

**THE MINUTES OF THE 619TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 14 MARCH 2014
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
Michael Fink, Department of Licenses & Inspections
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
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

Mark Merlini, Brickstone
John Connors, Brickstone
David Capelli, Stantec
Caroline Boyce, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
John Andrew Gallery
Leonard F. Reuter, Esq.
Tony Forte, Esq., Saul Ewing
Andy Kaplin, 220 Race
Marc Kaplin, 220 Race
Richard Villa, Ambit Architecture
Neil Rodin, IFC
O. Nash, IFC
Will Schwartz, INTECH Construction
Matt McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr
David Gest, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Peter Angelides, Econsult Solutions
Paul Safran, iPic Gold Class
Hamid Hashemi, iPic Gold Class
Meg Sowell, Real Estate Strategies
Stephen Kazanjian, Real Estate Strategies
Richard Gelber, spg3 Architects
Janice Vacca, Harman Group

Travis Alderson, Alderson Engineering
Eric Farrell, Stantec
Christian Busch, 20th Century Preservation
Susan Milner, Jefferson Hospital
Lawrence Weintraub, Martin Jay Rosenblum, Architects
Mark Feinstein
Cindy Feinstein
Daniel Harkins, Brickhouse Developers
Marcio Tavares, The Architectural Team
Taya Dixon, Epsilon Associates
Howard Haas, Friends of the Boyd (FOB)
Andrew Repasky McElhinney
Emma Wiggins
Zachary Darrup
J. Matthew Wolfe, FOB
Christine Sincavage, FOB
Katherine O'Brien, FOB
James Farmer, FOB
Kathy Dowdell, AIA/Preservation Alliance
Sharon Pinkenson, Greater Philadelphia Film Office
Inga Saffron, Philadelphia Inquirer
Gabriel Gottlieb
Robert Bender, FOB
Noah Burd, FOB
Roseanne Kozlow
Mark Lunden, O'Donnell & Naccarato
Nelda Horwitz, FOB
Nancy Colman, FOB
David Brownlee, University of Pennsylvania
Rich Heimlich, Slashcomment.com
Richard Tyler
Vincent Feldman, University of the Arts
Larry Pitt
Phyllis Melock
Denis Cormier
Peter Hearn, Esq.
Dane Wells, CCRA
Charles Goodwin, CCRA
David Rose, William Penn House
Matt Grubel, FOB
Robert Powers, Powers & Co.
Mark Wheeler, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Richard Gross
Kathryn Gay
Henry Hauptfuhrer, FOB
John Nelson, FOB
Mike McLoone, FOB
Herb Moskowitz, FOB
Carole Maher

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman, the chair, called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. Commissioners Dilworth, Hawkins, Fink, Jones, Leonard, Mattioni, Merriman, Palantino, Schaaf, and Turner joined him.

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

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the minutes of the 618th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 28 February 2014. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 FEBRUARY 2014

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included two applications: 4624-42 Walnut Street and 118 Kenilworth 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: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for 4624-42 Walnut Street and 118 Kenilworth Street. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 200 W WASHINGTON SQ

Project: Install ADA entrance

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: St. James Associates Joint Venture

Applicant: Eric Farrell

History: 1869; PSFS Building, York Row, St. James; Addison Hutton, architect; Additions and alterations by Hutton and Furness Evans & Co.

Individual Designation: 5/28/1957

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

Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application with the new ADA entrance on Walnut Street, provided the interior layout is reconsidered to allow for use by other building tenants and future tenants, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an ADA compliant entrance for a new urgent care facility that will occupy the northeast corner of the former PSFS building. The application offers two options for location of the ADA entrance. The first of these options modifies the existing window immediately to the west of the main entrance. The second of these options modifies the first existing window around the corner from the main entrance, on West Washington Square. The modifications to the windows in both options involves cutting down the masonry opening to the level of the sidewalk, removing an existing basement window and a section of spandrel cladding, and modifying the lower half of the existing double hung window

above, along with portions of the original wrought iron window grille. The proposed ADA entrance door for both options is a single, glass and raised-panel door with decorative jambs, head and transom, matching the original extant design of the historic main entrance. Also included in the proposal is a modest sloped awning over the new entrance.

There is an existing ADA compliant entrance at the rear of the building along Saint James Street that should be considered for this purpose, in order to alleviate the need to modify an existing window opening on the highly significant historic building.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Sherman announced that the Historical Commission would consider this application out of order at the request of the architect, who needed to travel to Virginia as soon as possible. Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Christian Busch and attorney Tony Forte represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants if they were able to reduce the size of the entrance vestibule, as had been requested by the Architectural Committee. Mr. Busch responded that they looked at several scenarios for the entrance vestibule, but owing to interior constraints, were not able to move it towards the wall. He also noted that they considered a different directional opening for the elevator cab, but they could not make that scenario work for the interior either. Ms. Hawkins provided background as to the Committee's recommendation, noting that there is an existing ADA entrance from Saint James Street, and the multiple tenancy of this building could result in future tenants requesting permission to modify the façades further for additional entrances. She explained that the Committee's recommendation of approval of the new Walnut Street entrance was based on a request that the new entrance be accessible to other tenants, to alleviate the need in the future to cut new openings. Ms. Hawkins further explained that the West Washington Square entrance option was more noticeable, and the Walnut Street entrance option provides a more dignified entrance for users. She also reminded the Commission that there is an existing ADA entrance on Saint James Street. Mr. Busch responded that the proposed interior circulation would allow other tenants to use the new Walnut Street entrance in the future. He explained that their preference of a Walnut Street ADA entrance is predicated on its proximity to the historic main entrance to the building, and its ease of use and clarity for a visitor to the building who needs to utilize the ADA entrance. He also noted that the existing ADA entrance on Saint James Street results in a much longer walk around the building for someone who is dropped off at the main entrance. Finally, he noted that the tenant has a long-term lease and will utilize this entrance for a long period of time.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to approve the application with the new ADA entrance on Walnut Street, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 9. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 1. Mr. Mattioni dissented. Ms. Hawkins abstained.

ADDRESS: 701-39 MARKET ST

Project: Construct residential tower

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Independence Center Realty LP

Applicant: Mark Merlini, Independence Center Realty LP

History: 1859; Lit Brothers Store; various buildings, 1859-1906

Individual Designation: 5/26/1970, 6/30/1970

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the bridge over Filbert Street and the copper bridge are preserved, owing to the proposed tower's footprint, its large setbacks from the primary facades of the very large historic structure, and to the development of the historic structure, which grew and changed over time; with the staff and Architectural Committee to review details; pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: The Mellon Independence Center, formerly the Lit Brothers Department Store, is an enormous structure occupying an entire city block. It consists of a series of interconnected buildings and additions bounded by Market Street, 8th Street, Filbert Street, and 7th Street. This application proposes to construct a 35-story, 400-foot-tall residential tower within the footprint of the existing building along Filbert Street, a service alley. A section of the interior and roof would be removed and the tower would be constructed within the existing building behind the six-story Filbert Street façade. The ground floor of the Filbert Street façade, which has been altered many times, would be altered to accommodate entrances and loading dock for the tower. Two historic bridges, one spanning Filbert Street connecting the former department store to the warehouse and the other spanning a loading entrance to the east along Filbert, would be retained. The tower would be setback at least 150 feet from the primary facades on 7th and 8th Streets and 180 feet from the front façade on Market Street.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. Developers Mark Merlini and John Connors, and architect David Capelli represented the application.

Mr. Connors commented that the Mellon Independence Center sits on a large parcel of land approximately 140,000 square feet, and the proposed tower will take up approximately 12,000 square feet, or less than 10% of the total land area. Owing to the prescribed floor area ratio (FAR), the property can be developed by right to about two and a half million square feet of space, while the existing building comprises roughly 700,000 square feet. The new tower will add approximately 350,000 square feet, still well below that allowed by the FAR.

Mr. Connors noted that the current building is an amalgamation of at least 13 to 17 structures combined over 50 or 60 years. When they undertook the redevelopment of the building beginning in 1986, he continued, they had to reorganize the parcels so that today the structure is organized into three buildings, which they call A, B, and C buildings. "A" building runs along 7th Street, north to south, "B" building comprises the middle, and "C" building runs along 8th Street. The buildings are further divided into north-south sections, creating six separate legal occupancies within the city block footprint. The proposed tower would be located in the north central piece, which operates independently from the other portions of the building, which are serviced by independent cores and mechanical systems. He noted that, when they purchased the building, there was an existing Part II of a historic tax credit application that had made an application for 109 residential units in the same area.

Mr. Connors stated that worked hard to find the location in the building for the tower that would have the least impact visually, with the proposed tower being set back 180 feet from Market Street and a minimum of 150 feet from 7th and 8th Streets. He added that the Federal Courthouse tower immediately to the east is actually closer to the building line than the proposed tower. The proposed tower limits the amount of material disturbance of the existing building, with only minor modifications at street level along Filbert Street for loading docks and a secondary entrance. The primary entrance, he noted, would be through the building core and accessible to 7th Street, 8th Street, Market Street, and the subway concourse.

Mr. Connors continued that they had always anticipated constructing a tower in the future, but that he would not have guessed it would be residential. He noted, however, that market forces have driven the project that way, and the proposed tower joins at least seven other conceptual towers along east Market Street.

Mr. Sherman asked when construction would begin on the project, pending the outcome of the meeting. Mr. Connors replied that considerable work still needed to be done, and that Historical Commission approval was the first step prior to Zoning and Civic Design Review. Once those reviews have been conducted and the developer has received feedback, Mr. Connors noted that it would take approximately two years to construct the building.

Ms. Hawkins noted that that Architectural Committee was in favor of the project conceptually, but did not feel that the design was in keeping with the context in which the building is located, and thus had recommended that the applicant consider alternative designs for the exterior skin of the tower and return to the Committee. Ms. Hawkins added that, in her opinion, the level of detail in this application regarding materials and other elements is not what is normally presented to or accepted by the Committee and Commission. She suggested that, if there is a favorable action by the Commission, the Committee conduct an additional review. Mr. Connors acknowledged Ms. Hawkins concerns, stating that one of the Committees' comments had been that the proposed tower was inappropriately bland, and noting that that had actually been done on purpose. Their interpretation of compatibility, he noted, was different than that of the Committee, but in response to the criticisms proffered the Committee, they subsequently revised the drawings to include a significantly different exterior wall comprised primarily of glass. Mr. Capelli presented the revised drawings to the Commission. The revised façade is composed of an aluminum panel and glass window wall system in a grid formation that picks up two units vertically in a single frame. The colors include a charcoal building frame with light grey framework and an aluminum finish on the window system, creating a modern look more in contrast with the historic structure.

Mr. Connors commented that they still must go through the Civic Design Review process, and are unsure what sort of feedback they will receive there. He noted that they are various opinions about the relative appropriateness of the two designs, but commented that the latter design represents a more contemporary look they feel is responsive to the Committee's comments by adding glass elements and removing the pronounced verticality of the original proposal.

Mr. Mattioni opined that his personal opinion was that the revised design had moved backwards in terms of appropriateness and compatibility. He felt the new proposal looks too much like the conversion of a factory building.

Mr. Schaaf asked the applicant to show where the proposed tower would be located on the roof plan, particularly in relationship to the existing skylight. The applicant clarified the relationship to the skylight, and Mr. Schaaf asked if the proposed tower would touch the Filbert Street façade, which the applicant noted it would, but minimally.

Mr. Sherman opened the floor for public comment. Caroline Boyce, Executive Director of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, distributed a letter that the Preservation Alliance submitted to the Architectural Committee, which concurred with the Architectural Committee recommendation. She emphasized that the Preservation Alliance is particularly concerned with the preservation of the pedestrian bridge known as the "Bridge of Sighs." She further noted that, while the Alliance believes that improvements have been made to the revised design, the proposed design still lacks the architectural distinction befitting the Lit Brothers Building.

Mr. Dilworth questioned whether, given the discussion about the design of the tower, an approval in-concept would be appropriate. Ms. Hawkins stated that, in her opinion, it would be. Mr. Sherman noted that the applicant is asking for final approval, and that he assumes the applicant still needs to secure financing. The applicant noted that, in order to move forward with the zoning process, they need to have approval from the Historical Commission, and then proceed with the Civic Design Review process as well. Mr. Schaaf clarified that the Civic Design Review process is advisory only. Ms. Hawkins reminded the Commission that the proposed project is still a 35-story building that will have an impact on one of the more notable buildings on Market Street, and that, in her opinion, final approval is not warranted unless the Architectural Committee has the time and opportunity to review and comment on the newly proposed design.

MOTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to deny the final approval of the application, but to approve it in-concept. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion.

Mr. Sherman asked whether, given the timeline the applicant is trying to follow, the applicant would be able to appear at the next Architectural Committee review. Mr. Farnham noted the deadline for submission to the next Architectural Committee meeting had already passed, which would push the applicant to the following month's meeting in May. The applicant noted that a May decision would further delay the zoning process. Ms. Hawkins noted that, given the Architectural Committee's recommendation that revised plans must be resubmitted, it would have been prudent for the applicant to have prepared the appropriate documents for resubmission. Mr. Farnham offered a compromise, noting that the Commission routinely provides final approval with the staff to review details, and, on occasion, the staff and the applicant disagree about the details, in which case, the staff forwards the application on to the Architectural Committee and Commission for a second review. The recommendation from the Architectural Committee, Mr. Farnham noted, was for approval with the staff and the Architectural Committee to review details, making it possible for the project to receive a final approval today, but be reviewed again by the Architectural Committee at a future date. If the Architectural Committee was unhappy with the ways in which the issues had been resolved, it could once again refer the application to the full Commission for resolution.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION: Ms. Hawkins and Ms. Leonard withdrew their motion to deny the final approval of the application, but to approve it in-concept.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided the bridge over Filbert Street and the copper bridge are preserved, owing to the proposed tower's footprint, its large setbacks from the primary facades of the very large historic structure, and to the development of the historic structure, which grew and changed over time; with the staff and Architectural Committee to review details; pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 4624-42 WALNUT ST

Project: Rehabilitate building, install ADA entrances, aluminum-clad windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Breslyn Limited Partnership

Applicant: Brett Meringoff, Breslyn Limited Partnership

History: 1913; Breslyn Apartments; Frederick C. Michaelsen, architect

Individual Designation: 11/4/1982

District Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the exterior and interior rehabilitation of five existing apartment buildings, to be undertaken as a historic rehabilitation tax credit project subject to review and approval by the National Park Service. Proposed exterior work includes exterior masonry cleaning, repair and repointing; replacement of existing windows and doors; and the installation of new ADA accessible entrances.

The application proposes to replace existing aluminum replacement windows with new historically-appropriate aluminum clad wood windows with historically-appropriate brickmolds and trim to match historic material. It also proposes to replace existing double doors on all front elevations with new metal doors with glazed panels to match existing, and to replace existing front elevation balcony doors and single-leaf doors on 47th Street with new solid core wood doors with panels and glazing to match existing, as well as to replace existing exterior aluminum storm doors with new aluminum storm doors.

The application further proposes new accessible entrances at 4628-30, 4636-38, and 4640-42 Walnut Street to be created by modifying existing window openings, and a new accessible enclosed vestibule to be installed below the east elevation metal fire balcony at 4640-42 Walnut Street. ADA accessibility would also require modifications to site grading and the installation of at-grade concrete ramps and stairs with railings. All work for ADA entrances would occur at side and rear elevations inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

The application also proposes the relocation of the existing metal gate between 4636-38 and 4640-42 Walnut Street, and the removal of the existing gate and replacement with a new gate on the Farragut Street elevation at 4624-26 Walnut Street, as well as the removal and replacement of the existing aluminum and PVC downspouts with new dark bronze aluminum downspouts and scuppers. Additional work includes the removal of the existing roof and repair of deteriorated decking followed by the installation of new insulation and a rubber membrane roofing system, and the location of mechanical equipment on the roof.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 1515-17 N 16TH ST

Project: Construct apartment building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 17 Street Development LP

Applicant: Hyon Kang, KCA Design

History: vacant lot, ID building demolished in 1999

Individual Designation: 7/1/1982

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the plans are revised to include articulation of the base, middle, and top of the building, a treatment over the main entrance, and the continuation of brick through the fourth floor façade and around the first bay of the side facades, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a nineteen 19-unit apartment building on a currently vacant lot. The proposed structure will be four stories in height, with the first three stories to be composed of burgundy/red/brown brick façade with brick quoins and the fourth story of stucco. The proposed windows on the 16th Street façade will be aluminum clad or composite, with trim to be of brick or cast stone.

The former structure at this location was individually designated in July 1982, but was demolished in May 1999 after it was deemed imminently dangerous. The Historical Commission approved the demolition without conditions. The property is not located does not fall within a historic district. The only remaining historic resource on the lot is a rear garden wall, which the applicant has agreed to retain.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Hyon Kang represented the application.

The Commissioners reviewed the revised application and agreed that it satisfied preservation standards.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 14 March 2014, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 118 KENILWORTH ST

Project: Construct third-floor addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: R. G. Woodstock Associates

Applicant: Dan Harkins, Brickhouse Developers, LLC

History: 1767

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the stair house to the deck is as low as possible, more of the rear wall is retained if possible, an appropriate transom is installed over the front door, the pent eave is roofed with wood shakes, and appropriate windows are installed on the front façade, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an addition on the rear ell of this eighteenth-century three-story structure. The rear ell is not visible from the public right of way. However, the building is very old and significant. The addition would demolish the roof of the ell and part of the rear slope of the main block. The staff contends that the design of the rear addition should be modified to avoid demolishing or connecting to the rear slope of the roof of the main building. The rear addition could gain additional space by replacing the hipped roof with a roof that extends to the rear of the rear ell. The application provides no details for the proposed restoration of the front façade, but the staff could work with the applicant to develop the appropriate details.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 417 S CARLISLE ST

Project: Construct roof deck and pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mark & Cindy Feinstein

Applicant: Martin Rosenblum, Martin J. Rosenblum & Associates

History: 1855

Individual Designation: 9/28/1965

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 3 to 2 to recommend approval, provided the deck railing is a cable wire railing and is reduced in height to 36 inches, the entire structure is lowered by cantilevering, the structure is invisible from the public right-of-way, and chimneys are not raised. Mr. McCoubrey and Ms. Pentz voted in opposition.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to add a roof deck and pergola on the main block of this house and a stair house on the rear ell. The Architectural Committee reviewed a similar application one month ago, in February 2014, and recommended denial. The earlier application proposed a deck on the front and rear slopes of the main roof of the rowhouse; the current application shifts the deck and stair house toward the rear, but the deck still stands on the rear slope of the main roof. The Commission typically approves roof decks on rear ells, but does not typically approve decks on main, gable roofs. This house is part of an exceptional row of

houses, which have a consistent height. A staff member is scheduled to view a mock-up before the Architectural Committee meeting.

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

Mr. Baron explained that he visited the site twice to determine the visibility of the proposed deck and stairhouse from the public right-of-way. The first one involved the proposal as seen by the Architectural Committee on 25 February 2014 with the deck set at the ridge line of the roof. At that time, all three elements of the structure were visible from the public right-of-way, mostly from the south along Lombard Street.

Mr. Reuter stated that they had revised the plans to make the deck and stairhouse either invisible or barely visible from the public right-of-way. He claimed that this assertion was confirmed by Mr. Baron's second site visit. The reduction in public visibility was accomplished by pulling the deck back four feet behind the ridge and lowering the structure of the stairhouse. The stairhouse would sit on the rear ell. Mr. Reuter said that a deck on the rear ell would not get sufficient sunlight. Mr. Baron displayed an aerial photograph that proved that the rear ell received direct sunlight. Mr. Reuter disputed the capacity of the photograph to accurately represent the sunlight at the level of the deck. Additionally, he asserted that the view from the rear ell would be unattractive.

Mr. Weintraub reported on the results of the site visit and explained that the pergola had been removed from the application.

Denis Cormier, the neighbor to the north, explained his and his neighbors' opposition to the deck on the main roof of the house. He submitted a petition from the neighbors objecting to the proposal.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to approve the application as presented at the Historical Commission meeting of 14 March 2014, provided no chimneys are altered, with the staff to review details. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 2. Ms. Hawkins and Mr. Schaaf dissented.

ADDRESS: 1219 LOCUST ST

Project: Legalize aluminum window

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rose Andrea Kozlow

Applicant: Rose Andrea Kozlow

History: 1890; Furness, Evans & Co.

Individual Designation: 7/5/1984

District Designation: None

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.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of aluminum windows installed without a permit. The illegal windows do not match the historic multi-pane windows, which are

known from historic photographs. The applicant contends that the illegal windows match later non-historic replacement windows. The Commission has always required restoration to the original design unless the later alteration has acquired its own significance. The one-over-one windows used as the basis for this replacement have no historical significance and should not have been used as models. A letter from the applicant asserts that damage from Hurricane Sandy resulting in one broken window necessitated the replacement. The owner is familiar with the Historical Commission's processes, having applied for permits in the past for the first-floor window and a rear garage.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Rose Andrea Kozlow and contractor Tim Maloney represented the application.

Mr. Maloney explained that he has done work for Ms. Kozlow over many years. He said that he repaired the building after it sustained damage from Hurricane Sandy. The work included repair of a perilously hanging cornice as well as a broken window. He said that while they had the scaffolding up they determined that it was wise to replace the windows. Mr. Maloney said that he had the window manufacturer make up windows over a weekend and they installed them quickly. He reported that he thought that he could apply for the permit after the fact. Ms. Kozlow presented a letter to the Commission which she said showed that the Commission had previously approved similar windows for this building. Commission members examined the letter from her lawyer and said that this letter did not come from the Commission and did not demonstrate a previous approval of the windows. Ms. Kozlow said that the whole façade had been changed in the twentieth century, rendering it different from the one next door. Mr. Baron explained that the first floor had been altered but that the upper floors were largely original except for the windows. The Commissioners concurred with the members of the Architectural Committee that the windows do not satisfy historic preservation standards.

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

ADDRESS: 230-40 RACE ST

Project: Construct eight townhouses

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: 220 Race Street Associates, LP

Applicant: Andrew Kaplin, 220 Race Street Associates, LP

History: vacant lots

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee voted to comment that the proposed buildings are incompatible with the surrounding streetscape and historic district. They may be contemporary in style, but should be completely redesigned to comply with Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct eight four-story, single-family townhouses on a vacant lot in Old City. The lot is considered an "undeveloped site" and the Commission's jurisdiction is Review-and-Comment only. The proposed townhouses would be constructed in two rows running south from Race Street with a center driveway. The facades facing the driveway would be clad in brick and metal panels and have windows. The north or Race Street

elevations would be mostly solid, with walls clad in brick and cast stone panels. The Race Street elevations would have few windows, mostly at the upper floors.

On this block and throughout the Old City Historic District, the buildings were historically used for light manufacturing, storage, and commerce and often had storefronts at the first floor. Many buildings have been converted to residential use, but retain vestiges of their former commercial uses. Residential townhouses are not typical of the main streets of Old City. The proposed buildings, especially with the first floor garages and mostly solid walls facing Race Street, are incompatible with the surrounding streetscape and district. Also, the size, scale, and proportions of the proposed buildings and their components such as windows overwhelm the two historic buildings that would flank the complex. Finally, the palette of materials is incompatible with the historic district.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Historical Commission. Developers Mark and Andrew Kaplin and architect Richard Villa represented the application.

Mark Kaplin stated that they have owned this lot since about 2004. Mr. Villa described the proposal. Mark Kaplin pointed out that the two houses on Race Street have their entrances on Race Street, not the center drive. He also noted that the facades on Race Street have lots of glass. He stated that a large glass building will be constructed at 205 Race, practically across the street from this site. He stated that he and his partner considered ten-story and five-story buildings for this property, but decided that a taller building would not fit in. He stated that they wanted to propose a townhouse project that would be compatible in massing and scale with the surrounding neighborhood. He stated that he read the minutes from the Architectural Committee meeting and was unable to understand the Committee's comments. He stated that he felt like the Committee suggested that they undertake a completely new design. He stated that they constructed a similar building at 22 Front Street with the same motif. He stated that they just do not understand the comments about this project. He showed the Commission before and after photographs of 22 Front Street as well as photographs of what is being built at 110 Walnut Street. He stated that they spent significant time trying to determine how to best redevelop this rather ugly parking lot and stay true to the context of the neighborhood.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the examples that Mr. Kaplin cited are different from this proposal. She stated that the Historical Commission's authority over this application is limited to review and comment only and it cannot reject the application. She opined that the design of proposed townhouses does not fit the context of the Old City Historic District. She stated that the windows are at the roofline on Race Street and do not address the street-level context.

Mr. Kaplin opined that the buildings that once occupied this site were not attractive. He stated that he is uncertain what the Commission is asking him to replicate. Mr. Sherman stated that, in his experience, the Architectural Committee offers some basic suggestions to follow. He reminded the applicant that this review is advisory only. He stated that the new design should pick up the cadence of the surrounding buildings and streetscape and not present itself as a Modernist design. Ms. Hawkins stated that there were two concerns at the Committee meeting. The first was the thirty-foot wide parking drive that creates a void in the street frontage; the Committee suggested spanning the drive on the upper stories to create some street frontage on Race Street. She stated that the Committee also suggested adding more windows at the pedestrian level of the buildings. Ms. Jones stated that the windows at the perimeters of the buildings do not replicate the rhythms of the windows in the surrounding historic buildings. Mr. Kaplin pointed out that Bread Street has a thirty-foot opening. He stated that small alleys off

the main streets can be found throughout the neighborhood. He stated that they could install a gate at the drive entrance, but he could not think of another gated street in the area. He stated that the windows cannot be placed at street level on the front because it conceals a garage; the design has as much glass facing out as it possibly can. He stated that although this is an advisory review only, he wanted the Commission to understand his design.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and comment that the proposed buildings are incompatible with the surrounding streetscape and historic district. They may be contemporary in style, but should be completely redesigned to comply with Standard 9. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JANUARY 2014

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

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

Sam Sherman, Chair

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL HARDSHIP, 27 FEBRUARY 2014

Sam Sherman, Chair

ADDRESS: 1910 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Demolish auditorium, restore front façade, construct addition

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Live Nation Worldwide, Inc.

Applicant: Matt McClure, Ballard Spahr, LLP on behalf of iPic Gold Class Entertainment LLC and Live Nation Worldwide Inc.

History: 1928, Hoffman & Henon, architects, Boyd Theater, Sameric Theater

Individual Designation: 8/9/2008

District Designation: None

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

On 4 April 2014, at the time of the release of the first draft of the minutes of the Historical Commission's meeting of 14 March 2014, the minute for the 1910 Chestnut Street review was not complete. The minute will be completed and distributed electronically before the Historical Commission meeting on 11 April 2014.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 3:30 p.m., Ms. Turner moved to adjourn. Ms. Leonard 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.

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.

§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.