

**THE MINUTES OF THE 590TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**14 OCTOBER 2011
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
Duane Bumb, Commerce Department
Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D.
Dominique Hawkins
Susan Jaffe
JoAnn Jones, Office of Housing & Community Development
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President
Joseph Palantino, Department of Public Property
Daniel Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections
David Schaaf, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Robert Thomas, AIA

ALSO PRESENT

Richard Thom, Thomitecture
Mathew Grubel
Janet Milkman
Brian Preski, Bowman Partners, LLP
Rafael Lissack
Hyman Myers, National
Peter Manoogian, Woodland Terrace Homeowners Association
Richard Tyler
Martin Rosenblum, MJR Architect
Kevin York, Temple
Neal Fisher, Hankin Group
Bob Hankin, Hankin Group
Boyden Erik Gabell, Gabell Law
Tony Forte, Saul Ewing
Daryl Carrington, J. Davis Architects
Farek Farid, J. Davis Architects
Esaul Sanchez, University of Pennsylvania
Kevin Rasmussen, Rasmussen/Su Architects
Marianna Thomas
Martin F. Cabry Sr., City Council
Gabe Canuso, D3 Development
Paul Avazier, Atkin Olshin Schade Architects
Sam Olshin, Atkin Olshin Schade Architects
Roy Murray, Old City Civic Association
Judy Murray, Old City Civic Association
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance
Deidre DeArcanis, JKR Partners
David Urffer, JKR Partners
Gibbs Connor
Peter DiCarlo

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Joe Ferry, Crescent Boat Club
H. Todd, Old City Civic Association
D. Tod, Old City Civic Association
Frances R. Byers
Rick Sudall, Nolen Properties
Cindy Hamilton, Heritage Consulting
Jim Nolen, Nolen Properties
Emanuel Kelly
Sarah Moses, Penn Design
Julie Murphy, Penn Design
Michelle Craren, Penn Design
David Hollenberg, Penn Design
Karina Bishop, Penn Design
Alyssa Luzupone, Penn Design
Anna Haslinsky, Penn Design
Sarah Peterson, Penn Design
Omari Baye, Rutgers University
Ellis Mumford, Penn Design

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Commissioners Bumb, Dilworth, Hawkins, Jaffe, Jones, Leonard, Palantino, Quinn, Schaaf, and Thomas joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 589TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Leonard moved to adopt the minutes of the 589th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 9 September 2011. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 SEPTEMBER 2011

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included applications for 1718 Pine Street; 219-29 S 18th Street, Unit 2001; 136 N 03rd Street; 2405 Pine Street; 1112 Locust Street; and 3 Awbury Road. Mr. Sherman asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments. Mr. Sherman asked if the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for 1718 Pine Street; 219-29 S 18th Street, Unit 2001; 136 N 03rd Street; 2405 Pine Street; 1112 Locust Street; and 3 Awbury Road. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 10 to 0. Ms. Jaffe abstained.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 101, 121, 201, 221 W JOHNSON ST

Project: Rehabilitate building, construct rear addition, construct site features, identify location and footprint for later construction of new building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Philadelphia Preservation Group, LP

Applicant: Deidre DeAsanis, JKR Partners, LLC

History: 1895; Nugent Home for Baptists; J. Franklin Stuckert, architect

Individual Designation: 10/8/2004

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of the application including the rehabilitation of the historic building, the height, massing, and connection of the addition, and the site plan with the footprints of the addition and new building, with the understanding that the design of the front parking lot adjacent to the Nugent building and the designs of the facades of the addition including the relationship of the brick and stucco, the window configurations, the plans of the trash rooms, and the roofline would be reconsidered based on the comments provided.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate and construct a rear addition on the former Nugent Home for Retired Baptists at 221 W. Johnson Street, on the boundary of W. Mt. Airy and Germantown in northwest Philadelphia. The historic building would be returned to its original use, housing for seniors. It also proposes site work including driveways, sidewalks, parking lots, and fencing for 101, 121, 201, and 221 W. Johnson Street. Finally, it proposes an approval of the location and footprint, but not the design of a new building to be constructed during a later phase. Except the addition to the Nugent building and revisions to the site plan to accommodate the addition, the Commission approved the project in concept in 2007.

The Commission has a long and complicated history with these properties on the 100 and 200-blocks of W. Johnson Street. The Presser Home for Retired Musicians, a grand Classical Revival style retirement home with carriage house, stands at 101 W. Johnson. The Nugent Home for Baptists, a grand Chateausque style retirement home, stands at 221 W. Johnson. A large open area, once gardens for the homes, separates the two buildings; it is now known by the addresses 121 and 201 W. Johnson Street. Thomas Presser and George Nugent gave their fortunes and estates for the establishments of the retirement homes at the turn-of-the-century. Although separately established, the Presser and Nugent properties have had common ownership since the late twentieth century, when a company unrelated to the current owner operated nursing homes at the two buildings. The nursing homes were closed after they were cited for numerous health and safety violations. The buildings sat vacant for a few years until 2004, when a religious organization signed an agreement to purchase the properties in order to demolish the buildings and construct a mega-church. Fearing that they would lose the historic buildings, a coalition of neighbors, neighborhood groups, and the Preservation Alliance nominated the two properties for designation. After a series of heated, emotional hearings, the Commission designated the properties in late 2004. The religious organization abandoned its plans and the properties, which were in poor condition, sat on the market awaiting a buyer. Eventually, the current applicant, Jim Nolen of Nolen Properties and the Philadelphia Preservation Group, purchased the buildings with the intention of redeveloping them with some new construction as market-rate housing. Since the purchase, Mr. Nolen has worked tirelessly to find a feasible means to adaptively reuse these buildings.

Mr. Nolen has worked for the last six years or so with the Commission to redevelop the properties. The Commission granted conceptual approval for his projects for the combined site in January 2006 and July 2007. In January 2006, the Commission approved a plan to rehabilitate the historic buildings and construct three new residential buildings. In July 2007, the Commission approved a similar scheme in which the three new buildings had been replaced by one larger new building. Before the project commenced, the housing market collapsed, making the approved project financially infeasible. Mr. Nolen struggled to find alternate plans that were feasible. Eventually, he was able to develop a scheme to rehabilitate the Presser building as elderly housing that took advantage of historic preservation tax credits, elderly housing subsidies, and other incentives and grants. The Presser building was recently restored to its former grandeur.

Mr. Nolen has not been so lucky with the Nugent building. He attempted to redevelop it with a scheme similar to the Presser scheme, with tax credits, grants, and other incentives for elderly house, but was unsuccessful owing to the complexity and configuration of the Nugent building, which does not lend itself to easy rehabilitation in the way that the Presser building did. Despite his best efforts, Mr. Nolen was unable to find a financially feasible way to rehabilitate the Nugent building as elderly apartments without constructing an addition. The subsidizing agencies all concluded that the unit cost at Nugent without an addition was too high. Therefore, Mr. Nolen has been compelled to propose a rehabilitation that includes an addition in order to reduce the unit cost.

The current application proposes a similar site plan to that approved in July 2007. However, to accommodate the addition to the Nugent building, the footprint of the new building has been reduced in length. It is important to note that the current application does not propose approval of the new building, but only of its footprint, so that the site work can be undertaken now. The design of new building, which is not slated for construction for many years, would be subject to the Commission's review at a later date.

The addition to the Nugent building would be constructed at the rear of the historic building, away from the public right-of-way. To accommodate the addition, a very small one-story rear addition as well as a rear porch, which were damaged by a fire several years ago, would be removed. A thin glass connector as prescribed by the National Park Service would link the addition to the historic building. The link would connect to the historic building at a register of windows that has already been significantly compromised by the insertion of a fire escape. The addition would be a brick and true stucco masonry building with punched openings of the scale, proportion, and rhythm of those in the historic building. The cladding of the addition would alternate in color and finish to reduce its overall mass. It would have stringcourses that would correspond to the divisions on the historic building. The addition would provide the elevators, egress stairs, and other utilities for the historic building, thereby minimizing changes to the historic interior.

The historic Nugent building has suffered at the hands of the previous owner and also vandals. The previous owner deferred maintenance, leading to significant degradation of the building. Despite the best efforts of Mr. Nolen to secure the site after he took ownership, vandals have repeatedly damaged the building, stealing all copper in and on the building, including the monumental cornice and all plumbing. Vandals also removed two columns from the front porches, causing a section of the roof to collapse. Also, fires and short dumping damaged the building and site. As experience at the Presser building has shown, the best way to secure and protect the building is to occupy it.

The application proposes a significant rehabilitation of the historic building. The windows would be replaced with aluminum windows to match the pane configurations and profiles of the historic windows. Aluminum windows are appropriate in this instance because the windows are all simple one-over-ones with thin frames, rails, and stiles set deeply in masonry openings. The masonry surrounds, which will be retained, ornament the windows. The missing front porch columns would be replaced with fiberglass replicas and the porch restored. The stolen cornice would be replaced with a fiberglass replica. Most of the terra cotta tile roof, which is at the end of its life and has failed, would be replaced with synthetic terra cotta tiles to match. The tiles on the turret would be retained and repaired. Missing and damaged balustrades and other ornamental pieces would be replaced with glass fiber reinforced concrete elements to match the originals. Exterior doors would be replaced to match originals. The masonry would be cleaned and repaired. A recessed porch would be infilled with non-reflective glass panels to create additional interior space.

Mr. Nolen and his architects have worked for years with the National Park Service, Department of Housing & Urban Development, Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission, Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency, Office of Housing & Community Development, and Historical Commission to develop appropriate, feasible reuse schemes for the Presser and Nugent buildings. The Presser building has been completed, but the Nugent building has not, owing to the complexity and configuration of the building. The current proposal may be the last chance for this building, which is threatened by vandals and the elements.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Developers Jim Nolen and Rick Sudall, architects Deidre DeAscanis and David Urffer, preservation consultant Cindy Hamilton, and engineer David Plante represented the application.

Mr. Nolen, the developer, explained that his team has developed numerous schemes to adaptively reuse this property, but none has been successful owing to the complexities and condition of the historic building. He explained that they have submitted several applications to the Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency (PHFA) seeking funding to redevelop this building as senior housing, but none has been deemed feasible. He stated that this proposal is different than the earlier, rejected proposals, in that they are now proposing an addition to reduce the unit cost to a level below PHFA's maximum threshold. He stated that his design team has worked very hard with the community, Historical Commission staff, and Architectural Committee to develop an acceptable scheme. He contended that the addition design is sensitive to the historic building. He noted that the addition would attach at a place where the building has already been altered. He stated that the addition would not require any alterations to the roof of the historic building.

Ms. DeAscanis and Mr. Urffer, the architects, explained the revisions made to the design in response to the Architectural Committee's and interested parties' comments. Ms. DeAscanis explained that the parking lot near the street had been altered to comply with the Committee's requirements. She stated that the footprint of the addition had been revised to reveal the rear window closest to the corner of the historic building, as the Committee recommended. She showed a site plan that indicated the work to be done under the three phases of the project. The first phase has been completed. She pointed out landscaping added to buffer the parking lot closest to the street. Mr. Urffer discussed the revisions to the facades of the addition. He noted that they had revised the roofline, changed the window patterns, adjusted the cornice, and made other amendments to the design of the addition, as the Committee recommended. He asserted that the addition is compatible with the historic building, but is subservient to it. He

showed a drawing of the connection to the historic building, demonstrating that the physical linkage is minimal. He displayed an elevation drawing of the rear of the addition.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the architects had complied with all of the recommendations of the Architectural Committee and she recommended that the Commission grant final approval to the project.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that he had commented on the original design that was reviewed by the Committee, and had offered several suggestions to improve that design. He agreed with Ms. Hawkins that the applicants had embraced the recommendations and significantly improved the project. He stated that his organization supported final approval.

Ms. Jones asked if the units in the new building, not the addition, would be used to reduce the unit cost. She asked if it was possible to reduce the unit cost for PHFA in this manner, given that the new building might not be constructed for years. Mr. Nolen stated that the application to PHFA involved the historic building and addition only. The new building was not involved in the current unit cost calculations.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application presented at the Historical Commission meeting of 14 October 2011, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 400 S 40TH ST

Project: Rehabilitate house, construct seven-story building

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: University of Pennsylvania

Applicant: Jonathan Weiss, Azalea Gardens Partners, LP

History: 1853; John P. Levy House; Colonial Revival alterations and additions for David P. Leas, 1902; additions for convalescent home, 1964, 1975

Individual Designation: 11/1/1973

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of the exterior restoration plan for the historic house and the siting, massing, and style of the new building, provided the front porch and doorway of the historic house are also restored to their 1902 appearances, the height of the parapet is reduced to the minimum, the wing extending toward Pine Street is reduced in length, and the facades of the new building are simplified, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, and 10 and the Commission's approval of December 2008.

OVERVIEW: This application in concept proposes to restore a grand house and to construct a 7-story apartment building adjacent to the house. The house has been significantly altered and encased in non-historic additions. It is vacant and in poor condition. It would be largely restored to its 1902 Italianate-Colonial Revival appearance. The property is individually designated; it is not within a historic district.

The house was constructed in the Italianate style in 1853 for John P. Levy, a partner in the Neafie & Levy Ship & Engine Building Company. It was substantially altered and expanded in the Colonial Revival style in 1902 for David P. Leas, a partner in Leas & McVitty, a leather tannery. From the construction of the house in 1853 until 1907, the lot at 400 S. 40th Street was

much smaller than it is today. A larger house that stood to the south at 402 S. 40th Street was demolished and its lot subdivided in 1907. The northern portion of the 402 S. 40th lot was consolidated into the 400 S. 40th Street property. Eight houses facing Baltimore Avenue were constructed on the remaining land to the south. Therefore, the southern portion of the property at 400 S. 40th Street, where the apartment building would be constructed, was not originally part of the property. When the Italianate-Colonial Revival house was converted into a convalescent home in 1942, it still retained its 1902 appearance. In 1964 and 1975, the house was significantly altered and almost entirely encased in a series of unsympathetic concrete block additions. Although the Historical Commission designated the property on 1 November 1973, it appears that it did not review the 1975 additions and alterations.

In July 2007, a different developer petitioned the Commission to rescind the individual designation of the property so that he could demolish the building and erect a hotel building. The developer claimed that the building was so altered at the time of designation that the Commission, which appeared to be unaware of the alterations, erred when designating it. The Commission denied the rescission request and suggested that the applicant develop a scheme for his hotel project that would allow for the retention and restoration of the historic house. The applicant followed that advice and developed a scheme for a 10-story hotel building with a connector to the restored house. The Commission approved that proposal in December 2008, but the project was not undertaken.

The current in-concept application solicits the Commission's opinions on three aspects of the design:

1. the exterior restoration plan for the historic house,
2. the siting of the new building, and
3. the massing and style of the new building.

The application proposes to remove the unsympathetic concrete block additions dating to 1964 and 1975 and restore the house in most regards to its 1902 appearance. The front porch and doorway, which were lost in 1964, are not slated for restoration. A replica of the historic windows that flanked the central doorway would be installed where the doorway had been. All other exterior aspects of the house would be restored to their 1902 appearances. The interior of the house would be converted to 10 apartments.

A 7-story, L-shaped apartment building would be constructed in the side and rear yards. The new building would be located on approximately the same footprint as the approved 10-story hotel building and also the extant non-historic additions and rear driveway. The building would house 114 residential units and support facilities. The stucco building would include 6-story projecting metal bays and a recessed seventh floor to break up its large mass. The divided-light windows would be set in punched openings. All facades of the building would be fenestrated; the building would not have large blank party walls. The building would be topped by a green roof. The grounds would be landscaped. Parking would be off site.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Architects Sam Olshin and Paul Avazier and developer Jonathan Weiss represented the application.

Mr. Olshin explained that the University of Pennsylvania owns the site and has entered into an agreement with Equinox Development to redevelop it. Mr. Weiss of Equinox addressed the Commission, explaining that they would remove the non-historic additions, restore the house with federal tax credits, and erect a seven-story apartment building on the site. The apartments would be primarily studios and one bedrooms, with a few two bedrooms.

Mr. Olshin noted the differences between the current scheme and the scheme that was approved a few years ago. He explained that that scheme was 11 stories tall; the current scheme is seven. That scheme included a link between the historic building and the new building; this one does not have a connection. Mr. Olshin conceded that some of the neighbors did not like the earlier scheme. He stated that there was general agreement that an 11-story building was not acceptable, but a nine-story building would be. He reported that the earlier project was relocated to another site and the University of Pennsylvania conducted another search for a developer for this site. He noted that the earlier design had been contemporary in style; the current design is more traditional and more in keeping with the neighborhood. The total unit count would be 124, with 10 in the historic house. Mr. Olshin displayed a 1960 plan showing the non-historic additions, which would be removed. Mr. Olshin pointed out that there are currently three curb cuts at the site; two would be removed to allow for maximum landscaping. He stated that the site is 200 feet by 130 feet. He displayed historic photographs, which will aid with the restoration. He stated that they met with the Spruce Hill Neighbors on 13 October 2011. He noted that there are numerous taller, compatible buildings in the neighborhood. He stated that the buildings offer design guidelines for the new building. Mr. Olshin showed elevation drawings of the proposed building. Mr. Olshin showed a plan with an outline of the porch that was demolished in the 1960s. He stated that the current plans do not call for the restoration of the porch. He added, however, that the developer and the University would be willing to reconstruct the missing porch. Mr. Olshin discussed the floor plans of the historic and new buildings. He stated that they would install about 60 bicycle racks. He stated that the bays on the proposed building both add character to the building and allow the apartments to be sized to meet the minimum requirements of the lender. The house would include 10,000 square feet of space; the new building 68,000. He pointed out that the building steps back at the upper floor, creating terraces. The new building would have a green roof. Storm water is handled on site. The house would be restored to its 1902 appearance. He showed a photomontage of the view of the building from Woodland Terrace. He noted that they have met with the Woodland Terrace civic group. He reported that they have appeared before the University's Design Review Committee twice. He showed a series of photographs that had provided inspirations for the design of the new building. He concluded with a rendering of the site with the restoration of the house and the new building. He discussed the color choices, material choices, and other elements. He stated that parking would be provided off site. He finished with a view from the trolley portal on Baltimore Avenue. He stated that the building would be compatible with the neighborhood.

Ms. Jaffe asked about the implications of the earlier approval of the similar project for this site. She asked if the earlier approval bound the Commission in any way. Mr. Farnham replied that the earlier approval did not bind the Commission. He stated that the Commission should apply the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and other review criteria set forth in the ordinance and the Rules & Regulations to this proposal. He contended that, legally, the earlier decision does not limit the Commission in the review of this application. He also reminded the Commission that, practically, it should seek to be consistent.

Mr. Schaaf asked the applicants if they would consider implementing the Committee's recommendation to reduce the length of the wing extending toward Pine Street. He elaborated, asking them how they would reduce the length, if they could. Mr. Olshin replied that the Committee recommended four revisions. He stated that they can accommodate two, the reconstruction of the porch and the minimizing the height of the parapet. He stated that cannot reduce the length of the Pine Street wing or remove the bays on the two facades facing the

house because those modifications would reduce the interior space to a level that would render the project infeasible economically.

Mr. Thomas asked the applicants to elaborate on their reasons for not wanting to reconstruct the historic porch. Mr. Olshin stated that they would reconstruct the porch, but that they had originally proposed not doing so because it would encroach onto the limited green space on the site; building on it has implications for their storm water management. He also noted that there are concerns that the porch could be used in ways that might be deemed nuisances. Mr. Thomas stated that the porch is a character-defining element. He stated that it may be necessary to reconstruct it to obtain the historic tax credits. He suggested that it should be rebuilt.

Ms. Leonard asked if the paint colors for the historic building were open for discussion today. Mr. Farnham replied that a discussion of the colors would best be left for a final review. He explained that the applicants have requested that the Commission opine on three aspects of the design: the exterior restoration plan for the historic house; the siting of the new building; and the massing and style of the new building.

Mr. Thomas asked if the closeness of the rear facades to the property lines impacts the window designs on those facades. Mr. Olshin explained that there are restrictions to the window designs owing to the proximity of the rear facades to the property lines. He explained that they have met with the Board of Building Standards and learned that they will need to include sprinklers at the windows near the property lines. He stated that they would meet the requirements so that they can fully fenestrate those facades. Mr. Olshin displayed elevations drawings of those facades. Mr. Thomas stated that he is concerned that the windows will be small to meet the building code. Mr. Olshin responded that they are seeking the necessary variances to provide large windows on those facades. Mr. Thomas asked him to investigate the matter further.

Ms. Jones asked the applicants if they had considered using brick as a facing material for the new building, given that the historic building is faced with stucco. She also asked them if they had looked at Garden Court Apartments in West Philadelphia, a complex of six-stories, for design cues for a compatible building. Mr. Olshin responded that he had looked at Garden Court Apartments. He contended that, if they clad their new building in brick, it would overwhelm the stucco historic building with the dark and heavy cladding. He added that they had specified brick detailing on the new building to give it character and articulation.

Mr. Sherman opened the discussion to the audience. Peter Manoogian stated that he resides at 509 Woodland Terrace and has lived in the area for about 40 years. He read a resolution of the Woodland Terrace Homeowners Association, dated 11 October 2011, into the record:

Whereas, The University of Pennsylvania through its representatives and developer have proposed the restoration of the mansion at 40th and Pine Streets and the construction of the Azalea Gardens Apartment on the site adjacent to the mansion consisting of a seven story building with 114 units intended to be occupied by graduate and professional students; and

Whereas, The height and scale of the proposed seven story building are not in keeping with the three and four story residential fabric of the neighboring historic buildings and far exceed the acceptable density under current zoning; and

Whereas, The absence of dedicated on-site parking in addition to the proposed curb cut will put a strain on an already difficult parking and traffic situation in the area; and

Whereas, The building of an apartment building on such an expanded scale in the midst of three and four story structures would create a negative precedent for other University City areas; now, therefore,

Be It Resolved by the Woodland Terrace Homeowners Association:

1. The Association opposes the proposal to construct the Azalea Gardens Apartments in its current form for the reasons cited in the preamble of this resolution.
2. The Association requests, if approval of the development is desired, that action on this proposal be deferred so that the Association and other parties may discuss modifications to the proposal to the end that the height and scale of the proposed building be reduced so that the building is more in keeping with the character of neighboring residential buildings.

Mr. Manoogian added that "Standard 9 of the code ... is a relevant concern of the Association."

Richard Tyler stated:

I am Richard Tyler. I live about three blocks of 400 S. 40th Street. At the Architectural Committee meeting of 27 September, I recommended the denial of an approval in concept of the rehabilitation of the somewhat compromised Levy House together with the proposed further development of the site.

To begin today, I should like to request corrections to the minutes of that meeting. Neither I nor anyone else referred to me as "the former director of the Historical Commission." Something not said should not be part of the record. I also did not characterize the proposed building as quote "too immodest" and quote "too large," a word I rarely use. Rather, I said that "like its predecessor, this proposal does not respect the scale of the site, its context, and of zoning." I also thought it "much too complex architecturally, immodest, and 'busy' for the context" The minutes also state that I quote "asserted that the proposed building would cause 'massive damage' to the surrounding neighborhood." Actually I said that if "the economics of the rehabilitation of the Evans [sic] House argue for a seven story building, the applicant must present a hardship case as provided by the preservation ordinance to justify the damage this massive building will inflict on the existing house and the neighboring structures, the surroundings and the streetscape." This is rather different from massive damage to the neighborhood.

I should now like to address the question of Section (7)(k)(4) of the ordinance which mandates that the Commission consider "The compatibility of the proposed work with the character of the historic district or with the character of its site, including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings, and the streetscape...." I realize that the Commission must adhere to the legal advice and opinions of the Law Department. I also realize that the Law Department has advised the Commission that 400 S. 40th Street appears on the Philadelphia Register as an individual listing and is not in a local historic district. The administrative and legislative

history of the Commission and the plain language of the ordinance, however, suggest that this interpretation needs revisiting.

In 1955 – ten years before the creation of the New York City Landmarks Commission and eleven years before the National Historic Preservation Act and the National Register – the City established the Philadelphia Historical Commission. Among the first commissions in the country with a citywide jurisdiction, it could designate only buildings. As the theory and practice of preservation evolved to include districts, the Philadelphia Commission responded by listing every building one by one in a given area such as Society Hill, Spring Garden and in May 1965 4002-18, 4100 and 4101-07 Pine Street, adding 400 S. 40th Street in November 1973 and 400 and 4037 Pine Street in December 1984. This yielded, in effect, districts.

In 1984, the City responded to the many changes in historic preservation and enacted the present ordinance. It authorized the designation of buildings, structures, sites, objects and districts. At Section 7(k) it also provided criteria for the consideration of alterations. And at (k)(4), it applied these criteria to districts. And with the conjunction “or” at (k)(4) in plain English these criteria extend beyond districts to the character of a site including the “effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings, and the streetscape.”

I recommend that you deny this request for an approval in concept.

Thank you.

Ms. Jaffe asked the applicants to respond to Mr. Tyler’s comments. Mr. Olshin asserted that their proposed project would be compatible with the site and its surroundings. He noted that his firm designed the Penn Alexander School for the same neighborhood and, despite concerns from the neighbors, was able to successfully integrate the building into the surrounding streetscape. He contended that this proposed apartment building would meet the criteria cited by Mr. Tyler. He stated that the proposed building is predicated on historic precedents in the neighborhood and is compatible with the neighboring structures, the surroundings, and the streetscape. Mr. Sherman explained to Ms. Jaffe that the Commission approved a very similar proposal for this site that was 10 stories in height. He noted that this proposed building is seven stories in height, three stories shorter than the approved building.

Emanuel Kelly stated that he was appearing as both a Zoning Code Commissioner and as a 30-year resident of Clark Park. Mr. Kelly stated that the Zoning Code Commission has been very concerned with maintaining neighborhood character and is reforming the zoning code to ensure that it will protect and preserve that character. He stated that the “zoning in this case was put on as a protection for the character of the neighborhood.” He asked that the Commissioners “as you move forward in the future not look at zoning separately, but look at it as a part of what is a protection for the character and stability of the neighborhood.” He stated that the block in question is zoned R5A, which stipulates density and open space. He acknowledged that the property is in a National Register historic district, but not in a locally designated historic district. He instructed the Commission to consider the surrounding area when determining whether this project is compatible in the eyes of the preservation ordinance. He stated that the open space and setbacks are important. He stated that the properties to the south of the property in question are locally designated. He asserted that this block is a “de facto district.” He stated that the new building would be compatible if it was five stories tall and in the wing toward Pine Street was removed. He asserted that a five-story building with 80 units would be profitable.

Mr. Farnham apologized to Mr. Tyler for any errors in the summary of his testimony in the Architectural Committee minutes and explained to the Commission that there was a brief gap in the audio recording of the meeting while Mr. Tyler was speaking. He explained that the staff endeavored to summarize the testimony from its notes taken during the meeting. He offered, with the Commission's approval, to revise the minutes of the Architectural Committee meeting by replacing the current summary of Mr. Tyler's testimony with his written testimony, if he would provide it to the staff. The Commission authorized Mr. Farnham to update Mr. Tyler's testimony using his written statement.

Mr. Dilworth noted that Mr. Tyler had contended that the Commission should consider this case as a financial hardship case. He asked the staff to comment on that assertion. Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission typically reviews financial hardship applications when demolition is proposed. He noted, however, that the preservation ordinance does authorize the Commission to consider financial hardship for alteration applications. He explained that the Commission may discount or even disregard the various review criteria set forth in the ordinance when reviewing alteration applications when the property owner proves that complying with the criteria would result in a hardship. He commented that one could submit a financial hardship application for this property contending that the only way to profitably reuse it would be to erect a large building on the site that did not satisfy the various standards. He reported, however, that this property owner has not submitted a financial hardship application and is making no financial hardship claim. He stated that this applicant is merely requesting that the Commission determine whether the proposed alterations satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and other review criteria set forth in the preservation ordinance. The question of financial hardship is irrelevant because the applicant has not asked the Commission to consider it and the Commission should not consider hardship when reaching its conclusion on the application.

Mr. Farnham addressed Mr. Tyler's claim that the Commission must consider the impact of this proposed project on the neighboring structures, the surroundings, and the streetscape. He reminded the Commission that the Law Department had addressed this issue with great precision during the reviews of applications for this property in 2008. He stated that the Law Department interpreted that passage in the ordinance for the Commission and advised that, when reviewing applications for sites that are individually designated and not in a locally designated historic district, the Commission must primarily, almost exclusively, limit its consideration to the impact of the proposed work to historic resources at the individually designated site. He stated that, when reviewing applications for sites outside locally designated historic districts, the words that follow the "or" in Section 14-2007(7)(k)(.4) do not apply, except perhaps in an instance when there is a physical, material, direct impact to an adjacent historic building. Offering an example, he stated that such an instance might arise when the construction of a building on one lot required the removal of part of a cornice of a historic building on an adjacent lot. He concluded that the Law Department has advised that the Commission should not consider the visual impact alterations at an individually designated site might have on other sites, even if those other sites are also designated.

Mr. Dilworth asked the staff to clarify the history of the assemblage of this parcel. He noted that the Architectural Committee minutes indicate that the size has changed over time. Mr. Farnham explained that the house was constructed in the Italianate style in 1853 and then substantially altered and expanded in the Colonial Revival style in 1902, probably by the prominent architectural firm of Keen & Mead. He displayed images from historic maps that showed that, from the construction of the house in 1853 until 1907, the lot at 400 S. 40th Street was much

smaller than it is today. A larger house that stood to the south at 402 S. 40th Street was demolished and its lot subdivided in 1907. The northern portion of the 402 S. 40th lot was consolidated into the 400 S. 40th Street property. Eight houses facing Baltimore Avenue were constructed on the remaining land to the south. Therefore, the southern portion of the property at 400 S. 40th Street, where the apartment building would be constructed, was not originally part of the property. Claims that the southern part of the property was historically a garden are incorrect. Mr. Farnham stated that the point of significance for the property is 1902, when the Colonial Revival alterations and additions were made.

Ms. Leonard asked the architects to display a rendering of the proposal looking from the north to the south across Pine Street, such as the elevation drawing that was provided in the 2008 application. She stated that she was attempting to judge the impact of the new building on the old building. Mr. Olshin explained that they had not yet generated such a drawing. He showed the 2008 drawing mentioned and explained that it was a dead-on elevation of the 11-story version of the project. He stated that no viewer would ever see the view depicted in the drawing because it was an idealized elevation drawing. He pointed out what the 2008 building would look like with the top four stories removed.

Mary Goldman of 4107 Pine Street stated that the 4000 and 4100 blocks of Pine Street are "very beautiful." She recommended that people look at the hotel on Walnut Street, a version of which was proposed for this site. She stated that it is a "monster." She stated that the building proposed for 400 S. 40th Street, even at seven stories, will be a "monster." She said that the Commission must ask itself, "What is enough?" She stated that the historic house "looks like hell." The new complex will "look like hell." She contended that the Fairfax and Garden Court apartment buildings were not valid comparisons. She said: "Mamma gets what mamma wants. And mamma is Penn." She objected to the behavior of students who live in the area. She objected to the shadows that the new building would cast. She suggested that five stories would be acceptable.

Magali Larson stated that she represents the Woodland Terrace Homeowners Association. She stated that others testified in 2008 about the south wall of the proposed building, which would stand near the property line and would loom over the houses on Baltimore Avenue, which are designated as historic. Ms. Larson stated that she is an expert on architecture. She contended that the historic house is "not very good." She claimed that the porch was "added later." Mr. Farnham clarified that the twin houses on Baltimore Avenue to the south of the site in question have not been designated as historic by the Philadelphia Historical Commission.

Mathew Grubel stated that he lives in the neighborhood and works in the preservation field. He contended that the Architectural Committee minutes did not accurately summarize his statement. He stated that his primary point was that the site as a whole, not the house, is significant. He asserted that "maintaining the building setting is critical for the site to continue to have historical value." He claimed that "taking the house out of context has questionable public value." He stated that this neighborhood is an important example of suburban development. He distributed two black-and-white photocopies of photographs showing the context. He provided a history of the development of the neighbor. He stated that the property's significance derives from the character of its setting, scale, and spatial relationships. He stated that the historic context is significant and should be maintained.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance asked the Commission to deny the application. He stated that it is important to note that the Commission rejected the prior application. He reported that the Commission reconsidered the application "one month later with no changes

whatsoever” and then approved it. He claimed that it was an “unprecedented” action. He stated that, even if one limits the review to the individually designated site, one must conclude that the scale and massing of the new building is not compatible with the site. He stated that one must consider the historic building with its site. The new building overwhelms the historic building. He stated that the new building is not compatible with the site. Mr. Gallery reminded the Commission that the applicant has not submitted a financial hardship application. Therefore, the Commission should not take any financial information or claims into account when reaching a decision. Mr. Gallery stated that he agrees with Mr. Tyler regarding the extent of the Commission’s jurisdiction in this case. He suggested that the Commission consider the impact of the proposed project on the neighboring structures, the surroundings, and the streetscape. He claimed that any reasonable interpretation of the ordinance would lead one to that conclusion. Mr. Gallery stated that he has conferred with several attorneys, who generally agree with his interpretation of this section of the ordinance. He asked the Commission to accept the logical interpretation of this part of the ordinance. He concluded, noting that the applicants have also asked the Commission to take the surroundings into account when they pointed to Garden Court and other sites as precedent for this project.

Mr. Farnham commented on Mr. Gallery’s testimony, contended that the anomaly in the Commission’s review of the earlier project was not the approval in December 2008, but the denial in November 2008. He asked the Commission to consider the entire sequence of events, which Mr. Gallery had failed to provide. He reported that the Commission approved the earlier hotel project in concept in November 2007. He stated that the project was submitted for final approval in October 2008. At that time, the Architectural Committee recommended final approval. When the Commission reviewed it in November 2008, it offered several suggestions and then denied the project. The applicants submitted a revised application responding to the Commission’s suggestions, which the Commission approved in December 2008. He observed that Mr. Gallery stated that there were no revisions to design between the November 2008 denial and the December 2008 approval. He corrected that testimony, reporting that there were design changes responding to the Commission’s suggestions. He concluded that the anomaly in the reviews was the November 2008 denial, not the December 2008 approval.

Marianna Thomas stated that she is a property owner and business owner in the neighborhood, “just around the corner.” Ms. Thomas stated that her testimony before the Architectural Committee was not accurately reflected in the Committee’s minutes. She stated that she assumed that the inaccurate summary resulted from the same technological problem that prevented Mr. Tyler’s testimony from being accurately represented. Mr. Farnham stated that he believes that the audio recorder was working when Ms. Thomas testified before the Architectural Committee. Ms. Thomas stated that she believes that the property in question derives its significance from its role in a larger ensemble of houses and their sites, as Mr. Grubel has testified. She disagreed with the Law Department’s interpretation of Section (7)(k)(.4), but nonetheless limited her comments to the impact of the new construction on the individually designated site itself. She noted that the building would be twice the height of the house and overshadow it. She stated that the juxtaposition of scales was “jarring.” She stated that the Commission reversed “its own due process” when it denied and then approved the project. She stated that the current design for the new building is more architecturally in keeping with the site than the previous design. However, “the profusion of bays is busy in ways that are inconsistent with the character of the house, where bays are unique accents to a very formal design.” She claimed that the window openings on the proposed building do not relate to the proportions or rhythms of the windows on the historic house. She stated: “While I realize the preservation advantage of the physical separation of the existing and new buildings - I guess the first sentence of Standard 9 - it is insignificant for the context and views from the street,

which are always something we've been asked to deal with for individually listed projects, even if this one is not relevant to views from the street because the narrow separation will be screened by the buildings and the public won't see that there's a separation at all." Ms. Thomas stated that the owner has never applied to the Commission for an approval to demolish the building. Therefore, the applicant has never submitted a hardship application. She claimed that the proposal to erect a new building on the site with seven times the floor area of the historic building "amounts to a hardship appeal because the owner and developer state that the renovation and reuse of the house are not feasible without the addition." She noted that the applicants may not have made this argument to the Commission, but they have made it to the community. She asserted that the Commission should require a hardship application as a condition to any approval. She stated that the new building would be destructive to the character of the historic house and the neighborhood and would set a dangerous precedent.

Ms. Jones asked Mr. Reuter to comment on the Law Department's interpretation of Section 14-2207(7)(k)(.4) of the ordinance. Mr. Reuter first clarified that formal City Solicitor's Opinions are binding on City agencies, but general advice is not. Mr. Reuter stated that the subsection in question is not well worded. He stated that the confusion arises from the phrase "including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings and the streetscape." Is it a gloss on the district, the site, or both? He stated that the best way to interpret this phrase is to consider the ordinance as a whole and the purposes of the Commission. He contended that, first and foremost, the Commission is charged with preserving historic resources. It is not charged with considering parking or other matters that may fall under the rubric of zoning. Regarding the assertion that the Commission must consider the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings and the streetscape, Mr. Reuter advised the Commission to maintain the distinction between individually designated sites and historic districts. He stated that, if the Commission considers the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings and the streetscape when reviewing applications for individually designated sites, it is conflating the individually designated site and the district. He stated that several people testifying today have made strong arguments for the designation of this area as a historic district, but he cautioned the Commission that it is not a locally designated historic district. He again stated that individual sites and districts are not the same and should not be conflated. Mr. Reuter also noted that, even if the ordinance could be interpreted, as some of the neighbors are suggesting, such an interpretation would not be enforceable. He stated that the owners of individually designated properties were not notified at the time of designation that proposals to alter their properties would be judged within a larger context. He stated that any attempt to base decisions at individually designated sites on effects to surroundings would likely be rejected on constitutional grounds. He advised the Commission to base its decision on whether the proposed alterations are or are not compatible with the historic resources at the site itself. He also noted that the question is, actually, moot. He stated that, if the proposed alterations have an adverse effect on the surrounding streetscape, then they certainly would have an adverse effect on the site in question. He contended that there is no reason to determine the effect on the surroundings, because, for all intents and purposes, one has made that determination when one makes the determination for the site itself. Mr. Reuter explained that none of the criteria set forth in subsection (k) is dispositive. He stated that the Commission should look at all of the criteria and weigh the individual factors appropriately. The Commission may decide that, in this instance, the work to the historic building outweighs the impact of the new building. He informed the Commission that, ultimately, it has the discretion to interpret its ordinance as it sees fit.

Mr. Bumb stated that the staff and the Architectural Committee have both recommended that the restoration of the historic building would be appropriate and that the new building would be

compatible with the site. He stated that he found the arguments for approval in concept compelling. He stated that the questions of color and other details should be reserved for a final review. Ms. Leonard asked Mr. Bumb if he was advocating for reducing the length of the wing that extends out toward Pine Street. Mr. Bumb stated that he was not. Ms. Hawkins reported that the Architectural Committee had advised that the wing should be reduced in length.

ACTION: Mr. Bumb moved to approve in concept application including the exterior restoration plan for the historic house and the siting, massing, and style of the new building, provided the front porch and doorway of the historic house are also restored to their 1902 appearances and the height of the parapet is reduced to the minimum, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, and 10 and the Commission's approval of December 2008. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 6 to 5. Mses. Hawkins, Jaffe, and Jones and Messrs. Dilworth and Thomas dissented.

ADDRESS: 1718 PINE ST

Project: Construct rear addition and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Martin J. Rosenblum

Applicant: Jenniffer Arnoldi, Martin J. Rosenblum & Associates

History: c. 1845

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reconstruct a non-original rear addition with roof deck, and to construct a one-story side yard addition. The rear of the property faces a service alley. Currently, a non-original addition provides access from the fourth-floor of the property to a roof deck on top of the rear ell. The proposed addition would maintain the same configuration and massing as the current addition. The reconstructed roof deck would also retain the same footprint as the existing. The new addition would be finished in smooth stucco and have two paired French doors for access onto the roof deck. The proposed one-story side yard addition would allow access to an apartment without altering the original interiors of this rowhouse. It would also be finished in smooth stucco.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 219-29 S 18TH ST, UNIT 2001

Project: Construct roof terrace

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rittenhouse Regency

Applicant: Deidre DeAsanis, JKR Partners, LLC

History: 1925; Penn Athletic Club, Parc Rittenhouse; Zantzinger, Borie & Medary, architects; alterations, Cronheim & Weger, architects, 1957

Individual Designation: None

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

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to finish a terrace at the penthouse level of Parc Rittenhouse. This penthouse is a non-historic addition, which was constructed recently. The terrace would have a metal railing on top of the parapet wall. The terraces and decks on the non-historic portion of the building below this penthouse all have metal railings on the parapets. The railing is a design feature of the addition and the proposed railing would continue that feature. The terrace would be accented by pergolas supported by columns. The public may notice the pergolas from different vantage points throughout the square, but they will be inconspicuous. Also, the perception of these alterations would be confined to the non-historic portion of the building.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 109-31 N 02ND ST

Project: Demolish sections, construct additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: National East Associates

Applicant: Hyman Myers, Preservation Consultant

History: 1958; National Products Building; Sabatino & Fishman, architects

Individual Designation: 11/8/2002

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

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the retention and rehabilitation of the significant Modern Style orange tile wall of the former National Products building and the construction of a six-story building behind it. The proposed building would be six stories tall, would stand along N. 2nd Street, and would extend south to Arch Street, where a non-contributing loading dock currently stands. This loading dock would be demolished for the new construction. The orange tile wall sits in front of altered late nineteenth-century buildings. These buildings would be removed for the new construction. The Commission determined in the past that the tile wall and not the much altered buildings behind is the significant historic resource at the site.

The Commission has reviewed several applications for the rehabilitation of this site. The Commission approved in-concept applications for similar projects at this site in March 2003, August 2004, and November 2006. In March 2007, the Commission granted final approval of a project that included the complete demolition of the orange tile wall and its faithful

reconstruction, and a new residential and commercial building that would have been six stories on 2nd Street and 10 stories on Arch Street. That approved development would have also included an underground garage and 10 townhouses. The current proposal scales back noticeably from the scheme granted final approval in March 2007.

The current application proposes retention and restoration of the tile wall. Most of the historic tiles would be conserved in situ and a select number would be replaced with exact replicas. The application proposes two minor modifications to the stainless steel storefronts along 2nd Street. First, it proposes to remove one door and insert two doors in the northern storefront; the new storefront elements would maintain the dimensions, profiles and details of the original storefront. The new doors would lead to the lobby and a retail space. Second, it proposes to replace an existing steel two-leaf door with a single door with sidelights. This door also stands along 2nd Street and would lead to a retail space.

The new construction differs significantly from the proposal approved in March 2007. The proposed building is the same height throughout, six-stories, both on 2nd Street and Arch Street. The earlier proposal was six and 10 stories. The currently proposed building is very responsive to the historic architecture surrounding the site, not in style, but in rhythm and articulation. All three facades are articulated with recessed planes where balconies are located. The recessed areas of the wall would differ in cladding material from the plane of the wall. The breaking up of the wall plane responds to the widths of historic buildings surrounding the site. The shifting of the planes of the façade also helps to break up the massing of the building and make it more compatible to the varied streetscape. The proposed materials vary throughout the façade; they include aluminum, corrugated metal panels, and cementitious panels. The Arch Street portion of the building would have a large garage entrance at grade. The ground floor of this facade would be finished in brick.

The proposed development is very similar to the one reviewed and approved by the Commission in March 2007, except for two important distinctions. The current proposal retains the historic tile wall, a significant improvement from a preservation perspective. The current proposal is arguably more sympathetic to the surrounding district in scale, rhythm, height, and massing.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Preservation consultant Hyman Myers, attorney Anthony Forte, architects Daryl Carrington and Farek Farid, and developer Erik Gabell represented the application.

Mr. Forte introduced the redevelopment project team. He stated that the designation of the building stems from the significant orange tile façade along N. 2nd Street. He noted that, in 2007, the Commission approved a more aggressive redevelopment project that would have demolished the historic tile wall and then recreated it with a six-story rooftop addition and the construction of a ten-story extension on Arch Street with underground parking. The project was ultimately not built owing to its complexity, expense, and the conditions of the real estate market. He stated that the owner wishes to save this building and has worked very diligently to redevelop it. He explained that the proposed project is less aggressive, simpler in scale, and would not require excavation of the site. He explained that the assumption was that the tile wall would have to be demolished and rebuilt, but that after much study a way was found to save it. He stated that the current application does not propose to demolish the tile wall, but instead proposes to stabilize it in place. He noted that the current proposal would also have two important preservation aspects, the retention of Flag Pole Park and the donation of the portion of the property known as 128 Elfreth's Alley to the Elfreth's Alley Association. He noted that, in

terms of preservation, the current proposal delivers everything the Historical Commission has sought.

Mr. Forte stated that the new construction presents its own set of challenges. He explained that the redevelopment team sought new construction that is contemporary yet relates to the historic surroundings of the district. He noted that the relationship between the new construction and the orange tile wall is very important. The orange tile wall was an intentional break from the traditional urban setting of Old City. He stated that, in their opinion, the proposed design addresses both the traditional neighborhood and the Modern tile wall quite successfully. Mr. Forte stated that the proposed massing, scale, and rhythms adhere to the Rehabilitation Standards in more successful ways than the previously approved project from 2007. He added that, as a result, the current proposal is arguably much more sympathetic to the historic district than the previously approved project. He stated that the discussion of colors and design details focus too much on aesthetic judgments, which lead to an assortment of opinions, often times contradictory to one another. He stated that they had very thoughtfully incorporated all the comments received throughout the design process to improve the project. He acknowledged that the design could not possibly please all interested parties, and that all the comments received could not be incorporated. He noted that the development team was all present and could answer the Commission's questions.

Mr. Myers stated that the proposed project had preservation at its core and that the entire proposal hinged on the preservation of the historic orange tile wall. He stated that they had discovered hidden damage on the wall, not visible to the pedestrian, which they intended to address and correct. He explained that many tests of the tile restoration system had been executed and that they had been able to successfully recreate the appearance of the glazed surface on the tiles through the manual application of paint. He clarified that, wherever tiles are missing, they would replace the tile with an exact replica in fired ceramic. He added that, fortunately, only a few areas are missing tiles. He stated that, because the current proposal does not involve any major excavation or underpinning, the tile wall can be saved in place. He added that they are also preserving the integrity of the design. He noted that the changes to the storefronts in the tile wall are modest and only involve the replacement of one door and the elimination of a single entrance and its replacement with two separate entrances. He noted that all the historic stainless steel signs would be preserved and reinstalled. He explained that the orange tile wall is two stories tall, but that the redevelopment team consciously decided not to include any occupied space on the second-story portion along N. 2nd Street, which would have necessitated the introduction of windows into the historic tile wall. Mr. Myers explained that the proposed construction is of lower height than the approved project from 2007, but that in this lower building they have managed to provide the necessary density to make the finances of the project work. He explained that various parties had offered sundry opinions about the new construction. He specifically noted that some had asserted that balconies were not part of the architectural vocabulary of Old City. He stated that they had walked around the district and found many examples of balconies, both old and new. He also added that many people had stated that the tile façade was ugly and should be demolished and replaced with something much more compatible to the district. Mr. Myers stated that they found Old City to be a conglomeration of styles and periods, which span from the eighteenth to the twenty-first century. He showed perspective renderings of the proposed new construction within the setting of the block. He noted that the redevelopment team had received comments about the supremacy of brick facades in the district, specifically along Arch Street. He brought the Commissioners' attention to the rendering and explained that Arch Street is a conglomeration of materials. He specifically noted the building at the corner of N. 2nd and Arch Streets, which is brick but painted with oversized signs. He opined that the conglomeration of styles, materials, and uses makes

the district a lively and vibrant urban neighborhood. He reiterated Mr. Forte's comment that it is not possible to satisfy everyone's requests or to incorporate everyone's aesthetic preferences into the new construction.

Mr. Carrington, the architect, stated that the main goals of the design team were to preserve the historic tile wall in its entirety and to make the new construction contextual to its surroundings. He stated that it would be inappropriate to construct a pseudo-historic building on top of the Modern tile wall. He noted that, instead they chose to work on the massing, scale, and articulation, which they based on the context of the site and its surroundings. He explained that the Arch Street lobby will serve as a secondary entrance for residents and will also host the service components of the building. He also explained that they had setback the new construction from Elfreth's Alley so as not to create any adverse effect on the historic streetscape. He added that they also created a setback from the neighbors along Appletree Court. He clarified that the entire height of the new construction is one story lower along N. 2nd Street than the previously approved building. Mr. Carrington noted that the scale of the proposed building is very complementary to the surrounding buildings, and very sensitive to Elfreth's Alley. He noted that the section drawings through Elfreth's Alley, as requested by the Architectural Committee, show that the proposed construction would not be visible from Elfreth's Alley over the two-and-a-half-story or the three-story houses.

Mr. Carrington explained the design for the N. 2nd Street elevation. He noted that the new construction is set back from the historic tile wall and that the new design above the tile wall is articulated by four bays. He clarified that the renderings distributed to the Commissioners had some minor design mistakes. He clarified that the corner balconies would not wrap around the corners of the building, and that a vertical sign on the Second Street elevation would not extend down to the engage the top of the historic façade as shown.

Mr. Carrington noted that the Architectural Committee made very specific recommendations. He stated that they had followed the Committee's guidance and incorporated their comments in the design. He explained the changes that they had made to the design of the new construction as per the Committee's recommendations. He stated that the louvers for the climate control units were changed to fit into the siding and would no longer be design features on the façade. He explained that the windows were regularized throughout the façade. He pointed out that the design for the Arch Street elevation was modified the most because the design team received comments from both the Architectural Committee and Old City Civic Association. He noted that the Old City Civic Association requested that the elevation be more engaging to the pedestrian. He explained that they had modified the ground floor to create smaller garage openings framed by pilasters and accentuated the entrance. He stated that the louvers and windows were altered in the same manner as those on N. 2nd Street. The elevation was redesigned to have fewer balconies and a setback at the top story. He acknowledged that the new design was very challenging, especially owing to the orange tile wall. Mr. Carrington stated that the design team felt confident that they had addressed most of the Committee's concerns and improved the project.

Ms. Hawkins thanked the redevelopment team for their thoughtfulness and for including some of the Committee's recommendations. She noted that two important comments were not incorporated into the revisions; the eighteen-inch setback, which the Committee felt was not sufficient, had not been addressed; and the articulated façade with balconies had not been redesigned to be more planar. Mr. Forte reiterated that they had received many comments related to the new construction throughout the process and that they had tried to incorporate as many as possible. Mr. Carrington stated that the historic orange façade projects beyond the

property line and is built out into the public-right-of-way. He noted that the previously approved design used the top of the tile wall as a parapet for the new construction, but they are not. He clarified that no element of the proposed new construction, including balconies or bays, would protrude beyond the tile wall. He reiterated that the proposed new construction will be set back from the historic wall. He explained that the historic tile wall was not built uniformly and that it has a nine-inch difference in its extension beyond the property line throughout its entire length. He clarified that, at a minimum, they would have an eighteen-inch setback, but that at its maximum it would be over twenty seven inches. He stated that the proposed setback duplicates the setback imposed when the tile wall was constructed. He noted that another comment that was directly addressed was the comment about the proposed color for the new building. He stated that the proposed color is lighter than previously proposed. He pointed out that they had keyed the revised colors to be complementary to the colors found throughout the tile wall. Mr. Forte stated that it would not be appropriate to refer to the bays as “projecting elements” since they do not project beyond the property line; they merely hold the property line and establish the street wall for the new construction. He reiterated that the tile wall was applied to an array of buildings of different ages and with different front facades, which did not all line up. He referred to the historic tile wall as a unifying force that brought all those individual buildings together and asserted that the new construction will act in the same manner. Ms. Hawkins apologized for not being more specific. She stated that she meant to say that Old City was more “planer” and that the proposed design was not. She requested that the applicant discuss how the proposed façade relates to the “planer” environment of Old City. Mr. Myers explained that the original buildings are recessed from the plane of the tile wall and create voids throughout the length of the façade and that the proposed façade of the new construction picks up on that rhythm and respects the historic pattern already established. Ms. Hawkins stated that in Old City there is an array of materials and volumes at the ground floors, owing to the commercial nature of the district, but that the facades above the ground floors are very regular. Mr. Forte pointed out that, currently, the buildings above the historic tile wall are irregular and create a pattern of voids and solids without a distinct pattern. Mr. Thomas concurred with Mr. Forte. He noted that he had walked the site years ago and that, indeed, the original buildings were all very different. He stated the old facades above the tile wall were of various heights and materials and stood in different planes. He explained that the rhythms of voids and solids of the new construction refer to those older rhythms and variations and are quite sensitive to the district. He disagreed with Ms. Hawkins assertion that the wall above the tile façade should be planar. A planar wall would ignore the historic conditions at the site. He stated that the changes made since the Architectural Committee meeting have improved the design and the project overall.

Richard Thom of the Developments Committee of the Old City Civic Association read a letter into the record stating the Association’s position. He explained that his Committee voted unanimously to approve the project. The Committee’s letter pointed out that the proposal is appropriate in “urban design and density with the surrounding district.” Mr. Thom encouraged the Commission to reject the Architectural Committee’s recommendation and to grant final approval to the project. He asserted that there is no valid reason to delay this project, which will be a great improvement to the historic district. He also submitted a letter of support from the Old City District.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Alliance supports the recommendation of the Architectural Committee to approve the application in concept. He acknowledged that the design had been improved since the Committee meeting. He specifically noted that the proposed plan, building height, density, and scale are all appropriately conceived. He stated, however, that the proposal is more in keeping with a conceptual review than a final review. He stated that there are several significant issues that would benefit from further discussion. He

stated that there are two reasons that the redevelopment team does not want to return to the Architectural Committee. First, they object to a “design by Committee” process. Second, they claim to have a time constraint, owing to the financing of the project. Mr. Gallery stated that in his nine plus years of attending Architectural Committee meetings he has come to appreciate the benefits of the Committee process in improving projects and offering solutions to difficult questions. Mr. Gallery stated that he was first presented with this project in mid July and that the redevelopment team could have submitted the proposal to the Historical Commission earlier to allow for an iterative review. He asserted that waiting to the last minute to submit an application for review and then claiming that there was not enough time to return to the Committee is not justifiable. Mr. Gallery stated that some of the outstanding issues that would benefit from further review are related to color, materials, and some design elements of the N. 2nd Street façade. He objected to the use of corrugated metal panels and stated that they are not found in this or other historic districts throughout the city. He noted that this material is not consistent with the Old City Historic District. Mr. Gallery stated that many colors are found throughout the district, but the 100-block of Arch Street is very homogeneous and not many colors are found on it. He submitted a rendering showing Arch Street and the difference it would make on the streetscape if the new building were clad in red brick rather than the proposed metal panels. He stated that the building would be much more compatible to the historic surroundings, yet retain its contemporary design. He noted that the cladding does not necessarily have to be brick, but that the question of the cladding and other questions are worth discussing again with the Architectural Committee.

Douglas Mooney of the Philadelphia Archeological Forum stated that a letter had been submitted to the Commission expressing the Forum’s concerns about the project’s potential for having adverse impacts on archeological resources at the site. He noted that, at the time the letter was submitted, the Forum only had minimal information on the subsurface impact of the project and that after listening to the architect’s presentation he is still unable to estimate the impact. He requested that the redevelopment team address this issue. Mr. Myers stated that the redevelopment team received the Forum’s letter. He noted that he contacted the project engineer and that the engineer informed him that, since the project will have a slab on grade, no major excavation will be necessary. In addition, the existing basements would be filled in. He added that any footings would only go six to seven feet into the ground and would not reach into areas where archeological resources may be located. He noted that the historic tile wall may require some underpinning, but any underpinning would not extend beyond the existing foundations. Mr. Mooney asked if the project would require spread footers or piles. Mr. Myers answered that spread footers would be constructed, but that they would only extend six to seven feet below the slab. Mr. Mooney stated that, if any excavation extends beyond the floor of historic basements, it has the potential to disturb archeological resources, and if those footers are located in areas where no basements exist they would likely have an impact. He noted that this area was settled very early and that there is a high probability for archeological resources. Mr. Mooney also noted that the Committee’s minutes state that some rear garden walls of properties along Elfreth’s Alley may be removed and replaced. He stated that those walls may be original and that archeological resources could be impacted. Mr. Carrington answered that the footings that support the existing walls would be utilized to support the new wall. No earth would be disturbed. Mr. Mooney noted that, since Elfreth’s Alley is a National Historic Landmark, the redevelopment team should contact the National Trust and the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission and inform them of any possible negative impacts to the alley. Mr. Forte stated that the redevelopment team is working very closely with the Elfreth’s Alley Association, which has the greatest vested interest in the protection of this landmark. He added that the project has revolved around the preservation of the tile wall and that eliminating

all major excavation from the project not only preserves potential archeological resources, but also allows for the tile wall to be preserved in place.

Mr. Baron stated that the comments provided by the Architectural Committee have improved the project, but that some of the comments, if implemented, might “dull down” the project. He stated that Old City is very vital and dynamic and that regularizing the windows, for example, creates a somewhat less interesting design. He asserted the Old City Historic District, more than any other district, could accommodate the proposed materials, owing to its industrial and commercial nature. He opined that the project has been very carefully designed and revised. Several Commissioners agreed with Mr. Baron. Mr. Thomas stated that he deemed the project worthy of a final approval.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to approve the revised application presented at the Historical Commission meeting of 14 October 2011, with the staff to review details. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 10 to 1. Ms. Hawkins dissented.

ADDRESS: 140 N CHRIS COLUMBUS BLV

Project: Install doors, windows, canopies, steps, clean masonry

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Philadelphia Live Arts Festival and Philly Fringe

Applicant: Gabe Canuso, D3 Development

History: 1902; High Pressure Fire Service Station

Individual Designation: 4/6/1972

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the aluminum windows and doors, provided they approximate the design, proportions, and details of the historic windows and doors; approval of the masonry restoration; with the staff to review the details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9; denial of the demolition of the chimney and the capping of historic brownstone lintel at the front entrance, pursuant to Standard 5; denial of the signage and canopy, owing to incompleteness.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate the former Fire Pumping Station at the corner of Race Street and Columbus Boulevard. The property would be rehabilitated for the Philadelphia Live Arts / Philly Fringe. The building would house performance and administrative spaces to support the functions of the organization. The exterior of the building would be rehabilitated in two phases. Phase One proposes work to the exterior that would allow the organization to occupy the building. Phase Two, which would be completed at an undefined later date, would finalize the exterior rehabilitation.

Phase One proposes the installation of new aluminum doors and windows in select openings of the façade. The building does not retain any original windows or doors. All openings are currently built-down with brick or glass block. The new windows would replicate the muntin pattern of the original windows. It is not known, however, if they would replicate the exact dimensions, details and materials. Presumably, the original windows were wood. The proposed windows would be aluminum. The application does not include any window details. The proposed doors would not replicate the original doors to the building. The selective installation of new windows and doors proposed under Phase One is as follows: on the north elevation one door with window above would be installed in the third bay from Columbus Boulevard. On the east elevation along Columbus Boulevard, the central door and window would be reopened. A

historic brownstone spandrel is present in this location. The application proposes to cap it with metal. On the west elevation, an emergency egress door would be installed into an enlarged window opening. This would require cutting down the masonry sill of the window opening. The door would open onto new concrete steps. Also, during Phase One, the applicant proposes to demolish a brick chimney. The chimney is located along the south elevation toward the rear. The chimney is proposed to be demolished in order to create space for a hallway.

Phase Two would include the reopening of all other remaining windows and doors, the restoration of missing modillions on the cornice, and the restoration of the exterior masonry. In addition, the application also proposes the installation of a canopy along the north elevation of the building. The canopy details are not finalized and were not included with the application. Banners and signage would be installed on the Columbus Boulevard elevation. The details for those signs were also not included.

The drawings and renderings submitted include a plaza space adjacent to the building. This space would be constructed on what is currently a street. The application does not include any information regarding this plaza.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Developer Gabriel Canuso and architect Antonio Fiol-Silva represented the application.

Mr. Canuso spoke about the proposed use of the building, which would be converted from a fire pumping station to a performing arts venue. He stated that the building is under an agreement of purchase and they are in a due diligence period. He stated that they are seeking approval for the installation of replacement doors and windows, masonry restoration, and the concept of the installation of a canopy over the main entrance. Mr. Canuso stated that the request for the demolition of a chimney had been removed from the application since the Architectural Committee meeting. Mr. Canuso stated that they had listened to the comments of the Committee and agreed that the retention of the chimney was important.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she was approved of the replacement of the windows and door and the masonry restoration. She stated, however, that the Committee had discussed the canopy during its meeting and determined that its conceptual approval was not appropriate without additional revisions. She specifically noted that the Committee had discussed breaking up the canopy into two or three separate canopies that would respect their window and door openings without spanning over the pilasters that differentiate bays. Mr. Silva acknowledged that the meeting with the staff and the Committee was very helpful. He stated that the canopy would be a light steel and glass construction. He explained that the canopy is very important to the program and functionality of the building. He encouraged the Commission to consider the concept of the canopy. Mr. Canuso stated that they would be willing to consider separate canopies. Mr. Silva agreed and explained that the design details could be worked out with the staff and the Committee at a later date. He stated that they are currently seeking a conceptual approval to ensure that they can have a canopy at the main entrance. Ms. Hawkins stated that she would agree to an approval in concept for canopies that would be limited to their respective window and door openings.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve all aspects of the application except the signs and canopy; to approve in concept the canopy, provided it is divided into two canopies, each limited to its respective window opening; and to deny the signage owing to incompleteness; with the staff to review details. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 136 N. 3RD ST

Project: Construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 136 N. 3rd St. L.P.

Applicant: Daniel Bosin

History: c.1845

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

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

Preservation Easement: No

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of a roof deck on this loft building, which has been converted to rental residential use. The deck would be set back more than 16 feet from the front façade. The applicant constructed a mock-up. The staff reviewed it and determined that the deck would be inconspicuous.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 2101 LOCUST ST

Project: Rehabilitate exterior

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: PNC Bank & Madeleine Q. Ewing Trustees

Applicant: Richard Thom, Richard W. Thom. AIA

History: 1889; Anna Neil House; attributed to Wilson Eyre Jr., architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the removal of the “plant shelf,” but approval of the remainder of the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 5, and 6.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the rehabilitation of the house at 2101 Locust Street. It has suffered from deferred maintenance and the coping and other masonry at the gable end have recently failed. The roof and coping would be restored. An interior stair would be removed to gain more interior space. An exterior stair house would be removed from a rear roof. What the applicant calls a “plant shelf” would be removed from the side façade. The staff believes that the so-called “plant shelf” is the base of a lost bay window. The staff contends that the “plant shelf” should be retained and repaired. The application also proposes to replace the windows at the “plant shelf” as well as the basement windows and a stone stoop. Research and a site visit should be undertaken to determine the original designs of the basement windows and stoop.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Architect Richard Thom represented the application.

Mr. Thom distributed supplemental photographic documentation. He noted that the removal of the “plant shelf” is the only contentious matter. He stated that he was originally planning to fight for its removal, but has recently learned, through investigation of the element’s structure, that the “plant shelf” is original to the building. He stated that the windows at the “plant shelf” were

probably double-hung at first, but later changed to casements. He concluded that the “plant shelf” was never the base of a bay window, but it is original. He stated that he concurs with the recommendation of the Architectural Committee.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the removal of the “plant shelf,” but approve the remainder of the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 5, and 6. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2405 PINE ST

Project: Remove rear wall, roof, and dormer, construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Janet Milkman

Applicant: Janet Milkman

History: c. 1835

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the remove of the rear wall, rear roof slope, and rear dormer of this early nineteenth-century house to allow for an addition. The rear of the building is not visible from a public right-of-way.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 4654 HAZEL AVE

Project: Legalize demolition of rear porch

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Maurice Curtis Thomas

Applicant: Lamont Dawkins, DMA Construction

History: 1910; Clarence R. Siegel, builder

Individual Designation: 12/2/1976

District Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the demolition of a rear porch. This property is at the end of a row. It is individually designated and not within a district. The porch is highly visible along the public right-of-way, since this house is the end of the row and is built up to the property line. The demolished porch was original to the construction of the house. The contractor did not acquire a permit for the demolition of this porch. The contractor intends to reconstruct the decking and steps of the porch, but not its roof supported by columns.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Contractor Lamont Dawkins represented the application.

Mr. Dawkins explained that he was hired by the owner to demolish the deck and roof. He stated that he was not aware the building was designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. He explained that he does not dispute the historic significance of the building or the Commission's jurisdiction, but would like to know if the porch needs to be replaced. Mr. Sherman affirmed that, in his opinion, it does need to be replaced. Mr. Dawkins asked if the railings on the front porch also need to be replaced and, if so, in what shape.

Ms. Sell clarified that the application was submitted for the legalization of the demolition of the rear porch only. However, the violation was issued for the work to the rear porch as well as the installation of incorrect balusters on the front porch. She stated that at the time of designation no balusters were present. Mr. Schaaf asked Ms. Sell if there are original balusters in the row that could be replicated. Ms. Sell responded that there are balusters on other porches, which are character-defining features of the houses. Mr. Thomas asserted that, if balusters are removed, the correct balusters must be installed. Mr. Dawkins explained that the owner is required by his insurance company to install a railing on the porch. He explained that he has not been able to find a millworks that can duplicate the required baluster design. He noted that he removed the inappropriate railings when he learned of the historic designation and the requirements. Mr. Sherman asked the staff what level of replication accuracy would be required for approval. Mr. Baron referenced Standard 6 of the Secretary of the Interior Standards, which states that, if a building element is replaced, then it should be replaced with one based on historical evidence. He explained that the baluster at the adjacent building could be replicated. He added that the staff could provide the applicant with contact information of millworks able to reproduce this design. Ms. Hawkins stated that the rear porch should be rebuilt. She also advised the applicant to work with the staff to find a manufacturer for new balusters based on the neighboring balusters.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2 and 6. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1112 LOCUST ST

Project: Construct rear deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Gibbs Connors

Applicant: Gibbs Connors

History: c. 1815

Individual Designation: 11/24/1959

District Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a second-story rear deck on the historic section of this row house. In June 2009, the Commission approved a three-story side addition with a third-story rear deck for the building. The deck would have a metal rail designed to match the third-story deck rail on the side addition. An original window opening would be cut down for a door to access the deck. The door would have an 18-light window with glazing proportions similar to the original window. The alterations would be minimally visible from Quince and Sartain Streets.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 5 BOATHOUSE ROW

Project: Replace windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Joseph Ferry, Crescent Boat Club

History: 1870; Crescent Boat Club; alterations and additions, Charles Balderston, architect, 1890

Individual Designation: 1/5/1984

District Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install vinyl windows on the front façade of the Crescent Boat Club's boathouse. Boathouse Row is a National Historic Landmark. The existing wood windows are deteriorated and in need of replacement. The windows are unique and character-defining features of the Tudor Revival building. The proposed windows would fit within the existing masonry openings, but would not match the historic materials, configurations, or proportions. For example, original wood one-over-one double-hung sash with arch tops would be replaced with vinyl six-over-one double-hung sash with square tops.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Joseph Ferry of the Crescent Boat Club represented the application.

Mr. Ferry explained that the center façade of the boathouse has deteriorated and that the club has begun to reconstruct it. He proposed to replace ten windows with vinyl clad windows, but acknowledged that the Architectural Committee recommended denial. Ms. Hawkins explained that the Commission's staff has reviewed and approved the replacement of wood timbering and stucco. Mr. Ferry disputed the Architectural Committee's suggestion that the windows be restored to their original materials and configurations. He stated that the gable portion was the original boathouse, built in 1867. In 1874, a two-story addition was added. At the time of the Centennial, a tower was built with an open porch that looked out over the river. In 1891, the architect added the top part of the building that included the half-timbering and stucco. By 1912, the porch and tower were enclosed and infilled with windows. He stated that he is not sure how to comply with the Committee's request when the windows are later infill. He explained that they are currently replacing rotted timbers exposed at the open tower porch. He stated that the side of the building has 15-year-old vinyl-clad replacement windows on the second level. He stated that he believes the first-floor windows may be original. He argued that the building is an architectural hodgepodge. He stated that its history as a landmark derives from the boat club activities at the building, not the architectural aspects of the building. He opined that, if the repairs are not made, the club will not be able to support the activities of the boathouse. He noted the 1867 agreement with the Fairmount Park Commission to build and maintain a solid structure. He contended that they have a responsibility to maintain the structure and that these window replacements fulfill that duty. The Commission members contended that the club could install appropriate windows that meet the Standards and fulfill its responsibilities to the City park agency.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 6. Ms. Jaffe seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 822-38 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Remove canopy

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: BFH Commercial Owner

Applicant: Stephan Potts, Stanev Potts Architects

History: 1925; Benjamin Franklin Hotel; Horace Trumbauer, architect

Individual Designation: 1/7/1982

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 5, and 6.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove the glass and metal canopy over the main entrance on the Chestnut Street façade of the Benjamin Franklin Hotel. The applicant contends that the building did not have a canopy originally. The staff contends that a canopy was added by the architect of the original building before its construction was completed.

The building was designed by architect Horace Trumbauer from 1923 to 1924 and completed by 1925. Architectural drawings from 1923 show the main entrance with revolving doors flanked by carved limestone shields and bracket stonework, but without a canopy. A rendering made prior to the completion of construction shows the main entrance flanked by large lanterns. However, two entries in Trumbauer's drawing ledger in August and September 1924 seem to indicate that the main entrance was revised and a canopy or "marquee" [marquee] was added at this location. No original architectural drawings survive to confirm this revision. However, renderings drawn shortly after the completion of construction depict a metal canopy at this location attached at the same locations that are currently utilized. Photographs from 1963 show the original canopy with later, non-historic signage wrapped around the base of the metalwork. In the mid-1980s, the canopy was removed and replaced with a modified version of the original design using modern materials and simplified framing, but some of the original canopy pieces. The application proposes removing this replacement canopy and original attachment hardware and patching the masonry to give the appearance that no canopy existed. Although the extant canopy is a replacement, it appears to adequately replicate the original canopy.

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

The Commissioners reviewed the application and agreed with the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

ACTION: Ms. Jaffe moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 5, and 6. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2411 SPRUCE ST

Project: Replace front façade windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rafael & Carol Lissack

Applicant: Rafael Lissack

History: 1880

Individual Designation: None

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

Preservation Easement: No

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of aluminum commercial windows with a 3-¼ inch “master frame” in the six openings of the front façade Queen Anne Revival rowhouse. The building retains its elaborate bracketed Queen Anne window frames. Because no drawings of the proposed windows have been provided, it is unclear whether the existing frames would be retained or how the 3-¼ inch frames would fit into the openings. Based on material alone, the proposed windows do not meet Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Commission. Attorney Brian Preski represented the application.

Mr. Preski explained that this application was not in response to a violation; it is not an application for legalization. He noted that he had represented this owner in an earlier application for legalization at another property. He stated that this application was a request to install six new windows. Mr. Preski stated that, because of the nature of this application, the applicant did not submit extensive drawings. He stated that Mr. Lissack was prompted to purchase the windows by a tenant’s complaints that the historic windows are drafty and difficult to operate. He stated that Mr. Lissack, a good landlord, purchased six, new, environmentally-superior, cost-effective windows rather than merely make minor repairs. He stated that they had gained experience with the Historical Commission and the Architectural Committee during an earlier application for a different property, where they illegally installed vinyl replacement windows. He acknowledged that they learned from mistake. Mr. Preski stated that these are not vinyl windows; these are aluminum windows. He reported that the windows currently in the building are not the original windows. He also contended that the proposed windows would look like the historic windows from the street, in part because they will be of the same black color, not an aluminum color. He stated that they would not change the color scheme. He stated that they would improve the building for the tenants and the city.

Mr. Preski stated that this property is within the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. He spoke of the nature and character of the 2400 block Spruce Street. Mr. Preski distributed a map of the district. He called out the 2400 block of Spruce Street on the map for the Commissioners. He stated that there are properties on that block that are not included in the district. He then distributed photographs of 2400 block of Spruce Street and table with window information about the 27 properties on the block. Mr. Preski stated that of the 27 properties, 18 of them already have replacement windows. He stated that of those 18, seven have the “dreaded” white vinyl windows. He asked the Commission not to follow the Architectural Committee recommendation, but instead to look at the application as a whole. He added that, because the property is within an historic district, when one considers the nature and character of the block and the proposed project as put forth by Mr. Lissack, the proposal will maintain the property, not changing it from

its current condition. Mr. Preski stated that they are not proposing to do anything that would harm the nature and character of the block because there are already seven houses that have vinyl replacement windows. He asked that the Commission take into account that not every property of the block is in the historic district and that the Lissacks are good landlords who maintain their property. He asked the Commission to grant final approval.

Mr. Thomas thanked Mr. Preski and commended him for his inventive presentation. He stated that the Commission seeks to restore buildings by reviewing within the scope of work proposed by the property owner. He stated that, even if this was the only building on the block without vinyl windows, the Commission would be compelled to ensure that the application satisfies the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He stated that the Commission is very conscious of energy efficiency. He asserted that preservation itself is a green activity. He added that he, executive director Jon Farnham, and chair Sam Sherman have met with the Green Building Council to ensure that we are all aware of green building practices. Mr. Thomas stated that windows are available that meet the Commission's requirements and the owner's energy efficiency requirements. Mr. Preski stated that he understood that such windows are available. He stated that the windows would be expensive; he asserted, however, that he would not "play the financial hardship card" because he thinks it is overplayed before Historical Commission. He stated that they investigated possible windows to determine what was reasonably priced and provided the sought energy efficiency. He stated that the cost of historically appropriate windows is prohibitive. He stated that they considered wood windows. He stated that they proposed windows in keeping with the rest of the 2400 block of Spruce Street. He stated that they did not select wood windows; instead, they decided to select "what is best." He stated that they rejected wood windows as well as the "dreaded" white vinyl replacement windows.

Mr. Thomas provided an example. He stated that his firm worked on the Rittenhouse Plaza, which has 19 stories. He stated that the Commission made exceptions above a certain height because the details were not highly visible from the street and because wind loads placed unusual requirements on the windows. Mr. Thomas thought that, in this instance, there are no extenuating circumstances. The windows are not an unusual shape; they are rectangular one-over-one sash. He stated that, if the correct windows really are cost prohibitive, then the applicant should submit a financial hardship application. He stated that, contrary to Mr. Preski's claim, the Commission reviews very few hardship applications. He stated that the applicant would need to provide the requisite documentation to make an argument for hardship. Mr. Preski suggested that, rather than taking the financial hardship route, the Commission could just approve the windows that are proposed.

Mr. Sherman reminded the Commissioners that these windows had not yet been installed. He observed that the application has been presented as if these windows are the only alternative.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 3 AWBURY RD

Project: Construct garden improvements

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Najjia Mahmoud & Mark Sellers

Applicant: Peter DiCarlo, Levy DiCarlo Partners, LLC

History: 1922; Anna Cope Evans House

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Awbury Arboretum Historic District, Significant, 5/14/2010

Preservation Easement: No

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a schist stone shed with a cedar shingle roof along with a schist garden wall. The shed would be located at the rear of the Anna Cope Evans House in the Awbury Arboretum. The shed and garden wall appear to be compatible with the historic house and the district.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Jones asked the staff to prepare some materials related to banners and other signage to facilitate a conversation about signage at the next Commission meeting. Mr. Farnham stated that the staff would prepare the materials.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance thanked Leonard Reuter, the Commission's attorney who is leaving his job at the City's Law Department, for his years of diligent service. He noted that he has not always agreed with Mr. Reuter, but has always learned from him. The Commissioners likewise thanked Mr. Reuter for his service and resolved to officially express their gratitude for his able representation of the Commission. The staff too thanked Mr. Reuter.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: Ms. Jones moved to adjourn at 12:58 p.m. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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

Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

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

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