 238-40 S 04TH ST

Project: Cut opening in wall, install gate, remove shed, add paving for parking

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Allan Domb Real Estate

Applicant: Nancy Bastian, Cecil Baker & Partners

History: 1765; Shippen-Wistar House; Norris-Cadwalader House; Mutual Assurance Co., 1912

Individual Designation: 6/26/1956, 4/30/1957

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

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to create parking areas at the rears of two rowhouses that face 4th Street. The parking would be accessed from Locust Street. The two rowhouses were consolidated into one structure for an insurance company office in 1912 and were most recently used as the headquarters of the Episcopal Diocese. They would be subdivided and returned to single-family residential use. The garden, which borders Locust Street behind the house at 238 S. 4th Street, was created in 1912 and expanded in the 1930s, within the period of significance of the Society Hill Historic District.

A wall borders the garden along Locust Street. The lower, eastern section of the wall with the wrought iron fence was built in 1912. The taller, western section was built in the mid 1930s, when a building along Locust was demolished to extend the garden. Currently, there is a pedestrian entrance with wrought iron gate in the western section of the garden wall. This entrance would be expanded for automobiles and a new gate installed. A wall running perpendicular to Locust Street at the rear of the garden behind 238 S. 4th Street would be removed. Two brownstone relief sculptures depicting scenes of the Schuylkill Navigation Company, which are in poor condition, are mounted in the section of wall proposed for removal. The revised application proposes to replace the removed section of wall with a new section of brick garden wall to the east to block views of the parked cars from the public right-of-way. At the rear of 240 S. 4th Street, a mid twentieth-century garden shed would be removed to create room for the parking.

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application. Some members objected to views of parked automobiles across the garden and through the gate. The applicants have revised the proposal, adding the new section of garden wall to hide the cars and deleting the transparent gate options. Other members of the Architectural Committee objected to the reduction of the size of the garden.

If the reliefs date to the early nineteenth century, they may have considerable historic value. If the application is approved and the reliefs are salvageable, they should be reinstalled in the new section of garden wall or donated to a repository like the National Canal Museum in Easton, Pennsylvania.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architects Nancy Bastian and Cecil Baker and property owner Alan Domb represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants if they were amenable to the relocation of the reliefs. Ms. Bastian responded that they will salvage and donate the reliefs to an appropriate repository. Mr. Farnham noted that the reliefs are in very poor condition and may not be salvageable, owing to deterioration of the brownstone.

Ms. Jones asked Mr. Domb why the parking area cannot be on the existing open lot on the north side of Locust Street. Mr. Domb responded that he no longer owns that lot.

Mr. Sherman opened the discussion to the public. Lorna Katz-Lawson of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that the Civic Association is generally pleased with the revisions that have been made to this application since its review at the Architectural Committee meeting. She asked if one of the five parking spots could be deleted from the plan so that a large tree proposed for removal could be replaced. Ms. Bastian responded that it would not allow enough room for the vehicles to make the turn into the parking area. Ms. Katz Lawson clarified that she would like to see the tree replaced, not retained. Mr. Domb explained that the parking spaces are necessary for single-family estate homes in today's market. Mr. Sherman suggested that the Civic Association work with the developer on some sort of compromise regarding the planting of a tree. Ms. Katz Lawson then requested that the Commission set a deadline for sale of the single-family homes so that they do not sit empty and are then subsequently converted to condominium units or rental apartments. Mr. Sherman stated that the Historical Commission has no jurisdiction over trees or the sale or use of the buildings. He informed Ms. Katz-Lawson that the Historical Commission could not legally place such restrictions or conditions on its approvals.

ACTION: Ms Hawkins moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 13 June 2014, with the staff to review details. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1816 DELANCEY PL

Project: Construct garage; replace windows; add balcony and deck; install star bolts

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mark Nicoletti

Applicant: Deborah Cianfrani, Cianfrani Law, LLC

History: 1855

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the side deck, provided that it is recessed one foot from the back edge of the building; approval of the window replacement and star bolt installation; approval of the garage as shown, provided the sidewalk and masonry openings of the first-floor rear windows are not altered; denial of the ladder; and denial of the rooftop deck and addition as submitted and revised; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert a basement space into a garage, erect a rooftop deck with one-story addition, add a balcony along the rear ell, replace all windows and install star bolts on a row house located within the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District.

The proposed garage opening would be located at the rear of the property on Panama Street. The basement windows would be removed where the garage door would be installed, but the first floor window openings would remain due to interior alterations to allow for adequate height.

The application proposes constructing a rooftop addition with deck on the main block of the house. To accommodate an addition as proposed in the architectural drawings, a chimney would need to be extended in height. The deck with four-foot tall wrought iron railing would be set back eight feet from the front façade. The rooftop addition would be set back six feet from the front edge of the deck. Two alternates for the addition itself are proposed, plus one rendering was provided at the time of the Architectural Committee meeting and is included in your packets. A staff member has not been present at the time of a mockup to determine visibility of the proposed addition.

A steel deck with railing is proposed for the second-floor level along the rear ell. A ladder for egress extending from the roof to the second-floor deck is also proposed.

Replacement windows and star bolts are also proposed.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Mark Nicoletti and architects Alvin Holm and Michael Cole represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked for clarity regarding the roof addition and whether the applicant revised the design as had been discussed at the Architectural Committee meeting. Mr. Nicoletti responded that Mr. Holm did revise the rooftop deck and addition, and he distributed paper copies of the revised design to the Commission members. Mr. Sherman asked if the proposed ladder is a code requirement. Mr. Nicoletti responded that the ladder is in response to his desire to have a secondary means of egress in the event of an emergency. He noted that the ladder is not visible when looking down Panama Street from either end, and would only be visible when standing directly behind the property on Panama Street, a service alley. Ms. Hawkins explained that the Architectural Committee's recommendation of denial for the ladder was based on the particular design of this proposed ladder, and that there are alternative "escape mechanisms" that are temporary, versus the permanently mounted metal ladder that is proposed. Alternative options include a ladder that could be dropped out of the window, or one that looks more like a downspout.

Ms. Hawkins asked if anyone from the staff had reviewed a mock-up of the rooftop addition. Ms. Broadbent responded that no one from the staff has reviewed a mock-up. Ms. Hawkins stated that the new rooftop drawings do not relate to the architectural drawings, and it is not possible to understand the size of the addition based solely on Mr. Holm's newest drawing. She stated that the addition in Mr. Holm's drawing looked to be roughly 20 feet in height. Mr. Nicoletti responded that the plans as submitted have a modest design for a room centered on the roof, and the artistic renderings from Mr. Holm were meant to be more visually attractive to those viewing the roof from taller buildings in the neighborhood. He stated that he understands that the Commission does not want either design to be visible from Delancey Place. Mr. Nicoletti explained that his preferred roof addition option is the version that was distributed to the Commission members at the start of his review, and he would like feedback on the design. Ms. Merriman stated that her preference would be a simple design that is not visible from Delancey Place. Mr. Schaaf asked if the applicant is working with a structural engineer; he expressed concern about the additional weight on the roof from the addition. Mr. Nicoletti responded that

he is working with a structural engineer, and the joists will be reinforced from underneath. He offered a brief narrative as to his successful experience in restoring a historic building in Lower Merion, Pennsylvania. Mr. Sherman explained that a mock-up should be constructed to show the edges and top of the proposed addition, and that it would be used to determine visibility from a public right-of-way, which, in this case, would be Delancey Place. He asked the Commission members if they would be comfortable approving the rooftop addition, provided a mock-up allows the staff to confirm that there is no visibility from the public right-of-way.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10 and the Roofs Guideline, provided:

1. nothing added to the rooftop is visible from the public right-of-way as confirmed by the staff with a mock-up,
2. alternatives to the rear ladder are explored,
3. the side deck is recessed one foot from the back facade of the building, and
4. the sidewalk or masonry openings of the first-floor rear windows are not altered for the garage.

Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1708 DELANCEY PL

Project: Construct rear stair tower and deck, replace windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Banyan Family Limited Partnership

Applicant: Brett Webber, Brett Webber Architects, PC

History: 1850; mansard added

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the deck is inconspicuous and the mechanical equipment is invisible from Delancey Place, with the staff to review details including a mockup of the deck and equipment, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear stair addition and roof deck. It also proposes window replacement and alterations to the rear façade related to the stair addition. The Architectural Committee reviewed and recommended approval of a rear stair addition that did not extend to the roof at its January 2014 meeting. That application was withdrawn before the Commission reviewed it. The current application proposes a rear stair addition that extends above the roofline to allow for access to a proposed roof deck. The public visibility of the stair addition is minimal from the rear on Panama Street. The proposed deck would be set back 17 feet from the front of the building and would align with a roof deck on the adjacent building at 1706 Delancey Place, which was legalized by the Historical Commission in 2001. The railing would be painted steel, and would be minimally visible from public right-of-ways.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 2111 DELANCEY PL

Project: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Dan & Rebecca Shapiro

Applicant: Ryan Debski, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects

History: 1865

Individual Designation: 1/6/1972

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to incompleteness.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes an addition on top of and at the rear of the rear ell. The rear ell has already been added to and altered more than once. Although the proposed addition would large and visible from the rear alley, the staff contends that it would be appropriate because of the context, limited visibility of the existing rear ell, and the altered nature of the existing rear ell. Most of the rears of the nearby properties have been extensively altered, including the building to the east, which has a very large addition.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Dan Shapiro and architects Ryan Debski and Stuart Rosenberg represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the architect had modified the drawings to incorporate the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. The deck had been set back from the rear edge of the ell. All panels had been removed from the brick walls of the ell. The addition had been modified to reflect the half-gable shape of the adjoining house. Although the chimney will be raised to accommodate the addition, it will not be conspicuous and it will be restored in other ways. The chimney currently is stuccoed and includes projecting metal pipes. The new chimney will be rebuilt in brick and have a traditional slate cap. Mr. Rosenberg confirmed that he had revised those aspects of the plans noted by Mr. Baron.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 13 June 2014, with the staff to review details. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 5320 GERMANTOWN AVE

Project: Legalize alterations to storefront

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 5320 Germantown Ave. Associates

Applicant: Marianne Baker, Baker Architects, Inc.

History: 1865; Bank Hotel; altered 1900

Individual Designation: 1/25/1966

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the storefront as submitted, but approval of the storefront scheme set forth during the Committee meeting, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 6.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the legalization of alterations to a storefront. The building had a storefront as early as the mid nineteenth century. The storefront was reconstructed with beaded board siding in the mid twentieth century. In November 2012, after that storefront was hit by a car and damaged, the staff approved a plan to replace a small section of the storefront with matching beaded board. Although the proposal did not constitute a restoration, the staff approved it because the applicant only proposed to replace a small portion of the storefront to match the remainder of the existing, legal, non-historic storefront. After obtaining the staff approval for the small repair, the contractor greatly exceeded the permit, demolishing the remainder of the storefront and replacing it in its entirety with an even more incongruous siding and small door. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a violation for the work which deviated from the permit. A restored storefront should have a paneled design in keeping with the period of the building and the second-floor bay.

Although not part of this application, the windows in the upper floors are in violation. The upper-floor windows were replaced with vinyl windows without a permit or approval in 2002. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a violation at that time. The owner submitted an application to legalize the windows in 2003, but the Commission denied it. The owner twice obtained permits to install the correct windows and clear the violation, in 2004 and again in 2006, but the replacement was never undertaken. A new violation was recently issued for the vinyl windows.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Aaron Shepherd and architect George Baker represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the revised architectural drawings appear to satisfy the Architectural Committee's recommendation, but she noted that she still had a few questions. She asked about the proposed door and whether it was ADA-compatible. Mr. Baker responded that it is; when one leaf of the double-leaf door is opened, the other opens automatically. Ms. Hawkins asked if the door and transom were revised as the Committee had directed. Mr. Baker stated that they were. The transom was removed and a kick plate mirroring the panels was added. Mr. Baron informed the Commission that he included both the original and revised submissions in their meeting materials packets.

Mr. Baker stated that they are working to resolve the illegal window problem. He reported that they are seeking proposals to replace the windows and have obtained one bid on the job for \$39,000. Mr. Baron noted that the Commission has allowed for phased window replacements

when the cost of the entire job poses a challenge to the owner. Mr. Baker explained that they need to replace 28 windows and offered to replace at least four per year. Ms. Hawkins stated that the revised storefront alterations are appropriate. Regarding the windows, she asked if they could replace them in five years, not seven. Mr. Shepherd stated that his company was unaware of the violation for the windows when it purchased the building. He stated that the replacement will be very costly and observed that it will need to be broken into manageable pieces. Ms. Hawkins explained that the applicants could submit a formal financial hardship application. Mr. Farnham pointed out that the application under review requests an approval for changes to the storefront, but it does not request any action on the illegal windows. Mr. Farnham noted that the Commission could condition an approval of the storefront on the replacement of the windows, but it could also take no action on the windows, which are not the subject of this application. He noted that the Commission could ignore the windows during this review and allow for the enforcement process to run its course. He concluded that the applicants are not requesting that the Commission take any action on the windows today.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 13 June 2014, with the staff to review details, provided all illegal windows in the building are brought into compliance within six years. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 11:18 a.m., Ms. Hawkins moved to adjourn. Mr. Schaaf 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 8: Archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

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

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

Roofs Guideline: 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.