

**THE MINUTES OF THE 618TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 28 FEBRUARY 2014
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Anuj Gupta, Esq.
Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP
Rosalie Leonard, Esq., Office of City Council President
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
Betty Turner, M.A.

Jonathan E. Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Broadbent, Historic Preservation Planner I
Erin Coté, Historic Preservation Planner II
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

Jeremy LeCompte, Harman Deutsch
Carolina Pena, YCH Architects
Jason Borden, O & S Associates, Inc.
Tariq Wasti, O & S Associates, Inc.
James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Co. Architects
David Hess
Mark Travis
Lawrence Weintraub, MJRA
Mark Feinstein
Cindy Feinstein
Leonard F. Reuter, Esq.
Shimi Zakin, Atrium Design Group
Jonathan Doran, Atrium Design Group
Sean Sullivan, JKR Partners
Jason Wistreich, JKR Partners
Dennis Cormier
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance

CALL TO ORDER

In the absence of Sam Sherman, the chair, Ms. Merriman, the vice chair, called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. Commissioners Gupta, Hawkins, Leonard, Maenner, Mattioni, Palantino, Schaaf, and Turner joined her.

MINUTES OF THE 617TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the minutes of the 617th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 10 January 2014. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JANUARY 2014

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included one application: 1700-06 Chestnut Street. Mr. Sherman asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments. Mr. Sherman asked if the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one asked any questions.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee for 1700-06 Chestnut Street. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 542-44 N 04TH ST

Project: Construct roof deck and pilot houses

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Spring Garden Associates

Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch

History: 1902; Integrity Title Insurance Company; Paul and Seymour Davis; 1912 addition, 1920

Individual Designation: 1/7/1982

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the single-light windows at the corner are restored with the appropriate double-hung windows and that the western pilothouse is squared off so that its roof is parallel to the parapet, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate a bank building for commercial and residential use. The Architectural Committee reviewed a similar application for this property last month and recommended denial. The application was withdrawn before the Historical Commission meeting. The current application incorporates revisions to the design based on the Architectural Committee's comments.

The earlier application proposed to remove security grills and replace the first-floor windows with windows that would not replicate the historic configuration. The current application proposes to retain the security grills and historic windows on the first floor. In three locations, the bottom lights of the historic windows would be made operable by installing hopper windows matching the historic windows.

The application proposes to retain, or replace in kind, the second-floor single-light and double-hung windows with curved glass at the corner of the building. The single-light windows are an illegal condition and should be replaced with the appropriate double-hung windows with curved glass. The designation photographs show the original windows in place; the single-light windows were installed after designation without the Commission's approval.

The application proposes an accessibility ramp for the non-historic entry on Green Street. The cheek of the ramp would be faced cast stone to match the base of the building. The earlier application proposed a concrete cheek, which the Committee rejected.

The original application proposed numerous roof decks with a pilot house for each residential unit. The many pilot houses would have been conspicuous from the street. The current application proposes a common or shared deck with two pilohouses. As currently proposed, the pilot houses will be set back from the street facades significantly. It is likely that deck and pilohouse will be visible from up 4th Street. However, given the setbacks of the deck and design of the pilohouses, they will likely be inconspicuous.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Jeremy LeCompte represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins confirmed that the revised drawings address the suggestions of the Architectural Committee.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the application, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 131 N 20TH ST

Project: Construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: You Dale

Applicant: Yao Huang, YCH Architect

History: 1860

Individual Designation: 4/28/1970

District Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck on the roof of the rear ell of this corner rowhouse. A rear window opening would be cut down to create a door opening. No details are provided for the door or the deck materials.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Carolina Pena represented the application.

Ms. Merriman asked if the applicant had provided revised or additional materials that address the Architectural Committee's suggestions. Ms. Pena affirmed that she had and distributed the revised drawings. She explained that they now propose a cable handrail, which will be more

transparent, and that they have revised the design of the door to have glazing to look like the window. Mr. Schaaf asked about the material of the deck bed. Ms. Pena responded that it would be stained wood. Mr. Schaaf asked if the stained wood would be visible under the cable handrail and along the roofline from Cherry Street. Ms. Pena affirmed that it would be visible.

Ms. Hawkins noted that there is already one deck on this building and this would be a second deck, albeit for different residential unit. She stated that one of the concerns of the Architectural Committee is that, with the shape of the roof and the required code of height of the railing, this structure would extend a minimum of five and a half feet above the roofline facing Cherry Street. Mr. Baron stated that the Commission has had a policy of approving decks on rear ells because they were traditionally located on ells. He cited the example of the reconstructed rowhouses at Independence National Historical Park and the location of decks on the rear ells of those buildings. He stated that this deck would not be inconspicuous, but it would be located in a historically traditional location and not on the main block of the building.

Ms. Merriman asked if pulling the deck back from Cherry Street would mitigate its conspicuousness. Ms. Hawkins stated that this rear ell is relatively narrow and the location of the door cut was determined by the location of the existing window, which is closer to the roof edge along Cherry Street.

Mr. Maenner asked if the applicant addressed all the code requirements with the cable handrail. Ms. Pena affirmed that she had.

Ms. Hawkins contended that the deck is conspicuous and there is already a deck on this property

FAILED MOTION: Ms. Hawkins move to deny the application. Mr. Maenner seconded the motion, which failed by a vote of 2 to 7. Commissioners Merriman, Schaaf, Leonard, Turner, Mattioni, Palentino, and Gupta dissented.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to approve the application as presented at the Historical Commission meeting of 28 February 2014, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline. Mr. Gupta seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7 to 2. Commissioners Hawkins and Maenner dissented.

ADDRESS: 1811-19 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Replace windows

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: The Belgravia Condominium Association

Applicant: Jason Borden, O&S Associates

History: 1902; Belgravia; Milligan & Webber, architects

Individual Designation: 6/3/1982

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application seeks in-concept approval of the replacement of all the windows and frames with aluminum windows. The proposed aluminum windows do not replicate the details of the historic windows.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Historical Commission. Jason Borden and Tariq Wasti of O & S Associates, Inc. represented the application.

Mr. Borden stated that, with the restoration of the building, they are proposing to replace all the windows in the building with aluminum windows, owing to water infiltration, rot conditions, and lack of operability. He stated that, because of cost implications, they propose to install aluminum windows. He explained that the cost of wood windows would be significantly higher. Ms. Merriman stated that the Architectural Committee discussed whether manufacturers would be able to replicate the historic windows. She asked the applicant if they have looked into aluminum windows that replicate the historic windows. Mr. Borden stated that they consulted with two different window manufacturers and they can indeed match the profiles in either aluminum or wood. He stated that he would submit those details for final approval.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the Architectural Committee also discussed installing aluminum windows at a certain floor level and higher and replicated historic windows in wood below, an approach that the Commission has approved in the past. She asked if the applicant looked into that option. Mr. Borden stated that they were unsure if, in that scenario, the aluminum windows are required to have the historic profiles. He stated that, if the aluminum frame and window did not have to be an exact match, then that would bring the cost down, as they would not have to order custom windows. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee was not necessarily explicit, but it was her understanding that the replication in wood be an exact match and the duplication in aluminum would be as close as possible within 1/8 inch and not necessarily using standard pieces and parts. Mr. Borden stated that, in that scenario, they would be paying for two custom sets of dies for blades to manufacture the windows, therefore doubling the cost. Ms. Hawkins stated that cutting a die for a wood profile is relatively inexpensive. Ms. Hawkins stated that a die is about \$3,000. She stated that that was not too expensive, given the number of windows in this project.

Mr. Mattioni stated that he was uncertain about the question before the Commission today. Mr. Baron stated that the application materials show a window product that is not a good match for the building. He stated that there is not enough information before the Commission to make a determination in regards to the scenario of installing the aluminum windows above row house height and wood below in this building.

Ms. Merriman advised the applicant to look into the Committee and Commission's suggestions and to consult the staff with any questions.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 223-227 CHESTNUT STREET

Project: Reconstruction of façade at 227 Chestnut in fiberglass

Review Requested:

Owner: David Hess, for 225 Chestnut St Associates, LP

Applicant: James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Co. Architects

History: 1856

Individual Designation: 11/4/1976

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

Staff Contact: Laura.DiPasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as submitted, but approval of an accurate reconstruction of the cast iron façade in fiberglass, with the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission to review details or, if such a reconstruction is impossible, a reconstruction of the tin façade, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove and reconstruct the façade at 227 Chestnut Street and the cornice along Bank Street in fiberglass. The original application presented to the Architectural Committee proposed a design to evoke the historic cast-iron façade, which extends the full height of the building. The application was revised following the Architectural Committee meeting to reflect the reconstruction of the later tin-cladding of the cast iron façade, per the Architectural Committee recommendation.

The four-story iron-fronted store in "imitation of sandstone" replaced a three-story brick building around 1856. Although no early photographs of this store have been found, an illustration of the property appeared in Baxter's Panoramic Business Directory in December 1879. The Baxter configuration of the façades of 227 and 223-25 Chestnut seems to have remained intact until around 1890 when the façade of 227 was clad to make it more compatible with the façade of 223-25. This was done by installing a cold formed sheet metal cladding that replicated some of the configurations and details of the adjacent building while obscuring the original cast-iron façade. This ornamental sheet metal covering on the Chestnut Street façade also partially wraps around to Bank Street. Currently, the remnants of the original cast-iron façade are partially hidden by the extant sheet metal cladding, and it is unclear precisely how many details remain.

According to an April 2000 condition assessment conducted by the engineering firm Keast & Hood, "the earlier façade had been poorly protected by the cladding for at least eighty years and the rusting of the plates was advanced, particularly on the unpainted portions." The report continued to state that "Several of the flat spandrel plates had cracked and/or spalled at the locations of their connections with the other components of the façade assembly." The assessment also found "'shadow' evidence on the flat cast iron spandrel surfaces of the previous existence of small ornamental items that were most likely removed when the sheet metal cladding was applied." The 2000 report stated that "It is this writer's opinion that little can

be predictably done to retain and repair the old cast-iron façade underlying the present deteriorated sheet metal façade. Furthermore, this office recommends that the old cast-iron assemblies be dismantled, removed, and replaced with a contemporary miscellaneous steel structure...”

The property underwent an incomplete renovation between 2006 and 2008, at which time permits were secured for the rehabilitation of the building in order to accommodate a day spa. The façade was not repaired at that time.

The more recent condition assessment by Keast & Hood, conducted in January 2014, found that the condition of the properties has slowly worsened, and recommended an accelerated timeline to brace the west (Bank Street) bearing wall and remove the front façade of 227 Chestnut Street. The report determined that the façade at 227 Chestnut was a high priority and recommended systematically removing the façade from top to base, and replacing it with a façade that evokes the original cast-iron but is constructed with lighter and more modern construction materials. The assessment concluded that all exposed cast iron is in poor condition, including the support columns that extend into the basement, and recommended installing secure structural engagement between the west wall, floor diaphragm and new south façade. The assessment also determined that the west masonry bearing wall along Bank Street is bulging, and recommended that through-building tie rods with anchor plates be installed at each floor prior to the removal of the façade. The report noted that there is no guarantee that a failure event, specifically with the 227 Chestnut Street façade, will not occur.

The proposed project would also include the installation of previously approved wood windows and doors at all floors, and new stone and painted concrete bases at 227 Chestnut, as well as the rehabilitation of the existing 223-25 Chestnut Street façade as previously approved by the Historical Commission in 2007, per the Harman Deutsch application.

The staff of the Historical Commission has been involved with the potential rehabilitation of this building for a decade, and accepts the engineering report findings that the deterioration of the historic cast-iron façade is beyond repair. Architect Richard Thom, who has worked on the building, claimed in November 2012 that “the cast iron facade could fall at any moment.” Given the presence of some existing details, of which more may be uncovered during the dismantling process, as well as historic photographs, the staff believes that the applicant could achieve an approximation, if not full recreation, of the historic façade. The staff recognizes that there are areas in which original details have been completely lost, and does not recommend that the applicant attempt to replace details without documentary or physical evidence. The current proposal is sensitive to the historic character of the building, and will seek to replicate details where evidence exists. The use of fiberglass or a similar modern material is appropriate in this situation, as the use of the original material, cast-iron, would be extremely cost-prohibitive. The staff recommends approval for the removal of the façade and bracing of the west wall, with the details of the new facade design to be refined as additional information is acquired during the dismantling process.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect James Campbell and developer David Hess represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins explained the Architectural Committee’s hesitance to base the proposed design on the 1879 Baxter’s rendering of Chestnut Street, which the applicant had indicated was only partially accurate. Given the lack of understanding about which parts were accurate, Ms.

Hawkins noted that the Committee was afraid to accept a restoration based on the rendering and partially uncovered extant cast-iron. She stated that, in their recommendation, the Committee was attempting to leave the flexibility for the applicant to duplicate pieces if they were uncovered, and if they were not able to duplicate, then there would be a Plan B. Mr. Campbell confirmed Ms. Hawkins' statements, noting that after discussing the recommendations in-house, the applicants decided to pursue the Plan B alternative, which is to restore the façade to the 1890s tin-clad façade.

Ms. Merriman asked if there was any comment from the public. There was none.

Mr. Farnham interjected that the staff, among others, hopes that documentation will come forth for the earlier design, and wanted to ensure that the motion did not preclude the possibility of reconstructing the original cast iron façade, if sufficient documentation is uncovered. He noted that historically, the earlier façade is more significant, although there is more information about the later version of the building. He continued that, depending on the quality of possible information uncovered, it may be possible to approve a pure restoration of the original façade at staff level.

Ms. Hawkins clarified, stating that, if for any reason the original cast iron façade cannot be duplicated, then the documentation of the cast must be presented to the Commission for its records.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised proposal as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 28 February 2014, provided the applicant documents any cast iron during construction, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1700-06 CHESTNUT STREET

Project: Insert door in storefront window, add canopy

Review Requested: Final approval

Owner: 1700 Chestnut, LLC—JEMB Realty and Morris Jerome

Applicant: Sean Sullivan, JKR Partners, LLC

History: 1927; Bonwitt Teller; Clarence Wunder, architect

Individual Designation: 1/3/1985

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Laura.DiPasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided no work is undertaken until the submission of a building permit application for interior renovations to the upper floors, and provided that the existing jamb against the stone is retained, with staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a single section of an existing storefront window and fabric canopy to construct a glass, frameless double entry door and modern glass and steel canopy in the southeastern most bay of storefront windows on 17th Street. The new door would require the removal of a single section of the existing storefront glazing and stone sill, and would serve as the new entrance for the potential future residential development on floors 4-8 of the building. The extents of the existing bay of storefront windows, including the ornamental transom, would remain intact.

Given the large scale of the building, the proposed intervention is minimal and does not destroy the spatial relationships that characterize the property. The proposed door would require the removal of a low stone sill, but otherwise would retain the existing window opening, and maintain the building's distinctive fenestration pattern and rhythm.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 417 S. CARLISLE STREET

Project: Construction of roof deck and pilot house

Review Requested: Final approval

Owner: Mark and Cindy Feinstein

Applicant: Martin J. Rosenblum, AIA

History: 1855

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a new roof deck and pilot house on the main block of the historic rowhouse's gable roof. The proposed roof deck would be 25 feet in length, set back five feet from the front façade, and extending across the ridge of the roof. The pilot house would be set back 16 feet from the front façade, and would be greater than 10 feet in height above the roof. The proposed project also includes the installation of a nine-foot high pergola. Both the deck and pergola would be visible from Carlisle Street. The deck would be supported on both the front and back slopes of the roof with through-roof post bases that would be connected to the inner wythe of the solid masonry party wall.

The staff contends that the proposed project would be extremely conspicuous from Carlisle Street, and would destroy the spatial relationship of this block, which is characterized by the consistent height of the rowhouses that were constructed as part of one development.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owners Mark and Cindy Feinstein, attorney Leonard Reuter, and architect Lawrence Weintraub represented the application.

Mr. Reuter distributed a drawing similar to that reviewed by the Architectural Committee on 25 February. He explained that, since the initial Committee meeting of 28 January, they had revised the design to set back the deck to the ridge line of the main roof and to move the stairhouse back onto the rear ell. Mr. Reuter said that the Committee had recommended approval of the new design on 25 February and that his clients had further refined the design since the Architecture Committee meeting of 25 February, reducing the height of the rail by ten inches. He said that, because of the Symphony House garage built behind this house, the back yard sits in a canyon, rendering the outdoor space unusable. He said a deck on the rear ell had a similar problem. Having a deck with better views and sunlight on the front portion of the roof adds to the value of the property. He said that the owners plan to restore the façade and interior and the extra value justifies that work. He said that they would like the Commission to consider a second proposal, which is scheduled to be presented to the Commission next month, because

they do not want to keep the house open for another month. Commissioners asked why the house was open if no permits or approvals have yet been granted.

Ms. Hawkins explained that the recommendation on the second proposal was a split vote, 3 to 2, and that, although she voted in favor at the time, she has since decided to oppose the application. She noted that the Committee's recommendation is advisory. She said that there is room for a substantial deck on the rear ell. There are many residents in Center City who have decks adjacent to skyscrapers. A deck on the ell would still constitute outdoor space. Property owners are not vested with rights to particular views. She said that the Committee recommended approval only if no part of the deck was visible from the public right-of-way.

Mr. Gupta suggested that a deck on the rear ell would add value because it is outdoor space.

Mr. Reuter said that the rear ell location would have less light than a location of the front portion of the roof. He said that the views would be of restored historic facades rather than a blank façade of the garage to the rear. He said that the owner will be spending tens of thousands of dollars restoring the front façade in addition to restoring the interior.

Mr. Baron said that he was hesitant to even comment on the second application, which is scheduled for the Commission's March meeting, because the Commission has not received the minutes for the 25 February Committee meeting yet. He noted that, although the second application is not under consideration at this meeting, a recent site visit to review a mock-up indicated that the second design will be visible from the street. He noted that the Symphony House garage is located a significant distance to the east of the rear ell of this house. The very tall Symphony House tower is substantially north of the property in question. The view from the rear to the south is open and substantial sunlight hits the rear ell. Mr. Baron rejected Mr. Reuter's claim that his clients would be spending large sums of money to restore the front façade; he said that the front façade is already in a restored state except for one basement window, which at most would cost \$2,000 to restore. He said that the rear ell is large and would provide for a substantial deck. He emphasized that the Committee also said that any deck should not result in the raising of the existing chimneys. Mr. Baron stated that he believes that the building code requires a 10-foot distance between the top of a chimney and any deck. Finally, he said that the "value" added by the extra view has to be balanced against the damage to the streetscape and a bad deck here would lower value from all the houses on the block.

Mr. Reuter said that he disagreed with Mr. Baron's statement that the view is open to the south from the rear ell. He said there would be much less light. He also said that he thought that there must be ten feet between the chimney and the stair house, but not the deck.

Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Baron about the distance between the back of the rear ell and the Symphony House garage. Looking at the plans, she noted that there would be approximately 15 feet between the rear of a deck on the ell and the rear property line. The garage may have some setback even from that line. She said that the placement of the deck north of the stair house and under a pergola would likely result in less light than on the rear ell.

Mr. Farnham explained that Mr. Reuter will have an opportunity to seek approval for the application for which he is currently advocating in March, when the Commission reviews the applications presented to the Architectural Committee on 25 February. Mr. Mattioni commented that it would be procedurally inappropriate for the Commission to address an application other than the one that is before them today. Mr. Reuter said that the Commission routinely considers

revisions to designs reviewed by the Committee. He said that they submitted the second application with the revisions in case the current application was denied. He emphasized that the Committee recommended in favor of the second application at its recent meeting. The Commissioners responded that the second application is not before them today. Ms. Hawkins emphasized again that the Committee's recommendation on the second application included several provisions. The Committee recommended approval only if no part of the deck, railing, and pergola were visible from the public right-of-way and if the construction of the deck did not necessitate the raising of any chimneys.

Ms. Merriman asked for public comment.

Dennis Cormier the neighbor adjacent on the north side of this building said that the neighbors were opposed in principal to the location of the deck and stair house on the main roof of the building. He said that the Symphony House had lessened the light to the back yards of the houses. He said that the neighbors had not had the benefit of looking at the new design. He hoped that the Commission would allow the review of revised designs in proper sequence to allow for public input on the design.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application (reviewed by the Architectural Committee on 28 January 2014), pursuant to Standards 2 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline. Mr. Schaaf seconded the application, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1800 DELANCEY PL

Project: Construct roof deck and pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1800 Delancey Street Partners, LLC

Applicant: Robert Flaynik, RFA Architecture, LLC

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the staff confirms the accuracy of the mock-up, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck and pilot house on a corner row house. The roof deck includes planters, glass panel guardrails, a skylight, and a small rain barrel. The pilot house will house both stairs and an elevator, and rises less than ten feet in height above the surface of the roof deck. Part of the pilot house is sloped towards Delancey Place to reduce the surface area that is visible from the street. The proposed exterior cladding material for the pilot house is a zinc-colored panel. It is placed in a location that is farthest away from any exterior wall front or rear.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Schaaf recused owing to his relationship with one of the applicants. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Developer Mark Travis, architect Robert Flaynik, and attorney Leonard Reuter represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the Committee had recommended approval, provided the staff verified that the mock-up demonstrates that the deck and pilot house would be inconspicuous from the street. He displayed photographs of the mock-up. He said that the stair tower was minimally visible, but that the Committee noted that it sits next to the existing elevator penthouse on the adjacent building and appears as part of that structure. He noted that, unlike the building in the previous application, this building has a flat roof, which is not a character-defining feature like a gable roof. In addition, this building has no rear ell and this deck and stair house would be placed in the location on this building that is the least visible from the street.

Mr. Travis noted that they had constructed the railing mock-up in the wrong location, only 3 feet from the rear wall. In fact, it will actually sit in about 10 feet from the rear wall. This will make it less visible than is shown by the mock-up.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the application, provided the penthouse is no taller than depicted by the mock-up and covered in a non-reflective finish in a neutral color and provided the deck railing is invisible from any public right-of-way. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1914-16 RITTENHOUSE SQ

Project: Renovate building, demolish and construct additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Barton Blatstein

Applicant: Carl Primavera, Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg LLP

History: 1859; Alfred M. Collins House

Individual Designation: 4/28/1970

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial and require the applicant to present additional materials.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations and additions to the property at 1914-16 Rittenhouse Square, at the southwest corner of the square. In November 2013, the Historical Commission reviewed an in-concept application and found that the proposed project would constitute an alteration as defined in Section 14-203(15) of the Philadelphia Code, not a demolition as defined in Section 14-203(88), pursuant to the Commission's approval of 27 September 1999, Standards 2, 4, 5, and 9, and Section 14-1000 of the Philadelphia Code. At that time, the Commission approved in concept the general form, scale, massing, placement, height, and footprint of the proposed building, provided the garages on Manning Street are redesigned, the tripartite division of the new façade on Rittenhouse Square is appropriately scaled, and the material choices are developed, and the fenestration patterns are refined, pursuant to Standard 9.

In keeping with the Commission's findings and approval in concept, the current application proposes to remove the non-historic domed entrance pavilion and construct a four-story addition. The addition would mirror the height of the existing main block and would be recessed from the sidewalk line where it would attach to the main block to respect the mansard on the main block. The application also proposes to remove the non-historic rear ell and garage and construct a new rear ell and garage of roughly the same sizes in roughly the same locations.

Since the Commission's approval in concept, the applicant has redesigned the garages on Manning and developed and refined the design of the new façade on Rittenhouse Square.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Bart Blatstein, attorney Carl Primavera, and architects Shimi Zakin and Jonathan Doran represented the application.

Mr. Farnham stated that he was confused by the Architectural Committee's recommendation and asked Ms. Hawkins to explain it to the Commission. Ms. Hawkins explained that the applicant provided a detailed presentation on the design and materials to the Commission when the application was reviewed for approval in concept. The Architectural Committee did not have the benefit of that presentation during its in-concept review. Without the information provided in that presentation, the Committee was not comfortable with a recommendation for final approval. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee did react positively to the revisions made to the design since the in-concept review.

Mr. Zakin presented the design to the Commission. He noted the changes to the front and rear facades, especially the windows at the front and the garage doors at the rear. He showed several animated Powerpoint slides that demonstrated the relationships between the historic and new sections of the front façade and the door rhythms on the rear facades. He showed slides of the houses along the south side of Rittenhouse Square and pointed out how his design for the new façade is compatible with the buildings on the Square in scale, massing, proportion, and materials. He showed a slide that indicated the ratios of solid to void on the front facades of nearby buildings and contended that his new façade has nearly exactly the same ratio of solid to glass as the historic buildings nearby. He stated that he experimented with various materials suggested by the Committee and Commission for the front façade. He stated that they chose bricks and brownstone to match those of the historic façade. He discussed the windows and provided details regarding the materials and design. He stated that all metal on the building will be the same color. Also, the historic and new windows will be the same color. Mr. Primavera stated that the architects will work with the staff on all of the details.

Mr. Zakin presented the proposal for the garage doors on Manning Street and showed how they would replicate the rhythms of doors and windows on Manning. He showed several examples of the garage door company's products. He showed examples of the corner window at the ell on Manning Street.

Mr. Mattioni stated that the original design was magnificent and is now even better with the refinements. He suggested that the staff review the details.

Mr. Maenner asked if the architect had considered running the brownstone watertable across the entirety of the new façade. Mr. Zakin stated that he did study that possibility, but decided that their contemporary interpretation of the historic brownstone watertable was more appropriate for the new addition. Ms. Merriman stated that she agreed with Mr. Maenner, but would not press the issue. Mr. Zakin and his client, Mr. Blatstein, agreed to reconsider the suggestion.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to approve the application as presented at the Commission meeting of 28 January 2014, with the staff to review details, pursuant Standard 9. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. Ms. Hawkins abstained.

OLD BUSINESS

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 OCTOBER 2013

Dominique Hawkins, chair

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL HARDSHIP, 28 JANUARY 2014

Sam Sherman, chair

ADDRESS: 48 E LOGAN ST

Project: Legalize and replace windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Garnett C. Littlepage

Applicant: Isom Gladden, Ultimate Construction

History: 1860

Individual Designation: 3/28/1967

District Designation: East Logan Street Historic District, Significant, 11/12/2010

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

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL HARDSHIP RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Thomas moved that the Committee on Financial Hardship recommend denial, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6) of the Philadelphia Code, Standard 6, and owing to incompleteness. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize vinyl windows already installed and approve vinyl windows yet to be installed in the house at 48 E. Logan Street. The property was individually designated as historic in 1967 and classified as Significant in the E. Logan Street Historic District in 2010. The property is vacant. The current owner of the property purchased it in 1996 and intends to rehabilitate it as a multi-unit residential building. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued violations and a stop work order for the installation of the windows without a permit or approval as well as for demolition by neglect and an unsecured vacant property on 13 September and 26 November 2012. The City initiated an enforcement case to instigate compliance. The equity case is currently being heard in the Court of Common Pleas. On 26 July 2013, the judge ordered the owner to submit an application to the Historical Commission to bring the building into compliance. The judge has issued absolute and conditional fines in this matter and is awaiting the outcome of this review.

The owner claims that the windows were purchased and partially installed before he was aware of the historic designation. The applicant provides documentation showing that the vinyl windows were paid for on 15 April 2010, before the owner was notified of the consideration of the establishment of the E. Logan Street Historic District in writing on 2 September 2010. However, the property is a multi-unit apartment building and, as such, a building permit is required to replace windows in existing openings regardless of its historic designation status. Had the owner sought the requisite permit for the windows, he would have been informed that the building had been individually designated as historic since 1967, long before the designation of the historic district in November 2010. Moreover, the owner was informed in writing of the property's historic designation on 5 May 2010, when the Historical Commission sent letters to all owners of designated properties reminding them of the designations, before the windows were apparently shipped on 2 June 2010.

The applicant presents a financial analysis contending that the building could not feasibly be rehabilitated if the owner is compelled to replace the vinyl windows with historically appropriate windows. The applicant estimates that the new windows would cost \$33,000 plus \$11,000 for installation. The staff asserts that the analysis is fundamentally flawed because any hardship suffered from the purchase of two sets of windows, vinyl and historically appropriate, is self-induced. The hardship provision in the preservation ordinance is not designed to protect owners from their own illegal work or lack of due diligence.

The applicant contends that other buildings in the historic district have non-historic windows. The staff counters that some may predate the designation and therefore would be legal; others may be illegal. The staff will review the documents provided by the applicant and request that the Department of Licenses & Inspections issue violations if windows are found to be illegal. The staff notes that the potential for illegal windows at nearby properties does not excuse the illegal windows in question.

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

Mr. Farnham noted that no one representing the application attended the Committee on Financial Hardship meeting. The Commissioners reviewed the application materials and recommendations of the committees and concluded that the vinyl windows do not satisfy the Standards and the applicant has not demonstrated that their replacement would result in a financial hardship.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee and Committee on Financial Hardship and deny the application, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6) of the Philadelphia Code, Standard 6, and owing to incompleteness. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 2:45 p.m., Ms. Merriman moved to adjourn. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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.

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.