

**THE MINUTES OF THE 615TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 8 NOVEMBER 2013
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman Jr., Chair
Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D.
Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP
Joann Jones, Esq., Office of Housing & Community Development
Rosalie Leonard, Esq., Office of City Council President
John Mattioni, Esq.
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Joseph Palantino, Department of Public Property
R. David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Robert Thomas, AIA
Betty Turner, M.A.

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

David Glassner, PARC
Christina Carter, John Milner Architects
Robert Flaynik, RFAA
Casey Parker, Jose Pistola's
Len Davidson, Davidson Neon
Jeff Pustizzi, Esq., Alterra Property Group
Leonard F. Reuter, Esq., The Reuter Law Firm
Adam Jeckel, Coscia Moos Architecture LLC
Kristina Simcic, Coscia Moos Architecture LLC
Bart Blatstein
Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Sean Whalen, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Robert Powers, Powers & Co.
Shimi Zakin, Atrium Design Group
Jonathan Doran, Atrium Design Group

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Dilworth, Hawkins, Jones, Leonard, Mattioni, Merriman, Palantino, Schaaf, Thomas, and Turner joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 614TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Jones moved to adopt the minutes of the 614th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 11 October 2013. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 OCTOBER 2013

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included two applications: 1915-23 Pine Street and 241-45 Market Street, 228-30 Church Street. Mr. Sherman asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. No Commissioners offered comments. Mr. Sherman asked if the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one asked any questions.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for 1915-23 Pine Street, 241-45 Market Street, and 228-30 Church Street. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 1915-23 PINE ST

Project: Insert garage, replace screen fence, construct rear additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Bob Lane & Randi Zemsky

Applicant: Christina Carter, John Milner Architects, Inc.

History: 1877; Christ Church Chapel; James P. Sims, architect; addition, Furness, Evans & Co., 1892; rear wing between 1901 and 1910

Individual Designation: None

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 approval, provided the new doors in the Pine Street façade match the historic doors and the garage door is compatible with the historic front doors, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations and additions for the conversion of a church to a single-family residence. The church was built as Christ Church Chapel, a satellite of the venerable Episcopalian church in Old City, in 1877 and then converted to Fifth Church of Christ, Scientist in 1930. The church building is composed of three sections, the original 1877 sanctuary along Pine Street, an 1892 addition for an entranceway at the west, and a two-story rear wing at the northeast, which was built between 1901 and 1910. A garden runs along the

rear of the building. Only the front façade along Pine Street and the upper section of the west façade of the sanctuary are visible from the public right-of-way.

The application proposes a series of alterations at rear facades, none of which are visible from Pine Street or any public right-of-way. It proposes removing a rear dormer from the back slope of the roof of the sanctuary and constructing a small connector addition between a mezzanine level of the sanctuary and the second floor of the rear wing. It proposes constructing a small, one-story, breakfast-room addition off the north façade of the 1892 addition, into the garden. The opening in the rear wall where the breakfast room would be connected to the historic building was altered from its historic condition about 1988. The application proposes removing the lower portions of two windows and cutting the window openings down for doors in the rear façade of the sanctuary. It proposes infilling two rear windows in the rear of the rear wing with recessed stucco panels. It proposes removing a chimney from the rear wing. It proposes removing a non-historic fire escape at the rear of the rear wing and partially infilling the door opening to reestablish the historic window. All alterations proposed for the rear facades can and would be approved administratively, at the staff level.

The application proposes three alterations that would be visible from Pine Street. It proposes replacing existing screen fences on the roof of the 1892 addition with wood screen fences of the same height and location. The fences hide mechanical equipment mounted on the roof of the addition. The first versions of the fences and equipment were installed with a permit in 1975, 20 years before the designation of the property. The application also proposes replacing two sets of non-historic entrance doors on the Pine Street façade with doors that would replicate the historic doors. The designs of the proposed doors should be revised to replicate those seen in historic photographs.

Finally, the application proposes cutting a garage opening in the Pine Street façade of the 1892 addition and installing a wood garage door. The garage would be installed to the west of the double-leaf entrance door. This section of the Pine Street façade has been significantly altered from its historic condition. Originally, this section of the addition included three leaded-glass windows with ornamental, incised lintels and sills. At some point, the ornamental lintels and sills were replaced with plain lintels and sills. Later, two of the three windows were removed, a large opening cut, and a utilitarian double door installed. Then, in 1988, in a misguided attempt to restore the area, the double door was removed and one not two windows installed in its place.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 241-45 MARKET ST, 228-30 CHURCH ST

Project: Construct buildings on vacant lots

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 249 Market Partners, LP

Applicant: Adam Jeckel, Coscia Moos Architecture LLC

History: designated buildings demolished, vacant lots

Individual Designation: 11/4/1976

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised design as presented to the Architectural Committee at its meeting on 22 October 2013, provided that facades of the buildings at 241, 243, and 245 Market Street are the same widths; the windows in 241, 243, and 245 differ in configuration and/or head and sill height from those in the new sections to the west; a seven-foot-tall brick wall is erected along Church Street and that the opening in the wall is the minimum necessary for a truck to enter; and, the remainder of the project conforms to the conditions of the September 2013 approval; with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to expand a project that the Historical Commission approved in September 2013. The initial project proposed to construct, reconstruct, and rehabilitate a series of buildings at the northeast corner of 3rd and Markets Streets for a mixed-use commercial and residential development. The current application proposes to expand that project, extending the new construction onto a series of vacant lots to the east. The Historical Commission has plenary jurisdiction over the application because designated buildings stood at 241 and 243 Market Street. The new section will generally replicate the new construction already approved. The additional land will allow for the inclusion of a loading dock and parking on the Church Street side of the parcel. A metal fence will enclose the parking and loading dock area. The façade of the Church Street building approved in September would be modified slightly to accommodate the parking.

The construction dates and designation histories of the lots added to this project are summarized below:

- 241 Market Street: c. 1830; individually designated, 11/4/1976, demolition approved 1988, Non-Contributing in Old City Historic District 2003
- 243 Market Street: c. 1830; individually designated, 11/4/1976, demolition approved 1988, Non-Contributing in Old City Historic District 2003.
- 245 Market Street, parking lot, Non-Contributing in Old City Historic District 12/12/2003.
- 228-30 Church Street, parking lot, Non-Contributing in Old City Historic District 12/12/2003.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 123-29 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Legalize sign

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 123-29 Chestnut Street Associates

Applicant: Danielle Drew-Wolas, Han Dynasty

History: 1903; Corn Exchange National Bank; Newman, Woodman & Harris, architects; alterations/additions, Horace Trumbauer, 1912, 1929, 1931

Individual Designation: 10/7/1976

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

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 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize a blade sign that was installed at the Chestnut Street entrance of the Corn Exchange National Bank building in Old City. The location of the sign's mounting plate differs slightly from that shown on the architectural drawing and appears to overlap a recess between two quoins.

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

The Commissioners considered the application and concurred with the Architectural Committee recommendation.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1800 DELANCEY PL

Project: Rehabilitate building, insert garage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1800 Delancey Place LP

Applicant: James Bennett, 1800 Delancey Place LP

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of new railings for the decks, with the staff to review details, but denial of the garage, pursuant to Standard 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert a multi-unit residential building back into a single-family house. The applicant proposes to cut an opening for a garage in the rear façade of the building, replacing two basement windows and some original brickwork. The rear façade faces a service alley with other garages, but is visible from 18th Street. An entry to the side yard would be modified with the demolition of two brick wing walls. A metal door would be moved into the well in the side yard and would be replaced with a metal gate at the street. The stockade fencing of the upper floor decks would be replaced with metal picket fencing. A door to the

second-floor deck would be replaced as well. The application also proposes to replace and/or repair windows and restore masonry work on the front façade, but the details are not provided. If such work is appropriate, it can be approved at the staff level.

DISCUSSION: Messrs. Schaaf and Thomas recused. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Architect Robert Flaynik and attorney Leonard F. Reuter represented the application.

Mr. Reuter suggested that they limit discussion to the installation of the garage, as the other items had already been recommended for approval. Mr. Sherman asked for clarity from Ms. Hawkins as Chair of the Architectural Committee as to whether all of the suggestions made at the Architectural Committee had been satisfied, and Ms. Hawkins confirmed that the only issue of contention was the garage. Mr. Sherman suggested that the subsequent discussion focus on the proposed garage.

Mr. Flaynik directed the Commission's attention to the perspective renderings of the proposed garage and section cut taken through the Panama Street side. Mr. Flaynik noted that the Streets Department had approved the driveway the previous day.

Mr. Reuter and Mr. Flaynik discussed the proposed changes to the exterior, including the removal of brick and the two basement windows on the Panama Street facade. They noted that the windows on the first floor would be retained in their entirety, and that the setback of the garage door from the plane of the façade would be six inches, in keeping with the setback of most of the windows on the building.

Mr. Reuter then discussed points that had been raised at the Architectural Committee meeting, specifically that this is a corner property and that some historic fabric would be removed. He noted that there is some question as to whether the rear ell is original to the building, the main block of which presumably dates to the 1850s or earlier. His research determined that an ancillary structure was located at the rear of the structure around the time of construction, but that this addition was demolished and the existing rear ell was constructed around the 1890s. He stated that it was possible that the original ancillary structure was a stable, as was typical of properties in the Rittenhouse/Fitler district in the mid-nineteenth century. He stated that he felt there was an impression that because historic fabric was being removed, it created a *per se* basis for denial by the Commission. He then distributed a National Park Service (NPS) brief on the installation of garages in historic structures, stating that it was the applicant's understanding that, under Standards 2 and 9, the installation of the garage at 1800 Delancey Street was compatible with the district. Mr. Reuter then noted that this block of Panama Street is strictly a service alley, with no properties fronting the street.

Ms. Hawkins interjected that the Architectural Committee's main cause for concern was not the removal of original historic fabric (noting that the existing rear ell was actually historic material that had gained significance over time), but the fact that the garage would be highly visible because the property is a corner lot. She stated that it was the property's location on the corner and the perception of the proposed garage from 18th Street, rather than Panama Street, that was of primary concern to the Architectural Committee. Ms. Hawkins acknowledged that the design for the garage is sensitive and an excellent architectural resolution to a geometric challenge, and that were the property located mid-block or even three properties down the alley, the proposed change would be more appropriate than at a principle cross-street.

Mr. Reuter countered that the Panama Street façade is a tertiary façade, with the main façade fronting on Delancey Street, and the largest, secondary façade facing 18th Street. He noted that there would be little to no visibility of the proposed garage from the corner of 18th and Delancey Streets, and that the garage would only be visible traveling south along 18th Street toward Panama Street. He again noted that the original use of this portion of the house was as a service entrance, and it was the applicant's belief that the garage was consistent with the character and use of the property. With respect to the character of the historic district, Mr. Reuter stated that they did not believe that the installation of the garage would negatively impact the district, despite the property's heightened visibility as a corner property, as many of the other properties in the district along Delancey Street already have garages. He contended that in preservation law, there is a focus on allowing properties to be updated for current needs.

Mr. Flaynik stated that the owner maintained that the installation of a garage would add approximately \$250,000 in resale value to the property, based on local real estate estimates.

Mr. Reuter noted that the property is currently a multi-tenant dwelling and that there could be as many as 4-6 units (and thus persons) in the building, each of whom could have a car, adding to the number of cars on the street. By converting the property to a single-family dwelling, the applicant would be decreasing that number to a maximum of two cars, and increasing the sustainability of the property. He further stated that the potential added value provided by the installation of a garage remains a significant factor in the applicant moving forward with the entire renovation project. He noted that, despite this fact, they are not making a financial hardship claim.

Finally, Mr. Reuter noted the Commission's approval of several other garages in the neighboring area, including another property at the corner of 18th and Panama Streets, and one at 1915-23 Pine Street, which was approved on the Consent Agenda earlier in the meeting.

Ms. Jones asked the staff and/or Ms. Hawkins if there was anything in the record to support the position that the portion of the property in which the garage would be constructed was once a carriage house. Mr. Baron responded that there was no information to that effect, but that it would be easy to check on historic atlases, because carriage houses were demarcated with an "X" on the roof structure. Mr. Reuter noted that he found a one-story addition with an "X" at the property on the 1864 Hexamer & Locher atlas, indicating that it probably was an ancillary structure. He did not provide a copy of this image as the digital quality was too poor for reproduction.

Mr. Sherman asked whether the existing wrought iron fencing at the rear of the property would be reused, and Mr. Flaynik responded that it would be used as a gate and to line the drive.

Mr. Sherman asked whether a brick wing wall would provide an appropriate turning radius and sight lines, and whether that option had been considered as a way to minimize the visual impact of the garage door from 18th Street. Mr. Flaynik responded that they had considered that option, and were open to the Commission's input on that matter. He noted that there would be sufficient salvageable brick to use to construct such a wall.

Mr. Sherman questioned the proposed means of access to and from the garage via Panama Street, and whether Panama Street is one or two-way. Mr. Flaynik responded that Panama Street is a two-way service road, and that the Streets Department had concluded that access into the driveway would be obtained from Panama Street.

Ms. Hawkins noted that when the Architectural Committee reviewed the application in the same way that the Committee and Commission have ruled on roof-top additions, looking specifically at the visibility of this property as a corner lot. She stated that the experience of walking down 18th Street was the primary concern of the Architectural Committee.

Mr. Schaaf asked whether it would be possible to retain a course or two of brick beneath the sills of the first floor windows on the Panama Street façade in order to soften the appearance of the garage. Mr. Flaynik responded that they were open to those kinds of modifications, and that it would be possible, although structurally more difficult, to retain two rows of brick. Mr. Flaynik noted that the current plans have a clearance of seven feet, which could be dropped to six feet, eight inches and still allow for vehicle access, although SUV access would be prohibited.

Mr. Reuter again presented the NPS brief on the installation of garages in historic structures, noting that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards allow for the modification of buildings to accommodate modern uses, and emphasized that the visibility of a modern alteration should not be the basis of a *per se* denial of the application.

Mr. Mattioni noted that the addition of a brick wing wall and brick courses beneath the first floor window sills would soften the appearance of the garage enough to make it relatively innocuous and create some degree of compatibility with the view down 18th street.

Ms. Hawkins asked for clarification that the window sills would be retained, and Mr. Flaynik confirmed that they would.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to approve the application, provided two courses of brick are retained above the garage door lintel and below the window sills and a brick wing wall is substituted for the proposed metal railing between the garage entrance and the 18th Street sidewalk, with the staff to review details. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 1. Ms. Hawkins dissented.

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.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize vinyl windows that were installed in this house without a permit and to approve the installation of additional vinyl windows in all other openings. The designs of the installed and proposed windows do not match the material, profiles, or pane configurations of the historic windows. Moreover, the application is incomplete. It lacks shop drawings as well as drawings or photographs of the facades detailing the locations where windows have been and will be replaced. A cover letter submitted with the application stipulates

that it is a financial hardship application, but the application fails to provide many of the documents required for a financial hardship review. The applicant also claims that he purchased the windows before the designation of the East Logan Street Historic District; however, such a claim is irrelevant. The building was individually designated many years before the applicant purchased the property and many years before the district was established. Moreover, a building permit is required for the replacement of windows in residential buildings with more than two units, such as this one, regardless of the property's historic designation status.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. No one represented the application. He said that the staff recommends tabling the application for a period of up to six months to allow the Hardship Committee to consider the application.

Mr. Farnham confirmed that the Committee on Financial Hardship would meet at 9:00 a.m. on 17 December.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to table the application for a period not to exceed six months and refer it to the Committee on Financial Hardship. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 8020 ST MARTINS LA

Project: Install ramp and doors

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: St. Martin-in-the-Fields Episcopal Church

Applicant: Lawrence McEwen, McEwen Architects

History: 1888; Saint Martin-in-the-Fields Church; Hewitt Brothers, architects; Baptistry added, T.P. Chandler, 1898

Individual Designation: 8/7/1980

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the ramp and associated railings, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install an ADA access at the sanctuary entrance of St. Martin-in-the-Fields Church. The installation of the ramp would require moving the existing steps out to provide space for a landing at the sanctuary entrance. The ramp would be either brushed concrete or thermal-finish flagstone. The side walls would be schist and the railings black-painted steel.

This application also proposes to install accessible doors in an entrance to the parish hall. The new doors would be compatible in design and materials. The original doors would be retained and mounted to the walls on either side of the doorway.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Schaaf recused. Ms. Cote presented the application to the Commission. No one represented the application.

Ms. Cote noted that there was some confusion regarding to the proposed doors. The staff had received an email indicating that the applicant had taken the Architectural Committee's

suggestions into account for this portion of the application, and that they did have the head height for glass doors.

Ms. Hawkins clarified that the Committee recommended that the existing historic wood doors remain as out-swinging and that new glass doors be placed inside. Because the applicant was amenable to this and the existing historic doors will remain in place, there is in essence no change.

Ms. Merriman noted that when she reviewed the before and after photographs of the existing and proposed conditions, she had difficulty identifying the change, indicating to her that the change was indeed sensitive and compatible.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to approve the application, with the staff to review details. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 263 S 15TH ST

Project: Remove projecting sign, install projecting neon sign

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: David Blumenfeld

Applicant: Linda Brown, Brown Expediting

History: 1922; Hoffman Henon Company, architects and engineers

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the new sign is approximately 6 feet tall and mounted approximately 12 feet above the sidewalk, like the historic sign, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a projecting neon sign. The sign would be based on a sign that once stood on this building and is documented in an historic photograph. The sign in the historic photograph appears to be approximately 6 feet tall and mounted about 12 feet above the sidewalk. The proposed sign would be 8 feet tall and mounted 17'-8" above the sidewalk.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Business owner Casey Parker and sign maker Leonard Davis represented the application.

Mr. Baron noted that the applicant met with the staff and presented information indicating that the historic sign actually was larger than the staff had originally estimated by counting brick courses. He explained that the mortar joints between the bricks are wider than typical. Mr. Baron also stated that the applicant would like to use a particular type of neon tubing that requires a minimum radius size that would not fit on six-foot-tall sign. Mr. Baron noted that the proposed sign design includes a curve that is not depicted in the elevation drawing, which would make the sign appear smaller in width once constructed. He noted that the staff now recommends approval of the sign, provided that it is lowered to the agreed upon height on the façade of the building.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1914-16 RITTENHOUSE SQ

Project: Renovate building, remove and construct additions

Review Requested: Review In Concept

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 that the proposed removals constitute a demolition, not an alteration. Ms. Pentz dissented. Regarding the new construction, the Committee voted unanimously to recommend that, in general, the form, scale, massing, placement, height, and footprint are compatible with the streetscape and historic district, but that the garages on Manning should be redesigned, the tripartite division of the new façade on Rittenhouse Square was not appropriately scaled, and the material choices should be developed.

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes alterations and additions to the property at 1914-16 Rittenhouse Square, at the southwest corner of the square.

A large house stands on five parcels, 1914 and 1916 Rittenhouse Square and 1915, 1917, and 1919 Manning Street. The house has a long and complex history. The main block of the house stands at 1914 Rittenhouse Square and was constructed about 1859 for Alfred M. Collins. Henry McIlhenny, famed socialite and art collector, purchased the house at 1914 Rittenhouse and the parcels on Manning in 1950 and the house at 1916 Rittenhouse in 1955. In the early 1950s, McIlhenny reconstructed the rear wall of the main block and much of the rear ell at 1914 and constructed a garage along Manning. In 1957, McIlhenny and his architect George B. Roberts undertook a major rehabilitation of the property. They demolished the house at 1916 and constructed a one-story domed entrance pavilion on the site. At that time, they removed a large section of the west party wall at the first floor of the main block of the house at 1914 to accommodate a large gallery that stretches across the entire width of the parcels at 1914 and 1916. They also repaired, reconstructed, stuccoed, and painted the remaining west party wall, which shifted significantly with the demolition of 1916 and was in danger of collapse. The pavilion, main block, rear ell and garage form a U-shaped structure that encloses a courtyard. Although one interconnected property at the time of construction in 1957 and at the time of the designation of the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District in 1995, the main block, entrance pavilion, and garage are treated separately in the district's inventory. The main block at 1914 is classified as Significant, the pavilion at 1916 as Contributing, and the garage on Manning as Non-contributing in the district inventory. Also, the 1916 section is incorrectly dated to 1940 in the inventory; its correct date is 1957, post-dating the district's period of significance, 1801-1950. In 1973, McIlhenny purchased the mansion to the east at 1912 Rittenhouse Square and internally connected it to the buildings at 1914-16. When McIlhenny died in 1986, his heirs subdivided the mansion at 1912 from the remainder of the property at 1914-16 and sold it separately. The

property at 1912 is not part of the current application. The property at 1914-16 Rittenhouse Square has remained vacant since McIlhenny's death in 1986.

This in-concept application proposes to remove parts of the building including the entrance pavilion, rear ell, and garage and construct new additions. The application seeks an in-concept approval based on the Historical Commission's 27 September 1999 approval of a very similar application for Henry McNeil Jr., a former owner.

Before purchasing the property and submitting the application that led to the final approval in September 1999, Mr. McNeil submitted an in-concept application to determine whether the Commission would look favorably on the notion of demolishing the 1950s additions and adding to the historic section of the house. At meetings on 31 March and 8 April 1998, the Architectural Committee and Commission expressed general support for the proposal, albeit in an advisory manner.

In 1999, Mr. McNeil submitted an application proposing to remove parts of the building including the entrance pavilion, rear ell, and garage and construct new additions. It proposed a rooftop addition with deck on the main block of 1914, a 4-story addition on the site of the entrance pavilion at 1916, a four-story rear ell, and a two-story garage on Manning. The Architectural Committee reviewed the application on 25 May 1999, 8 July 1999, and 27 July 1999. The Historical Commission reviewed the application on 9 June 1999, 14 July 1999, and 11 August 1999, and approved it with revisions and conditions on 27 September 1999. The application survived years of appeals, but was never implemented. Following the Commission's approval on 27 September 1999, two neighbors appealed the approval to the Board of License & Inspection Review (Appeals 32363 and 32366). The appeals were placed on hold while dimensional zoning variances were considered. On 29 March 2000, the Zoning Board of Adjustment granted the variances, which were appealed. On 2 January 2001, the Court of Common Pleas reversed the Zoning Board and invalidated the variances. In response, the Board of License & Inspection Review declared the appeals of the Historical Commission's approval moot on 5 February 2001. The appellants appealed that Board's decision to declare the appeals moot to the Court of Common Pleas, which reversed it and remanded the appeals of the Historical Commission's approval back to the Board on 26 April 2001. On 2 August 2002, the Commonwealth Court reversed the Court of Common Pleas and reinstated the zoning variances. Finally, on 21 April 2003, almost four years after the original decision, the Board of License & Inspection Review affirmed the Historical Commission's approval. Despite the decision, the project was never undertaken and the property has sat vacant since 1986.

In 2002, while the approval was on appeal, Mr. McNeil submitted an application to the Commission that proposed revisions to the design of the Manning Street façade. The Architectural Committee reviewed the application on 28 May 2002 and the Historical Commission approved it on 14 June 2002, reaffirming its 1999 approval.

Like the earlier, litigated application, the current application proposes to remove the 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. Like the earlier application, the current application also proposes to remove the rear ell and garage and construct a new rear ell and garage of roughly the same sizes in roughly the same locations. It also proposes removals and alterations to the rear section of the main block including the rear wall, which was reconstructed in 1951, and the west party wall, which was partially reconstructed in 1957.

The in-concept application asks the Commission to determine whether the removals constitute a demolition in the legal sense. The record of the 1999 and 2002 approvals, which were extensively litigated, can be examined to determine whether that case established a precedent for the current application. Beyond the alteration-demolition question, the in-concept application asks the Commission to determine whether the proposed work complies with historic preservation standards, especially Standard 9. With the level of detail provided, the Commission's review should be limited to the overarching concepts such as the footprint, heights, volumes, massing, scale, and proportions, but not the detailing and other parameters of the design, which remain undefined.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Property owner Bart Blatstein, attorneys Carl Primavera and Sean Whalen, preservation consultant Robert Powers, and architects Shimi Zakin and Jonathan Doran represented the application.

Mr. Primavera explained that Mr. Powers, who served as the preservation consultant for the project approved in 1999, will provide an overview of the building's history and many alterations and additions, and Mr. Zakin, the architect, will summarize the proposal to remove sections of the building and construct new additions. Mr. Primavera stated that he agrees with the history of the property as outlined by Mr. Farnham in the introduction to the project. He noted that he and Mr. Farnham researched the property independently in different archives and came to the same conclusions about it. Mr. Primavera stated that the Commission's 1999 decision stands as strong precedent in this case. He noted that that decision was "vigorously litigated" and stood up to the scrutiny. He stated that expert consultants looked at the issues from all sides at the time and all of the relevant information was considered. He concluded that the Commission's earlier approval as well as the affirmation of the Board of License & Inspection Review and the collateral Court of Common Pleas decisions on the zoning aspects of the case provide, "if not binding precedent, then tremendous guidance." He asked the Commission to conclude, as it had in 1999, that the proposed work is an alteration, not a demolition.

Mr. Powers stated that he served as a consultant to the former owner on the earlier project, which was approved. He stated that he tracked the evolution of the building, dating and determining the significance of each of the sections that comprise it. He stated that he had concluded in 1999 that the former owner's proposal satisfied historic preservation standards and was a reasonable solution to the complex redevelopment question posed by this difficult property. He stated that the current application is very similar to the application approved in 1999. It too is proposing to retain and restore the main block and remove the same later additions and alterations. The current application is consistent with the 1999 application, which was approved and litigated. Mr. Primavera asked Mr. Powers to summarize some of his key findings. Mr. Powers stated that he found that the pavilion wing at 1916 Rittenhouse was not a stand-alone building, but was a wing constructed in 1957, after the historic district's period of significance. Mr. Powers also pointed out that Henry McIlhenney owned 1912 Rittenhouse, the mansion to the east, which served as his primary residence. He contended that McIlhenney considered the 1914-16 Rittenhouse Square property as less significant. He also noted that the 1916 portion of the property is classified as an intrusion in the National Register Historic District.

Mr. Primavera introduced Mr. Zakin and asked him to speak first about the alteration-demolition question and then about the proposed construction. Mr. Zakin displayed a series of images showing the sections of the building that were proposed for removal in 1999 and are proposed for removal currently. He noted that he is proposing to retain most of the roof of the main block

of 1914 Rittenhouse, while the former owner proposed to remove it entirely. He is also proposing to retain the front chimney. He observed that he is proposing to remove a portion of the west or party wall, but to retain the front section of it. Mr. Zakin displayed a front elevation drawing from the 1999 application and pointed out the large rooftop addition that was proposed at that time. He stated that he is not proposing any rooftop additions. Mr. Primavera stated and Mr. Powers confirmed that the building has been vacant since the mid 1980s. Mr. Zakin showed floor plans of the proposed development compared to the development approved in 1999.

Mr. Sherman suggested that the Commission decide the alteration-demolition question before reviewing the design of the proposed construction. Ms. Merriman stated that, after reviewing the record including the litigation and the current proposal, she is convinced that the earlier approval establishes a precedent in this case. She stated that she believes that the Commission must find that the removal of the pavilion, ell, garage, and other features are an alteration in the legal sense, not a demolition. Mr. Thomas reported that he was a member of the Commission when the earlier application was reviewed and approved in 1999. He observed that the Commission reviewed the earlier application carefully at many meetings before reaching a conclusion that the proposed removals were an alteration, not a demolition. He stated that the current application is similar to the approved application in all relevant ways and noted his agreement with Ms. Merriman that the Commission should come to the same decision that it reached in 1999. He stated that he has seen no new information that would persuade him to change his mind and reach a different conclusion today. He asserted that the currently proposed work should be considered an alteration. He also complimented the architects on their visual presentation that detailed the 1999 and 2013 proposals. Ms. Hawkins stated that she disagreed with Ms. Merriman and Mr. Thomas and suggested that the precedent in this case should be the church on the west side of N. 21st Street, just south of Fairmount Avenue, not the earlier application for this property. She reminded the Commission that it had determined that the proposed removal of the rear of the building would constitute a demolition. She noted that this applicant is only proposing to retain the front 15 feet of the historic building at 1914 Rittenhouse. She conceded that the pavilion section of the building is not historically significant, but contended that the Commission should not approve the demolition of all but the front façade of a historic building. She stated that the demolition is “grossly inappropriate and really, really troubling to me.” Mr. Mattioni suggested that earlier decisions of the Commission are not “binding” on the Commission, but also suggested that it would be “unseemly” for the Commission to ignore its earlier decision for this property when the current proposal is nearly identical to the proposal approved in 1999. He suggested that it would be “inappropriate” to consider a set of facts and circumstances that are almost identical to those considered in 1999 and come to an opposite conclusion. He also noted that the Commission should take into account the fact that this property is the site of failed projects and has been vacant for many years. He concluded that he agrees with Mr. Thomas that the Commission should find that this application proposes an alteration, not a demolition. Ms. Jones asked Mr. Mattioni how he would distinguish this from the case of the church on N. 21st Street. Mr. Mattioni responded that one must look at each case on its merits. He added, however, that the applicant proposed removing significant fabric in the church case, but the current applicant only proposes removing non-historic fabric. Mr. Farnham agreed with Mr. Mattioni and explained that, in the case of the church, the applicants proposed to remove an original and unaltered section of the building. In this case, the sections of the building proposed for removal were either constructed or modified significantly in the 1950s, after the end of the period of significance of the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District. He noted, for example, that the rear wall of the main block of the house at 1914 Rittenhouse was reconstructed in the 1950s, after the district’s period of significance. Ms. Hawkins asked the architect to display the image showing the extent of the removals currently

proposed. She then asked Mr. Farnham to indicate the significance or lack thereof of the sections proposed for removal. Mr. Farnham explained that the pavilion is incorrectly dated to 1940 in the district's inventory; documents clearly show that it dates to 1957. The garage at the rear on Manning dates to the early 1950s. The rear ell underwent numerous changes in the twentieth century, but mostly dates to the 1950s. He stated that the rear wall of the main block was rebuilt when the windows were significantly enlarged in the 1950s. He noted that the return on the mansard dates to 1957. He observed that the party wall between 1914 and 1916 and the roof are largely original 1850 fabric, but were significantly altered and reinforced in 1957. He stated that the current plan deviates from the approved 1999 plan in only one regard, at the west party wall between 1914 and 1916 Rittenhouse. He noted that the party wall was an interior wall until 1957, when it was exposed with the demolition of the building at 1916. During the period of significance, the west party wall was an interior wall. He added that the Commission has routinely treated exposed party walls as non-historic fabric. For example, the Commission has allowed them to be stuccoed and has even suggested that they are appropriate locations for murals. He concluded that the removal of a former party wall is not a demolition in the legal sense because the Commission has not treated party walls as historically significant fabric. He also explained that the current application does not propose the removal of the entire roof structure of the main block, as did the approved 1999 application. Mr. Sherman asked Mr. Farnham to explain why this application is not akin to the Curtis Institute application for Locust Street. Mr. Farnham explained that the Curtis application proposed to demolish all but the front facades of two rowhouses, including fabric that was original and significant. In that case, the Commission decided that the removals were demolitions because of the extent of removal of significant fabric, but then approved the application after the Curtis Institute demonstrated that the demolition was necessary in the public interest. Mr. Primavera stated that the Dilworth House case is more akin to this case. There, the Commission approved the removals of side and rear wings as alterations after determined that they were not character-defining features. Mr. Powers, the preservation consultant, concurred with Mr. Farnham's explanation of the significance and lack thereof of the various sections of the building. He stated that his 1999 report demonstrated that the sections of the building proposed for removal were constructed or significantly altered after the end of the district's period of significance and, by definition, are therefore not historically significant. Mr. Primavera added that Richard Tyler, the former director of the Historical Commission, had also prepared a report on the history of the building for the 1999 review and noted that the conclusions of that report corresponded with the conclusions of the report of Mr. Powers.

Mr. Sherman asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak on the merits of the application related to the alteration-demolition question. No one spoke.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to find 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. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 10 to 1. Ms. Hawkins dissented.

Mr. Zakin presented the new construction portion of the application to the Commission. He explained that the building would be used as a single-family townhouse. He noted that the main entrance would be shifted to the west to the new addition, but the historic entrance at 1914 would be retained and used as a secondary entrance. He walked the Commissioners through the interior plans and pointed out the features such as the interior courtyard and garages.

Mr. Zakin displayed elevation drawings of the proposed development. He noted that the addition at 1916 Rittenhouse would be set back at the east to respect the mansard at 1914 and to create an alcove for a new entranceway. The addition would be three stories at the front and would have a fourth story, which would be set back and would have the scale and proportions of the mansard at 1914. With a series of images, he showed how the fenestration in the addition at 1916 would correspond with the windows at the historic building at 1914 without mimicking them. He explained a series of subtle, complex relationships between the new and old sections of the building, some of which balanced mass with void and void with mass. He concluded that the addition is a new, modern interpretation of the historic building, not a copy. He stated that the additions will have the same massing as the historic segments of the building and its neighbors. It will not be taller. He stated that they are not proposing the rooftop pilot house and deck that was approved for the previous owner in 1999. He stated that the set-back area at the new entrance to the house will include a large public sculpture, which will refer to the old use of the pavilion as an art gallery. The wall behind the sculpture will be limestone. He noted that the main entrance will be emphasized, as are the main entrances to the nearby historic mansions; they are not simply punched openings, but have special architectural character. The cornice line at 1914 will be continued onto the addition at 1916. There will be a terrace at the fourth-floor level of the 1916 façade.

Mr. Zakin turned his attention to the rear façade along Manning Street. He explained that the rear façade conforms to the heights and characters of the buildings to the east and west. At the east, the ell is as tall as the ell to the east and includes a bay like the ell to the east. At the west, the building conforms to the heights of its neighbors to the west. He noted that the building is broken down into three sections, like the three buildings that once stood on the lots. He observed that his proposal is very similar to the approved 1999 proposal. He noted the correspondences between his design and the designs of the adjacent buildings, especially the proportions and rhythms of doors and windows.

Mr. Zakin then discussed the proposed materials. The brick would be similar to the brick of the historic house at 1914. He noted the limestone that would be used for accents on the front façade. The cornices and roof fascia would be metal. The doors would be wood and the windows in 1914 would be restored.

Mr. Schaaf stated that the architect's presentation was convincing and the design well composed. He noted that the detailing on 1914 is brownstone and asked the architect if he could replace the proposed limestone detailing on 1916 with brownstone to give the building a unity. Mr. Zakin thanked Mr. Schaaf for his suggestion and offered to explore it. Ms. Merriman suggested additional glazing at the western edge of the front façade of 1916. Mr. Zakin explained that they had considered additional glazing in that part of the façade, but had decided that the volume needed a massiveness to counterbalance the larger volume at 1914. He noted, however, that he would study the suggestion. She suggested that the façade would be more engaging with more glass. Mr. Zakin noted that he is proposing glass on both sides of the limestone. He also noted that the exterior is designed to reflect the spaces and activities in the interior. For example, the double-height window reflects the double-height space behind it. Ms. Hawkins reported that historic rowhouses have 30% to 50% glass on front facades. She suggested that the proposed façade should have a similar amount of glazing; it appears to have only 15% or 20% glazing. Mr. Zakin again offered to study the suggestion. Mr. Thomas asked about the treatment of the wall facing the alley between 1916 and 1918. Mr. Zakin replied that it would be brick, not stucco. Ms. Hawkins asked the architect to display the Manning Street elevation. She stated that the scale of the double-wide garage doors is out of character with the

street. She stated that they would detract from the pedestrian experience. She suggested breaking up the span of doors by adding a pedestrian door or turning the large doors into three smaller doors. Mr. Zakin replied that he is exploring alternative garage doors. For example, he is looking at a company that can make garage doors from almost any material including bricks. He stated that he will revise the garage door design. Mr. Primavera concurred that the design team will explore garage door options. Mr. Schaaf asked if a detail like the corner window on the ell could be used on the front façade to add more glazing. Mr. Primavera agreed to explore Mr. Schaaf's suggestion.

Mr. Sherman asked if audience members had comments or questions. No one spoke.

Mr. Farnham apologized to the Commission for a typographical error in the Architectural Committee recommendation, which should read: "but that the garages on Manning should be redesigned," not simply "designed."

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

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 10:48 a.m., Ms. Hawkins moved to adjourn. 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 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

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

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

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

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

Section 14-1005(6)(d) Restrictions on Demolition.

No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building, structure, site, or object, or of a building, structure, site, or object located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.

DRAFT