

**MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**TUESDAY, 23 JULY 2019
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-031
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. The following Committee members joined him:

Committee Member	Present	Absent	Comment
Dan McCoubrey, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair	X		
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP		X	
Rudy D'Alessandro	X		
Justin Detwiler	X		Arrived 9:30am
Nan Gutterman, FAIA	X		
Suzanne Pentz	X		Arrived 9:08am
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP	X		

The following staff members were present:

- Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner I
- Megan Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner I

The following persons were present:

- Dominic Folino
- Tom Kundig, OK Architects
- Minglee Yuan, OK Architects
- Carl Primavera, Klehr
- Brett Peanasky, Klehr
- Doug Fogle, CS&S Insurance
- Lorna Katz Lawson
- Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
- Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic
- Matt Masterpasqua, Mass Arch Studio
- Emmett McGowen, CAN
- Abigail Tookes
- Rebecca Tookes
- Deborah Hayward
- Meredith Rockwell

Carrie Nase
Mark Gimly
Jenn Rosenberg
Sanjana Muthe, AOS Architects
Sam Olshin, AOL Architects
Kevin Kaminski, Kaminski + Pew
Whitney Joslin, Kaminski + Pew
Andre Stephano, CM Inc
Andrew Kozak, A.K. Designs
Brett Feldman

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 230, 232, 234-36 S 4TH ST

Proposal: Consolidate lots; demolish rears; construct additions

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: 234 S. 4th St. LP and Forman Family Realty Trust

Applicant: Ming-Lee Yuan, Olson Kundig

History: 1805

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This in-concept application proposes work to a site that consists of three parcels and includes two rowhouses and a garden surrounded by a brick wall with iron fence. The site runs west from 4th Street to Leithgow Street along Locust Street. The application proposes to combine the parcels, join the historic rowhouses, and to demolish the rear ells of the two rowhouses as well as a later garage and addition facing Leithgow Street and the INHP Rose Garden. The staff has concerns about the demolition of the character defining early 19th century rear ells as well as the early 20th century additions. A portion of the party wall between the rowhouses would also be removed. The application proposes to construct a large addition that would include a rowhouse-like structure facing S. 4th Street. Two courtyards would be created. The new addition, while fitting into its context in massing and materials, features a large glass window that is not appropriate to the rhythm and scale of the historic buildings that it connects with.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish rear sections of the buildings at 230 and 232 S. 4th Street.
- Construct addition.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the features, size, scale, and massing to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The features, size, scale, proportions of the addition's large window and wall are not compatible with the complex of buildings or historic district.

Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the prohibition against demolition:

- *No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building, structure, site, or object, or of a building, structure, site, or object located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.*
 - The applicants have not demonstrated that the existing building cannot be reasonably adapted, that the sale is impracticable, or that all other potential uses of the property have been foreclosed upon.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) and Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:10

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Tom Kundig and Ming-Lee Yuan and attorney Carl Primavera represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Kundig explained that he was very impressed with the Bingham Court Development across the street and used that as a model for the architecture of this addition. He stated that he also studied the development of the neighborhood. He showed boards of the proposal.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked Mr. Kundig if he could comment on the significance of the rear ells and why he has not incorporated them into his design.
 - Mr. Kundig responded that the rear ells seem to have a different floor heights and qualities of construction than the front portions of the two houses. He added that the rear ells do not fit into the program of the new house.
- The Committee members looked at a photograph supplied by Mr. Baron and noted that the walls appeared sound and undamaged. They asked if the applicants could provide a structural report on the rear ells or if the Department of Licenses & Inspections had issued any violations related to the ells. They explained that rear ells are typically considered to have significance. The Committee members suggested that any application for final approval of this project proposing removal of the rear ells must include documentation about condition or significance supporting the removal.
 - Mr. Kundig responded that the ells suffer from leaky roofs. He stated that no violations have been issued regarding the ells. He explained that he does not have a structural report or information regarding significance.
- The Committee members suggested that the proposed addition should have a cornice and smaller punched fenestration that respond to the façades of the existing historic buildings.
 - Mr. Kundig responded that he was taking his cues from the I.M. Pei houses across the street that featured large windows and solid wall sections.
 - The Committee members noted that the architecture of the Bingham Court period was constructed in a defensive manner that looked away from the street. Today's

additions should engage with the street and relate the historic buildings to which they attach.

- Mr. Kundig responded that the older buildings have shutters to provide much needed privacy on the first floor.
- Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that generally in Philadelphia larger structures stand at and anchor the corners. This scheme with its diminutive corner structure reverses the norm. He added that, if the ells could be saved, the design might make up for the loss of space in that area of the addition with more mass at the corner.
 - Mr. Kundig responded with a photograph of a property in the area that has a smaller structure at the corner.
- Mr. Baron asked the Committee to opine on whether the removal of the ells and the structures on Leithgow Street should be considered a demolition in the legal sense and require a hardship or public interest justification.
 - Mr. Primavera responded that the decision of whether this proposal is deemed a demolition or an alteration should only be made upon the advice of Historical Commission's attorney, who is not present, not a staff member. He contended that the proposal is an alteration.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro responded that the Committee is independent and makes its own determination regarding demolition. He explained that the Committee is charged with preventing demolition of significant fabric regardless of the opinion of the staff.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Boni of the Society Hill Civic Association said that his group supported the project in general because of the compatible massing and material. He said that they have concerns noted in their letter about the design of the tall blank walls facing 4th Street. Mr. Boni suggested that the fence wall on Locust Street does not meet the zoning requirements. He said that his organization did not comment on the demolition of elements of the building because it received no information regarding the significance of those elements or the need for their removal.
- The National Park Service provided a letter as an abutting property owner expressing concern that the demolition of the rear ells does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposal construction will result in the demolition of the historic rear ells and additions on Leithgow Street with no justification offered.
- The proposal construction is generally appropriate in height but could be strengthened with more of the massing shifted to the corner.
- The proposed fenestration and wall details are not compatible with the scale and proportion of the existing historic buildings.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed project does not comply with Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the demolition prohibition, because no significance, public interest, or financial hardship argument had been made regarding the demolition of the rear ells and the later additions facing Leithgow Street.
- The proposed project does not meet Standard 9 because it will destroy historic materials, features and special relationships that characterize the property.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance and Standard 9.

ITEM: 230, 232, 234-36 S 4TH ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: D'Alessandro SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver					x
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler					x
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 1512-16 N BROAD ST

Proposal: Demolish fire-damaged rear; brace and make safe front of building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: The Original Apostolic Faith Church of the Lord Jesus Christ, Inc.

Applicant: Matt Masterpasqua, Mass Architecture Studio

History: 1933; Levin Funeral Home; Edwin Rothschild, architect

Individual Designation: 11/27/1985

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

The application proposes to demolish a fire-damaged rear ell, seal the building at the resulting opening, reconstruct a parapet, and seal window openings. The front, three-story portion of the building as well as rear garage will be retained. The damaged decorative parapet at the front of the building will be rebuilt using original materials. The applicant proposes to remove the front windows and temporarily seal the openings.

The building suffered from a fire on 29 March 2018. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued violations and partially demolished the middle section of the building. An engineering report has been submitted to document the condition of the middle section of the building proposed for demolition. The Commission reviewed a previous application to demolish the entirety of the building in May 2019 but denied that application and recommended repair of portions of the building.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove rear ell
- Seal rear of building.
- Reconstruct parapet
- Seal windows

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *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.*
 - The parapet will be reconstructed using original materials.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed work is necessary to stabilize the building, which suffered from a significant fire. The real ell that will be removed does not characterize the property. The windows may be sealed, but the surviving window sash and frames should be retained in place behind the seals.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the front windows and window frames are retained in place, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:27:49

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Matt Masterpasqua, attorneys Mike Creedon and Jason Rabinovitch, and Abigail Tookes and Deborah Hayward, representatives of the property owner, represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Masterpasqua distributed a revised drawing showing the retention of the windows frames.
 - The Committee members asked that the surviving sash with any muntins also be saved for now.
- The Committee members asked how the walls will be braced.
 - Mr. Masterpasqua responded that he has designed bracing comprised of lateral double 2"x10"s to support the wall.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about the possibility of keeping the rear wall of the main block to help stabilize the side walls. He also asked how the main block will be closed.
 - Mr. Masterpasqua responded that that wall sits on steel supports that were damaged in the fire. He said that they will build a new wall with wood posts and vinyl siding.
- Ms. Stein said that the success of the plan will depend on the means and methods and asked the applicant to work closely with staff.
 - Mr. Creedon responded that they will.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Toner, an attorney for the Act 135 conservatorship action on this property, asked the applicants several questions. He asked what had changed to make it possible to save the property now, when they claimed that they could not in the past. He asked if the property insured today. He asked if Mses. Tooke and Hayward

- represent the church organization. Mr. Masterpasqua said that the engineer took a closer look and decided that the front portion of the building could be saved. Ms. Tookes stated that all questions of this nature were inappropriate at this time and could be answered in a different setting by her attorney.
- Douglas Fogel of CS&S insurance explained that there is a dispute regarding an insurance claim. He asked when the decision would be made regarding this property. It was explained that the Historical Commission would act on the application on 9 August 2019.
 - Mr. Rabinovitch explained that he had been retained to fight the conservatorship action and that he feels confident that that action will be dismissed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The middle section of the property is not highly significant and is largely demolished by the fire.
- The work to seal the property is appropriate as long as the windows and sash are preserved.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed restoration of the parapet complies with Standard 6.
- The proposed project complies with Standard 9, provided the windows are preserved in place.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, provided the surviving window frames and sash are retained in place, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ITEM: 1512-16 N Broad St MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver					x
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 523 FAIRMOUNT AVE

Proposal: Legalize windows and door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Kelsey H. Sturdivant

Applicant: Kelsey & Parris Sturdivant

History: 1815, Stephen Girard, developer

Individual Designation: 10/30/1962

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to legalize the installation of vinyl, one-over-one windows and a door and doorframe installed without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit. The staff approved an application for a building permit to re-point the building for the current owner, provided a pointing sample was reviewed in the field prior to the work. The pointing was undertaken without the required review of a pointing sample. At the same time, the property owner installed vinyl, one-over-one windows. Six-over-six wood windows are the correct windows. In addition, the dormer window should have an arched sash. The correct windows are documented by photographs and an insurance survey. The property owner later contacted the Historical Commission about a new door, but then went ahead and installed the door and frame without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit. The door and frame do not replicate the historic door and frame.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize windows, door, and door frame

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *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.*
 - The windows, door, and door frame do not match the historic elements in design or materials.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:44:10

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- No one represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman explained that the property owners were obliged to seek and obtain the Historical Commission's approval for their new windows even if the windows that they were replacing were non-historic. The Historical Commission typically requires the installation of historically correct windows regardless of the type of windows being replaced.

- Mr. Baron said that the old windows were grandfathered until such time as they were removed.
- Mr. Baron observed that the applicants point out in a letter that there are several houses in their block with non-historic, one-over-one windows. He explained that he researched the conditions of those windows and found that all of them are at least 12 years old. None have been installed recently. He said that many owners on the block have installed the historically correct wood windows with the Historical Commission's approval.
 - Mr. McCoubrey noted that an insurance survey indicates the correct window pane sizes for the block.
- Mr. Baron explained that a contractor had obtained a permit for masonry work to this house, but did not comply with the terms of the approval. The non-compliant masonry work resulted in damage to the brick from pressure washing and overly hard pointing.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- This individually designated house developed for Stephen Girard is highly significant.
- The doors and windows are inappropriate in material and design and are not based on historic documentation.
- The work was done without a building permit or the Historical Commission's approval.
- No application has been submitted proposing to restore the door frame even though the owners claims that they are willing to do so.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application does not comply with Standard 6. The newly installed windows, door, and frame do not match the historic material or design.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

ITEM: 523 Fairmount Ave MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver					x
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 325 S 2ND ST

Proposal: Cut new window opening at side; replace rear window

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Meredith Rockwell and Brian Goldberg

Applicant: Matthew Blank, Orion General Contractors, Inc.

History: 1965; Penn's Landing Square

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

The building at 325 S. 2nd Street, constructed in 1965, is a Contributing building in the Society Hill Historic District, the significance of which includes the Redevelopment Era and its associated mid-twentieth century buildings.

Located at the corner of S. 2nd Street and Delancey Street, the building is one of two end units that bookend a row of houses that face S. 2nd Street between Delancey and Pine Streets. While the front elevations of the whole block and the rears of the mid-block units are uniform in appearance, the side and rear elevations of the two end units differ in massing and fenestration.

This application proposes to cut a single casement window at the second-floor of the side elevation of the property in order to allow for light into and egress out of a new interior room. The proposed window would align in height with the front second-floor windows, but as currently shown, would be slightly offset from the third-floor windows. The staff suggests that the applicants align one edge of the new window with the third-floor window, to be in keeping with the alignment of other fenestration on the building. The application also proposes to replace an existing window at the rear.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Side Elevation:
 - Cut opening and install single casement window at second floor
- Rear Elevation:
 - Replace existing second-story window with two-pane slider over awning

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - While this application proposes to remove some original exterior brick, the modification is minimal and does not destroy character-defining materials. The proposed window is differentiated from the old, but is compatible with the overall design of the property.
- *Windows Guideline | Recommended: Adding new window openings on rear or other secondary, less visible elevations, if required by a new use. The new openings and the windows in them should be compatible with the overall design of the building, but, in most cases, not duplicate the historic fenestration.*

- *Windows Guideline | Not Recommended: Changing the number, location, size, or glazing pattern of windows on primary or highly-visible elevations which will alter the historic character of the building; Cutting new openings on character-defining elevations or cutting new openings that damage or destroy significant features.*
 - While this application proposes to install a new window on a street-facing elevation, it is a secondary elevation, and the new window is minimal, is compatible with the overall design of the building, and does not destroy any significant features of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided one edge of the new window aligns with an edge of the third-floor side window, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Windows Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:49:45

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Owner Meredith Rockwell represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee noted that the application is lacking in details.
- The Committee noted that the proportions of the rear window drawing do not seem to match the proportions of the opening shown in the photographs. The Committee members asked whether the intent is for the window to fill the masonry opening or to build down the window opening.
 - The owner responded that the intent is for the window to fill the opening.
 - Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff would ensure that the proposed window fits the masonry opening as part of the shop drawing process.
- The Committee noted that the orientation of the proposed rear window differs from what is existing.
 - The owner responded that the window would match the configuration of the existing third-floor side window.
 - Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff does not believe the existing window is original and feels the proposed window is in keeping with the historic appearance of the building.
- The Committee noted that the graphic depiction of the proposed side window—the red rectangle drawn onto the side elevation photograph—is shown as only four bricks wide, which would be approximately 32 inches, but the proposed window is 36 inches wide. The Committee noted that the staff should review more detailed drawings that accurately reflect the proposed alteration.
 - The owner confirmed that the proposed width of the window is 36 inches.
 - The Committee stated that the staff should review the details of the proposed window cut.
- The Committee agreed with the staff that one edge of the new side window should align with the window above, and suggested that it align with the eastern edge of the third-floor window, closer to the front elevation and corner with S. 2nd Street.
 - The owner responded that she thinks that would be fine, but needs to check the electrical and mechanical re-routing plans.
- The Committee noted that there are numerous window configurations on this building and opined that not all are original to the building.

- Ms. DiPasquale noted that the four-part window on the front elevation is a replacement; originally that window opening held a larger center pane with two narrower flanking window panes.
- The Committee asked whether the rear window is in its original configuration.
 - The applicant responded that she is not sure because the rear of her property differs from others on the row.
- The Committee opined that it did not have an issue with adding a window to the side elevation, given the lack of fenestration and light on that elevation.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Boni stated the Society Hill Civic Association's support for the concept of the application and for the Committee's suggestions.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The staff should review more detailed drawings that detail how the rear window will be installed in the existing masonry opening, and how and where the new side window will be cut and installed in relationship to the window above.
- The second-floor side elevation lacks fenestration.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The replacement of the rear window with a two-over-one configuration is in keeping with the character of the building.
- The cutting of a single casement window on the side elevation does not alter the historic character of the building or damage/remove any character-defining features.
- The proposed project complies with the Windows Guideline Standard 9 because no character-defining elements will be altered or removed and the new window will be compatible with the overall design of the building, provided one edge of the new window aligns with an edge of the third-floor side window and there is no build-down of the rear window

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided one edge of the new window aligns with an edge of the third-floor side window and there is no build-down of the rear window, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Windows Guideline.

ITEM: 325 S 2nd St MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver					x
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 505-09 S 9TH ST

Proposal: Demolish and reconstruct rear ells at 507 and 509 S 9th Street

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 505-09 South 9th Associates LP

Applicant: Ian Smith, Ian Smith Design Group LLC

History: 1840; The Drexmoor/Branch House of St. Francis' Industrial School

Individual Designation: 7/23/1963

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

Located on the east side of S. 9th Street between Lombard and South Streets, 505-09 S. 9th Street is a consolidated property with three, 3.5-story c. 1840s rowhouses. The property recently suffered a fire, after which time it was discovered that the bearing walls of the three-story rear ells of 507 and 509 are substantially deteriorated and structurally compromised. The ells have been declared Imminently Dangerous by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. An engineer's report determined that the rear ells should be demolished in order to abate the dangerous condition. The rear of the property is partially visible from S. Darien and South Streets.

This application proposes to demolish the majority of the three-story rear ells and reconstruct them to their historic height and width, but to extend them by approximately 15 feet (or approximately two bays) in depth, plus an additional one-story extension with optional deck. Although not explicitly identified, based on the renderings, the additions would be clad in brick and would feature a combination of one-over-one and six-over-six windows, the material of which is also not specified in the application. The additions would be visible from S. Darien and South Streets.

The staff notes that, although not part of this application, alterations were made on the main block of the property without the Historical Commission's review or approval following the fire. The staff recommends that these elements be restored to their historic appearance.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish rear ells of 507 and 509 S. 9th Street
- Construct rear additions

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
 - The severity of deterioration of the rear ells of 507 and 509 S. 9th Street necessitates their removal. With the exception of the two additional bays in depth and one-story addition, the proposed construction matches the old in design and materials. The application largely complies with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:03:55

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Carrie Nace, owner Mark Ginsburg, and architect Ian Smith represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The applicant reiterated the scope of work, noting that the proposed demolition is limited to the rear ells of 507 and 509 S 9th Street, the basement walls.
- The Committee asked whether the basement walls were damaged pre- or post-fire.
 - The applicant responded that they believe the basement walls were damaged pre-fire, noting that the buildings were consolidated into the same parcel a long time ago, and that the fire occurred on the upper floors of the main blocks.
- The applicants noted that modifications were made to the dormers of the main block owing to the fire.
- The Committee questioned the materials of the reconstructed rear ells.
 - The applicant responded that they would feature red brick exteriors, asphalt shingle roofs, and aluminum-clad windows.
- The Committee questioned the use of both six-over-six and one-over-one windows on the rear ells.
 - The applicant responded that they have proposed six-over-six windows for the openings that will be visible from public rights-of-way.
 - The applicant noted that there is a tall masonry wall that extends around the perimeter of the rear of the property, blocking views of the first floor.
 - The Committee suggested that, since the rear ells are being rebuilt, and the proposed six-over-six windows are in bays that were not there historically, that one-over-one windows would be more appropriate.
- The Committee questioned the configuration of the rear ell windows at the time of designation.
 - Ms. DiPasquale responded that it is an early designation, so she is not sure about the configuration of the rear windows at the time of designation, but that historically the windows would have been six-over-six.
 - The applicants noted that the current windows are all replacement windows.
- The Committee asked to what extent the optional deck on top of the proposed first-floor rear extension would be visible from the public right-of-way.
 - Ms. DiPasquale responded that she believes a deck in that location would be minimally visible, if at all.
 - The applicant noted that there is a significant grade change at the rear of the property, which, along with the existing eight-foot tall wall, would limit views of the proposed extension and deck.
- The Committee questioned the visibility of the rears of the property from the public right-of-way.
 - Ms. DiPasquale responded that a small portion of the upper floors of the existing rear ells are obliquely visible across a garden plot at the corner of South and S. Darien Streets, and from S. Darien Street down an existing driveway/parking lot.
 - The applicant noted that photographs of the visibility of the rear are presented in the application materials.

- The Committee asked how many additional bays of windows long the new rear ells would be in comparison to the existing rear ells.
 - The applicant responded that it would be two bays of windows longer.
- The Committee questioned why the proposed rear elevation is not flush.
 - The applicant responded that the existing rear ells are offset by a few feet, with the extension of the party wall.
 - The Committee suggested that it would be more successful to strike the line down the center of the wall, at the peak of the roof.
 - The applicant responded that that would be easy to do with the proposed wood construction.
- The Committee asked what work occurred to the front dormers and whether the massing of the dormers was altered.
 - Ms. DiPasquale responded that there were two, four-over-four windows in the dormers of 507 and 509 S 9th Street until recently.
 - The applicant noted that the work has not yet been completed, but that the dormers are different sizes and those sizes will not be changed.
 - The applicants asserted that the dormers were not reconstructed.
 - The Committee noted that roof framing, overhang and trim of the dormers differs from what was there previously.
 - Ms. DiPasquale noted that the sides of the dormers have also been clad in asphalt shingles.
 - The Committee stated that the shop drawings and details of the dormer windows should be reviewed by the Historical Commission's staff.
 - The applicants agreed to work out the dormer details with the staff and to restore the dormers to their historic appearance.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The rear of the property is minimally visible from the public right-of-way.
- Work occurred to the dormer windows without the Historical Commission's review or approval.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application demonstrates that deterioration of the rear ells necessitates their removal, satisfying Standard 6.
- The proposed construction largely matches the old in design and materials, satisfying Standard 6.
- The installation of six-over-six windows in the extended portions of rear ells creates a false sense of history, and therefore the rear ell windows should all be one-over-one.
- The front dormer windows should be restored to their historic appearance, pursuant to Standard 6.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided one-over-one windows are used on the rear ells, the offset of the rear ells is struck at the midpoint of the buildings to align with the peak of the roof, and the front dormers are restored to their historic appearance, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

ITEM: 505-09 S 9th St MOTION: Approval, with conditions MOVED BY: Stein SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver					x
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 508-32 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Construct pedestrian bridge and rooftop enclosure

Type of Review Requested: In Concept

Owner: Keystone Property Group

Applicant: Sam Olshin, Atkin Olshin Schade Architects

History: 530, Edgar Seeler 1914; 520, Ernest J. Matthewson, 1930; 508, Mitchell/Giurgola Associates, 1971, Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company Building

Individual Designation: 9/25/1962

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

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

The property at 508-32 Walnut Street, the former Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company, includes three interconnected buildings: a 1971 building by Mitchell/Giurgola Associates at 510 Walnut; a 1930 building by architect Ernest J. Matthewson at 520 Walnut; and a 1914 building by architect Edgar Seeler at 530 Walnut. This in-concept application proposes to construct a pedestrian bridge at the top floor, west façade of the 1971 building and a rooftop enclosure for a restaurant on the 1930 building.

The Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company installed a public observation deck with views of Independence Hall on the rooftop of the building at 520 Walnut about 1963. In anticipation of the Bicentennial, the observation deck was relocated to the top floors of the new Mitchell/Giurgola building at 510 Walnut in 1975. The deck in the new building was serviced by two elevators that ran from the lobby directly up 22 floors; the elevators are indicated with articulations on the north or front façade of the Modernist building. In 1983, Penn Mutual closed the observation deck because it was losing money.

The current application proposes to reopen the original observation deck on the 520 Walnut building as a restaurant. To access the restaurant, the direct lobby-to-rooftop elevators in the 510 Walnut building would be utilized and a bridge would be constructed from the 510 building to the 520 roof. The rooftop area around the mechanical penthouse would be enclosed with a steel and glass greenhouse-like structure for the restaurant. The non-historic canopy framing currently on the roof would be removed. The forms of the canopy framing to be removed roughly approximate those of the proposed structure. Mechanical equipment to support the restaurant

would be added at the roof and mechanical penthouse levels. The equipment would be screened. The roof structure would be internally strengthened to support the extra load.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Remove non-historic rooftop canopy framing
- Construct pedestrian bridge
- Construct rooftop enclosure
- Add mechanical equipment with screening

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *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.*
 - The construction of the bridge and rooftop enclosure will be differentiated from and compatible with the historic property and environment. The new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property, provided the sizes and locations of the mechanical equipment are adjusted to reduce its visibility from the street and the screening is limited to the areas around the equipment.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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.*
 - The bridge, rooftop enclosure, and mechanical equipment could be removed in the future and the integrity of the historic property would be unimpaired.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in concept, provided the sizes and locations of the mechanical equipment are adjusted to reduce visibility and the screening is limited to the areas of the equipment, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:27:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Brett Feldman, development director Jennifer Rosenberg, and architects Sam Olshin and Sanjana Muthe represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Feldman stated that the applicants have been working with the Historical Commission staff and Art Commission over the last 18 months to arrive at the design before the Committee.
- Mr. Olshin explained that the most challenging aspect of the design is the bridge, or link, which hugs the side of the 1971 building. He stated that they do not want customers to walk all the way into the core of the building to access elevators, so utilizing the Bicentennial elevators is a logical solution because they are at the front of the building. A bridge, or link, is necessary if using those Bicentennial elevators. He explained that the space upstairs is a paid tenant space, and there is a fire tower

in the way of connecting at that level. He continued that the bridge solution arrived at is spare, transparent, and modern. It will be built on the ground and hoisted up. He stated that the design ensures that all mullions line up with the mullions below on the 1971 building.

- Mr. D'Alessandro asked for documentation of the lobby and an explanation as to why other elevators cannot be reprogrammed and used.
- Mr. Olshin responded that the elevators in the core require walking far into the building, and then there is an issue of being seven or eight feet above the level desired. He stated that those are the two major reasons. Ms. Rosenberg stated that the second floor is the elevator machine room, and those elevators are not all high-rise elevators. She explained that the other factor is that the observation elevators were built for the experience of the Bicentennial, and the idea with this concept is the arrival experience and taking in the view of Independence Mall as one goes up. She explained that the observation balcony at 510 Walnut Street is at the 19th floor, which is occupied by a tenant that has sole use of that balcony.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if the bridge could be held back from the front to maintain the knife edge that is character-defining to the 1971 building. Several other Committee members agreed with this suggestion.
 - Mr. Olshin responded that there is nothing programmatically in that space which requires it to extend forward, but in every study done by the architects, the bridge looked unfinished when cut back as opposed to allowing the mullions to continue up.
 - Mr. McCoubrey commented that pulling it back would enable the full turning of the corner of the historic building. He suggested that the picture windows be retained to allow for the bridge to be less of a visual element.
 - Ms. Stein disagreed that simply holding the bridge back from the corner would make it appropriate. She stated that it is highly visible and very obtrusive to the original façade. She acknowledged that it is difficult to make it complement the building, and suggested that all other options are explored which keep the connections internal.
- Mr. Olshin stated that the location and size of the new mechanical equipment to support the new facilities on the roof is still being determined, but that every effort will be made to minimize the appearance of the mechanical equipment from public viewpoints. He explained that they intend to keep it low, gray, and porous, where possible.
 - Mr. McCoubrey responded that the screening appears to be highly visible, and the bump-out of the screening makes it more visible.
 - Mr. Olshin explained that they will be unable to remove all of the mechanical equipment that currently exists on the upper roof. He confirmed that there is existing equipment for the building which will remain, and that additional equipment will need to be added for the restaurant use.
- The Committee members asked about visibility of the restaurant enclosure from the street and from the parks.
 - Mr. Olshin directed the Committee's attention to the rendering showing visibility from Independence Mall. Mr. Feldman directed the Committee's attention to photographs showing the existing chain-link fence, which will be removed for the construction of the restaurant.
 - Ms. Gutterman stated that the glass enclosure of the restaurant will be more reflective than the chain-link fence structure that currently exists, and therefore will be more visible. She asked if the restaurant enclosure could be set back.

- Mr. Feldman responded that this portion of the building already steps back significantly from the street. Mr. Olshin explained that it is already a small footprint to work with in terms of interior function.
- The Committee members asked about the attachment location of the existing chain-link fence compared to the restaurant enclosure.
 - Mr. Olshin responded that the chain-link fence sits on top of the parapet wall and is anchored to the back of the parapet wall. The new structure will be anchored to the back of the parapet wall as well, and the glazing will sit on top of the parapet wall. He stated that otherwise water and leaves would be trapped behind it with no way to service it.
- The Committee members and applicants agreed that these buildings are highly visible from multiple vantage points, making for a challenging project.
 - Ms. Gutterman opined that it is acceptable to add something to these buildings that does not take away from what currently exists. She opined that a restaurant is not inappropriate, but it comes down to the details of how to respect and complement the historic buildings.
- Ms. Stein asked if the applicants have met with the National Park Service.
 - Mr. Feldman responded that they have not yet met with the National Park Service.
 - Ms. Stein strongly encouraged the applicants to do so.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that the concept is acceptable, but that every option should be explored regarding the connection between the buildings.
 - Ms. Gutterman agreed, and reiterated that she is not opposed to the concept of the rooftop restaurant, but that the bridge component needs further study and may not be the appropriate solution. She stated that the Committee did not get to see all of the architectural studies that led to this solution.
- Ms. Rosenberg asked if the Committee is opposed to any link, regardless of design, constructed on the exterior of the building.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that she objects to the current proposal, but would need to see a different proposal before opining on it.
- Ms. Stein asked that glass and other material samples are provided if this project is submitted for a final review. She suggested that green or blue glass, like what was used at 500 Walnut Street, is not appropriate.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Lorna Katz Lawson, representing Society Hill Civic Association, commented that the Civic Association was not notified of this project by the architect or developer. She commented that the Civic Association does not support the project as proposed, and that the project has the potential to be the same “disaster” as the Kimmel Center in terms of illumination at night.
- Patrick Grossi, representing the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, commented that the project was previously presented to the Alliance and that the Alliance does not conceptually oppose the project. He commented that suggestions provided during this review regarding the bridge should be considered by the applicant.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Committee was not provided with documentation of the prior studies for accessing the space that led to the current design solution. All other solutions for connecting 510 and 520 Walnut Street should be explored.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed project does not comply with Standard 9. The proposed scope of work alters the historic features and spatial relationships that characterize the property.

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

ITEM: 508-32 Walnut Street MOTION: Denial in concept MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver					x
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 6813 RIDGE AVE

Proposal: Legalize wall

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Gil Chavez

Applicant: Gil Chavez, Pasta To Go, Inc.

History: 1825

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Ridge Avenue Roxborough Historic District, Contributing, 10/12/2018

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

The property at 6813 Ridge Avenue contains a restaurant in the main building, and apartments in additions at the side and rear. To access the apartments from Ridge Avenue, one would cross an open area to the side of the main building and enter into a rear addition. Until recently, a low metal fence with gate separated this open area from the sidewalk along Ridge Avenue. Despite the metal fence, the open area was subject to illegal dumping, drug use, and other illicit activities. The owner, who was frustrated with the illicit activity, installed a wall behind the fence without a building permit or the Historical Commission's approval. The wall is free-standing, clad in vinyl siding, and includes an entrance door. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a violation for the construction of a one-story "addition" without an approval or permit. The owner seeks to legalize the wall to comply the violation.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Legalize wall constructed without permits.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 JULY 2019

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *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.*
 - The materials and design of the new wall are not compatible with the historic property. A tall fence or even a stucco garden wall with entrance gate would be more in keeping with the historic property.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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.*
 - The wall could be removed in the future and the integrity of the historic property would be unimpaired.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:14:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- No one represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee members asked if the staff offered alternatives or options to the applicant.
 - Ms. Chantry responded that she had offered to approve a tall fence or gate when the applicant first discussed the application with the staff, but the applicant only wanted to pursue legalizing the new wall.
- The Committee members commented that a gate in the door opening might be more appropriate, but that the vinyl siding would remain inappropriate for the building.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The wall was constructed without a building permit or the approval of the Historical Commission.
- A fence, taller gate, or stucco garden wall could be appropriate for this location and could address the property owner's concerns regarding illicit activities.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The wall as constructed does not comply with Standard 9 owing to its materials and design.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 JULY 2019

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

ITEM: 6813 Ridge Avenue MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver					x
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 228 MONROE ST

Proposal: Remove rear roofs; construct rear addition

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: John and Mary Viscardi

Applicant: Whitney Joslin, Kaminski + Pew

History: 1765

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958, 11/24/1964

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

This three-story residence was constructed in 1765. Historic maps dating back to 1858 and 1895 show the existence of a two-story ell and a one-story rear addition

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove existing second-floor roof at rear ell; construct new third-story addition;
- Remove rear portion of gambrel roof, including dormer, to tie in new addition;
- Interior alterations.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *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.*
 - The existing two-story rear ell appears on early atlases, and the gambrel roof of the main block is original to the period of construction; the applicant proposes partial demolition of both in order to construct a third-story on top of the existing two-story rear ell.
 - It does not appear that the proposed rear addition will be visible from the right of way;

- The use of a stucco finish and windows to match the existing is a compatible design choice.
- *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.*
 - Because this proposal involves the removal of both the roof of the existing rear ell, as well as a portion of the rear gambrel roof, the essential form and integrity of the historic property would be altered to an extent that it would not comply with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff is not opposed to the idea of a rear addition at this property given the likelihood that it would not be visible from the right-of-way. However, because of the partial demolition of historic fabric that is proposed to the second-story roof of the ell and a portion of the rear gambrel roof, the staff does not think that the project as presented complies with the standards. The staff recommends tying in the new third-story addition in a way that does not adversely impact the gambrel roof. The staff recommends denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:20:12

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Kevin Kaminski and Whitney Joslin of Kaminski + Pew represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee asked if the applicant had anything more to add to the staff's overview.
 - Mr. Kaminski responded that they had looked at a variety of ways to make a more delicate connection between the main block of the house and the proposed third-story rear addition, but ultimately the client needs more space for their growing family. Mr. Kaminski stated that they felt that their proposal was a suitable response to their client's needs that would not be visible from the public right-of-way. He explained that they had investigated trying to connect the main block to the new addition through the dormer, but they could not achieve the required head height. Mr. Kaminski said that their investigations into adding on to the existing one-story addition also proved unsuccessful.
- The Committee commented that the subject property was an individually designated property, and that features such as the gambrel roof were special. The Committee asked if there was a way to retain the gambrel and pull the existing stair back.
 - The applicant answered that they had studied that option; however, it left the usability of the new space challenging.
- The Committee asked for clarification as to why an overbuild at the existing one-story rear addition would not work.
 - The applicant explained that previously there had been complications regarding the ownership of certain pieces of the parcels, and that the existing one-story addition had been built over the property line.
- The Committee commented that they did not have an issue with building an addition at the rear of this property; however, their concern was with the removal of historic fabric, including a section of the gambrel roof. The members agreed that there had to

be a way of designing an addition that would not require the destruction of the gambrel roof.

- The applicant asked if they were to further explore connecting the third-story addition to the main block through the existing dormer, would increasing the size of the dormer opening something they could consider. The Committee responded that this approach would be preferred over the current proposal.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The gambrel roof of this 1765-constructed individually designated house was very important historic fabric that needed to be retained.
- The third-story rear addition as proposed required too much demolition of historic fabric.
- There was likely a solution that would not adversely impact so much historic fabric and using the existing dormer window to connect the main block to a third-story addition was the preferred option to explore.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The project as proposed does not comply with Standard 9, owing to the destruction of the gambrel roof; however, they agreed that by re-examining the existing stair or other interior spaces, the applicants could find a workable design.
- The proposed project does not comply with Standard 10, owing to irreversible alteration proposed to the gambrel roof, a character defining feature of the subject property.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, but approval of a third-story addition connected to the house through the existing dormer to retain more of the gambrel roof.

ITEM: Remove rear roofs; construct rear addition					
MOTION: Denial as proposed, but approval if revised					
MOVED BY: Stein					
SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver					x
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 3948-50 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Apply terra cotta sealant

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Glenn Kucher, Robert Michaels and Associates, Inc.

History: 1905, Clarence C. Zantzinger, architect, West Philadelphia Branch of the Free Library

Individual Designation: 4/10/2015

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

This Renaissance Revival style building was constructed in 1905 to the design of Clarence C. Zantzinger. The building, the first Carnegie Library branch built in Philadelphia, has a granite base and is clad with glazed terra cotta tiles. There is a modern bay window at the north façade.

SCOPE OF WORK:

The following work is limited to the building's west façade:

- Power wash water table, coping stones and terra cotta elements;
- At the water table: cut out mortar joints and replace with new backer rod and sealant;
- At the coping stones: cut out sealant and backer rod and replace in kind;
- At the terra cotta façade: cut out mortar joints and install new tooled mortar joints;
- At the windows: remove sealant and backer rod from around the windows and masonry openings and replace in kind;
- Reglaze terra cotta façade from the top of the window lintels to the top of the parapet walls.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 7: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damages to historic materials will not be used.*
 - The proposal indicates that the façade will be power washed without specifying water pressure or whether any cleaning products will be used;
 - The proposal to treat areas of the terra cotta where the glazing has been lost is intended to address what has been described as a problem with water infiltration. The waterproofing work, including the removal and replacement of mortar and sealant at the joints is understood to be in response to the same issue. However, the application materials do not provide sufficient information about the existing conditions at the roof in order to understand whether water is leaking from there into the building and causing the loss of glazing seen at locations under the projecting cornice. The staff has concerns that the proposed treatment is not adequately addressing the root cause of the water infiltration because there is not sufficient evidence provided in the application that explains specifically why or where it is occurring.
 - The staff does not understand if the proposed coating is intended to both repair/fill existing voids/spalls and perform as a waterproof replacement for the missing glaze.
 - The staff would like to know what percentage of the terra cotta tiles are experiencing this loss of glaze? Is this loss limited to the west façade of the

building? How will the coated tiles look next to those that remain uncoated? Is the water infiltration limited to the west façade of the building?

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff requests assistance from the members of the Architectural Committee to determine whether the application adequately explains the water infiltration issue, and if the proposed scope of work is the appropriate manner in which to address the problem.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:33:21

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- No one represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee pointed out that the burden is on the owner to answer many of the questions that the staff was asking of the Committee members.
- The Committee stated that the owner needs to work with a preservation architect or engineer who can analyze the issues that the building has that are causing the water infiltration.
- The Committee said that the applicant needed to provide further information such as architectural drawings showing the scope of the work and an existing conditions assessment.
- The Committee agreed that the applicant needed to have testing conducted to confirm how and where the water was penetrating the façade.
- The Committee asked if the City of Philadelphia was the applicant.
 - The staff responded that they had connected with both the Department of Public Property as well as the Department of Parks and Recreation about the project.
- The Committee commented that once mortar joints were filled with a sealant they could not be re-filled with mortar, but rather only with a sealant.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The coating the applicant was proposing to use was not a waterproofing product but was rather a product strictly used to replicate glazing.
- The proposed coating would not waterproof the building at all.
- The loss of glazing at the terra cotta was not especially significant, nor did the façade appear very dirty.
- The façade appeared to be in need of pointing, not the aggressive treatment that was being proposed by the applicant.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The project does not comply with Standard 7, owing to the aggressive nature of the methodology being proposed.
- The application did not adequately explain the origin of the water infiltration causing the damage to the terra cotta.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 7.

ITEM: Apply terra cotta sealant					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver					x
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 2309 ST ALBANS ST

Proposal: Construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Ahmir Thompson

Applicant: Mieczyslaw Pawelec, Mietek Construction Co.

History: 1869; Charles Leslie, developer

Individual Designation: 9/30/1969

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

Located mid-block on St. Albans Street, the Second Empire-style building is one of fifty-two nearly identical units on the garden block. Typical features on the front façade include a marble base, iron grilles over the basement windows, a four-panel door with bolection molding, two-over-two windows, and scalloped slate shingles on a mansard roof. The rears include a second-story projecting bay, though many rears have been altered over time.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install roof deck on main block with roof scuttle.
- Install mechanical equipment and enclosure on roof.
- Install new shingles on mansard roof.
- Repair front façade.
- Install new door.
- Repair or replace front and rear dormers.
- Rebuild bay.
- Install new windows and door at rear.
- Stucco rear.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
 - The application is vague in its description of repair work to the front and rear facades. The front and rear dormers appear to be in repairable condition and should not be replaced. More information on the bay's condition is necessary to determine the proper treatment. The mansard roof currently contains asphalt shingles, and the staff recommends replacing the front façade roof with either slate or rubber to match the original in color, shape, and dimension. The proposed restoration work may comply with this standard.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The application proposes to stucco the entire rear of the building. The rear is currently only stuccoed at the first story, and exposed brick is visible at the second story. The work does not comply with this standard.
- *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.*
 - The proposed roof deck would be set back 8 feet from St. Albans Street, leaving the railings potentially visible from the garden court. There are very few decks on this block of St. Albans Street, and no precedent for roof decks on the main blocks of the buildings. The Historical Commission approved a smaller deck, limited to the rear ell, at the adjacent property at 2307 St. Albans Street. The staff recommends that the applicant reduce the size of the deck to match the adjacent deck at 2307 St. Albans Street. As proposed, work does not comply with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the restoration of the facades, with the staff to review details, but denial of the roof deck and roof scuttle, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and the Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:39:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Andrew Kozak and contractor Andre Stephano represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. D'Alessandro requested more information be included on the drawings. He questioned what work was proposed to the front façade.
 - Mr. Stephano replied that he would leave the actual determination to the sub-contractor professional to see what made sense.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro countered that the Committee needs to understand what is proposed to determine whether the application satisfies preservation standards.
 - Mr. Stephano stated that he discussed the work with the staff.

- Mr. McCoubrey asked Ms. Keller whether the staff is comfortable reviewing the proposed work.
 - Ms. Keller answered that she had a conversation with the applicant about the intended repair work to the front façade. She commented that photographs showed areas of the façade where bricks were severely deteriorated and that the staff agreed that there were certain areas where brick replacement would be necessary. She added that she and the applicant came to an agreement on what the exterior repair work entail, noting that the work could be approved at the staff level.
- Ms. Gutterman asked whether the entire front wall would be repointed.
 - The applicant responded that the wall would be spot pointed.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired about the staff's recommendation for denial of the roof deck.
 - Ms. Keller replied that there is little precedent for roof decks on this block, though an application was approved by the Historical Commission for a roof deck at the adjacent building at 2307 St. Albans Street. She elaborated that the roof deck is visible in some of the photographs included in the application and that it was limited to the rear of the building with only the hatch constructed on the main block. The Commission, she added, was specific in requesting that the deck be limited only to the rear and that it not encroach on the main block. She noted that the garden block lends high visibility to decks and that the staff recommends that the proposed deck at 2309 St. Albans Street resemble that approved at the adjacent building.
- Ms. Gutterman questioned the location of the mechanical equipment.
 - The applicant responded that the units would be located on the main roof but set back from St. Albans Street.
 - Ms. Keller suggested that if there is an opportunity to locate the units in the rear yard, that option would be preferable.
- Ms. Gutterman asked whether the owner would be opposed to having the deck limited to the rear ell to match the dimensions of the neighboring deck.
 - The applicant responded that he did not think the owner would oppose the request, though he noted that a larger deck is desired.
- Mr. McCoubrey noted that a clear precedent was set next door.

Mr. Detwiler asked Ms. Keller if she would be comfortable approving drawings that lack specific details.

 - Ms. Keller answered that more information would be required before she could offer an approval but that she believes she can obtain that information from the applicant. She added that the applicant will need to submit shop drawings for windows and doors and provide samples of the masonry work.
- Ms. Keller asked the Committee to review the stucco proposed for the rear, noting that only the first story is currently stuccoed.
 - The applicant noted that the rear was either partially or fully stuccoed in the past, and areas have worn off over time. He added that several similar alterations have been made to nearby buildings, including the addition of wood and concrete.
 - Ms. Gutterman observed that the main block of the building was never stuccoed. She added that she would not want to see an area stuccoed where it was not currently stuccoed.
 - Mr. McCoubrey observed that there was no stucco on the side wall of the ell.
 - Mr. Detwiler questioned whether the remnants of the stucco at the second-story rear wall could be removed.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- There is no precedent for a roof deck on the main block of any building on the 2300 block of St. Albans Street.
- The Historical Commission approved a small deck located on the rear ell with a hatch on the main block at 2307 St. Albans Street.
- The rear of the main block and the side wall of the ell were never stuccoed. The second-story rear wall of the ell may have been stuccoed in the past, but most stucco has been removed.
- No details were provided to describe the proposed repair work to the front and rear facades.
- The mechanical units are proposed on the roof and would be visible from the public right-of-way.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The deck as proposed is too large, but a deck like that at 2307 St. Albans Street is appropriate and would comply with Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.
- Stucco should be limited to the first-story rear wall, and the remaining brick at the rear should be cleaned and/or pointed to comply with Standard 6.
- The staff should be provided with all details for windows, doors, pointing, brick replacement, and any other repair work to comply with Standard 6.
- The mechanical units should be located in the rear yard to comply with Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and the Roofs Guideline, with the following conditions:

- No stucco is installed on the second-story rear wall;
- An annotated photograph is provided to the staff to show specific locations of brick replacement;
- The mechanical equipment is located in the rear yard;
- The deck is limited to the rear ell, with the hatch on the main block, to match the deck configuration at 2307 St. Albans Street; and
- The staff reviews the details of the windows, doors, and deck railing, and a brick pointing sample.

ITEM: 2309 ST ALBANS STREET MOTION: Approval, with conditions MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver					x
Rudy D'Alessandro			x		
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein			x		
Total	4		2		1

ADDRESS: 1200 MARKET ST

Proposal: Install signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Twelfth Street Hotel Associates

Applicant: Stephanie Tuccio, Permex

History: 1932; PSFS Building; George Howe & William Lescaze, architects

Individual Designation: 1/30/1968

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

Designed by architects George Howe and William Lescaze in 1932 for the Philadelphia Savings Fund Society, the building at 1200 Market Street was the first International-style skyscraper in the United States. Today, the PSFS building stands as a National Historic Landmark, noted for its progressive design and importance in American architectural history. From an architectural perspective, it is one of the most significant buildings in the city and is known worldwide.

Since designating the building in 1968, the Historical Commission has approved minimal signage for the tenant spaces, and signage has been largely limited to the Market Street façade.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install signage at 12th Street elevation.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - This application proposes to install illuminated and non-illuminated channel letters on the stainless steel band of the PSFS building where signage did not historically exist. Each letter would be anchored into the band, creating numerous holes in the historic fabric. The work does not comply with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:51:23

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- No one represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Keller stated that the applicant explained that the proposed signage is associated with a fifth-story tenant space. She added that the staff had recommended placing signage behind the storefront or on the canopy, which is not an original feature.
 - Ms. Gutterman commented that the proposed signage is inappropriate and would set a bad precedent. She encouraged the tenant to find an alternative to the exterior signage.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Signage consisting of illuminated and non-illuminated channel letters is proposed for the 12th Street elevation of the PSFS building.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Signage is inappropriate at the proposed location due to the building's significance, and therefore the proposal does not comply with Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 1200 MARKET STREET					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Detwiler					
SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver					x
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 123-29 CHESTNUT STREET

Proposal: Install two banner signs

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 123-129 Chestnut St Associates

Applicant: Denise Koster, Project Expeditors Consulting Corp.

History: 1903; Corn Exchange National Bank; Newman, Woodman & Harris, architects; alterations/additions, Horace Trumbauer, 1912, 1929, 1931

Individual Designation: 10/7/1976

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

Preservation Easement: Yes

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

The applicant is proposing new signage for 123-29 Chestnut Street on behalf of its client, Chase Bank. The application proposes to install two double-sided fabric flags to be installed on the building's façade. One flag is proposed along the Chestnut Street elevation and one flag is proposed along the 2nd Street elevation.

Staff from the Historical Commission previously agreed to approve the transom signage administratively due to a history of signage in the transom and the limited locations for signage on this historic building.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Install two double-sided fabric blade signs.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 2, with staff to review details of the proposed mounting plates. The staff recommends exploring options for smaller mounting plates to minimize the appearance of the signage hardware.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:55:20**PRESENTERS:**

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- No one represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked why the applicant needs blade signs if there is already signage in the transoms.
 - Ms. Mehley responded she believes the applicant simply wants additional signage beyond the transom signage. She noted that in this area if you were looking for the bank, you would have to be standing directly in front of the transom to see their sign.

- Ms. Stein stated that she finds the proposed placement of the signage odd, as it is not anywhere near the main entrance.
 - Ms. Mehley responded that more signs were proposed originally and the staff asked the applicant to reduce the number down to two. She continued that they can ask the applicant to adjust the location of these signs.
 - Ms. Stein noted that the applicant needs to figure out how the signage is going to get anchored into the mortar joints.
- Ms. Stein and Ms. Gutterman stated that they think placing signage closer to the entryway makes more sense. Ms. Gutterman commented that it would make more sense to have one blade sign at the corner rather than two signs halfway down the block.
- Mr. D'Alessandro inquired about historic photographs of the building.
 - Ms. Mehley responded that there are many historic photographs in the Historical Commission's files but photographs showing advertising are more recent. She stated that other banks have occupied the space, including Citizens Bank, which had their signage in the transoms.
- Ms. Stein stated that in this area of the city there is a tradition of post-mounted signs on buildings. She stated that she is not opposed to a blade/banner-style sign or even two on this building. She continued that the signs should be near the entrance doors with one on Chestnut St. and one on 2nd Street, with the brackets installed on the portals and into the mortar joints. Ms. Stein added that placing the signage in the middle of the building is not helpful.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated he would not recommend approval of this type of signage anywhere on this building.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that he would rather not see the signage installed in the portals but rather in the piers closest to the entrances.
 - Ms. Stein agreed that it would be better in the nearest pier rather than the portal.
- Ms. Gutterman pointed out that the brick has such lovely detailing, stepping in and out, that any signage put on the piers is going to obstruct that.
 - Ms. Mehley responded that she had asked the applicant about hardware options that would reduce the size of the hardware or eliminate one of the brackets but had not received a response.
 - Ms. Gutterman noted that they probably need the second bracket to keep the banner from rotating and flipping.
 - Mr. McCoubrey questioned the size of the proposed banner. He noted that it does not have to be 30.5 inches wide.
- Ms. Gutterman commented that she does not understand why the applicant does not consider signage in the windows.
- Mr. Detwiler stated that this is a neighborhood that has this type of signage. He noted his questions are: Where is it? How big is it? And how is it attached?
 - Ms. Stein agreed about the question of size. She pointed out that nearby similar signs are narrower in width to the ones proposed. Ms. Stein also commented that the proposed type and logo are much smaller than the 30-inch width of the sign.
- Ms. Gutterman proposed the idea of the sign going on a flagpole rather than into the historic masonry. She continued that options for additional signage should be furthered studied by the applicant including the idea of a flagpole for signage.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- This individually designated building is highly significant and has maintained a high degree of architectural integrity.
- The proposed locations of the blade signs should be closer to the entryway. The piers adjacent to the entryways are more appropriate for signage location.
- The signage and the brackets are oversized. The brackets must be installed into the mortar joints rather than the historic brick.
- Alternate options should be studied for this signage such as flag poles placed into the sidewalk to avoid damaging the historic masonry.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed project does not comply with Standard 2 owing to its proposed size, locations and potential damage to the historic masonry, potentially altering the historic character of the property.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application as proposed, pursuant to Standard 2; noting that the blade signs/banners should be smaller in both height and width; bracket mounting plan should be revised; and signage locations that will not be detrimental to historic masonry should be worked out with the staff.

ITEM: 123-29 Chestnut Street MOTION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 2 MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver					x
Rudy D'Alessandro		x			
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz		x			
Amy Stein	x				
Total	4	2			1

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:06 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

- Minutes of the Architectural Committee are presented in action format. Additional information is available in the audio recording for this meeting. The start time for each agenda item in the recording is noted.
- Application materials and staff overviews are available on the Historical Commission's website, www.phila.gov/historical.