

THE MINUTES OF THE 526TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

9 JUNE 2006

1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18029

MICHAEL SKLAROFF, ESQ., CHAIR

PRESENT

Michael Sklaroff, Chair

Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D., Vice Chair

Warren Huff, City Planning Commission

Joseph James, Department of Public Property

Sara Merriman, Commerce Department

Kathleen Murray, Office of the Council President

David Perri, Department of Licenses & Inspections

Vincent Rivera, AIA

Norman Tissian

Scott Wilds, Office of Housing & Community Development

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist

Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner

Jonathan Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director

Erin McGinn, Historic Preservation Planner

Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician

Leonard Reuter, Assistant City Solicitor, Law Department

ALSO PRESENT

Lydia Grose, SEPTA

Anthony Bohara, SEPTA

W. Green, SEPTA

Harry Laspee, Pennoni Assoc.

Larry Link, PennDOT

E. Kerry

Thomas Witt, Esq., Wolf Block Schorr & Solis-Cohen

Jason Brown

M. Becal, Society Hill Towers

George Lyons, Chestnut Hill Historical Society

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance

Howard Coonley, Old City Civic Association

Tim Duffy

Andrew Scott, Urban Engineers

Farah Jimenez, Mt. Airy U.S.A

M. Eskine, Greenbelt Knoll

A. Brooks, Greenbelt Knoll

Vesna Hess, 316 S. 21st Street

Catherine Franklin, Penn-Knox N.A.

Laura Siena, West Mt. Airy Neighbors

Larry McEwen, architect

Jennifer Foster

Julia Scott

Kristin Pazulski, Chestnut Hill Local
Elizabeth Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
J. Berwick, Glen Foerd
C. Romano, Glen Foerd
Jack Conroy, Conroy Catering
Mark Wieand, Bower Lewis Thrower
Kevin Smith, Manayunk Neighborhood Council
Arlene Matzkin, Friday Architects
Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers
Douglas Mellor
Joe Pagano
Jerry Fiore, CVM Design-Build

526TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 526th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:07 a.m.

MINUTES OF THE 525TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Upon a motion proffered by Mr. Sugrue and seconded by Mr. Tissian, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the 525th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 12 May 2006.

THE REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PAVING, JOSEPH JAMES, SARA MERRIMAN, DAVID PERRI, VINCENT RIVERA

5200-5400 BLOCKS OF GERMANTOWN AVENUE

Applicant: Larry Link, PennDOT

Project: Remove granite-block paving and rails and lay new rails with concrete paving in the track area and granite block in the outer lanes

OVERVIEW: The 5200-5400 blocks of Germantown Avenue are designated as historic as part of the Historic Street Paving Thematic District. Currently, the designated cartway consists of two sets of trolley tracks with granite-block paving in the track and outer lanes from curb to curb. This application proposes the removal of the girder-rail tracks and granite-block paving in the track area and their replacement with T-rail track and concrete. It also proposes restoring the paving of the lanes outside the track area in granite block. In December 2005, the Commission reviewed and tabled the application for the 5200-5400 blocks of Germantown Avenue for a period not to exceed six months.

7200-7600 BLOCKS OF GERMANTOWN AVENUE

Applicant: Larry Link, PennDOT

Project: Remove granite-block paving and rails and lay new rails with concrete paving in the track area and granite block in the outer lanes

OVERVIEW: The 7200-7600 blocks of Germantown Avenue are designated as historic as

part of the Historic Street Paving Thematic District. Currently, the designated cartway consists of two sets of trolley tracks with a mix of granite-block and concrete paving in the track and outer lanes. This application proposes the removal of the girder-rail tracks and granite-block paving in the track area and their replacement with T-rail track and concrete. It also proposes restoring the paving of the lanes outside the track area in granite block. In February 2006, the Commission reviewed and tabled the 7200-7600 block application for a period not to exceed four months. It also created a special committee on paving to commission an engineer's report clarifying the competing claims made during the reviews.

4200-4800 BLOCKS OF CHESTER AVENUE

Applicant: SEPTA

Project: Remove granite-block paving and rails and lay new rails with concrete paving

OVERVIEW: The 4200-4800 blocks of Chester Avenue are designated as historic as part of the Historic Street Paving Thematic District. Currently, the designated cartway consists of two sets of trolley tracks with granite-block paving between the tracks and asphalt outside the tracks. Like the tabled applications for Germantown Avenue, this application proposes the removal of the girder-rail tracks and granite-block paving in the track area and their replacement with T-rail track and concrete. Unlike the Germantown Avenue applications, this application does not propose the paving of the lanes outside the track area in granite block; it proposes no work to the outer lanes. The applicants make several assertions that mirror those made during the Germantown Avenue reviews: 9-inch girder rail is no longer available; the new SEPTA rail system is not compatible with the granite block; granite block paving is very expensive; concrete is safer than granite block; concrete is compatible with SEPTA's maintenance procedures; and concrete would be consistent with other sections of the Avenue. At its March 2006 meeting, the Commission tabled the Chester Avenue application for a period not to exceed three months.

The Historical Commission reviewed a proposal for the reconstruction of the 3700-4000 blocks of Germantown Avenue in 1999 and 2000. At that time, the Commission created an Ad-hoc Committee to explore the possibility of reusing the granite block within the track area. The Committee concluded that the use of the new T-rail precluded the use of granite block. The Committee also discussed the treatment of the concrete in the track area. It determined that raw concrete proved to be the most maintenance-free and consistent along Germantown Avenue. The Commission adopted the Committee's recommendations, but specifically stated that the decision would not set a precedent for Germantown Avenue. It decided that it would review proposals to alter the Avenue on a case-by-case basis in the event that new technologies allowed for the tracks to be integrated with the granite block.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Perri presented the engineering report commissioned by the Special Committee on Paving. Mr. Perri summarized it as follows:

1. 9-in girder rail is obsolete, unavailable, unsalvageable and not recommended.
2. A viable method for using granite block from curb line to curb line is to use 7-in. deep foreign girder rail in rubber boots (see sketch on page 4).
3. The disadvantages to using 7-in. deep girder rail and paving curb line to curb line in granite block are:

- a. The track slab needs to be engineered to a smaller depth. The smaller depth would require the use of fiber or metal reinforced concrete. This will increase the cost of the slab by approximately 30%;
 - b. The additional reinforcement of the track slab will make access to the utilities below more difficult;
 - c. Girder rail is less "bicycle-safe" than T-rail;
 - d. In comparison to at least a partial concrete surface, the street will be more slippery and less safe for automobile traffic.
4. The use of T-rail is not compatible with paving from curb line to curb line in granite block. The reason being that a concrete or rubber rail header must be installed to allow the groove for the wheel flange.
5. One T-rail alternative presented uses "box-outs". Box-outs are relatively small areas located between the tracks that could be set aside for architectural granite block of four inch depth only (see Appendix B - figure 4).
6. The author's primary recommendation is to use rubber bootied T-rail with granite block from the curb to the edge of the track, along with textured/colored concrete for the entire track area. The advantages to this method are:
 - a. Relatively inexpensive compared to girder rail and curb-to-curb paving;
 - b. Minimal track design change;
 - c. Safer for bicycles and cars.
7. The author said that much can be done with concrete in the track area to replicate the look, color, and texture of granite block in the cartways.

Mr. Perri reported that the committee did not have a formal recommendation but that he would offer a personal recommendation. He suggested that, in most areas, the Commission require a rubber-bootied T-rail with concrete paving in track area and granite block paving outside the track area. In zones of great historical significance, he suggested that the Commission require 7" girder rail with granite paving from curb to curb. He also suggested that the staff review concrete treatments for texture and color in the track areas and pedestrian crossings.

Mr. Wilds asked if the report had addressed the maintenance issues raised by the stamped concrete. Mr. Perri replied that the report did not address issues relating to different types of concrete. Mr. Perri mentioned that he did not believe that stamped concrete was appropriate. He also noted that he did not believe that the concrete used on the reconstructed sections of Germantown Avenue in Chestnut Hill was appropriate. He suggested that the Commission require a better concrete finish than was achieved in Chestnut Hill, but not stamped concrete.

Mr. Sklaroff asked if the previous report of the Ad Hoc Committee headed by Robert Thomas was still valid. Mr. Perri answered that the previous report had proven very useful and retained validity. He stated that the findings of the Special Paving Committee were essentially consistent with the findings of the earlier committee.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Perri to comment on the types of areas where curb-to-curb granite block would be required. Mr. Perri stated that the committee had determined that curb-to-curb granite block ought to be retained in the most historically significant areas. Mr. Thomas, now a member of the Architectural Committee, asked Mr. Perri if any specific areas had been identified for the 7" girder. Mr. Perri answered that none had been identified yet.

Mr. Sklaroff requested a clarification on the use of girder and T-rail together. Mr. Perri answered that girder rail can be successfully joined to T-rail.

Mr. Wilds reminded the Commission that the conditions at Chester Avenue are very different from those at Germantown Avenue.

Ms. Murray asked if there was a considerable price difference between the two systems. Mr. Perri answered that there was a significant increase in the use of the girder rail, which would need to be imported. He stated that, because it is foreign-made, it may require special permission for purchase.

Larry Link of PennDOT commented that, in general, Mr. Perri's recommendations are acceptable. However, he mentioned timing concerns. Mr. Link stated that he had generated a report in response to the Commission's engineering report, which he would like to read. Mr. Sklaroff suggested that he summarize rather than read the report. Mr. Link stated that the report addressed engineering, economics, historic preservation, and safety. He noted that the two sections of Germantown Avenue under consideration today are the last two along the entire avenue to be rehabilitated. He asserted that the work to them should be consistent with the work already completed on the Avenue.

Lydia Grose and Anthony Bohare of SEPTA introduced themselves. Ms. Grose stated that they were concerned with Mr. Perri's recommendation regarding the use of 7" girder and requested clarifications on these historically significant areas. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the historically significant areas would not be identified during today's meeting. He suggested a special meeting to negotiate the identities of the special areas. Ms. Grose stated that SEPTA remained steadfast in its request for approval of the use of T-rail with stamped concrete in the track area. Mr. Perri remarked that there is a technical solution that allows the use of curb-to-curb granite block paving.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance asked if the committee had evaluated the possibility of using concrete just immediately adjacent to the rail. Mr. Perri answered that it was possible, but only outside the rails. The concrete bed would be too thin between the rails and would be susceptible to maintenance problems.

Mr. Gallery stated that the 5200 to 5400-block section of Germantown Avenue is highly significant and merits preservation. He asserted that the Commission should require curb-to-curb granite block paving in this area.

Emanuel Kelly, an architect, member of State Historic Preservation Board, and resident of the Chester Avenue area, stated that concrete was not as durable as granite and recommended that the granite block be preserved on Chester Avenue. Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Perri if granite block could be retained in the track area. Mr. Perri stated that there is no viable solution that would allow the use of T-rail with granite paving in the track area. However, the use of a 7" girder rail would allow for the retention of granite block in the track area.

Larry McEwen, an architect whose office is located on Germantown Avenue, stated that granite paving is more easily maintained than concrete. He noted that the concrete already laid on Germantown Avenue is problematic.

Mr. Sugrue stated that he was concerned about maintaining stamped concrete. Mr. Perri

clarified that he is recommending plain concrete, not stamped concrete. He is suggesting a better texture and color for the plain concrete.

Mr. Tissian asked Mr. Perri to define precisely the track area. Mr. Perri responded that it is the zone between the tracks and the apron just outside the tracks. Ms. Grose added that it extends 18" outside the outer rails.

Mr. Reuter, the Commission's attorney, stated that the Streets Department does not maintain state roads. Mr. Sklaroff clarified that the Streets Department issues permits, but PennDOT maintains the cartway and SEPTA maintains the track area. Mr. Link added that three departments are involved in street paving repairs and that part of the proposed work would include replacing most of the utility lines within that stretch, which would reduce future maintenance. Mr. Reuter stated that PennDOT was responsible for repaving. Mr. Sklaroff asked who inspects repaving done by private contractors. Mr. Reuter replied that, for plumbers, the private contractor backfills to 2" of the road surface and either PennDOT or Streets, whichever has jurisdiction, completes the work. For water and telecommunications work, the contractor completes the work and the agency with jurisdiction verifies it.

MOTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to approve the replacement of the existing rail with T-rail, the restoration of the granite block in the travel lanes, and the installation of plain, not stamped, concrete in the track area and at the crosswalks, with the staff to review details, for the 7200 to 7600 blocks of Germantown Avenue; and to deny the proposal as submitted, but to approve the use of 7-inch girder rail, granite block from curb to curb, and concrete at the crosswalks, with the staff to review details, for the 5200 to 5400 blocks of Germantown Avenue. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion.

Farah Jimenez, the executive director of Mt. Airy USA, stated that this application was a watershed moment for the Historical Commission. She remarked that a current television commercial depicts a Philadelphia trolley car running on a granite-block street in San Francisco. Ms. Jimenez contended that the Commission should consider the importance of the historic material that would be lost on the 7200 to 7600 blocks of Germantown Avenue. She asked that the Commission hold true to its ordinance. Ms. Jimenez stated that SEPTA was thumbing its nose at the residents, the Historical Commission, and the elected representatives of the city. She noted that SEPTA had paved the section of the Avenue with asphalt without any review or approval.

George Lyons of the Chestnut Hill Historical Society stated that the community would like to meet with the applicant and interested parties to review and discuss the engineering report. Mr. Lyons stated that cost seemed to be the only factor preventing the preservation of the historic paving. He asserted that the preservation can and should be undertaken. He suggested that additional funding be sought to allow for the preservation. Mr. Sklaroff asked if he or anyone else was seeking the funding to allow for complete preservation. Mr. Tissian stated that the Historical Commission only looks at historic preservation, not at cost. Other Commission members disagreed. Ms. Murray added that cost was not the only concern; there are also safety issues involved.

Katherine Franklin of Germantown stated that historic paving is a fundamental element in the city's history and that to discard the historic paving material would be a desecration of history. She pleaded for the Commissioners to preserve the granite

paving on the 5200 to 5400 blocks of Germantown Avenue, where it fronts nationally significant sites. Mr. Sklaroff reminded her that the current motion before the Commission would, in fact, preserve the paving on those blocks. Ms. Franklin acknowledged her hearing problem and relinquished the floor.

Robert Previdi of the Chestnut Hill Business Association stated that the current motion offered an appropriate compromise. Mr. Previdi asserted that the safety concerns are not convincing because the street is not currently properly maintained. He also stated that he believed that a visual contrast at pedestrian crosswalks is important and increases pedestrian safety. He asked that the staff work with the community to develop an appropriate concrete for the crosswalks.

ACTION: On the motion tendered by Messrs. Sugrue and Rivera, the Commission voted 7 to 1 to approve the replacement of the existing rail with T-rail, the restoration of the granite block in the travel lanes, and the installation of plain, not stamped, concrete in the track area and at the crosswalks, with the staff to review details, for the 7200 to 7600 blocks of Germantown Avenue; and to deny the proposal as submitted, but to approve the use of 7-inch girder rail, granite block from curb to curb, and concrete at the crosswalks, with the staff to review details, for the 5200 to 5400 blocks of Germantown Avenue. Commissioners Sugrue, Rivera, Merriman, Murray, Huff, Perri, and Wilds voted in favor; Mr. Tissian dissented; Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

Discussion turned to the Chester Avenue application. Mr. Perri stated that it is technically feasible to restore the granite block in the track area, but added that he has concerns about the feasibility of its restoration.

Mr. Thomas reported that, historically, roads were paved with granite in the rail area only and that this paving method was used as a traffic calming measure. He stated that curb to curb paving would create false historicism on Chester Avenue and would create a dangerous situation for bicyclists. Michael Hardy of the University City Historical Society stated that his organization was requesting the restoration of the existing granite block in the track area.

Mr. Sklaroff asked if anyone representing Councilwoman Blackwell was present. When no one responded, he asked Mr. Farnham if he had had contact with her office on the matter. Mr. Farnham explained that he had forwarded a copy of the engineers report and other application materials to her office at the same time the report was distributed to the Commissioners. He also noted that he had sent them a reminder about today's meeting. Mr. Wilds noted that the Councilwoman was extremely busy with the budget and other matters.

Ms. Grose stated that SEPTA would like to use its standard T-rail with full depth concrete and no granite on Chester Avenue. She stated that a requirement to restore the granite block would impose a hardship on SEPTA. Mr. Wilds stated that he lived one block from Chester Avenue and was appalled at the lack of maintenance in the track area. He asserted that SEPTA had never reinstalled a single granite block along Chester Avenue. He stated that SEPTA was guilty of demolition by neglect. Ms. Grose disputed Mr. Wild's comments and mentioned that maintenance and reconstruction differed significantly. Mr. Sklaroff acknowledged that SEPTA has a difficult mission, but added that it must maintain those areas under its jurisdiction. He stated that the City must work

harder to protect these corridors and that there must be better cooperation between City agencies and other governmental entities.

Mr. Tissian asked how much more it would cost to restore the granite blocks than to remove them and lay concrete. Mr. Bohare answered that it would cost 100% more to restore the granite block. Mr. Tissian asked if he was certain about that number. Mr. Bohare reconsidered and stated that it would be at 50% more.

Mr. Wilds stated that Baltimore Avenue was repaved in concrete four years ago and that it was already failing.

Mr. Gallery stated that the SEPTA's position was unacceptable. He noted that SEPTA has but one type of track system for streets within Philadelphia, which is employed regardless of historic significance or designation. He urged the Commission to deny the application.

Wayne Spilove, the chair of the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission, stated that SEPTA should preserve the granite block. Mr. Wilds asked Ms. Grose if SEPTA's capital program included federal funds. Ms. Grose answered that it did.

ACTION: Ms. Murray moved to deny the proposal as submitted for 4200-4800 blocks of Chester Avenue, but to approve the restoration or replacement in kind of the granite block paving in the track area. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 8 to 0. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 25 MAY 2006, THOMAS SUGRUE, CHAIR

GREENBELT KNOLL HISTORIC DISTRICT, 1-19 LONGFORD STREET

Various owners

RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted unanimously to recommend that the Greenbelt Knoll Historic District be designated as historic and placed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places with the boundaries expanded to include the park (3064 Holme Avenue) as "contributing" and with lot #17 classified as "contributing."

OVERVIEW: Greenbelt Knoll is a planned suburban development located on Longford Street, a cul-de-sac running south off Holme Avenue in Northeast Philadelphia. The development is situated on a long slender finger of land bounded on three sides by wooded parkland. It originally included nineteen single-family Modern residences set in a natural, wooded environment. One has been lost, but eighteen survive in nearly original condition. Morris Milgram, a leader of the open housing movement in the United States, created Greenbelt Knoll in the mid 1950s as the first self-consciously integrated suburban development in the city and one of the first in the nation. In addition to Milgram, prominent Greenbelt Knoll residents included Robert N.C. Nix, the first African American to represent Pennsylvania in the U.S. Congress, and the Rev. Leon H. Sullivan, a leading civil rights activist and the creator of the anti-apartheid Sullivan Principles. The establishment of Greenbelt Knoll marks a major milestone in the American open housing and civil rights movements. In addition to its significance in

American socio-political history, Greenbelt Knoll is important architecturally. Designed by the prominent firm of Montgomery & Bishop with Louis I. Kahn, one of the most important architects of the twentieth century, the houses and landscape at Greenbelt Knoll are excellent examples of the organic vein of mid-century Modern architecture. Set in a wood, Greenbelt Knoll is one of the most important collections of Modernist buildings in Philadelphia.

Greenbelt Knoll is highly significant and therefore eligible for inclusion on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The district fulfills Designation Criteria a, b, c, d, e, g, and j as delineated in paragraph 5 of the City's "Historic Buildings" ordinance, section 14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code. Satisfying Criterion a, Greenbelt Knoll, one of the nation's first integrated suburban housing developments, has significant character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth, and Nation and is associated with Morris Milgram, Louis I. Kahn, Robert N.C. Nix, and the Rev. Leon H. Sullivan, persons significant in the past. Satisfying Criterion b, Greenbelt Knoll is associated with an event of importance to the history of the City, Commonwealth, and Nation, the open housing movement. Satisfying Criteria c and d, Greenbelt Knoll reflects the environment characterized by a distinctive architectural style, the mid-century Modernist style; and it embodies distinguishing characteristics of the architectural style. Designed by Montgomery & Bishop with Louis I. Kahn, Greenbelt Knoll is the work of architects whose designs significantly influenced the historical, architectural, economic, social, and cultural development of the City, Commonwealth and Nation; it thereby satisfies Criterion e. Criterion g is satisfied by Greenbelt Knoll, which is located on a finger of land projecting into Pennypack Park, is related to a part of a park worthy of preservation. And finally, satisfying Criterion j, Greenbelt Knoll truly exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social or historical heritage of the community. Greenbelt Knoll is a unique and important place that overwhelmingly deserves to be listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Commission. He explained that the City agency responsible for 3064 Holme Avenue, the park, had not been identified as the Fairmount Park Commission until this morning. The Park Commission had not had an opportunity to review the nomination and waive its notice, as the Committee on Historic Designation had recommended. Mr. Farnham suggested that the Commission not include 3064 Holme Avenue within any designation made today because proper notice had not been issued to the owner. He suggested that, if the Commission sought to include the park within the district, it do so as a later amendment to the district. Mr. Farnham also noted that the City's preservation ordinance requires that the City Planning Commission review and comment on all proposed historic districts. He suggested that any motion to designate the district be conditioned upon the Planning Commission's favorable comment.

Emmanuel Kelly, an architect who has worked in the proposed district, stated that he concurred with the nomination's assertion that the district is historically significant. He endorsed the approval of the designation of the district and recommended that it be nominated to the National Register of Historic Places as well.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that he supported the nomination and commended the residents of Greenbelt Knoll for writing the nomination. He asked the Chair to recognize the residents for writing the nomination and for maintaining their community. The Commission acknowledged Charles Fuller and Arthur Friedman, who

authored the nomination. The Commission also acknowledged the large number of Greenbelt residents in the audience who supported of the nomination. Finally, it especially recognized Virginia Barlow, an original resident who was a friend and supporter of Morris Milgram.

Mr. Sugrue reported that he is working on a book that includes a section on Morris Milgram. He stated that he fully supported the nomination of the district.

ACTION: Mr. Huff moved that Greenbelt Knoll Historic District be designated as initially nominated, except that lot 17 be classified as “Contributing,” provided the City Planning Commissions comments favorably on the district. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

801 MARKET STREET, STRAWBRIDGE & CLOTHIER DEPARTMENT STORE

May Department Store and 801 Market Street Holding, Owners

RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation unanimously recommended that the property at 801 Market Street, formerly the Strawbridge & Clothier Department Store, be designated as historic and placed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

OVERVIEW: The nomination, which was prepared by the Preservation Alliance, states that the Strawbridge & Clothier Department Store is historically and architecturally significant and therefore qualifies to be listed individually on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. It satisfies Designation Criteria a, d, e, h, and j as defined in Philadelphia’s Historical Preservation Ordinance. Satisfying Criterion a, the establishment as embodied by the buildings has significant interest or value as part of the city’s development and is associated with important individuals; Justus Strawbridge and Isaac Clothier. Satisfying Criterion d, the buildings embody distinguishing characteristics of the Renaissance Revival style. Satisfying Criterion e, Addison Hutton and Simon and Simon were significant architects in Philadelphia and the region. Satisfying criterion h, the building is significant visual feature within the retail zone around the intersection of 8th and Market Streets, a transportation hub. Satisfying Criterion j, the establishment significantly influenced department store and retail development in the city and commonwealth.

The proposed designation does not include any of the underground portions of the buildings, even those that are open to the public as parts of the Gallery and the transit concourse. Likewise, the proposed designation does not include the mid twentieth-century bridges between the Main Building and the parking garage to the north.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Commission.

MOTION: Mr. Rivera moved that the property at for 801 Market Street, the former Strawbridge & Clothier Department Store, be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Huff seconded the motion.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that his organization produced the nomination. He commended Liz Blazeovich, who wrote the nomination. He stated that the department store was an important historic resource.

Mr. Reuter asked if the local property owner had been notified of the consideration of the designation. Mr. Farnham responded that he had notified the property owners as required by the ordinance. He stated that the property is owned by two parties; one is located in St. Louis, Missouri and the other in Conshohocken, Pennsylvania. Ms. Murray asked if Federated now owned the property. Ms. Merriman stated that Strawbridge's had closed when Federated purchased the property. Mr. Reuter asked what owner information was available when the nomination was submitted. Mr. Farnham replied that the May Company and a real estate company in Conshohocken were listed as the property owners at the time the notice was issued. He stated neither property owner had contacted him regarding the designation. Mr. Farnham noted that the Commission assumed jurisdiction over the property at the moment the notice letters were mailed. Mr. Sklaroff suggested that the Commission identify the new owners and notify them of the proposed designation. Mr. Gallery remarked that the notice provision in the ordinance had been met. He questioned why the Commission would not proceed with the designation of the property. Mr. Reuter suggested that the Commission could request to have "designation" put on the deed. Mr. Wilds stated that the Commission should be wary about requiring a title search prior to designation. Mr. Farnham again stated that the notice of the consideration of the designation had complied fully with the historic preservation ordinance. He stated that he sent notice letters to the property owners listed on the tax records at the time as required by the ordinance. He also sent letters addressed to "Owner" to the property itself as required by the ordinance. Mr. Wilds remarked that the notice requirements had been met and suggested that the Commission proceed with the review of the nomination. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the Commission was obligated to identify and notify the actual property owner. Mr. Sugrue read from Section 14-2007(6)(a):

Notice shall be sent to the registered owner's last known address as the same appears in the real estate tax records of the Department of Revenue and sent to "Owner" at the street address of the property in question.

Mr. Sklaroff acknowledged that the staff had met the notice requirement as set forth in the ordinance.

ACTION: By a vote of 8 to 0, the Commission adopted the motion tendered by Messrs. Rivera and Huff to designate 801 Market Street, the former Strawbridge & Clothier Department Store, as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

316 S. 21ST STREET, A.K.A. 2100 CYPRESS STREET

William Hozack, Owner

RECOMMENDATION: By a vote of 4 to 1, the Committee on Historic Designation recommended that the inventory for the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District be amended to classify the property at 316 S. 21st Street as "Contributing."

OVERVIEW: In March 2006, the owner of 316 S. 21st Street presented a permit application to the Commission proposing additions and alterations to the large rowhouse on the site. While reviewing the application, the Commission's staff discovered an error in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District inventory. The inventory labels the property as an "Intrusion" in the district. However, the Commission's ordinance and

Rules & Regulations do not recognize “Intrusion” as a valid classification. Therefore, the property has no classification. The Commission reviewed the application at its April 2006 meeting and directed the staff to prepare an application to amend the district inventory to comply with the ordinance and *Rules*. Accordingly, the staff requests that the Commission delete the undefined term “Intrusion” from the inventory entry for 316 S. 21st Street and classify the property as “Contributing.”

The building at 316 S. 21st Street was erected about 1860 as a three-story Italianate rowhouse. In the 1880s, it was significantly altered; a Queen Anne mansard with dormers and a bay window were added. In 1949, the City condemned the building and the front and side facades of the main block were replaced with new brick facades; the mansard and rear ell were retained. Owing to the retention of the mansard, it is likely that only the outer wythe of brick was replaced during the 1949 façade reconstruction. The zoning permit for the 1949 facade project notes that the height and area of the building would not change during the work. When the façades were rebuilt, the main entrance was shifted to the Cypress Street façade. In 1994, the building was converted from a four-family to a single-family dwelling. As part of the conversion, he added the columns and pergola at the entrance on Cypress Street.

Although the main block of the building has a twentieth-century brick façade and the entrance has been relocated to the side façade, the building retains its historical use, footprint, massing, mansard with dormers, rear ell, and bay.

The Commission designated the property as part of the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District on 8 February 1995. It had not been individually designated prior to the creation of the district. The entry in the local Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District inventory lists the property as an “Intrusion.” However, the term “Intrusion” is not a valid classification for properties within locally designated historic districts; therefore, the property has no classification. Section 14-2007(2)(e) of the local historic preservation ordinance defines the term “Contributing.” The ordinance does not define “Non-contributing,” “Significant,” or “Intrusion.” However, the Commission’s *Rules & Regulations* elaborates on the ordinance and defines “Non-contributing” and “Significant.”

“Intrusion” is a term used in National Register district nominations. The Commission adapted the Rittenhouse National Register Historic District inventory to generate the local Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District inventory. The National Register inventory entry for the property classifies it as an “Intrusion.”

When the Commission generated the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District inventory, it used the National Register inventory as a basis. However, it amended the inventory in numerous ways including updating the classifications of all properties to conform not only to the local nomenclature, but also to the local guidelines set by the Commission and its Committee on Historic Designation. Most importantly, the Commission did not simply replace the term “Intrusion” with “Non-contributing” while creating the local inventory. It reevaluated every building based on its own rules. The staff has identified 71 instances in which a building labeled “Intrusion” in the national inventory was classified by the Commission as “Contributing” in the local inventory.

Several of these buildings labeled as “Intrusion” in the national inventory but classified as “Contributing” in the local inventory are refaced buildings like the one in question. The

Committee on Historic Designation's discussion of the Rittenhouse-Fitler nomination on 3 April 1987 is especially pertinent and explains the discrepancy between the national and local inventories. The minute states:

The Committee took up the discussion of classifying buildings in the district inventory and recommended that only three classifications be used: Significant, Contributing and Non-Contributing. Significant refers to those buildings or resources of outstanding architectural or historical merit that would be worthy of individual listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The term Contributing applies to buildings that add to the historical and architectural fabric of the district. This includes buildings that have been refaced at a later period but still retain the scale of the streetscape, and modern buildings that contribute positively to a streetscape through their scale, materials or detail. Buildings that are both relatively contemporary and badly out of scale to their streetscape are labeled non-contributing. ... The Committee recommends not placing a date as a cut off between Contributing and Non-contributing buildings, arguing that history is continuous and does not end at a certain date.

According to the guidelines set by the Committee, the building at 316 S. 21st Street should be classified as "Contributing." It is a building that has "been refaced at a later period but still retain[s] the scale of the streetscape." It is neither "relatively contemporary" nor "badly out of scale." Note that the building at 320 S. 21st Street, which is almost identical to this building and which was refaced, is classified in the local inventory as "Contributing."

Moreover, the staff has identified several refaced buildings that are labeled as an "Intrusion" in the Rittenhouse National Register District, but classified as "Contributing" in the local Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District. Three examples will suffice.

The building at 318 S. 15th Street was erected in the mid nineteenth century, but refaced in brick in the mid twentieth century. It retains its historic scale. It is labeled as an "Intrusion" in the national district, but classified as "Contributing" in the local district.

The building at 2217 Locust Street was erected in 1872, but refaced in PermaStone in the mid twentieth century. It retains its historic scale. It is labeled as an "Intrusion" in the national district, but classified as "Contributing" in the local district.

The building at 317 S. 20th Street was erected about 1890 and altered about 1920. The entranceway was moved and the building was refaced in stucco. Yet, it retains its historic scale. It is labeled as an "Intrusion" in the national district, but classified as "Contributing" in the local district.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the nomination to the Commission.

MOTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and amend the inventory of the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District to classify 316 S. 21st Street as "Contributing." Mr. Huff seconded the motion.

Thomas Witt, Esq., counsel for the property owner, stated that the "Intrusion" in the National Register inventory for the district translates to "Non-contributing." Mr. Witt also

asserted that any new amendment of the classification of the property should have no bearing on the review of the pending building permit application. He added that, because of the alterations to the facades, the building is no longer in scale with the surrounding buildings. The absence of a door on the 21st Street facade breaks up the rhythm of the doors along the block. Mr. Wilds questioned Mr. Witt's use of the term "scale." He added that the 21st Street façade reads as a "front," suggesting that the building is in scale; he noted that Mr. Witt had, in fact, just referred to the 21st Street façade as the "front" of the building. Mr. Witt responded that, from the pedestrian viewpoint, the 21st Street façade is out of scale due to the lack of a door. He continued that the building is also out of scale on Cypress Street because the rear ell sits along Cypress, which is unusual. Mr. Sugrue responded that rear ells of corner buildings facing secondary streets are very common in Philadelphia. Mr. Witt added that very little of the façade of the building is older than the 1940s.

Mr. Witt stated that the property was correctly identified as "Intrusion" in the National Register inventory because the 21st Street façade is out of scale and the rear ell is set back from Cypress Street. He claimed that "Intrusion" should translate to "Non-contributing" in the Philadelphia Register. Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Witt how he related that statement to the "Statement of Significance." Mr. Witt responded that he recalled that part of the significance of the district is its four-story, red brick pedestrian environment. He continued that key to the environment is the repetition of those forms, which is lacking at this property causing the pedestrian to be jarred by its appearance. Mr. Wilds stated that the height, the cornice, the mansard, and fenestration pattern still exist on the building.

Mr. Tissian asked Mr. Farnham how much of the building is considered historic fabric. Mr. Farnham stated that staff asserts that the building is historic. He continued that the mansard and dormer are original. The main block was refaced, but the building retains the material and scale of the neighborhood. The ell has been altered in insignificant ways, but is essentially original. Mr. Sklaroff asked if the window and façade materials are original. Mr. Farnham stated that the ell is original. Mr. Witt added that Mr. Holm, the project architect, thinks that a majority of the building was replaced in the 1940s.

Mr. Sugrue stated that the minutes of the 1987 Designation Committee meeting specifically stipulated that refaced buildings would be classified as "Contributing" if they retain the materials and scale of the neighborhood. He continued that the absence of a door and the alterations to the building have not significantly changed the building; it relates to the district through its materials and scale. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the front door is has been lost and the front portion of the building has been faced with new brick. He continued that these changes are significant and there is a loss of meaning. He added that scale is not reason enough to classify a building as "Contributing."

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance asserted that the staff presentation and the minutes are clear. Scale and materials are the criteria for "Contributing." The building still holds its shape and its original mansard. The building clearly qualifies as "Contributing" according to the criteria set forth by the Commission at the time of designation. He urged the Commission to classify the property as "Contributing."

Mr. Huff stated that he would still consider the building "Contributing," even it was altered by the pending proposal because it would still meet the criteria of materials and scale.

Mr. Riviera stated that the alterations to the building change the character of the building but not the scale.

ACTION: By a vote of 6 to 4, the Commission endorsed the motion tendered by Messrs. Wilds and Huff to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and amend the inventory of the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District to classify 316 S. 21st Street as "Contributing." Commissioners Sugrue, Rivera, James, Huff, Perri, and Wilds voted in favor; Commissioners Merriman, Murray, Tissian, and Sklaroff dissented.

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 30 MAY 2006, VINCENT RIVERA, CHAIR

2336 S. 21ST STREET

Owner/applicant: Rita Donatucci

History: built 1911, architect John Windrim, Contributing to Girard Estate District

Project: Enclose rear porch

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee recommended approval of the enclosing of the porch with casement windows, set above a recessed base infill of beaded wood board or stucco, not brick, and a simple glazed wood door with lower panel, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: The proposal calls for infilling the back porch of this corner house. The porch has a high degree of visibility. The documentation submitted with the application is a photomontage simulating the appearance of the porch after the alterations. The photomontage shows the porch infilled with a new brick base toothed into the existing brick piers and new six-over-six windows above the base. A door to match the front door with brick infill above would be placed at the side façade of the porch, which faces the street.

A design that sets the infill back a few inches from the existing piers without cutting into the existing bricks would better satisfy the Standards. The windows should have as few divisions as possible, perhaps single-light casements or one-over-one double-hung sash. The infill at the base of the windows should be a material other than matching brick, to reveal the alteration. On the side, the wood door should not replicate the historic front door. The area between the door and the porch roof should infilled with the same material used beneath the windows.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. He explained that the applicant had notified the staff that she would be unable to attend the Commission meeting.

Mr. Wilds asked if the owner had any comments or concerns about the Committee's recommendation for casement windows. Mr. Baron stated that the owner was willing to revise her application to comply with the Committee's recommendation.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance noted the absence of a quorum at the Architectural Committee meeting. He opined that it was inappropriate to refer to the recommendation as an "Architectural Committee recommendation" if it was not proffered by a quorum of members. Mr. Farnham remarked that the Architectural Committee

minutes reflect a lack of quorum for this and all reviews conducted by fewer than three members.

ACTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to adopt the recommendation of the members of Architectural Committee and approve the proposal to enclose the porch with casement windows, set above a recessed base infill of beaded wood board or stucco, not brick, and a simple glazed wood door with lower panel, with the staff to review details. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

718-724 S. 2ND STREET

Owner: Queens Mews South L.P.

Applicant: Katherine Bottom, architect

History: both constructed c. 1780; 718 entirely rebuilt in 1949; 724 refaced c.1990

Project: Demolish portions of the buildings and construct a residential complex with parking

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Denial, owing to the amount of demolition, pursuant to Standard 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application seeks to demolish portions of two designated buildings and combine the remaining buildings with structures on two other lots into a residential complex. At 718 S. 2nd Street, the applicants propose the demolition of the later yellow-brick façade and the reconstruction of the historic red-brick façade. They also propose the demolition of the rear wall, rear ell, and rear roof slope. At 724 S. 2nd Street, the applicants propose the demolition of the rear ell. The houses will be joined through breaches in the party walls to a complex to be constructed on lots at 720 and 722 S. 2nd Street. The vacant lots are not designated. The Commission reviews conjoined additions to designated buildings. The plans show substantial demolition of the sides and rear of the historic houses which may be deemed to constitute demolition in significant part.

An application for these properties was presented to the Architectural Committee in April 2006. The Committee recommended denial owing to the significant demolition. The applicants withdrew that application and revised the plans to reduce the amount of demolition.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Attorney Brett Feldman and developer Ian Anderson represented the application.

Mr. Sklaroff suggested the applicant return to the Architectural Committee owing to the recent discoveries about the site. Mr. Feldman stated that Mr. Farnham had recently conducted a site visit and determined that there was no original fabric at the 718 S. 2nd Street building. Therefore, the Commission should consider this matter. Mr. Farnham reported the conclusions from his site visit. Initially, he and Mr. Baron had believed this to be a very old building that had been refaced; they had worked from this assumption during their review. However, the site visit revealed that there was little, if any, historic fabric left at 718 S. 2nd Street. Mr. Farnham stated that this building dates to the 1940s. It retains the footprint and massing of the historic building along with the original foundation, but otherwise dates to the 1940s. Mr. Anderson explained that he intends to reconstruct the front façade to its eighteenth-century appearance.

Mr. Sklaroff suggested that the applicants present their design to the Architectural Committee again to allow it to review it in light of the new information. Robert Thomas of the Architectural Committee, who was in the audience, responded that the Committee had voiced its approval of the design, but had recommended denial because of the demolition of what was thought at the time to be historic fabric.

Mr. Gallery voiced his disapproval of the design, owing to the new buildings imitation of historic styles. He noted the lack of a quorum at the Committee meeting, but indicated his respect for the architectural abilities of Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Baron stated that the first time the proposal was heard by the Architectural Committee, there had been a quorum. In that hearing, Mr. Levy had commented on the design and made a series of suggestions. Mr. Baron noted that the applicants had revised the design to comply with the Committee's comments.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the proposal as submitted, with the staff to review details. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

3 RECTOR STREET

Owner: David Waxman

Applicant: Tiffany Strother

History: c. 1876 as the office for Archibald Campbell & Co. textile mills

Project: Construct five-story addition on two-story building

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The member of the Architectural Committee recommended denial, pursuant to 704.2.3 and 704.2.7 of the Property Maintenance Code.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the conversion of an industrial building to residential use. In the spring of 2005, the current applicants applied to the Commission to demolish the historic building and erect an entirely new residential building. The Commission denied the demolition application in June 2005. The applicants appealed the denial to the Board of Building Standards, which upheld the Commission's decision. The applicants appealed to the Board of Building Standards decision to the Board of License & Inspection Review; at the appeal hearing, the applicant agreed to send a revised application to the Commission rather than pursue the appeal. The Commission reviewed a revised application in February 2006 and approved the proposal in concept with a four-story addition set back at least ten feet from the Rector Street facade and a garage opening no more than ten feet wide.

The current proposal differs significantly from the proposal that the Commission approved in concept. The addition is now five, not four, stories tall. It is no longer styled like an industrial building. The exterior materials have changed significantly from those shown in the photo-simulations submitted with the in-concept proposal. The parking design has been significantly altered. There are now two, not one, parking entrances and they are on the north facade. Parking now occupies most of the historic building; the earlier proposal limited parking to the basement; the current proposal shows parking at the basement and first-floor levels. Also, the addition now extends beyond the historic building's footprint, overlapping the wall of the historic building at the north.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the proposal. Attorney Brett Feldman, architect Jonathan Broh, and developer David Waxman represented the application.

MOTION: Mr. Tissian moved to adopt the recommendation of the member of the Architectural Committee and deny the proposal, pursuant to 704.2.3 and 704.2.7 of the Property Maintenance Code. Mr. James seconded the motion.

Mr. Feldman briefly introduced the project and enumerated the key facts included in the conceptual approval. He explained that the garage entrance had moved to the north façade and that entire Rector Street façade would be retained. He explained that the towpath connection was accentuated with the inclusion of a bike ramp. Mr. Feldman stated that the applicant was requesting final approval with the details to be reviewed by the staff.

Mr. Tissian asked if the parking was underground. Mr. Feldman answered that the parking was now planned for the basement and ground-floor levels.

City Councilman Michael Nutter stated that the new proposal was a dynamic design that would save a historic building in disrepair. He encouraged the Commissioners to approve the proposal as submitted.

Mr. James asked if the existing openings could be reused for entrances into the parking garage. Mr. Broh answered that they cannot be reused for structural and space planning reasons.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION: Messrs. Tissian and James withdrew their motion.

Mr. Wilds stated that he approved of the proposal. He added that, owing to the numerous restrictions, this was the best possible proposal for the site. Mr. Huff commended the design and suggested lighting along the towpath. Mr. Rivera stated that the material cladding the stair tower should be revised to better harmonize with the historic building.

Kevin Smith of the Manayunk Neighborhood Council stated that this was the most promising design he had seen to date. However, he requested that the Commission approve it in concept only and require another review before any final approval.

ACTION: Mr. Tissian moved to approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. James seconded the motion, which passed 9 to 0. Mr. Sklaroff abstained.

Mr. Sklaroff recused and passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

1906-1908 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: 1906 Spruce Street L.P., Wayne Spilove

Applicant: Robert Thomas, architect

History: built c. 1865 façade, altered c.1955, Contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District

Project: Restore front facade

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Committee recommended approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the partial restoration of the façade of this former townhouse. When the building was converted to apartments the first floor was lowered and an elevator installed. The first-floor front façade was clad in red granite. The upper-floor windows were also altered. The applicants propose to remove the granite and restore the windows and their brownstone surrounds. The doorway, however, will remain lowered. Its surround and transom will be restored, but a second non-historic transom will be added to account for the change in floor height.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect Robert Thomas and owner Wayne Spilove represented the application.

ACTION: Mr. Tissian moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and approve the proposal, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. James seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 8 to 0. Mr. Sklaroff recused. Ms. Murray was not in attendance during the vote.

Mr. Sugrue returned the gavel to Mr. Sklaroff.

20-30 N. FRONT STREET

Owner: 20-30 N. Front Street L.L.C.

Applicant: Mark Wieand, architect

History: built 1832 for Girard Estate, individually designated and Significant to Old City District

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the alteration of the rear gable at 30 N. Front, provided the original roofline is expressed on the north party wall; denial of the proposed alteration of the rear gable at 28 N. Front but approval of a large rear dormer; approval of the decks and HVAC equipment; denial of the non-historic windows; denial of the storefronts as submitted but approval of the restoration of the storefronts; denial of the removal of the historic painted signs; with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: The application proposes the renovation of six Greek Revival warehouse structures into condominium units. The plans show the reconfiguration of the roof lines on 22-30 N. Front and the addition of decks, HVAC units and a 5-story addition on number 30. The main facades on Front and Church Streets will receive new windows and doors based on their original appearances. The Commission approved a similar application with demolition of rear ells and the construction of a rear addition on number 30 in February 2006. They excluded roof decks, removal of painted signs, windows, and storefronts at that time.

The proposed changes to the rear roof structures for the decks and the details of the windows do not comply with Standards. The plans show changes to the central windows of several storefronts and proposes applied muntins for the new windows and doors.

Some Commission members expressed concern about the removal of painted facade signage during their last review of the project.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect Mark Wieand and developer Alexander Taylor represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the Architectural Committee had suggested that the windows should be wood, not metal as proposed. He also noted problems with the proposed design for the storefronts and reported that the Architectural Committee had suggested that the applicants work with the staff to refine the storefront restoration details. He also reported that the Architectural Committee recommended approval of the cleaning of the façade provided the painted signs are retained. Mr. Tissian asked for more detail on the storefronts. Mr. Baron explained that the storefronts are covered by boards. With the removal of the boarding and a detailed review of the insurance surveys, Mr. Baron can advise the applicants on the restoration.

Mr. Sklaroff asked the applicants if they had revised their proposal since the Architectural Committee meeting. Mr. Wieand responded that they had. He displayed a drawing of the revised elevation showing the large rear dormer as the Committee had suggested. Mr. Wieand acknowledged Mr. Baron's concerns about the storefront and offered to work with him to correct the details. Mr. Wieand turned the discussion to the windows. He stated that the proximity to Interstate 95 made the window selection critical. He noted the need to reduce sound transmission. Mr. Wieand expressed his desire to compare both true- and simulated-divided-light windows to find the best solution for sound transmission and historic appearance. Mr. Wilds suggested that the applicant work with the staff to find the most suitable window. He stated his preference for the correct muntin width over true-divided lights.

Mr. Tissian asked about the number of parking spaces proposed for the development. Mr. Wieand responded there would be three spaces for the thirty-five units.

Mr. Wieand asked for the Commission's position on the historic signage. Mr. Taylor stated that members of the Architectural Committee believed that the building could be cleaned and pointed while retaining the signage. Several Commissioners opined that the signs should be preserved.

MOTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to approve the alteration of the rear gable at 30 N. Front, provided the original roofline is expressed on the north party wall; deny the proposed alteration of the rear gable at 28 N. Front but approve the large rear dormer as shown in the revised plans; approve the decks and HVAC equipment; deny the non-historic windows, but authorize the staff to approve more appropriate non-historic windows; deny the storefronts as submitted but approve the restoration of the storefronts; deny the removal of the historic painted signs; with the staff to review details. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue and excused himself from the meeting.

138 N. FRONT STREET, QUARRY STREET

Owner: 138 Front Street L.P.

Applicant: George Guzzie

History: vacant lot and non-contributing building, wall on Bladen's Court

Project: Demolish non-contributing structure, build townhouses

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provide the metal panels along Bladen's Court are a darker color, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the demolition of a non-contributing structure and construction of a new residential building on that site and an adjacent vacant lot. A similar application was approved in concept by the Commission in January 2006. The approval in concept specifically did not sanction the height of the building or the design facing Bladen's Court. The structure has been completely redesigned since that approval.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Jerry Fiore of CVM Design-Build represented the application.

MOTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal, provided the metal panels along Bladen's Court are a darker color, with the staff to review details. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2229 SPRUCE STREET

Owner/Applicant: George Mortelliti

History: built c. 1840, contributing to Rittenhouse/Fitler Historic District

Project: Legalize sidewalk

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Commission recommended denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

OVERVIEW: This application seeks to legalize the removal of a brick sidewalk from the 23rd Street side of the building. The owner received a letter from his insurance company asking him to patch and repair his sidewalk, where there were some uneven bricks. Instead, he removed the brick walk and installed a concrete walk without a permit or Historical Commission review.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. The applicant was not present.

Ms. Murray asked if the adjacent properties sidewalks were in brick. Mr. Baron responded he did not think they were. Mr. Wilds noted the letter from the insurance company, which requested that the applicant repair, not replace, the sidewalk.

ACTION: Mr. Tissian moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the proposal, pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. James seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

111 SOUTH 15TH STREET (A.K.A. 1428-1432 CHESTNUT STREET)

111 South 15th Street Associates, LP, Owner

David Blumenfeld, Applicant

Project: Install temporary signage

History: Designated 8/2/1973. Built 1922 by Ritter & Shay

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee recommended approval, provided the banners are a canvas-like material and hang for a period not to exceed 12 months, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install temporary signage at the northwest corner of the building. Two 40' by 5' vinyl banners with reinforced nylon hems would be secured into the mortar joints of the building using 3/16" Tapcon Concrete Screw Anchors. One banner would hang from the seventh-story level and span four stories on the Chestnut Street façade. The other would hang from the seventh-story level and span four stories on the 15th Street façade. Upon the removal of the banners, the anchors would be removed and the mortar joints would be patched with color tinted non-shrink grout.

DISCUSSION: Ms. McGinn-Cote presented the application to the Commission. David Blumenfeld represented the application.

MOTION: Mr. James moved to deny the application. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion.

Mr. Tission remarked the Commission had had numerous problems with this particular project; he noted that the applicant had not abided by the Commission's decisions in the past regarding temporary signage. Mr. Wilds joined in agreement on this point and asked Mr. Blumenfeld to elaborate on his definition of "temporary." Mr. Blumenfeld stated that the Metco Development Company wanted the signage for less than one year. Mr. Tission asked about the House of Blues signage that appears in the architectural drawings submitted with the application. Mr. Blumenfeld responded that the Commission has already approved that signage, but it had not yet been installed. Mr. Baron noted that the building is being converted from rentals to condominiums. Several Commissioners asked why the House of Blues signage was included in this application package if it had already been approved. Mr. Baron explained that it was included to provide a context. The Commissioners stated that the approved signage should have been noted on the drawings to avoid confusion. The Commission requested that the staff exercise more care in the preparation of the information packets.

Mr. Blumenfeld stated that he was seeking a temporary approval; he requested an approval for one year. He stated that the proposed signs were almost identical to those hanging on the building across the street. In response to a question from Mr. James, Mr. Blumenfeld stated that the signs will lay flat against the building. Mr. Blumenfeld stated that the developers do not yet have a signed contract with the House of Blues, but expect to begin the project as soon as one is signed.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION: Messrs. James and Wilds withdrew their motion to deny the proposal.

Mr. Huff stated that this address is in the Center City overlay district and therefore the

signage requires the review of the Art Commission.

ACTION: Ms. Murray moved to approve the signage for a period of one year, to 9 June 2007. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 8 to 0. Mr. Sugrue abstained.

1225 WAVERLY STREET

Julia L. Scott and Jason M. Rekulak, Owner

Julia L. Scott, Applicant

History: Designation on 11/28/1961. Building constructed c. 1830

Project: Construct third-floor rear addition

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the application as submitted, but approval of a revised design consisting of a clapboard-faced dormer and double window, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter the roof of the rear ell to provide more interior room in the third-floor bedroom. This alteration would require changing the traditional half gable roof line of the rear ell with a flat roof. The applicant proposes to stucco both sides of the new exterior walls created by altering the roofline. The rear wall of the ell is currently stuccoed. The side of the rear ell, which is visible along Waverly Street, is currently exposed brick.

DISCUSSION: Ms. McGinn-Cote presented the proposal to the Commission. Julia Scott, the owner, stated that she had revised her plan to comply with the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application as submitted, but approve the revised design consisting of a clapboard-faced dormer and double window, with the staff to review details. Ms. Murray second the motion, which passed unanimously.

5001 GRANT AVENUE

Owner: Fairmount Park Commission, City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Letitia Edwards, Glen Foerd Conservation Corporation

History: c. 1850 for Charles Macalester

Project: Legalize addition

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the legalization of the construction of a large addition to Glen Foerd, a mid nineteenth-century mansion on the banks of the Delaware River. The site is owned by the Fairmount Park Commission and managed by the Glen Foerd Conservation Corporation. The Corporation, in turn, has an arrangement with Conroy Catering, which uses the site as a catering hall. Conroy Catering erected the addition with the approval of the Glen Foerd Conservation Corporation, but not the Fairmount Park Commission, the owner of the property. On 10 May 2006, Conroy Catering appeared before the Fairmount Park Commission seeking its belated approval

of the addition. The Commission tabled the request and remanded the matter to a sub-committee. The Park Commission will not consider the matter until its September 2006 meeting.

A temporary, open, canvas tent stood where the new structure now stands. The applicant contends that the caterer replaced one tent with another. However, the new structure is very different from the old tent. The new structure looks permanent. It links to the historic house via an enclosed corridor that runs across the historic porch. Portions of a garden and the lawn were paved and combined with an existing patio to create a platform for the structure. Stone retaining walls were altered. A portion of the structure is solid, not glazed, and houses utility equipment. The structure is electrified and climate-controlled.

The structure stands to the east of the historic mansion, between the house and the Delaware River. It occupies a space that was once garden and lawn. It obscures views of the river from the house and of the house from the river.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the proposal to the Commission. Jack Conroy, the caterer, represented the application.

Mr. Wilds asked about the transmission of sound from the structure. Mr. Conroy stated that there is sound baffling in the ceilings.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance asked the staff to explain why it had recommended denial of the application. Mr. Farnham stated that the staff had based its recommendation on Standards 2 and 9 and the Building Site Guidelines. He contended that the addition of the structure altered the “spatial relationships that characterize [the] property” and disrupted “the historic relationship between the building ... and the landscape.”

Mr. Tissian asked if the Park Commission had approved the structure. Mr. Wilds stated that the Park and Historical Commissions are independent. Mr. Rivera commented that he and Robert Thomas of the Architectural Committee had decided that, although large, the structure is very transparent and therefore acceptable.

ACTION: Mr. Huff moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the legalization as submitted. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 7 to 2. Mr. James and Mr. Sugrue dissented.

2526 S. COLORADO STREET

Janet DiMeo, Owner

Janet DiMeo, Applicant

Project: Replace roof

History: Designation in 11/10/1999 as a contributing property in the Girard Estate Historic District

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reroof this Bungalow/Mission style house with gray asphalt shingles. The roof was originally clad in red tile although currently the roof has gray asphalt shingles. The contractors work order notes repairs to roof deck but no details have been provided

DISCUSSION: Ms. McGinn-Cote presented the proposal to the Commission. The applicant did not attend the meeting.

Mr. James asked if the roof was originally red. Mr. Sugrue replied it was originally red terracotta tile, but was currently gray asphalt-fiberglass shingles. Mr. James noted that the red tiles were lost years ago and asked why the Commission would force the applicant to use a red shingle. Mr. Wilds explained that the Commission always requires that the applicant move in the direction of restoration whether the application proposes a door, windows, a roof, or any exterior work. Ms. Murray inquired about the roof on the neighboring house. Ms. McGinn-Cote responded that the neighboring house was roofed in gray.

FAILED MOTION: Mr. Wilds moved to deny the proposal to reroof with a grey asphalt-fiberglass shingle, but to approve reroofing with an appropriate red asphalt-fiberglass shingle. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which failed with a vote of 4 to 5. Commissioners Merriman, Murray, Huff, James, and Tissian dissented.

MOTION: Mr. James moved to approve the proposal to reroof with a grey asphalt-fiberglass shingle as submitted. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 5 to 4. Commissioners Perri, Rivera, Sugrue, and Wilds dissented.

3428 SANSOM STREET

Judy Wicks, Owner

Arlene Matzkin, Applicant

Project: Construct rear addition

History: Designation on 12/6/1979. Building constructed in 1869-71, attributed to James Cochran, architect

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

OVERVIEW: The current application seeks the final approval for an application that was approved in concept in December 2005.

The proposal entails a two-story addition on the rear of this Second Empire rowhouse. The Moravian Street facades of these houses sit at a lower grade, exposing the basements. The rears of many houses in the row have been altered with terraces and additions at this lower level. Moravian Street is a heavily utilized pedestrian area, with outdoor seating for neighboring restaurants.

This house has an intact rear ell; a glass enclosed stair tower had been added at the rear of the main section. The proposal calls for adding a two-story addition at the basement and first floors. The addition would sit under the bay on the rear ell. The portion that sits in front of the stair tower would have a gate at the street level and a double-casement on the floor above with a pedimented roofline that breaks into the second floor. The section in front of the rear ell would have three fixed-light windows at the basement level and two double-hung windows at the first floor.

The current proposal is consistent with the proposal approved in concept.

DISCUSSION: Ms. McGinn-Cote presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect Arlene Matzkin represented the application.

ACTION: Mr. Tissian moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

PHILADELPHIA MUSEUM OF ART

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Michael Schade, Atkin Olshin Lawson-Bell Architects

History: Designated 6/29/1971; Horace Trumbauer and Borie, Medary & Zantzinger, architects, constructed 1927.

Project: Final approval of parking garage.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee recommended approval.

OVERVIEW: The Commission reviewed and approved in concept an application for this garage on 10 February 2006. The current application seeks final approval.

As previously presented, the application proposes to construct an underground parking garage. The garage would be located on the northwest side of Fairmount hill. Currently this area is landscaped with rocky outcrops along its slope and matured plantings. The garage would be four levels and would be mostly underground. The garage would be entered from the Italian Fountain and Museum Drive; an elevator house would provide access for pedestrians. This elevator house will be completely clad in glass. A terrace is proposed over the northwestern end of the garage and a sculpture garden is proposed for this area. The landscape design would include the reconstruction of the rocky outcrops as well as curtains of trees and shrubbery along the perimeter of the garage, making the garage minimally visible from Kelly Drive and reducing the visibility along the axial view corridor between the Italian fountain and the west façade of the museum. In addition, the existing parking lot between the grounds of the museum and the Azalea Gardens would be eliminated and landscaped.

The current application for final approval shows some minor changes. The garage has been reduced by twelve spaces, all located at the western corner facing the Italian Fountain. The corner of the ventilation shaft facing the central axis between the museum and the fountain has been chamfered and the exterior stair previously shown on this corner has been eliminated. In addition, the façade along this axis is shown heavily planted to further shield the view of the garage from the west. Otherwise, the proposal is largely unchanged.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that although the revisions to the proposal were relatively minor, they made a significant, positive impact on the design. Mr. Gallery also commended the Art Museum for its efforts and suggested that the Commission approve the application.

ACTION: Mr. Huff moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

7048 GERMANTOWN AVENUE

Owner/Applicant: John Capoferri

History: Designated on 1/13/06. C.1850 Italianate expansion of an earlier Greek Revival country villa designed by Thomas U. Walter

Project: Construction of fifteen residential units and restoration of villa and barn.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The member of the Architectural Committee recommended approval, provided the design of the front façade of the unit closest to Germantown Avenue and the design of the front parking area are improved, with the staff to review the restoration details of the house and barn, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct fifteen townhouses on a large parcel facing Germantown Avenue. The townhouses would be clustered towards the southern and western ends of the parcel. They would be placed in a fan shape, which would preserve the main axis between the villa, the barn and the open space behind the barn. The perimeter of the parcel will retain its vegetation and a green buffer between the Acme Supermarket lot and the subject parcel will also be preserved as backyards for the new units. A new curb cut would be created along Germantown Avenue to allow for a one-way traffic flow. This curb cut would require a break in the historic schist stone garden retaining wall. Parking would be created along the southeastern edge of the parcel, between the villa and the barn, diagonally to the barn, and in front of the new townhouses. The parking spaces closest to Germantown Avenue would be shielded from view by vegetation and the parking spaces behind the villa would be paved with open-grid blocks to allow grass to grow.

Two similar townhouse types are proposed; Types A and B. The townhouses will be of contemporary design, three stories in height with roof decks. The main entrance would be recessed with a porch. The ground floor would be accentuated by a garage. The upper floors will have contemporary casement and fixed fenestration. Type A will have a

deck railing in the main façade, while Type B will have the railing facing the rear elevation. The townhouses will be finished in stucco and will have aluminum siding and clad windows.

The application also proposes work to the villa and barn. Most of the proposed work would be a restoration. The applicant proposes to restore the exterior elements of the original Thomas U. Walter Greek Revival villa as well as the Italianate addition. The applicant proposes to demolish a rear addition of unknown date and demolish two wood sheds attached to the house. Selective demolition is also proposed for the barn. A side one-story addition and rear non-historic CMU block addition would be removed. The main façade of the barn, facing the villa will be restored. The rear façade will be treated with contemporary clad windows and a large clad door and window system at the location where the CMU block addition currently exists.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Lawrence McEwan, the architect, and John Capoferri, the developer, represented the application. Mr. McEwan presented the proposal and highlighted the changes that he made since the Architectural Committee meeting.

Mr. James asked about the reuse of the proposed house; Mr. Capoferri replied that it would house two condominium units. Ms. Merriman asked about the proposed use of the barn; Mr. Capoferri replied that it would house a single-family unit.

Mr. Riviera stated that it was a great design. He commended Mr. McEwan and Mr. Capoferri. Mr. Sugrue stated that it is one of the most intelligent designs that the Commission has seen. It is a great mix of contemporary with the old. He added that this type of design would enliven Philadelphia. Mr. Huff suggested that, if the application is approved, the Commission communicate its approval to Licenses and Inspections and Zoning.

Mr. Wilds asked about the sizes and prices of the units. Mr. Capoferri responded that they would be between 2500 and 2700 square feet and would be priced in the low to mid \$400,000-dollar range.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance noted that the applicant incorporated the suggestions of the Architectural Committee. He commended the design. George Lyons of the Chestnut Hill Historical Society applauded Mr. Capoferri for engaging the Historical Society early in the design process. Laura Siena of West Mt. Airy Neighbors congratulated the developer and architect, especially for saving and using the barn. She unconditionally supported the design.

ACTION: Ms. Murray moved to approve the revised design displayed at the 9 June 2006 Commission meeting, with the staff to review the restoration details of the house and barn, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2046 SANSOM STREET

Owner: Feng Xia Ge

Applicant: Sherry Yang

History: c. 1850; designated 2/8/1995, contributing in the Rittenhouse/Fitler district

Project: Second-floor rear addition and front window enlargement.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The member of the Architectural Committee recommended approval of the rear addition and roof deck, approval of enlarging the front display window, provided that the window is divided to be compatible with other ground-floor commercial windows on this block of Sansom Street, with the staff to review details, pursuant Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a second-story addition on an existing one-story rear ell. The addition would measure 13'-6" in width by 8'-6" in height. The second-story rear wall of the main block would be preserved as an interior wall. The addition would be clad in stucco; the entire house is stuccoed currently. The adjacent properties have two story rear ells.

The application also proposes to enlarge a small non-historic window in the front façade at the ground floor. The window is not a historic opening. The applicant proposes to install a 5' by 5' fixed wood frame picture window. The ground floor of the property is used as a commercial space.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission.

Mr. Sugrue asked Sherry Yang, the applicant, if she agreed with the recommendations of the Architectural Committee. She stated that she did.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the rear addition, roof deck, and enlarging of the front display window, provided that the window is divided to be compatible with other ground-floor commercial windows on this block of Sansom Street, with the staff to review details, pursuant Standard 9. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1508 PINE STREET

Owner: 1508 Pine Street Associates

Applicant: Martin J. Rosenblum

History: Lewi's Row, eighteen 4-story brownstone Italianate rowhouses designed by Thomas U. Walter, built in 1849. Individually designated in 09/28/1971; designated as a Significant resource within the Rittenhouse/Fitler Historic District in 02/08/1995.

Project: Rear additions and masonry openings alterations

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The member of the Architectural Committee recommends approval of third-and-fourth floor addition, provided it is finished in stucco and not brick; approval of the roof deck, pursuant Standards 9 and 10; denial of third-floor rear addition, pursuant Standards 2, 5, and 6.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct two rear additions with a roof deck on an outstanding Thomas U. Walter brownstone Italianate rowhouse. The rear of the

property has a two-story addition with a metal bay at the second floor built c. 1910. The original three-story rear ell, as seen on the house next door, was clad in wood clapboard. The subject property still retains its original clapboard at the third floor of the rear ell. Furthermore, the subject property and its adjacent twin are the only two that retain their original configurations at the third floor. All other rear ells have been altered by addition or replacement.

A total of two additions are proposed for this property. The applicant proposes a one-story addition on the two-story portion of the rear ell dating from about 1910. This addition would mimic the scale and design of the original 1849 third floor. Instead of wood clapboard it would be clad in fire-rated "Hardi plank".

The second addition would be located at the rear of the main block. It would be two stories in height and would be clad in brick. This addition would require the infill of a fourth-floor window and relocating two others, all of them on the rear façade of the main block. The addition would also include a wood roof deck that would measure 23' by 15'. The deck would be located on the roof of the rear ell and an existing window would be enlarged into a door for access.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Martin Rosenblum, the architect and co-owner, represented the application. Mr. Rosenblum distributed additional renderings to the Commission.

In response to Mr. Sugrue's question, Mr. Rosenblum stated that he did not agree with the Architectural Committee's recommendation. He asked the Commission to consider approving the rear addition. Mr. Rosenblum displayed photographs of neighboring properties. He disputed the claim that the rear of his property was the only one intact; he claimed that the adjoining twin was more original than his rear ell. Mr. Rosenblum commented on the buildings nearby on Waverly Street; he stated that most of the buildings had been altered with aluminum siding and other non-historic materials. He stated that the buildings, which were designed by Thomas U. Walter, were poorly constructed. He claimed that his front façade is failing and in need of major repair work. He stated that sheer walls had to be erected, resulting in a loss of square footage. Mr. Rosenblum stated that the front façade needs \$120,000 worth of restoration. The additional rent from the added space would allow him to undertake the restoration. Mr. Rosenblum noted that he would like to use Hardi Plank on the rear.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the proposal, with the staff to review details. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2010 PINE STREET

Owner/Applicant: Douglas Mellor

History: Built c. 1865; new façade and major alterations c. 1910; contributing in the Rittenhouse/Fitler Historic District in 2/8/1995

Project: Replace rear windows, demolish roof, install "green roof" and stair enclosure.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The member of the Architectural Committee recommended approval of the retention of the front half of the gable, demolition of the rear half of the gable, and installation the deck, skylight, stair housing, and green roof behind the ridge of the gable.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter the roof on this property. The current roof dates from the mid nineteenth century. It has a gabled front, not visible from the street, and a flat roof on the rear ell. The house underwent major modifications around 1910; a front façade was added at that time that obscures the original roof line. The applicant proposes to replace the entire roof with a flat roof and raise the height of the roof at the rear ell by about a foot. However, no specific details have been provided. Two-thirds of the roof would have a roof deck, which will span the main block and parts of the rear ell. A green roof system is proposed for half of the rear ell. The roof deck would be accessed from an enclosed stair house with an attached trellis. The new roof would have several skylights illuminating the stair well and second-floor baths.

Additionally, the applicant proposes to replace the windows in a side bay and in three non-historic rear façade openings and the French doors at the ground floor

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. No one represented the application.

ACTION: Mr. Rivera moved to accept the Architectural Committee's recommendation to approve the retention of the front half of the gable, demolition of the rear half of the gable, and installation of the deck, skylight, stair housing, and green roof behind the ridge of the gable, with the staff to review details including a revised architectural drawing. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2236 MOUNT VERNON STREET

Owner/Applicant: Joseph A. Pagano

History: Individually designated in 12/05/1974; designated as a 10/11/2000; built c. 1859, contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District.

Project: Rear additions, alterations and deck

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The member of the Architectural Committee recommended approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a one-story addition to a two-story rear ell. Currently the rear ell is stuccoed and has a second-story deck. The new addition would be 13' by 14' and would be finished in stucco. A deck is proposed for the roof of the addition; the deck would cantilever past the plane of the rear façade. The applicant proposes alterations to openings at the ground floor of the rear ell. These changes include converting an existing window into a door and vice versa. Finally, the application proposes to replace the existing rear fence with a masonry wall. However, no details have been provided for this change.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Joseph Pagano, the owner, represented the application.

Mr. Tissian expressed a concern about the deck cantilevering three feet out. Mr. Sugrue noted that, if designed properly, the deck should be secure.

Mr. Pagano stated that he would finish the wall like the neighboring wall, which was

approved by the Commission. Mr. Wilds requested the approval include the stipulation that the new wall would match the neighboring wall.

ACTION: Ms. Murray moved to approve the proposal, provided the wall matches the wall approved by the Historical Commission for 2238 Mt. Vernon Street, with the staff to review details. Mr. James seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

150 VINE STREET

Owner: 2PH Real Estate LLP

Applicant: Peter Monzo

History: Vacant lot at the time of designation

Project: Construct three new townhouses (45-day review and comment)

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The member of the Architectural Committee commented that the parking should be relocated to a secondary façade and the fenestration should be revised

OVERVIEW: This parcel is an undeveloped site and was at the time of designation. This application is presented for review and comment only. The application proposes to construct three new townhouses on an empty parcel located at the corner of Vine and 2nd Streets. The townhouses would be four stories tall and include roof decks. They would be finished in brick and metal cladding. The main facades would face Vine Street. The ground floor of each unit would include two garage doors, a pedestrian door, and large glass block accents. The upper stories would have strong registers of aluminum casement windows and balconies at the fourth floor. The N. 2nd Street elevation would have a strong corner emphasis with a single register of casement windows. The rest of the facade will be accentuated by metal panel siding.

The south facades would have continuous balconies at the second floor, and various fixed and casement windows. The units would have individual backyards.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the project to the Commission.

Mr. Huff remarked that the parking should be consistent with the guidelines of City Planning Commission.

ACTION: Mr. Tissian moved to adopt the comment of the Architectural Committee and suggest that the parking should be relocated to a secondary façade and the fenestration should be revised. Mr. James seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

2428 POPLAR STREET

Applicant/Owner: Robert Moy

Project: Legalize roof-deck on rear ell

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the legalization application, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This proposal seeks to legalize the construction of a deck on the rear ell of this corner property. The deck is extremely large and stands very high above the pitched roof of the rear ell. It is highly visible from the street and constructed in a way that obstructs the rear dormers on the mansard. A door has not yet, but would be cut through the rear mansard, which is clad with slate.

The Roofs Guideline in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards is directly on point. It recommends "designing additions to roofs such as ...decks and terraces ... 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." This deck is highly conspicuous from the street and would damage and obscure character-defining features.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Robert Moy, the applicant and owner, represented the application.

MOTION: Mr. James moved to adopt the Architectural Committee's recommendation and deny the legalization. Mr. Huff seconded the motion.

Mr. Moy claimed his ignorance of the historic designation. He also stated that he was unaware that he needed a building permit for a roof deck. Mr. Moy remarked that the street that runs along his rear ell is a one-way street. His rear ell and deck are not highly visible from the street because drivers are headed away from, not toward, his building. When asked about pedestrians, Mr. Moy replied that people walking toward his building are headed to an undesirable neighborhood to the north. No one ever walks in that direction, he reported. Several Commissioners suggested that Mr. Moy not pursue that argument; they noted that all people and neighborhoods are important to the Commission. Mr. Moy reported that neighboring buildings have decks. Mr. Sugrue replied that Mr. Moy's property is not within a district; therefore, the neighboring buildings may not be designated. He also posited that, if on designated buildings, the other decks may have been constructed prior to the designations.

Mr. Wilds commented that the roof of the rear ell appeared to be pitched, not flat. Mr. Moy responded that it is only slightly pitched. Mr. Wilds opined that the Commission typically approves decks on flat rear ell roofs, but not pitched roofs.

Mr. Moy stated that he had not erected the deck knowing he needed a building permit. He asked the Commission to be merciful and legalize his deck. Mr. Sugrue stated that a licensed contractor would have been aware of and complied with the building permit regulations of the City of Philadelphia. Mr. Sugrue suggested that Mr. Moy might consider legal action against his contractor. Mr. Moy responded that he has not been

able to contact the contractor.

Mr. Reuter asked why this application was considered old business. Mr. Farnham explained that after the Architectural Committee meeting the applicant requested and was granted a one-month continuance to develop his application.

Mr. Moy offered to reduce the size of the deck. He again cited other decks in the area. He stated that the Commission should not concern itself with the appearance of his building because the neighborhood immediately to the north is dilapidated. He asked why the Commission cared about the appearance of his building if people were firing guns at one another one block to the north. Mr. Sugrue advised the applicant that the Commission must apply its standards and rules consistently, regardless of the type of neighborhood. Mr. Wilds again objected to Mr. Moy's reasoning.

Ms. Merriman inquired about the size of the deck; Mr. Moy responded that it is 15' by 20'. Mr. Wilds noted the high visibility from the street. Ms. Merriman agreed that the deck stood too high above the roof and was very visible, but she suggested that the applicant could propose a revised deck. Mr. Sugrue noted a complicating factor; creating a door to access the deck would further damage historic fabric. Mr. Moy explained that he currently accesses the deck through a window, but that the window could not be converted to a door. Mr. Moy stated that he hopes to cut a door in the slate mansard between the windows; three steps would be added on the roof to reach the deck, which stands above the level of the dormer sills. Ms. Merriman asked about the windows. Mr. Moy stated that one was in a bathroom that could not be moved; the other overlooks a stairway landing, but is too high above the landing to be used for a door. He did say that he would work with a window if necessary. Mr. Sugrue noted that the application proposed to not only legalize the deck, but also to approve an unbuilt door in a slate mansard. Mr. Moy stated that he would be willing to compromise for an approval. Ms. Merriman suggested converting a window to a door.

Mr. James and Ms. Merriman both suggested that Mr. Moy prepare a new application to the Commission. Ms. Murray suggested that the applicant consider lowering the deck or covering the open area below it. Mr. Moy agreed with these suggestions. Mr. Sugrue asked the applicant again to work with his contractor and devise a less intrusive railing. Mr. Rivera noted that the deck should be reduced in size. He suggested that a stair up from the rear ell be substituted for the proposed door through the mansard. Other Commissioners opined that an appropriate deck could not be devised for this location.

Mr. Tissian excused himself from the meeting.

ACTION: By a vote of 6 to 2, the Commission endorsed the motion tendered by Messrs. James and Huff to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline. Commissioners Merriman and Murray dissented.

116 KENILWORTH STREET

Owner/Applicant: Josephine Henderson

History: late eighteenth century

Project: Remove and reinstall Perma-brick front

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

OVERVIEW: This house was faced in scored brick-like stucco before designation. The owner claims that water is infiltrating the house because the stucco is failing. She proposes that Garden State Brick Face cover the building with an additional layer of brick-like stucco. The addition of a layer of stucco on this façade will not solve the water problem and will probably exacerbate it. The most likely source of the water infiltration is a faulty roof, gutter, or downspout. Or, perhaps, the stucco facing is trapping of moisture within the facade. The existing stucco should be removed and the brickwork below assessed. Judging from the protruding belt courses, the building probably retains its original eighteenth-century brick façade, which should be exposed if its condition warrants.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham reported to the Commission that the applicant both refused to attend the meeting and to withdraw her application in writing. Mr. Farnham stated that she no longer intended to reface her building with stucco. He suggested that the Commission deny the application rather than let it lapse.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to deny the application. Mr. James seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE HISTORICAL COMMISSION STAFF

Jonathan E. Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director

Mr. Farnham presented the report to the Commission. When asked if they had questions about the report, the Commissioners replied that they had none.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adjourn the meeting at 1:50 p.m. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED

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

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where

the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportions, 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.

Building Site Guidelines: Recommended: Designing new onsite parking ... when required by the new use so that they are as unobtrusive as possible and assure the preservation of the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape; and Recommended: Designing ... adjacent new construction which is compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserves the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape.

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.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan Farnham, Randal Baron, Jorge Danta, Karen Gonski, Erin Coté