

**THE MINUTES OF THE 611TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 12 JULY 2013
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman Jr., Chair
Anuj Gupta, Esq.
Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP
Michael Maenner, Department of Licenses & Inspections
John Mattioni, Esq.
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Joseph Palantino, Department of Public Property
R. David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Robert Thomas, AIA
Betty Turner, M.A.

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Erin Coté, Historic Preservation Planner II
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II

ALSO PRESENT

Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Caroline Boyce, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
David Yeager, Radnor Property Group
Neil Sklaroff, Esq. Ballard Spahr
Michael Ytterberg, BLT Architects
Robert Graves, BLT Architects
Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker Partners
Larry Weintraub, AIA
Charles J. Guinta
Joseph Morrison, Beanlab
Andrew Kamins, Conservatory Group
Ian Cope, Cope Linder Architects
Evan Linnett
Michael Sklaroff, Esq.
Michael Kowlachick, M. Kowlachick Construction
Lorna Katz Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association
Michael Black-Smith
Nick Coce, Esq.

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. Commissioners Gupta, Hawkins, Maenner, Mattioni, Merriman, Palantino, Schaaf, Thomas, and Turner joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 610TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the minutes of the 610th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 14 June 2013. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 JUNE 2013

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Danta introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included four applications: 13-19 S. 38th Street and 3723 and 3725 Chestnut Street, 269 S. Van Pelt Street, 1835 Porter Street and 1632-38 Diamond Street. Mr. Sherman asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. Ms. Hawkins stated that she opposed the proposed tower at 13-19 S. 38th Street and 3723 and 3725 Chestnut Street. She stated that the tower was too tall for the site. She stated that although she was opposed, she would not remove the project from the Consent Agenda to be discussed. 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 13-19 S. 38th Street and 3723 and 3725 Chestnut Street, 269 S. Van Pelt Street, 1835 Porter Street and 1632-38 Diamond Street. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 1. Ms. Hawkins dissented.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 13-19 S 38TH ST AND 3723 AND 3725 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Construct mixed-use tower

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Philadelphia Episcopal Cathedral

Applicant: Robert Graves, BLT Architects

History: 13-19 S. 38th Street: 1855, Church of the Savior; Samuel Sloan, architect; enlarged and altered by Charles M. Burns, architect, 1889; rebuilt after fire by Charles M. Burns, architect, 1902-1906

Individual Designation: 5/7/1981

District Designation: None

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the application, provided the height of the atrium as shown on pages 9 and 26 of the architectural drawings is reduced as discussed during the Committee's review, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes final approval of a project to construct a mixed-use tower and office building on a large site at the northeast corner of 38th and Chestnut Streets, adjacent to the Episcopal Cathedral. The Historical Commission approved the new construction portion of the project in concept in June 2012.

The site is comprised of several parcels. The Episcopal Cathedral is located at 13-19 S. 38th Street. The office building would be constructed at 3717-19 Chestnut Street, which is not designated as historic. The non-historic apartment building standing at 3717-19 Chestnut would be demolished. The tower would be constructed at 3723, 3725, and 3727-29 Chestnut Street.

Two brownstone buildings, which are designated as historic and stand at 3723 and 3725 Chestnut Street, would be demolished. On 8 June 2012, the Historical Commission granted final approval of the demolitions of these buildings as necessary in the public interest. The demolition question has been decided and is not part of the current application. The parcel at 3727-29 Chestnut Street is vacant and is not designated as historic. The parcel at 3721 Chestnut Street is not owned by the Episcopal Cathedral, is not part of this project, and is not designated as historic. An apartment building stands on the 3721 Chestnut parcel.

The tower would house spaces dedicated to the cathedral as well as retail and residential spaces and would include underground parking. The office building would also include underground parking and would provide loading dock facilities for the complex. Both the tower and office building would connect to the cathedral building and provide support facilities for it.

The Historical Commission reviewed an earlier application for this project at its May and June 2012 meetings. At the June 2012 meeting, the Commission granted final approval to the demolitions of the buildings at 3723 and 3725 Chestnut Street. As part of that approval, the developer and Episcopal Cathedral have agreed to implement a plan to restore and maintain the cathedral building. The Commission will have opportunities to review the restoration and maintenance plans in the future. Also at the June 2012 meeting, the Commission approved the construction of the tower and office building in concept.

The current application proposes final approval of an updated design for the complex that was approved in concept in June 2012. The height, massing, volumes, footprint, and overall design are almost identical to those approved in concept. Since the in-concept approval, the design has been developed, especially with regard to the entrance at 38th Street to the cathedral's space in the tower, the connections between the historic cathedral and the new construction, and the location of the office building relative to Chestnut Street.

The design for the intersection of the cathedral building and the tower along 38th Street has been developed since the in-concept approval. Page 9 of the architectural plans depicts the revised design for the entrance at 38th Street to the cathedral's space in the tower.

The design of the glass circulation spine between the tower and the cathedral has also been improved. The structure is now cantilevered out from the tower, relieving the cathedral of any structural obligations for the new construction. The physical attachment of the old and new is dedicated solely to providing a weathertight connection. Also, the roof of the corridor has been pitched away from the cathedral to drain storm water away from the historic building. Additional information about stormwater management has been provided.

The elevation of the office building above the grade of Chestnut Street has been reduced, lowering the office building down toward Chestnut Street. This has two positive impacts. First, it simplifies the connection between the office building, cathedral, and tower, thereby greatly reducing the impact of the connection on the cathedral. The cuts into the side of the cathedral and the change to the roof pitch at the connection have been eliminated, leaving more of the cathedral undisturbed. Second, with the plaza lowered down toward Chestnut Street and the office building extended forward toward Chestnut Street, the office building is better connected visually and physically to the sidewalk, improving the pedestrian experience.

The design of the tower has been developed. Exterior materials, primarily metal panels and glass, have been selected. The design of the lower floors has been revised to give the building more of a base.

The Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia appealed the Historical Commission's approval of the demolitions of the buildings at 3723 and 3725 Chestnut Street to the Board of License & Inspection Review. The Board held hearings in late 2012 and early 2013, but the developer and the Alliance settled matter before the Board reached a decision. The Alliance agreed to drop its appeal and not oppose the project in exchange for more specificity from the developer regarding the proposal to restore and maintain the cathedral building and for a pledge from the Deputy Mayor and the Commission's executive director to propose that the Commission establish an ad hoc committee to review the Rules & Regulations as they relate to necessary in the public interest. That proposal will be formally submitted to the Commission in the near future. The proposals to restore and maintain the cathedral building will be reviewed by the Commission in the future as they are developed and implemented.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 269 S VAN PELT ST

Project: Construct addition and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Melanie Amster

Applicant: Joseph Morrison, Beanlab LLC

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the windows are replaced to match the original pane configurations, and the corners of the mansard are revised to eliminate the historicist detail.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rooftop addition and deck on a two-story carriage house in the Rittenhouse Filter Historic District. The proposed addition would be located towards the front of the building facing Van Pelt Street. The deck would be placed at the rear, away from Van Pelt Street. The addition is designed as a mansard with a centered wide dormer. The mansard would be clad in synthetic roof tiles with copper flashing and wood double-hung windows in the dormer. The sides of the mansard would be finished in stucco. The deck would be accessed by a set of sliding doors at the rear of the addition. The rear of the property has limited visibility and can only be seen obliquely from Manning Street. The Commission has approved several rooftop additions on this block of Van Pelt Street including a mansard addition on a similar carriage house a few doors to the north.

The application also proposes to replace all windows in the carriage house. The front façade windows would be replaced with double-hung wood windows. The windows at the rear of the property would be replaced with wood-clad casements. The windows at the rear are not visible from the public-right-of-way. As proposed, the replacement windows for the front façade would not replicate the original windows. One-over-ones are proposed. The historic windows were four-over-fours in the narrower openings. The center opening at the second floor was a hay door that has been converted to a window. The historic window in the center opening at the second floor of the adjacent, nearly identical carriage house was a six-over-six, which would be an appropriate pane pattern for this window.

The carriage door and entrance door would be replaced with wood doors. Neither opening is original. The carriage door has been squared and widened. The entrance door was originally a

window, but was cut down to a door. The façade was stuccoed. The proposed doors are appropriate for the non-original openings.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 1835 PORTER ST

Project: Remove fence and wall, install parking pad

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Charles Guinta

Applicant: Lawrence Weintraub, Lawrence Weintraub AIA

History: 1907; John T. Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised application including lanterns on the piers, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to create a parking pad for two cars in the rear yard of this corner property at 19th and Porter Streets. The property is located at the northern edge of the Girard Estate Historic District. The rear yard of the property faces Roseberry Street, which has the character of an alley. The few houses facing Roseberry Street are outside the district and are not designated as historic. The yard is currently enclosed on the side along 19th Street with a non-original wood fence in front of the original metal hair-pin fence. A non-historic concrete block wall stands at the rear along Roseberry. The entirety of the rear yard is paved with concrete.

The application proposes to create a curb cut on Roseberry Street and to remove the non-historic cement block wall to create an entrance to a parking pad on the existing concrete at the back half of the rear yard. The application also proposes to remove the concrete paving at the front half of the rear yard and plant grass.

Most of the houses along the north side of 1700 and 1800-blocks of Porter Street in the Girard Estate Historic District have rear-yard parking pads accessed from Roseberry Street. Since the establishment of the historic district, the Commission has approved two applications for the rear parking at these houses. It denied one application proposing parking at the rear, but the parking would have been accessed from 18th Street, not the alley-like Roseberry Street.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 2109-11 WALNUT ST AND 2108-14 SANSOM ST

Project: Demolish non-contributing building, renovate buildings, construct nine townhouses

Review Requested: In Concept

Owner: Andrew Kamins/Conservatory Group USA

Applicant: Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker & Partners

History: 1950

Individual Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept, provided the Walnut Street elevation is revised and the proposed wood panels are changed to a more appropriate material, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the redevelopment of a large parcel at the intersection of Van Pelt and Walnut Streets. The new parcel will consolidate several smaller parcels with varied improvements upon them and different classifications in the inventory of the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District. The consolidated parcel will include 2108, 2110 and 2112-14 Sansom Streets as well as 2109 and 2111 Walnut Streets. Carriage houses stand on the parcels on Sansom Street. The properties at 2108 and 2112-14 are classified as Contributing to the historic district; 2110 is Non-contributing. The parcels on Walnut Street are occupied by a one-story commercial building and a surface parking lot, which are classified as Non-contributing. The application proposes the demolition of the Non-contributing commercial building and the construction of nine townhouses and the rehabilitation of the carriage houses on Sansom Street. No exterior work is proposed for the rehabilitation of the carriage houses.

The proposed townhouses are contemporary in style and would not replicate the historic Second-Empire townhouses that once stood on the site facing Walnut Street. The townhouses would be oriented towards the west and face Van Pelt Street, not Walnut, as the historic townhouses once did. They would be four stories tall and have projecting bays and complex massing. Parking would be accessed from Sansom and located at the rear of the townhouses. The parking would not be visible from the public-right-of-way.

The height of the new construction is appropriate to the district, as is the placement of garages at the rear of the properties. The orientation of the townhouse at the corner of Van Pelt and Walnut Street, however, is incompatible. The proposed development orients all townhouses to the west. This orientation places a secondary or side façade of the southernmost townhouse on Walnut Street, which is unquestionably one of the most important streets in the city. The proposed elevation along Walnut Street is mostly blank and accentuated by a projecting bay and a terrace at the second-floor. The lack of primacy and fenestration of the façade on Walnut and the lack of engagement between the façade and the street is unsympathetic to the district and should be reconsidered.

The proposed cladding materials do not represent the palette of materials typically found in the historic buildings around the site. Instead, the proposed materials are contemporary in nature. The townhouses would be clad in a combination of glass, wood composite siding, fiber cement panels and cast stone veneers. The proposed materials are not inherently inappropriate to the district. However, the use of such diverse materials on the same elevation is not typical of the mostly late nineteenth-century streetscape in the 2100th block of Walnut Street. Most of the buildings around the site are clad in brick, brownstone, and sandstone. There are noted exceptions, such as the two-story limestone-clad commercial building at the northwest intersection of Van Pelt and Walnut Streets and the Mediterranean Revival townhouses on Van Pelt Street, but the majority of the built environment around the site is clad in masonry. The

palette of materials should be restrained and masonry, not wood, should be emphasized to better integrate the new construction into its surroundings and the overall district.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Developer Andrew Kamins and architect Eric Leighton represented the application.

Mr. Danta noted that the applicant submitted revised drawings that address the comments offered by the Architectural Committee. He stated that the revised drawings show more fenestration along Walnut Street and the replacement of the wood cladding along Van Pelt Street with metal panels. Mr. Danta stated that the revised elevations were distributed to all Commissioners at the beginning of the meeting.

Mr. Leighton presented revised renderings that showed the change in materials and the redesigned Walnut Street elevation. Mr. Thomas asked if the ground-floor plan had been revised. Mr. Leighton presented a revised floor plan and explained the changes. Mr. Schaaf asked about the purpose of the room at the rear of the house on the corner of Walnut Street. Mr. Leighton answered that it was labeled as a bonus room. He explained that the corner house is identical to the others, with the exception of the bonus room and the terrace at the second floor. He stated that the plan may change once a buyer has been identified.

Ms. Merriman opined that the redesign of the Walnut Street elevation was not successful. She asked Mr. Leighton to explain the design changes. She specifically asked him to explain why the corner house could not be oriented towards Walnut Street. Mr. Leighton explained that the project is conceived as a Van Pelt address project. He stated that they would like all of the houses to have the same address. He also explained that the flow of the project is important and that, as designed, all houses have front doors on Van Pelt Street with garages at the rear. Ms. Merriman asked if the placement of the corner house was based on symmetry and circulation. Mr. Leighton stated that it was more than circulation; it was also the project identity. He noted that keeping the houses uniform is important to the scale and feel of the development. Ms. Merriman noted that typically residential properties at corners throughout the district have entrances along their long facades. Mr. Thomas concurred and stated that the pattern is not only seen in individually designed houses, but also in speculative row developments. He noted that having a corner house that engages both streets is a benefit to the district. He noted that there is no reason why the house could not have a Van Pelt address and still fully engage Walnut Street, even if the entrance was kept on Van Pelt. Mr. Thomas stated that the proposed floor-to-ceiling windows along Walnut Street are not appropriate. He noted that the future owner would likely want more privacy and request that those windows be blocked or reduced in size. Mr. Thomas noted that the blank bay window, as proposed for Walnut Street, is very common in the side elevation of houses with very narrow side-yards. He explained that the bays are mostly blank for practical reasons owing to the proximity of the two houses, which is not the case along Walnut Street. Mr. Thomas stated that the interior rooms of the house could benefit from more windows in the bay. He also noted that Walnut Street is south-facing which would ensure good light in this corner house. Mr. Thomas strongly encouraged more fenestration in the Walnut Street elevation and noted that the main entrance can remain on Van Pelt Street. He stated that the revised façade is still too blank and needs more refinement. He suggested looking at infill redevelopment-era houses in Society Hill to better understand how a corner house should address both streets successfully.

Mr. Schaaf stated that the solution to the corner house was developed 250 years ago in Society Hill. He explained that corner houses in the Georgian period had the main entrance along their long façade and centered directly below the gable with windows on either side on all floors. He

stated that the solution to the corner house is more fenestration along the long façade. Mr. Thomas stated that the Walnut Street elevation could have two bays instead of punched windows. He reiterated that the south-facing rooms along Walnut Street would benefit tremendously from the light. Mr. Leighton stated that he greatly appreciated the comments. He clarified that they are at a stage of the project that only seeks to receive approval of the concept for the redevelopment. He acknowledged that there is a lot of work to be done and that the design will evolve before they are ready to present the project for final approval. Mr. Thomas explained that the Architectural Committee is advisory to the Commission, and that this is the first time the Commission is seeing the proposal. He reiterated that the Commission does not wish to delay the project, but it is charged with making sure that the new development fits within the context of the district. Mr. Leighton stated that the comments expressed by the Commissioners can all be incorporated into the final presentation. Mr. Kamins explained that they are currently in a due diligence period and only seek conceptual approval. He stated that, primarily, he would like to receive assurance that the proposed demolitions and redevelopment scheme as a whole are acceptable. Mr. Thomas stated that he agreed with the Committee's recommendation for conceptual approval. Mr. Kamins stated that, although Van Pelt Street is emphasized as the main elevation and is intended to establish the sense of place, the Walnut Street elevation is also important. He stated that he agreed with the comments received in regards to improvements to the elevation along Walnut Street. He noted that his intention is to develop that elevation and give it the importance it deserves during the design and development phase of the project as it moves forward.

Caroline Boyce of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Alliance is very excited about this project and commended the applicant on the project. She stated that she was in agreement with all the comments stated earlier. She reiterated that the Walnut Street façade should be redesigned and treated as a primary, not a secondary, elevation.

Mr. Thomas suggested that the bonus room could also be transformed into a commercial space. He encouraged the applicant to consider a mixed-use space. Mr. Leighton stated that they had already considered that option and that a small professional office with an appointment only business may be a good solution for this corner house. Mr. Kamins agreed that it would be a good solution, yet he expressed his hesitation on detracting from the residential character of the development. He reiterated that the development is foremost a residential townhouse development. He pointed out that a mixed-use development is a different business model, which lenders are hesitant to finance. He stated that the issues a mixed-use development would create are disproportionate to the size of the project. Mr. Thomas appreciated the clarifications, but he noted that those issues are beyond the purview of the Commission. He rephrased his earlier comment and stated that a storefront along Walnut Street would be appropriate.

Mr. Schaaf asked if they had considered two houses facing Walnut Street, rather than one house facing Van Pelt Street. Mr. Schaaf noted that Van Pelt and Sansom Streets are small secondary streets and that Walnut is one of the primary streets of the city. He opined that two houses that fully addressed Walnut Street would greatly enhance the project. Mr. Leighton answered that they were approaching the project as a whole, and that two houses on Walnut would fragment the project. He also stated that the houses on Walnut would be much smaller than the proposed Van Pelt Street houses. Mr. Schaaf agreed that the houses would be smaller, but stated that they could be made taller. Mr. Leighton stated that moving forward they could study it and consider it for the final presentation. Mr. Schaaf noted that the current proposal presents a secondary elevation on Walnut Street. He contended that, if the project were to have two smaller houses facing Walnut, they could create a grand gesture on Walnut

Street. Mr. Leighton stated that a single house facing Van Pelt could also create a grand gesture. Mr. Schaaf agreed, but reiterated that he would prefer two houses and a better scale.

Mr. Mattioni stated that the floor plans showed a garage on Sansom Street and he wondered if the garage entrance could be eliminated. Mr. Leighton clarified that the garage opening on Sansom Street exists and that it would remain. He explained that this opening allows for garages to be placed at the rear of the properties, rather than the fronts. He noted that the garage door currently serves a small court where cars are parked.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the applicant still accepted a conceptual review as opposed to a final review. Messrs. Leighton and Kamins answered that they agreed with the change to a conceptual review.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the application in concept, provided that the Walnut Street elevation of the corner house is revised. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1632-38 DIAMOND ST

Project: Install telecommunications equipment

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Epiphany Fellowship

Applicant: Nicholas Cuce, Riley Riper Hollin & Colagreco

History: 1906; Bell Telephone Company; John T. Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: 11/4/1982

District Designation: Diamond Street Historic District, Contributing, 1/29/1986

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install six antennas and associated equipment cabinets on the roof of this building. Four antennas would be mounted behind a stealth concealment wall, which would give the appearance of a brick penthouse. Two antennas would be mounted on the existing stairwell penthouse and would be painted to match. In addition, a backup generator would be located at grade at the southwest corner of the building and surrounded by a board-on-board fence.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 241 AND 243 S 07TH ST

Project: Enlarge and cut new window openings, install windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Evan Linnett

Applicant: Evan Linnett

History: 1963; Stonorov & Haws, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the reconstruction of the pergola and the replacement of the front windows and rear door, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6; denial of the alterations to the side or north façade at 241, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, 9, and 10 and the Window Guidelines.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations to two adjacent townhouses to combine them into one residence. The buildings are located at the southeast corner of S. 7th Street and S. Washington Square. The front facades face S. 7th Street and the north or side façade of 241 faces the square. The buildings are part of a complex that includes rows of townhouses on S. 7th and Spruce Streets and the Hopkinson House tower on S. Washington Square. The complex was designed by the architectural firm of Stonorov & Haws and constructed in the early 1960s. With the exception of Louis I. Kahn, Oscar Stonorov was arguably the most prominent Modernist architect working in Philadelphia at the time. The complex was an important component of the Washington Square East or Society Hill redevelopment plan and the site's reuse was overseen by the Redevelopment Authority, which assembled the parcel and conveyed it to the developer with restrictions. The townhouses ring the tower at the south and west and provide a transition from the overtly Modernist tower to the surrounding low-scale eighteenth and nineteenth-century neighborhood. To effect this transition, the facades of the townhouses have two personalities. The rears, which face Hopkinson House and its Modernist courtyard, are Modern in style. The front facades, which face older historic buildings, are traditional in style. The exposed side facades of the townhouses, of which there are three, were originally unfenestrated brick. The townhouses are classified as Contributing to the Society Hill Historic District.

The Modernist rears of the properties are visible from S. Washington Square. The rears of 241 and 243 S. 7th are essentially in their original conditions, except that the undivided, plate-glass, Modernist windows and doors in 241 were replaced with inappropriate small-paned Neo-Colonial windows and doors before designation.

The majority of the work proposed in this application would occur at the north or side façade, which faces Washington Square. Originally, the façade was unfenestrated brick. In 1971, two windows were cut into the façade, a small, single-light window at the first-floor east and a tall, narrow, projecting, prism window at the second and third-floor west. The two other exposed side façades in the complex, at 255 S. 7th Street and 637 Spruce Street, remain unaltered. This application proposes to remove both windows and significantly enlarge both openings, cut new openings, and install multi-light windows and doors, some with transoms and guard rails. With its extensive removal of brick and its replacement with glazing, the historic character of the side wall would be significantly diminished with the implementation of this proposal. Therefore, it fails to satisfy the Standards and Guidelines.

The application package includes copies of Stonorov's architectural drawings for a design for these townhouses that was not implemented. Reconstruction Standard 6 clearly states that

“Designs that were not executed historically will not be constructed.” Stonorov’s unimplemented drawings shed no light on this review. The application package also includes images of large windows on buildings in the area surrounding these properties. Again, the Rehabilitation Standard 3 clearly prohibits drawing elements from unrelated buildings: “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.” (italics added) The fact that nearby buildings have large windows has no bearing on this review.

The application proposes additional work to the exterior. It proposes to replace in kind the windows in the front facades; a rear door and transom; and the original pergola at the rear. No details are provided. The staff should review the details of these replacements to verify that they are, in fact, in kind.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Commission. Property owner Evan Linnett, attorney Michael Sklaroff, and architect Ian Cope represented the application.

Mr. Sklaroff distributed a package of materials illustrating modifications to the proposal. Mr. Sklaroff stated that these properties were classified as Contributing when the Society Hill Historic District was created in 1999. He noted that the buildings were not designated individually. He stated that they are Contributing because of their scale. He noted that the windows on the east side are Modernist to honor the iconic Hopkinson House tower by Stonorov and the windows on the west are Neo-Colonial to honor the surrounding, older, small-scale, residential buildings. He observed that 241 S. 7th Street was classified as Contributing even with the current, non-original windows on the north wall. He opined that the existing windows do not contribute anything to Washington Square. He pointed out that the Modernist windows at rear of 241 S. 7th Street have been altered to multi-light windows.

Mr. Cope stated that they propose to have all the the living space in the house orientated towards the Square. Mr. Cope indicated the floor levels in the drawings. He stated that it is important to understand that this is an early split-level house. He stated that they are trying to work with three different elevations and many floor levels. He stated that the front room on the north elevation is a double-height room and is the reason for the proposed double-height windows. He said that this window addresses and enlivens the Square, certainly more than the current prismatic window.

Mr. Sklaroff stated that there is no obligation to restore the rear of 241; however, they are making it part of their proposal to make this consistent with the historic windows in the row and to improve the façade that faces Hopkinson House. He pointed out that two of the proposed windows on the north façade would have Juliet balconies like the ones found on the rears in this row.

Mr. Sklaroff stated that one of the the four Architectural Committee members, Suzanne Pentz, would have voted to recommend approval of the proposal as presented to the Committee, with out the current modifications. He stated that the other three members felt that the north face could have additional windows. He stated that the standard used for a building that is not Significant to the district, but merely Contributing, is to determine whether the proposal would destroy that which makes it Contributing. He stated that the scale and the windows on the east and west sides make this building Contributing and those things will not change. He stated that it will continue to contribute after it is altered. He contended the altered building will be more respectful of the Square than is the current building. He stated that the Commission has the

discretion to approve this application. He asked the Commission to use its discretion and approve the proposal with the staff to review the details. He stated that the Juliet balconies are preferred.

Mr. Thomas stated that, in the earlier review for the 2108-14 Sansom Street and 2109-11 Walnut Street, a large part of the discussion focused on the end wall of a row. He noted that the end wall of that proposed complex would face Walnut Street. He stated the Commission encouraged the applicant to add more windows to the blank wall to address Walnut Street. Mr. Thomas stated the he often rides his bicycle through Washington Square and has wondered why this wall did not have windows originally, especially since it faces the Square. He concurred with Mr. Sklaroff that the scale is important in this case. He stated that the neighborhood has changed since these homes were constructed and now it is appropriate to have windows facing and respecting the Square. He stated that is also important to remind people that this was a blank wall. Mr. Thomas observed that the brick will be penetrated, but the overall field of brick will remain as a reminder. Ms. Merriman concurred. Mr. Maenner also agreed. He stated that the windows will reflect the Square, which will be great for the streetscape.

Mr. Hawkins stated that she did not attend the Architectural Committee meeting, but she attended the one before at which a similar proposal by the applicant was reviewed. She stated that all the members at that meeting agreed that there should be windows in this façade; however, they should address the transition between the Neo-Colonial front and the Modernist rear as well as the vocabulary used for side walls of row houses that front on streets in Philadelphia. She stated that this design does not have the punched fenestration pattern that one sees on side walls. She opined that this large extravagant vertical shaft of glass belongs in a suburban McMansion. She stated that it does not belong here.

Mr. Sherman asked why the French doors do not have divided lights. Mr. Cope replied that they thought it best not to have divided-light doors adjacent to the Modernist rear and the Hopkinson House. Mr. Sherman observed that they had to work with varying floor levels, which can make it complicated. Mr. Cope agreed and stated that the varying floor levels exist to allow for parking underneath.

Lorna Katz-Lawson of the Zoning and Historical Preservation Committee for the Society Hill Civic Association stated that the committee generally agreed that it was not opposed to the idea of increasing the amount of fenestration on the north facing façade, but found the proposed design unacceptable because the proportion of openings to solid wall is too great, thus preventing the subtle role the wall plays in transitioning from the more Modernist rear and Hopkinson House to the eighteenth and nineteenth-century houses of the Society Hill District at the front. She stated that the scale and style of the openings are out of character with openings on either of the other facades of the building.

Caroline Boyce of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated the the Alliance supports the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. She stated that the current windows are an intrusion on the design and the new windows as proposed will also be an intrusion.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to approve the application with the window design as shown in Drawing G submitted to the Historical Commission on 12 July 2013, with the staff to review details. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 2. Ms. Hawkins and Mr. Schaaf dissented.

OLD BUSINESS

5340 GREENE STREET

Flavell Family House

Owner: Charles W. & Carol M. Schramek

Nominator: Staff of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Lavery moved to recommend that the property at 5340 Greene Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E and should be designated as historic and listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Klein seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Flavell Family House at 5340 Greene Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E. The Flavell Family House designed in the Queen Anne Style by renowned Philadelphia architect George T. Pearson and was constructed between 1887 and 1889. It is an extremely important, well-preserved example of Pearson's unique and exuberant interpretation of the Queen Anne Style. The property is located in the National Register-eligible Penn-Knox/Wister Historic District, which was determined eligible in 1992.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented an overview of the nomination and the Committee on Historic Designation recommendation to the Commission.

Ms. Cote explained that the review of this nomination was continued from the June 2013 meeting of the Historical Commission at the request of the property owner. She stated that the owner sent a letter and an email, copies of which were distributed to the Commissioners. Ms. Cote stated that the owner did reply to her email answering a series of questions.

Mr. Mattioni stated that the letter from the owner expresses opposition to the designation. He stated that he has reservations when the owner is opposed to designation. He stated that he finds it difficult to justify overriding that opposition. Messrs. Gupta and Maenner concurred.

Caroline Boyce of the Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia stated that they support the nomination. She stated that the property clearly meets the Criteria for Designation. She stated that Historic Preservation Ordinance and the Commission's Rules & Regulations do not require owner consent. She stated that the courts have long upheld local designation for public interest. She stated that she was concerned that moving away from ordinance would potentially undermine the authority of the Historical Commission.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to determine that the property at 5340 Greene Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and E and to designate it as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which motion passed by a vote of 7 to 3. Messrs. Mattioni, Maenner, and Gupta dissented.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 10:20 a.m., Ms. Turner moved to adjourn. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

Standard 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.

Window Guidelines: Not Recommended: Changing the number, location, size or glazing pattern of windows, through cutting new openings, blocking-in windows, and installing replacement sash that do not fit the historic window opening.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.