

**THE MINUTES OF THE 584TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**8 APRIL 2011
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman
Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D.
Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP
Susan O.W. Jaffe
JoAnn Jones, Office of Housing & Community Development
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President
John Mattioni, Esq.
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Joseph Palatino, Department of Public Property
Daniel Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections
David Schaaf, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Robert Thomas, AIA
Miles Wilson

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II

ALSO PRESENT

Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Matthew Wolfe, Gensler Architects
Ron Sheldon, Kimpton Hotels
Robert Koochagian, O'Donnell & Naccarato, Inc.
Monsignor Arthur Rodgers, Rector Primus, Cathedral of Sts. Peter & Paul
Lee Quillen Society Hill Civic Association
Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Architects
Theresa Pearce Shepherd, Shepherd Restoration
John Christinzio, Quest Design Services
William Menke, Menke & Menke LLC, Landscape Architects & Planners
Paul Steinke, Reading Terminal Market
Tony Bracali, Friday Architects
Steve Balin, AMC Delancey
Scott Donahue
Jerry Roller, JKR Partners
Da'Ron Ravnell, Unique Metal Concepts, LLC

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Commissioners Dilworth, Hawkins, Jaffe, Jones, Leonard, Mattioni, Merriman, Palatino, Quinn, Schaaf, and Wilson joined him. Mr. Thomas joined the meeting during the 1126-36 Arch Street review.

MINUTES OF THE 583RD STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the minutes of the 583rd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 11 March 2011. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 MARCH 2011

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the applications for 209-25 N. 18th Street, 2105 Spruce Street, 35 S. 02nd Street, 121 Beck Street, 541 Pine Street, 417 S. 08th Street, and 4700 States Drive. Mr. Sherman asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. Ms. Jones requested moving the application for 4700 States Drive from the Consent Agenda to the Agenda to allow for further discussion. 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 209-25 N. 18th Street, 2105 Spruce Street, 35 S. 02nd Street, 121 Beck Street, 541 Pine Street, and 417 S. 08th Street. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 433-41 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Alter and replace storefronts, install canopy and signage

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: KHP II Chestnut, LLC

Applicant: Jack Paruta, Gensler & Associates

History: 1907, James H. & John T. Windrim, architects, Lafayette Building

Individual Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the illuminated pediment sign and the awnings, but approval of all other aspects of the application, with the staff to review the details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a combination of restoration and alterations to ground-floor windows and doors and the installation of a canopy, awnings, and signage. The building is being renovated as a hotel. The Commission has reviewed and approved other applications for other aspects of this renovation.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Matthew Wolfe and hotel developer Ron Sheldon represented the application.

Mr. Wolfe introduced to the Commission the project using a Powerpoint presentation. He described the property and extant historic building. He discussed the restoration of the exterior masonry. He provided a brief overview of the interior plans, which are outside the Commission's jurisdiction. He presented information about revisions made in response to the Architectural Committee's comments. He noted that height of the banner signs proposed for the north and west facades had been reduced since the Architectural Committee meeting. He also presented photographs of other buildings of similar style and age as the Lafayette Building in Philadelphia that have awnings in their ground-floor bays.

Ms. Merriman stated that the proposed awnings are respectful, transparent, and high enough so as not to block views of any character-defining elements of the windows. She asked about the need for the Ranstead Street banner. Mr. Wolfe answered that the banner would identify the building from Market Street and for traffic travelling south on 6th Street. Ms. Merriman asked about the use of the rear entrance. Mr. Wolfe explained that the rear entrance would be a secondary entrance and that it would be internally connected to the main lobby on the Chestnut Street side of the building. Ms. Merriman stated that the Ranstead Street banner does not seem necessary. Mr. Wolfe noted that the banner was proposed, not just for vehicular traffic, but also to give the building street a presence from Independence Mall.

Ms. Hawkins noted a concern expressed by the Architectural Committee regarding the illumination of the banners. She asked if those details had been developed further since the Architectural Committee meeting. Mr. Wolfe said that the details had not been finalized. He noted that he intended to up-light the banners.

Ms. Hawkins expressed her concern regarding the pediment sign on 5th Street. She referred to the proposed sign as a "light beacon" and claimed that it would be illegible from the street. She asked about the height of the letters on the sign. Mr. Wolfe stated that the letters would be approximately 22 to 24 inches tall. She stated that the Committee found the awnings objectionable and described them as "gratuitous signage" without functionality. She noted that the restaurant space has large plate glass windows, which is more than most restaurants in Philadelphia have. Ms. Merriman stated that she understood Ms. Merriman's opinion, but did not think that awnings at this location were unprecedented, especially after seeing the photographs of similar buildings presented by the architect. Ms. Merriman reiterated her support for the awnings.

Mr. Schaaf thanked the applicant for a first rate project. He described it as a fabulous project. He noted that the Kimpton at 17th and Sansom did not have large banners. He suggested that the banners be installed temporarily. He stated that the large banners troubled him in terms of their relationship to the building. Mr. Schaaf described them as a "first-prize" ribbon at the county fair.

Mr. Mattioni stated that he had watched the Lafayette Building deteriorate through the years and thought that the proposed rehabilitation as a wonderful project. He expressed his endorsement of the banners, owing to the overwhelming benefit of the project overall.

Ms. Jones asked if any other buildings along the perimeter of Independence National Mall had canopies or banners and, if so, what if any actions the Historical Commission had taken in those cases. Mr. Farnham answered that not all the buildings around the perimeter are designated. He noted two that are, the Bourse and the Public Ledger buildings. He explained that the Commission had approved banners at the Public Ledger building for the Center City District and for Lights of Liberty, although not in locations such as those proposed in this case. He noted

that signage had also been approved for the Bourse Building, but not a banner as far as he could recall. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Bourse Building currently had very similar awnings to the ones proposed for the Lafayette Building. Mr. Farnham explained that buildings of this type and age historically were “riots” of awnings. He stated that awnings were very common on office buildings before the advent of air conditioning. He concluded that there is very strong historical precedent for awnings on buildings of this type and age.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance addressed the Commission. He described the awnings as inappropriate. He stated that the Committee had carefully looked at the proposed awnings and concluded that they were inappropriate. He stated that he strongly supports that position. He noted that he was aware of the examples presented by the architect to defend the awnings. He explained, however, that those buildings had smaller openings and did not have architectural details that were being covered by the awnings. He further stated that, in all of the examples presented, the awnings were present in every bay. He opposed the differentiation of a few bays from the rest of the façade. He stated that this was completely inconsistent with previous approvals by the Commission. He stated that the Commission had set a precedent by denying awnings at the former Benjamin Franklin Hotel. He noted that that building was very similar to the Lafayette Building with consistent bays. He explained that, in that case, the program had been the same as currently proposed; the installation of a few awnings to differentiate a restaurant from the rest of the building. He stated that the public expected the Commission to be consistent.

Mr. Gallery stated that the proposed banners are inappropriate. He noted that there were no signs on any building facing Independence Hall. He stated that this would be a very precedent setting decision if they were to be approved by the Commission. He agreed with the Independence National Historic Park’s position that the banners are inappropriate and damaging to the character of the mall. He expressed his strong support of the Architectural Committee’s recommendation.

Mr. Farnham pointed out that the Commission did not deny the awnings proposed for the Benjamin Franklin Hotel; the application was withdrawn before it was reviewed by the Commission. He stated that the Commission had not set a precedent in that case, since it never acted on it.

Ms. Hawkins stated that no restaurateur had been selected and that it was unclear if the proposed awnings would be needed or wanted by the restaurateur that would ultimately occupy the space. Ronald Sheldon, the Vice President for Development for Kimpton Hotels, clarified that Kimpton operates the restaurant and it would not be leased out. He noted that the name of the restaurant had not been selected yet, hence the place-holder restaurant sign on the drawings.

Ms. Jaffe asked Ms. Hawkin’s opinion regarding the illuminated sign at the pediment. Ms. Hawkins reiterated her opposition to the sign. She explained that the rooftop bar would give a glow that would make the building more noticeable. She stated that she would be of a different opinion if the proposal included a single letter sign, such as an M, that would make the sign more legible from a distance.

FAILED MOTION: Mr. Dilworth moved to deny the illuminated pediment sign, but approve all other aspects of the application. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which failed with a tie vote of 6 to 6. Mses. Hawkins, Jaffe, Jones, and Leonard and Messrs. Schaaf and Wilson dissented.

FAILED MOTION: Ms. Merriman moved to approve the application, provided the banners are installed temporarily for a period not to exceed 18 months. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which failed with a tie vote of 6 to 6. Ms. Hawkins, Jaffe, Jones, and Leonard and Messrs. Dilworth and Quinn dissented.

FAILED MOTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to deny the illuminated pediment sign and the awnings, but approve all other aspects of the application, with the staff to review the details, provided the banners are installed temporarily for a period not to exceed 18 months. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which failed with a tie vote of 6 to 6. Ms. Merriman and Messrs. Dilworth, Mattioni, Quinn, Schaaf, Sherman, and Wilson dissented.

Ms. Hawkins suggested that the awnings be brought back to the table for discussion. She stated that the Committee viewed these awnings as merely additional signage. She reiterated her opposition to them. Ms. Jones agreed with the Architectural Committee. She noted that the Four Seasons Hotel has a restaurant that does not have awnings and such an omission enhances the dignity of the building. Mr. Wolfe reiterated that the applicant views the awnings as important identity markers for the restaurant. Mr. Mattioni asked whether the objection expressed by some Commissioners was an objection to signage or to the awnings themselves. Ms. Hawkins clarified that her objection was to the installation of awnings on this building, given its grandeur and the symmetry of its facade. Mr. Mattioni expressed his support for the awnings, even if they were primarily signage. He opined that the hotel's desire to give the restaurant space its separate identity from the hotel made sense. Mr. Dilworth stated that the argument that installing awnings compromises the historic nature of the building seemed to contradict history itself, since Mr. Farnham had earlier stated that awnings were often found historically on these types of office buildings. Mr. Dilworth stated that even if the awnings blocked views of certain architectural elements, or they were not symmetrical on the façade, those concerns were not relevant because this type of building had awnings historically. Mr. Farnham clarified that buildings of this type would have had awnings at all levels. He clarified that, historically, buildings such as this one would have had awnings installed in a seemingly haphazard or irregular manner. The awnings were not installed symmetrically or following a specific rigid geometry because they would have been installed by individual tenants, who would have occupied part of the retail area or a small section of offices. He asserted that a building such as this would have had awnings historically. Mr. Dilworth stated that it seems the opposition to the awnings is based on contemporary aesthetic judgments, not on history. Mr. Sherman agreed with Mr. Dilworth.

ACTION: Mr. Sherman moved to approve the awnings. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 3. Ms. Hawkins, Jaffe, and Jones dissented.

ACTION: Ms. Jones moved to approve the banners temporarily for a period not to exceed 18 months. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 10 to 2. Messrs. Dilworth and Mattioni dissented.

ACTION: Ms. Jones moved to deny the pediment sign. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 3. Messrs. Dilworth, Mattioni, and Schaaf dissented.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the remainder of the application. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 209-25 N 18TH ST

Project: Construct entrance pavilion and garden

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Cathedral Basilica of Sts. Peter & Paul

Applicant: Robert Koochagian, O'Donnell & Naccarato Inc.

History: 1846, John Notman and Napoleon LeBrun, architects, Cathedral of Sts. Peter and Paul

Individual Designation: 5/28/1957

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of an entrance pavilion at the southern transept of the Basilica of Sts. Peter & Paul and the creation of a garden on the southwestern corner of the cathedral's property. The area currently has a lawn with minimal landscaping.

There is already an entranceway with ADA ramp and 1950s airlock at this location at the transept; the proposed pavilion would formalize this as a main entrance. The entrance pavilion would be clad in brownstone and would connect to the Basilica and the Parish house with glass walls. The design of the pavilion is complementary to both the Basilica and the Rectory. The rear of the rectory currently has a bathroom addition and service spaces. These bathrooms and their related hallways and spaces would be refurbished and connected to the pavilion.

The existing garden at the southwestern corner of the Basilica's property would be redesigned with new landscaping and pathways. A fountain would be installed in the middle of the garden. The garden would be enclosed by an iron fence.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 2105 SPRUCE ST

Project: Construct rear addition and decks

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Nadine & James Biles

Applicant: Arthur Willson, Foster-Willson Co. Inc.

History: 1875

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a rooftop addition over the rear ell of the property. This residential property has a three-and-one-half-story main block with a three-story rear ell. The rear ell currently has an addition that extends from the rear of the mansard roof. The proposal would extend the existing addition the entire length of the rear ell. The ell of this property faces a service alley with very limited visibility from the public-right-of-way. The most prominent view of the ell would be blocked by the much larger corner property directly adjacent to the east. The proposed addition would be clad in stucco.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 19 S 21ST ST

Project: Construct addition

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Marc Ginsburg

Applicant: Jose Hernandez, JKR Partners LLC

History: 1885

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995

Staff Contact: Erin Cote

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the windows are wood, and provided the stucco is traditional without scoring or expansion joints, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the second-floor rear bay and construct a two-story addition over a one-story rear portion of this much altered Victorian Gothic rowhouse in the Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District. The addition would have a stucco finish with vinyl windows. Alterations are proposed for an existing historic window opening on the second-floor side elevation of the building. Please note that there are discrepancies in the window information provided between the plans, section, and elevations.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Architect Jerry Roller represented the application.

Mr. Roller distributed copies of revised drawings to the Commission members, which he contended addressed the suggestions of the Architectural Committee. Ms. Hawkins confirmed that the applicant addressed the Committee's recommendations, but suggested that the Commission approve the Committee's recommendation to allow the staff to review the details.

Mr. Schaaf asked the applicant if the addition can be feasibly clad without the use of expansion joints. Mr. Roller responded that they would use a traditional stucco with an acrylic surface finish. He explained that the acrylic surface would prevent cracking and retain the appearance of traditional stucco. It would not have expansion joints. Ms. Hawkins stated that lime stucco withstands cracking as well.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided the windows are wood, and provided the stucco is traditional without scoring or expansion joints, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 35 S 02ND ST, UNIT C1

Project: Alter signage and awning

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Water Bridge

Applicant: John Christinzio, Quest Design Services

History: 1885

Individual Designation: 10/7/1976

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

Staff Contact: Erin Cote

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove the existing letters on the flat wall signs and install new backlit letters. This application also proposes to remove the existing awing cover and install a new cloth cover. The Historical Commission reviewed and approved a similar proposal for this building in August 1999.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 121 BECK ST

Project: Construct rear addition

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rachel Matkoski

Applicant: James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Company Architects

History: 1830

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958, 1/26/1965

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Erin Cote

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story rear addition over an existing one-story addition. The new addition would be clad in stucco with six-over-nine double hung windows with brick row lock course headers and sills. French doors are proposed for the rear of the existing one-story addition. The existing gable roof on the main block would remain. The new roof would meet the building at the cornice line.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 1126-36 ARCH ST

Project: Enlarge mezzanine, construct restrooms, relocate kitchen, alter aisle, add partitions

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Reading Terminal Market Corporation

Applicant: Tony Bracali, Friday Architects-Planners, Inc.

History: 1893, Wilson Brothers, architects, Reading Terminal Market

Individual Designation: 2/5/1981

Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the mezzanine windows are articulated and the glazing in the demonstration kitchen is treated for safety, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes several changes to the interior of Reading Terminal Market.

This application proposes straightening what is called Avenue D, the north-south aisle running along the eastern edge of the market. Currently, Avenue D twists and turns as it runs around the freight elevator area and other obstructions. The application proposes to straighten the aisle by shifting some vendor and storage space and then realigning the walkway.

This application proposes creating a flexible rental room along Avenue D at the east end of the Center Court. The room would be separated from the public space by a sliding butt-glazed wall. A large sign reading "Rick Nichols Room" would be installed over the entrance to the room.

This application also proposes demolishing the inadequate restrooms, which do not meet code, and replacing them with new, larger restrooms. Also, the demonstration kitchen would be relocated.

The application also proposes enlarging a mezzanine area, which currently houses the administrative offices for the market. The current space is not adequate for the market's needs. A conference room would be added at the west end of the mezzanine, extending out over a non-historic vendor space. The extension would be clad in corrugated metal and windows.

On 11 February 2011, the Historical Commission reviewed and approved this application in-concept. Since the Historical Commission meeting, the applicant submitted new drawings with final floor plans, details of finishes, and signage.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Historical Commission. Market manager Paul Steinke and architect Anthony Bracali represented the application.

Ms. Sell noted that the applicants had submitted revised drawings, which were included in the meeting packet, that address the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Ms. Hawkins confirmed that the suggestions made by the Architectural Committee were addressed by the applicant in the latest iteration of the plans. She explained the changes to the Commission members including the Committee's suggestion for punched and framed openings on the mezzanine. She asked Mr. Steinke if the cladding on the mezzanine addition would be corrugated metal and drywall. Mr. Steinke confirmed that they would be.

Mr. Steinke presented a Powerpoint of the latest iteration of plans. He described each page of the new drawings. He noted that the stairs to the mezzanine will be replaced with stairs that satisfy the building code. He explained that the Rick Nichols Room will now be treated with a

wood and corrugated metal facing on the glass doors to prevent cart damage and address Architectural Committee's and Preservation Alliance's concerns about the appearance of doors. He demonstrated how the doors will move on tracks, and can be closed for private events and opened for general seating. He stated that the demonstration kitchen will be named "La Cucina at the Market." He explained that there will be an operable screen wall between the kitchen and the Rick Nichols Room.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance asserted that the revisions are consistent with his comments and the discussion at the Architectural Committee meeting. He opined that the applicants have greatly improved the project. He advocated for the Commission to approve the application.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission on 8 April 2011, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 150 S INDEPENDENCE WEST ML

Project: Install banners

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: PLB Partners LP

Applicant: Amy Needle, Historic Philadelphia, Inc.

History: 1926, Horace Trumbauer, architect, Public Ledger Building

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

Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 7, 9, and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install two banners on the northeast corner of the Public Ledger Building, covering two pilasters. The banners would be hung from existing banner attachments, where banners previously hung at this location. The attachments are a series of pulleys bolted to the granite and marble entablature. The Commission has no evidence of an approval of the existing banner attachments, but it does have evidence that they existed in 2005. The staff visited the site and observed that the banner attachments have eroded marble pilasters at several points. Therefore, the staff suggests that the pulley system, which is damaging the building, be removed.

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

The Commissioners reviewed the application materials and agreed that with the assessments of the staff and Architectural Committee.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 7, 9, and 10. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 541 PINE ST

Project: Construct garage, ADA ramp, and deck

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Louis Castelli

Applicant: Louis Castelli

History: 1970

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a garage with roof deck and a curb cut on the 6th Street side of this property. The additions are proposed for rear parking and ADA access to the building. The garage would be built with brick to match the main house with blue stone coping. The garage doors would be paneled to match the front door of the house in design and color. The existing sidewalk brick would be reinstalled.

There is an existing brick garden wall at the rear of the building on 6th Street. Behind the wall is a temporary ramp that provides the owner with access to the house.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 417 S 08TH ST

Project: Add gate for parking

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Marc Neff

Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Architects

History: 1835

Individual Designation: 6/28/1976

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

Staff Contact: Randal Baron

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Site Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes removing a section of a rear garden wall on Addison Street and installing a wooden gate to provide access to a new parking space in the yard. The curb would be lowered at the entrance to the parking.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 2307 ST ALBANS ST

Project: Construct roof deck and stair house

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: F. Scott Donahue

Applicant: F. Scott Donahue

History: 1869, Charles Leslie, developer

Individual Designation: 9/30/1969

Staff Contact: Randal Baron

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the original and revised designs, but to approve a deck on the rear ell, without the stairhouse but with a hatch on the main block of the building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: The application proposes to construct a deck and stair house on the main block of this rowhouse. The building does have a rear bay where a small deck could be located. Small decks have been installed on several of the rear bays on this block. The Commission has never approved a deck for a main block on this street.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Scott Donohue represented the application.

Mr. Baron noted that the applicant has submitted revised designs in an attempt to comply with the Architectural Committee recommendation. Mr. Baron observed that Option 3 does, in fact, comply with the Committee's recommendation. Ms. Hawkins agreed, stating that, in her opinion, Option 3 was consistent with the recommendation of the Architectural Committee. She recommended its approval, with the staff to review details. Mr. Donohue, the property owner, stated that he would accept an approval of Option 3.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the original and revised designs, but approve a deck on the rear ell, without the stairhouse but with a hatch on the main block of the building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2310 DELANCEY PL

Project: Install deck, windows, and doors

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: AMCD Walnut Street Associates LP

Applicant: John Laning, JC's Home Improvements

History: 1875

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

Staff Contact: Randal Baron

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the deck, provided it is set back eight feet from the rear facade, denial of the illegal vinyl windows and sliding door, and approval of a single-leaf wood door configured like a six-pane window and two six-over-six windows within the width of the masonry openings, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rebuild an existing deck on the rear ell of this house. There is no evidence that the existing deck was constructed with a building permit or the

Commission's approval. The same applicant submitted a very similar application to the Commission earlier this year for the adjacent property at 2312 Delancey Place. In January 2011, the Commission:

denied the legalization of the deck, but approved a deck pulled back eight feet from the south façade of the rear ell, provided the door and window surrounds are painted and the rear brick cornice is repaired and repointed, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

The applicant has already altered the rear window openings and installed a vinyl sliding door and vinyl double-hung window without a building permit or the Commission's approval. In general, when reviewing applications to convert a rear window opening into a door to access a deck, the Commission has required the retention of the original window opening, but allowed it to be cut down to install a door, provided the new door is fenestrated to replicate the original window size and pane configuration.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Steve Balin represented the application.

Mr. Balin stated that his company did not build the deck at 2312 Delancey that was mentioned by Mr. Baron in the overview. He also claimed that, in this case, 2310 Delancey, he replaced the windows and lengthened the window openings, but did not widen them. He said that the windows that were removed were replacement windows. He noted that the windows at 2310 were installed at the same time as the windows at 2312. He also noted that the Commission legalized those, provided they are painted. He reported that he had taken multiple photographs of the windows at 2310 from different angles in Fitter Square; he contended that it is difficult to see the windows from the Square. He argued that the Commission should legalize them, provided they are painted. He apologized if he had made any mistakes. He stated that he assumed that he could install vinyl windows on the rear of a building. He asked the Commission to take into account his good work to a building on Chestnut Street, where he is replacing 50 windows.

Ms. Merriman asked Mr. Farnham whether the Commission was bound to require a restoration in such an instance, when the façade had already been modified. Mr. Farnham replied that, when a building has been modified, the Commission has some flexibility and can use its discretion. It could require a strict restoration or allow something that is compatible, but not a recreation of the historic condition. He contended that the Commission also has more flexibility when considering the rear of a building.

Mr. Balin claimed that his company is committed to maintenance and informed the Commission that his company has also replaced the deteriorated bays on these buildings.

Ms. Hawkins stated that this application raises two questions. First, are the modifications to the window openings acceptable? Second, are the vinyl windows acceptable?

Mr. Balin again noted that the Commission legalized the vinyl windows at the rear of the adjacent building at 2312 with the condition that they are painted. The Commissioners asked Mr. Baron if the situations are similar. Mr. Baron stated that they are similar. Mr. Balin explained that they are virtually the same. There are slight differences in the installation of the siding door. Mr. Balin agreed that the white vinyl takes away from the historical character of the building.

Mr. Sherman asked if the contractor had obtained the appropriate permits before undertaking the work. Mr. Balin stated his contractor had not obtained the proper permits, and is no longer working for his company. Mr. Balin stated that he is not trying to hide anything from the Commission. He acknowledged that he will be before the Commission again, this time to legalize some windows installed on the rear of a Walnut Street building.

Mr. Thomas stated that the rear of the property is visible to the public. He contended that Panama Street is an alley, but it fronts on Fitler Square. He stated that the rear facades are principal facades in this case. He stated that there is no reason for leniency in this case. It is not as though a permit was issued for the windows in error. He asserted that Mr. Balin should have known about his responsibilities, especially if he owns 15 properties. Mr. Balin asserted that the vinyl windows will blend with the neighborhood when they are painted. Mr. Thomas stated that approving these windows would set a negative precedent. Mr. Balin responding that the precedent was already set with the approval for 2312. Mr. Baron stated that there is a significant difference between the prior approval and this proposal. At the time the Commission legalized the windows at 2312, it had been misled into thinking that the windows were not visible from the public right-of-way. The Commission now knows that the windows are visible from the public right-of-way.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the deck, provided it is set back eight feet from the rear facade, deny the illegal vinyl windows and sliding door, and approve a single-leaf wood door configured like a six-pane window and two six-over-six windows within the width of the masonry openings, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 4700 STATES DR

Project: Install temporary tent on gravel base

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: David Goverman, Ohio House Café

History: 1876, Heard & Sons, architects, Ohio State House

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and 10 and the Setting Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a temporary tent on the lawn adjacent to the Ohio State House, one of the few buildings to survive from the Centennial Exposition of 1876. The Ohio State House stands near the intersection of Belmont and Montgomery Avenues in West Fairmount Park. The building is owned by the City and leased to a restaurant operator. A large, original annex to the building once stood in the approximate location of the proposed tent. The tent would be temporary; it would be used seasonally and stored out of season. The tent would not connect to or attach to the historic building in any way. The tent would sit atop a gravel bed with the structure and floor supported by paving stones. Much of the tent would be located on what is now the parking area. The parking area would be reduced in size to accommodate the tent.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. Landscape architect William Menke represented the application.

Mr. Mattioni stated that the Commission should acknowledge that this tent may not be temporary. Once the Commission approves the tent, it could stand forever. Mr. Farnham agreed, stating that an approval would not be time limited.

Ms. Merriman asked about the materials of the tent. She stated that the application documents do not specify the tent material. She added that the proposed tent is not represented in a consistent manner in the various renderings and photographs in the application.

Mr. Menke explained that he was filling in at the meeting for the business owner, David Groverman, who is out of the country. He explained that the tent would be vinyl with translucent side panels. The tent would sit on a raised platform that would create a level space. The platform legs would rest on bricks. He showed a sample of an iron spot brick that might be used. The rest of the area under the tent would be gravel. When the tent is not standing, one would see a field of gravel with some intermittent bricks.

Ms. Merriman stated that the application does not include anything on the material of the tent. She remarked that it would be unusual for the Commission to approve an application without such information. Mr. Farnham noted that the staff often reviews details such as these after the Commission's approval; however, this is one of the thinner applications presented to the Commission in recent years. Ms. Merriman stated that she would be comfortable with an in-concept approval, but not a final approval.

Mr. Menke explained that they would purchase an Aztek tent, a standard off-the-shelf tent of white vinyl with transparent sides. The tent platform would be 18 inches above grade and have a ramp leading into it. Ms. Hawkins asserted that the bricks would not harmonize with the gravel. Mr. Menke cautioned her not to assume that the gravel would be grey. He stated that they would probably use a reddish brown, earthy gravel that would be compatible with the selected brick.

Mr. Thomas noted that the parking area would need to move to accommodate the tent. Mr. Menke said parking area would be reduced in size. The center lane through the parking area would remain asphalt so that it could be plowed. The edges would be gravel. Additional parking would be identified off site.

The Commissioners asked Mr. Menke if he is seeking final approval. He stated that he is seeking final approval. Mr. Thomas contended that the details of the proposal should be carefully reviewed because the project will have a significant impact on the appearance of the site. He noted that the staff could review some of the details. Mr. Menke remarked that he provided several views of the proposed tent on the site to his client. He asked if they had been forwarded to the Commission. Mr. Farnham responded that they had been provided to the Commission, but as poor quality photocopies. Ms. Merriman stated none of the views provide a pedestrian or car level perspective. They are show aerial views that are not easy to extrapolate to ground-level views. Ms. Merriman suggested that the Commission could approve the project in concept, but she opposed a final approval until more information is provided that will allow the project to be adequately assessed. She stated that the applicant should work with the staff and the Trust to develop a better application. Mr. Farnham agreed with Ms. Merriman, saying that he was confused by some inconsistencies between statements at the Committee meeting and this meeting, especially as it relates to the parking.

Mr. Palantino asked how the tent would be attached to the ground. He asked if there would be augurs or other devices needed to anchor the tent. Ms. Hawkins asked in the project would have an archeological impact. Mr. Mattioni asked for clarity regarding the term "seasonal." Mr. Menke explained that the tent would likely be up from April through the summer to October. It would be dismantled and stored each winter and returned to the site the following spring. He stated that this is a normal season for most caterers. Mr. Menke stated that his client wanted a 4,500 square-foot tent, but the Fairmount Park Historic Preservation Trust limited the size to 2,400 square feet. The Trust accepted a tent of this size because the Ohio House once had a rear addition of about this size.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to approve the application in concept. Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 613 PINE ST

Project: Convert walled parking area to carport

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Scott Levin

Applicant: Scott Levin

History: 1990, Stephen Varenhorst Architects, architect

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

Staff Contact: Erin Cote

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a steel and glass canopy over the rear yard. The canopy would be supported by the existing concrete-masonry brick garden walls that line the rear of the property and steel columns. The canopy would primarily consist of structural steel I-beams, glazing on the sides, and a metal roof.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Da’Ron Ravnell represented the application.

Ms. Merriman stated that, according to the minutes of the Architectural Committee’s review, the application lacked certain information. She asked the applicant if he was ready to provide additional information today. Mr. Ravnell answered that he would distribute revised drawings.

Ms. Hawkins clarified that the application was originally presented as a car port, but is, in fact, a garage. Mr. Ravnell clarified that the application is for a garage. Mr. Ravnell explained that the revised drawings have more information related to the proposed roof over the garage.

Mr. Sherman expressed his discomfort with reviewing roofing details at the Commission meeting. He stated that this level of review should be undertaken by the Architectural Committee, and not the Commission. He suggested remanding the application to the Committee.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to table the application for a period not to exceed six months. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

604-36 S. WASHINGTON SQUARE, HOPKINSON HOUSE

Owner: Hopkinson House Owner's Association

Applicant: Theresa Pearce Shepherd, P.E.

History: 1961, Oscar Stonorov, architect

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

Proposal: Install HVAC equipment

Staff Contact: Erin Cote

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the replacement of the building's central hot water heating system with individually controlled electric heating and cooling systems in every condominium unit. The building was constructed with black-colored vent panels under some windows and plain black panels under others. The new electric units, which will be black in color, would be inserted into some, but not all of the panels. They would project out 7 to 8 inches beyond the faces of the panels. The units could be moved farther into the interior, thereby projecting less, but they would potentially disrupt interior spaces.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Consultant Theresa Shepherd represented the application.

Mr. Danta noted that Ms. Cote had inspected the mock ups on site and had determined that the installation of the HVAC equipment would satisfy the Standards. Ms. Shepherd clarified that the HVAC equipment was mocked up in two colors, beige and black, as was requested by the Architectural Committee. She stated that she preferred the black. Mr. Schaaf agreed and noted that the panels in the building are black. He stated that the louvers should match the color of the panels. Mr. Thomas asked if all panels would have louvers inserted in them. Ms. Shepherd answered that equipment would be installed, but not all panels. Mr. Thomas stated his support for the black louver for color consistency throughout the façade of the building. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee was also concerned with the projection of the louvers from the face of the panel. Ms. Shepherd explained that the units are very small; if the units are located largely in the interiors, they will take up too much room. She stated that they had designed the installation to limit the projection on the exterior as much as possible which preserving the limited interior space. In general, the Commissioners agreed that the balance was appropriate.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to approve the application, provided the exterior portions of the HVAC units are black to match the existing metal panels. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 12 to 1. Ms. Hawkins dissented.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adjourn at 11:24 a.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 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

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

Standard 7: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damages to historic materials will not be used.

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

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

Additions Guidelines: Recommended: Designing a rooftop addition when required for the new use that is set back from the wall plane and is inconspicuous as possible when viewed from the street.

Additions Guidelines: Not Recommended: Designing a new addition that obscures, damages, or destroys character-defining features of the historic building.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as ... decks and terraces ... when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.

Setting Guideline: Recommended: Identifying, retaining, and preserving building and landscape features which are important in defining the historic character of the setting. Such features can include roads and streets, furnishings such as lights or benches, vegetation, gardens, and yards, adjacent open space such as fields, parks, commons or woodlands, and important views or visual relationships.

Site Guideline: Recommended: Designing new onsite parking, loading docks, or ramps when required by the new use so that they are as unobtrusive as possible and assure the preservation of the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape.