

**THE MINUTES OF THE 604TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 14 DECEMBER 2012
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D.
Anuj Gupta
Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President
John Mattioni, Esq.
Dan Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections
David Schaaf, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Robert Thomas, AIA
Betty Turner

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

ALSO PRESENT

Joan Wachlin
Al Hanssen
Adrienne Mendell
Russell Troyer
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Van Potteiger, VPA
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Jim Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Co.
Ralph Allen Perkins
Tom Witt, Esq., Cozen O'Connor
Carl Primavera, Esq. Klehr Harrison
Lynda Hubbell
Allan Rubin, Spring Garden Civic Association
Antoinette Levitt, Spring Garden Civic Association
R. Miller, Spring Garden Civic Association
C. Sawyer
Mike Patterson
Sandy Smith, Phillyliving.com
Tim Shaaban, Urban Space

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Dilworth, Gupta, Hawkins, Leonard, Mattioni, Quinn, Schaaf, Thomas, and Turner joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 603RD STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the minutes of the 603rd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 9 November 2012. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 NOVEMBER 2012

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included three applications for review and comment, 818-20 Chestnut Street, 410 S. Front Street, and 1708 And 1710 Rittenhouse Square. Mr. Thomas recused from any consideration of 818-20 Chestnut Street, owing to his firm's involvement in the project. Mr. Sherman asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments. Mr. Sherman asked if the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for 818-20 Chestnut Street, 410 S. Front Street, and 1708 And 1710 Rittenhouse Square. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 818-20 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Create new entrance at storefront

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Posel Enterprises

Applicant: James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Company

History: 1880; Horn & Hardart; alts for Horn & Hardart, Ralph Bencker, architect, 1930, 1936

Individual Designation: 4/30/1986

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of restoration work and Alternative A of the storefront alteration, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes exterior alterations as part of the rehabilitation of the upper floors of this building into residential units. The alterations would include the replacement of front façade windows, the rehabilitation of the cornice, and the creation of a new entrance at the storefront. The upper floors of the building have been vacant for decades. The ground floor, which was also vacant for many years, is currently occupied. The original date of construction of the structure is 1880; however, it was significantly modified in the 1930s for Horn & Hardart with an elaborate Art Deco style storefront and sign.

The creation of a new entrance at ground floor is necessary in order to access the residential apartments on the upper stories. The applicant proposes two alternatives: Alternative A, which would place the entrance in a recess of the storefront, and Alternative B, which would place the door in the easternmost bay of the storefront. Alternative B would have the greatest impact visually and in terms of the removal of historic fabric.

The Historical Commission approved altering this storefront in 2002 for the creation of a second entrance, much in the same manner as is proposed in Alternative B. That work was never undertaken.

The current applicant submitted a similar application in October 2012. The Architectural Committee suggested that the applicant should study the details of the storefront further. The applicant withdrew the proposal from the Commission's agenda in order to develop the details of the alteration as suggested. The applicant submitted the current application with the requested details. The October 2012 application included the replacement of metal panels with glass in the signage niche; that aspect of the project is not proposed in the current application.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 410 S FRONT ST

Project: Install plaza

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Toll PA XV, LP

Applicant: Shawn Frawley, Toll Brothers Inc.

History: vacant lot; New Market, 1973, Louis Sauer, architect; demolished 2000

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with natural stone paving and capping to extend the entire depth of the plaza in a regular pattern, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: The Historical Commission approved the construction of a residential building at this site in July 2012. At that time, the Commission determined that the design of the plaza facing Headhouse Square required additional refinement. The applicant now proposes the final design for the plaza.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 1708 AND 1710 RITTENHOUSE SQ

Project: Raise rear roofs, construct rear parapets, install elevator

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1708-1710 Rittenhouse Square Street LP

Applicant: Thomas P. Witt, Cozen O'Connor

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided each parapet matches the material of the wall below, the parapet wall above the new roof line is not greater than 12 inches, and the existing doors to the roofs are replaced with appropriate windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter the roofs on the rear ends of two adjacent rowhouses, which are internally connected, and to install an elevator. The floor levels and ceiling heights of the rear portion of the buildings do not meet the building code for the commercial use of the property, which will be used as a medical office. The proposed alteration would raise the roofs over the rear ends and elevate the floors to align them with the floors in the main blocks of the buildings. The only visible exterior alteration would be the construction of parapets at the rear facades of the buildings. The rear facades of the buildings have different cladding materials: 1708 is clad in brick and 1710 is clad in stucco. The rears of the properties face Manning Street, which has the character of a service alley for most of the block. An elevator is proposed, the shaft of which would extend beyond the roof line, but would not be visible from the public right-of-way.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 2100 FAIRMOUNT AVE

Project: Legalize exterior alterations

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2100 Fairmount LLC

Applicant: Ori Feibush, OCF Cafe

History: 1898, Dominguez Brothers Cigar Factory

Individual Designation: 12/6/1979

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize alterations to the ground-floor facades of a building at 21st and Fairmount Streets. The staff approved an application in July 2012 for the exploratory removal of stucco to allow for the identification of the original window openings. The approval did not include the removal or installation of windows. Without an approval, the applicant removed the non-historic windows, enlarged the window openings, and installed new windows and garage-like doors. The applicant now seeks to legalize the exterior alterations.

The Architectural Committee reviewed the application and voted to recommend denial.

Since the Committee meeting, the staff has researched the building more thoroughly and discovered that it has a much more complicated history than indicated by the historic district inventory. The building was not constructed in 1922, as earlier believed. Instead, it was constructed about 1898 for the Dominguez Brothers Cigar Company, which occupied it until 1904. It housed various light industrial firms including the American Tinol Company, Hess Steel Castings Company, and Hess-Bright Manufacturing Company during the first decades of the twentieth century. In 1910, for example, the building was occupied by a trunk manufacturer; in 1917 by a cabinet maker at the lower floors and a piano string manufacturer at the top floor. In 1920, Westing, Evans & Egmore purchased the building, where it manufactured furniture until 1942. In the 1940s, the building was used for the manufacture of fire extinguishers and the mending of woolen cloth. In the 1950s, the Colorcraft Company ran a printing business in the building before it was taken over by a plumbing firm. By 1965, an auto parts warehouse occupied the building. By the early 1970s, when the neighborhood hit rock bottom, it was vacant. As the neighborhood rebounded, it was converted for residential use at the upper floors in 1977. The first floor was rehabilitated for a coffee shop in 2004.

From evidence at the building as well as various documents, it appears that the first-floor, street façades of the building have undergone numerous reconfigurations. The stucco that now covers the first floor was applied to mask many alterations to the façades owing to many changes in use. The original building likely had large openings at the first floor on Fairmount Avenue for moving materials and products in and out of the industrial building. A photograph of the building from about 1942 indicates that alterations had already occurred. Changes in the brick below the sills and large lintels over small openings indicate alterations to opening sizes and window and door configurations. The ground floor was altered for the auto parts warehouse in 1965, as evidenced by a zoning permit and seen in a c. 1970 photograph. Window and door openings were infilled with concrete and glass block, a garage door was added, and the first-floor facades were stuccoed. With the conversion to residential use in 1977, first-floor window and doors were again altered and the last large industrial opening at the second floor was infilled. The building was designated as historic as part of the de facto Spring Garden district in 1979. In 2004, the

Commission approved an application to reopen the infilled windows openings along 21st Street and Fairmount Avenue and install aluminum windows. Only part of the project was realized.

Since the Architectural Committee meeting, the staff has met with the applicant and his architect and concluded that, owing to the many changes to the ground-floor facades as well as incomplete documentation of the building, a true restoration of the windows and doors is not possible. Moreover, in 2004 the Commission approved aluminum windows in larger openings, much like those that were recently installed. Therefore, the Commission should be guided by Standard 9 and determine whether the alterations undertaken without an approval are compatible with the historic building.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application. Attorney Carl Primavera and developer Ori Feibush represented the application.

Mr. Feibush stated that he had hoped to fulfill the Historical Commission's approval from 2004, which included lowering the sill and exposing the original lintels over the masonry openings, as well as creating a Modern interpretation of a factory aesthetic with the garage doors. He claimed that the garage doors are in keeping with the historic use of the property as a factory. Mr. Feibush explained that he had leased the space with the expectation that the café space would need very little upgrading. However, he instead discovered that the space had been vandalized, windows broken, and the façade graffitied. He noted that the vinyl windows present at the time were not secured and that he had approached the Historical Commission's staff to seek an approval for removing the windows, which the staff could not grant. Instead, the staff granted an approval for exploratory stucco removal. He acknowledged that he exceeded the permit and removed the windows and doors and installed new windows and doors. He stated that he was unaware of the 1942 photograph at the time he did the work. He based the alterations on a 1970s photograph of the building, which he used as a guide. He noted that the City issued violations for conditions at the property including the non-compliant ramp. Mr. Primavera thanked the staff for its time and guidance through this process.

Mr. Sherman asked what elements of the design would not have met the guidelines had the work been reviewed before it was performed. Mr. Farnham answered that almost everyone agrees that the garage doors do not meet Standard 9. He explained that originally he was convinced that the windows did not meet Standard 9, but that after looking at the 2004 approval from the Commission as well as the complicated history of the building he had changed his mind. He stated that the question in front of the Commission was whether those windows were compatible with the building and if they satisfied Standard 9. He noted that he had hoped to find photographic evidence illustrating the original configuration of the ground floor, but that in the absence of such evidence, it was up to Commission to use its discretion and decide whether the windows are compatible with the historic building.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee came to the conclusion that approving the application as presented would set a very bad precedent. She explained that the original configuration was an unknown, but that the historic development of the property discovered by the staff allowed for a broader interpretation. She stated that the Commission should provide the Committee with direction, so that the Committee can review a new application in a more constructive manner.

Russ Troyer, a resident of the Spring Garden neighborhood, distributed a bulleted list of talking points. Mr. Sherman asked if the list had been distributed to the staff ahead of the meeting. Mr. Troyer answered that they had not. Mr. Troyer stated that the neighborhood is not interested in specifying a design for windows for building, but that they are interested in a collaborative

review process, which would yield an appropriate answer regarding alterations to the exterior of the building. He noted that applicant knew, but ignored the rules. He stated that Mr. Feibush had documented the illegal alteration on a web-based forum known as "Philly Speaks." Mr. Troyer read entries from the forum. He stated that the applicant made a business decision to deliberately sidestep the Historical Commission process. Mr. Troyer stated that the subject property is located across the street from Eastern State Penitentiary, which is a highly visited historic site. He asserted that visitors to the prison would be affronted by the illegal alterations. He described the neighborhood as a thriving neighborhood, which did not need the rules to be bent or ignored in order to foster economic development. He stated that, in his recollection, the property has not been vacant in over 33 years. He described a historic district as an accumulation of details, and noted that the district has become progressively better through the years. He stated that the historic review process ensures the preservation of that accumulation of details, which, in the end, make the district. He described the alterations as a really big detail that should not be overlooked.

Alfred Hansen described himself as a 40-year resident of 2000th block of Wallace Street. Mr. Hansen stated that he was the chairman of the Spring Garden Civic Association's zoning committee in the early 2000s and worked with Richard Tyler to certify the neighborhood as a historic district. He stated that he took the photograph of the building in question from the 1970s shown earlier in the discussion in 1977. He explained that the process to certify the neighborhood began in the early 1970s, that it was listed on the National Register in 1978, and that the subject property was individually listed on the Philadelphia Register in 1979. He described the property as "not just another property, but a pivotal property owing to its corner location." He described it as the entrance to the neighborhood. Mr. Hansen stated that the neighborhood needs the Historical Commission to uphold its regulations, which have been ignored by the developer. He has also ignored other municipal regulations. He described the aluminum windows that were installed as inappropriate. He stated that, even if the Commission does not have a photograph from 1900 that shows the original configuration, the Commission certainly knows what would be appropriate. He stated that the windows that were installed are not right for the neighborhood and are not right for a building across from Eastern State Penitentiary.

Mr. Sherman stated that the garage doors are the most inappropriate element of the alterations in his opinion. Mr. Thomas explained that a café requires interaction with the street, which the installed garage doors achieve, but that most historic alterations are done in a way that they fit the design of the building while achieving certain programmatic needs. He stated that the windows and garage doors that were installed do not fit the design of the building. Mr. Sherman asked if there was a possibility of modifying the existing windows to make them fit. Mr. Schaaf noted that the windows in the upper stories have thick mullions and windows in between, which is not found in the illegal windows. The mullions in the illegal windows are too thin. He stated that the building loses solidity at ground-floor because of the abrupt change in proportions. He stated that the thickness of the mullions is a critical element. Mr. Thomas noted that the door that was installed is also inappropriate and it does not match the height and proportions of the historic door with transom still present in the easternmost bay. Mr. Dilworth stated that it can be assumed from the evidence in the 1942 photograph that the bays were altered and that they may very well have had doors originally, rather than windows. He stated that asserting that the claim that the ground-floor alterations are not compatible because they do not match the upper stories may very well have no historic bases. Mr. Schaaf noted that, even if the 1942 photograph shows altered conditions, they were done in a way to complement the design in the upper stories. Mr. Thomas stated that he is convinced that the ground floor was altered, but that not having a definitive photograph of the original design does not preclude an alteration that is

respectful and complementary to the building. He noted that a design can be achieved that is stylistically compatible to the building even in the absence of any photographic evidence of the original design. Mr. Sherman asked if the existing windows could be saved and modified to make them more compatible. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Commission should not do the design work for the applicant, when the developer was aware of the process and chose to ignore it. Mr. Farnham noted that the mullions between upper windows are capped and are thicker than they would have been historically. Mr. Farnham also noted that all of the windows in the upper stories were illegally installed many years ago. Mr. Farnham also stated that they had met with the applicant to discuss altering the existing, illegal windows to make them appropriate, but that such a solution appeared difficult if not impossible to achieve.

Mr. Sherman observed that, if the Commission denied the application, the applicant could submit a revised application to the Architectural Committee and Commission for review. Mr. Farnham noted that that would be the case unless the staff discovered solid evidence of the original façade and the applicant decided to restore to that evidence; in that case, the staff could approve the application. Mr. Farnham stated that he wanted to clarify some incorrect claims regarding work to the property under the Stop Work Order. He stated that the applicant had undertaken some work to the sidewalk and an associated ramp while the Stop Work Order was in place, but that that work was not in violation of the Stop Work Order. He clarified that the sidewalk work had been permitted.

Mr. Primavera stated that an end result that satisfies all parties involved is attainable. He stated that a failed business with boarded-up windows will not benefit anyone, the business owner, the City, or the neighbors. He acknowledged that his client had made a bad decision, but contended that a positive result could still be achieved. Ms. Hawkins stated that a compromise proposal should be presented to the Committee and Commission. She noted that the deadline for the submissions for the January 2013 Commission meeting had already passed. She suggested that the applicant should work with the staff to devise a design that meets the Standards and can be reviewed by the Architectural Committee in January and the Commission in February 2013. She also suggested that the Commission could table the application, and the applicant could revise it and present it to the Commission for consideration at the January 2013 meeting.

Mr. Mattioni asked if the 1942 photograph could be used as a basis on which to formulate a design that is acceptable. Ms. Hawkins stated that it could, but that the applicant wishes to have large openings, which do not appear in the 1942 photograph. She stated that the 1942 photograph appears to show that the building had larger openings at some point prior to that date. Mr. Mattioni clarified that he would like the Commission to guide the applicant toward an acceptable design, rather than leaving him in the dark. Mr. Thomas stated that we know the uses of the building through time. He suggested that other buildings that retain their original configurations and had similar uses could be used as models. Mr. Thomas stated that the Commission could agree to retain the openings as altered, because we know that they were a certain width based on the metal lintels. Mr. Thomas suggested that, if the applicant brings to the staff a design that is acceptable, then it could be approved.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance pointed out that there is many neighbors present, more than normally attend Commission meetings. They are asking for the Commission to follow the rules and help preserve the character of the neighborhood. He also noted that the applicant deliberately ignored the rules and chose to undertake work that was clearly not permitted. He categorized the Commission's willingness to table the application or bend the regular submission process in order to accommodate the applicant's time frame as uncharacteristic. He urged the Commission to abandon a streamlined process and asked that any new design be

reviewed by the Committee with the involvement of the community. Mr. Mattioni clarified that the Commission was not proposing to ignore its regular process. He observed that the Commission would ultimately review any proposal that the staff found unacceptable. He stated that it is not the Commission's role to deliver punishment, but to develop a reasonable solution. Mr. Sherman stated that tabling an application is not out of the ordinary. It has been done many times before.

Adrienne Mendell, a neighbor, stated that the neighbors have been very disturbed by the alterations. She described the work as a savage intervention. Ms. Mendell asked that the Commission follow its rules and require more appropriate windows and doors. She asked the Commission to hold the business owner to same standard to which it holds home owners in the historic district.

Antoinette Levitt, the president of the Spring Garden Civic Association, agreed and stated that Mr. Feibush chose to ignore the rules and process. Ms. Levitt stated that Mr. Feibush did not reach out to the neighborhood, that she reached out to him instead and received a cold reception. She stated that the illegal alterations are a serious threat to the integrity of the historic district and the process. Lastly, she stated that there was never any graffiti on the exterior of the building, countering the applicant's claim.

Al Hanssen, a neighbor, stated that the 1942 photograph does not show enough evidence to suggest that the openings at ground floor were altered. He suggested that a cigar factory likely did not need six loading docks on Fairmount Avenue.

Justino Navarro, the vice president of the Spring Garden Civic Association, reiterated the comments expressed by the community members. He encouraged the Commission to deny the application and compel the applicant to work with the neighbors and the Architectural Committee to find an acceptable design.

Rosalie Leonard stated that the applicant should meet with the neighbors and work with the Architectural Committee. Mr. Primavera clarified that there had been several meetings with the neighborhood, primarily owing to zoning regulations. He stated that it would be inaccurate to say that the developer has ignored the community. Ms. Leonard moved to remand the application to the Architectural Committee. Mr. Farnham stated that the Commission can approve, deny, or table the application, but it cannot remand it to the Architectural Committee. He clarified that the only way to compel the applicant to appear again before the Committee would be to deny the current application and allow the applicant to submit a revised application. No one seconded Ms. Leonard's motion.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1531 NORTH ST

Project: Construct 3-story residential building

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Willis Berry

Applicant: Michael Patterson, Ashaur, Inc.

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Non-contributing, 10/11/2000

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented that the arrangement of the windows and doors is awkward and not reflective of typical fenestration patterns found in the district; the bay window, set back, and roof deck would be more appropriate for the rear than the front.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story, three-unit house with a roof deck on a vacant lot within the Spring Garden Historic District. The lot is considered to be “undeveloped” and the Commission’s jurisdiction is Review-and-Comment only. The first and second story of the front elevation would be clad in brick with a bay clad in aluminum siding on the second floor. The windows would be one-over-one. The third-story, parged in stucco, would be set back, allowing space for a wood deck. The side and rear elevations would be parged in stucco with one-over-one windows.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Historical Commission. Contractors Michael Patterson and Michael Patterson Jr. represented the application.

Mr. Patterson stated that the deck could be relocated from the front to the rear to comply with the Committee’s comments. He stated that he and the property owner are willing to work with the staff to implement the Historical Commission’s comments. Ms. Hawkins reiterated the Architectural Committee’s comments.

Allan Ruben, a resident of Spring Garden neighborhood, stated that this lot presents a great development opportunity. He opined that it is nice to hear that the developer is willing to work with the Historical Commission. Mr. Ruben suggested a three-story brick façade with appropriate windows that are the same scale as the typical windows in the neighborhood. He also agreed that the deck should be moved to the back. Mr. Ruben suggested that the Commission propose that City Council amend the historic preservation ordinance and give the Commission full jurisdiction over undeveloped sites in historic districts.

Justino Navarro of the Spring Garden Civic Association and Community Development Corporation stated that the community will work with the developer in specify a house that is more in keeping with the historic character of the neighborhood. He stated that his organizations will propose to their City Councilman an amendment to the historic preservation ordinance giving the Commission full jurisdiction over vacant lots in historic districts irrespective of the date of vacancy.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia stated that he met with Jon Farnham, Alan Greenberger, and Eva Gladstein about one year ago, when the zoning code was under review, to discuss the Review-and-Comment authority of the Commission. He stated that it was determined that the zoning code reform was not the avenue in which to change the Commission’s authority and that a discussion of the authority under the auspices of the Commission should take place. He suggested that the Historical Commission direct the staff to

prepare a recommendation on revising the Review-and-Comment provision of the ordinance and present it to the Commission. He suggested that the Commission should hear from both community groups and developers on this issue. He stated that it would be beneficial to know how many lots fall under the Review-and-Comment authority. Mr. Gallery stated that, if the Commission, as a result of that process found good reason to change the Review-and-Comment provision, then it could make a recommendation through Deputy Mayor Greenberger to introduce an ordinance to change the Review-and-Comment provision in the ordinance. He opined that this would be a more orderly process than community groups approaching their City Council representatives individually.

Ms. Hawkins commended the developer for being willing to work with the staff and the community.

COMMENT: The Historical Commission commented that the arrangement of the windows and doors is awkward and not reflective of typical fenestration patterns found in the district; and the bay window, set back, and roof deck would be more appropriate for the rear than the front.

ADDRESS: 1516 GREEN STREET

Project: Demolish rear ell, construct 3-story rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: AHA Development Company

Applicant: Danilo C. Vincencio

History: 1860

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the restoration of the front façade, with the staff to review details, but denial of the remainder of the application including the removal of the rear ell, which would constitute a demolition, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code and Standards 2, 6, and 9.

OVERVIEW: The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a building permit to undertake the proposed work without referring the application to the Historical Commission for its review. When the Department realized that the permit had been issued in error, it stopped the work and revoked the permit. Other than the removal of the front windows, no significant work had occurred when the project was stopped.

The building is an Italianate twin with the typical front block and rear ell configuration. The attached twin has been demolished. The building is separated from the rowhouse to the east by an open area.

The application proposes to demolish the rear ell and construct a three-story rear addition in its place that would be not only wider than the demolished ell, but also wider than the main block. The application proposes no justification for the demolition of the rear ell, which may potentially be considered a demolition in significant part, thereby necessitating a finding of financial hardship or necessity in the public interest before any approval. The application also proposes restoration work to the front façade including a new door, windows, paint removal, and masonry repair.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the project to the Commission. No one represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the plans had been revised since the Architectural Committee meeting to narrow the rear addition to the same width as the main block. He stated that, although he considered this revision an improvement, he contended that it did not address the demolition of the rear ell and rear wall of the main block of the building. The Commissioners agreed and concluded that the removal of the rear ell would constitute a demolition, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code. They discussed the application and concurred with the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the restoration of the front façade, with the staff to review details, but deny the remainder of the application including the removal of the rear ell, which would constitute a demolition, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code and Standards 2, 6, and 9. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 102-10 N 03RD ST

Project: Construct 6-story mixed-use building

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Keble Associates Real Estate LP

Applicant: Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker and Partners

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee voted to comment that, although the proposed building is generally compatible with the historic district in size, scale and proportion, and massing, it is not compatible in materials and features. It could better relate to its immediate neighbors, the roofline could be delineated with a terminating element, and the storefronts could be redesigned to better reflect the features, rhythms, and scales of the typical storefronts in the area.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a six-story, mixed-use building on a vacant lot with frontages on both Arch and 3rd Streets. The lot wraps around the building at the northwest corner of 3rd and Arch and is located within the Old City Historic District. The lot is considered "undeveloped" and the Commission's jurisdiction is therefore Review-and-Comment only. The front elevations of the proposed building would be clad with horizontal metal siding, green louvers for ventilation, and punched window openings on the second through sixth stories. The 3rd Street elevation would be visually divided with red vertical stripes. The first story of the 3rd Street elevation would have butt-glazed storefronts separated by precast stone piers and surrounds. A garage entrance with curb cut is proposed for Arch Street.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architects Cecil Baker and Eric Leighton represented the application.

Mr. Baker presented revised plans to the Commission and explained that he made the revisions suggested by the Architectural Committee. The Commission members thanked Mr. Baker for

embracing the process and implementing the Committee's comments even though the Commission does not enjoy full jurisdiction over the property. Mr. Baker stated that the Committee's review had helped him improve the design. The Commission thanked the applicants for their collaborative approach and congratulated them on the well-designed project.

ACTION: The Historical Commission commented that the building proposed in the revised application is compatible with the Old City Historic District.

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 233 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Restore exterior, construct fifth-story addition with roof decks

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 233 Chestnut Street Development, LLC

Applicant: Tim Shaaban, Urban Space Development Inc

History: 1870

Individual Designation: 11/4/1976

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the restoration of the storefront and windows is accurate, Jahn or a similar product is used for the brownstone repair, and a mock up of the deck railings , addition, and elevator machine room indicates that they will not be visible from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, and denial of the alteration to the doorways, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore the front façade, which includes, washing the brick, repairing the brownstone elements, replacing windows, and reestablishing the historic storefront configuration. The restoration is based on a period photograph from 1930. A more accurate restoration could be done if this photograph is used in conjunction with the 1857 Baxter Panoramic view of the street. The staff suggests that Jahn or a similar product would be a more appropriate repair method for the brownstone rather than paint.

This application also proposes to construct a fifth-story addition with a roof deck. The addition would be set back about 11 feet. However, a roof deck is proposed for front of the addition. The addition would have brick cladding and windows to match the restored façade.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Historical Commission. Developer Tim Shaaban represented the application.

Mr. Danta explained that the staff had reviewed a mock up of the rooftop addition in the field and found that the addition and railing would be invisible from the public right-of-way. He noted that the top of the elevator penthouse would be slightly visible yet inconspicuous from the street. He also explained that the staff had closely examined the conditions at the sidewalk and found that there were many electrical vaults present, which made the installation of an external ramp impossible. Mr. Danta also noted that one of the two storefront bays that would be altered for the interior ramp did not retain an original threshold. Therefore, there would be no loss of historic fabric if the sill we cut away for an at-grade entrance. Ms. Hawkins stated that the redesign of the storefront and the findings of the mock up addressed the concerns of the Committee.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the application as presented to the Historical Commission at its 14 December 2012 meeting, with the staff to review details. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1530-34 LOCUST ST

Project: Legalize repainting of ground floor

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Versailles Affiliates

Applicant: William Schwartz, Obermayer Rebman Maxwell & Hippel LLP

History: 1921, Frederick Webber, architect, The Versailles

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 5, 7, and 9.

OVERVIEW: The owner recently repainted a portion of the facades of this cream-colored terracotta apartment building. The base was repainted black and the first floor was repainted a lavender-grey color. The application includes a series of paint chips intending to demonstrate that the building was repainted with similar colors.

Generally, masonry buildings should not be painted because the paint traps moisture in the walls, leading to deterioration. In the case of glazed terracotta, moisture can escape through unpainted mortar joints. In addition to the potential moisture problem, the paint colors are not good matches for the underlying terracotta. A possible compromise might include removing the paint from the black-painted base of the building. This would remove the most inappropriate color, but, more importantly, would re-expose the mortar joints of the base, to allowing water vapor to escape from the building.

The application was continued from the Commission's November 2012 meeting to this meeting.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron explained that the applicant is seeking an additional one-month continuance. Ms. Leonard recused from the review because a family member works with the applicant.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to continue the application for one month. Ms. Turner seconded the application, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adjourn at 10:50 a.m. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

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 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.

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.

PM-704.2.7: Design: Additions, alterations, and new construction shall be designed so as to be compatible in scale, building materials, and texture, with contributing buildings in the historic district.

Storefront Guidelines: Not Recommended: Using inappropriately scaled signs and logos or other types of signs that obscure, damage, or destroy ... character-defining features of the historic building.