

**THE MINUTES OF THE 626TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 10 OCTOBER 2014
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman Jr., chair
Ralph DiPietro, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP
Rosalie Leonard, Esq., Office of City Council President
Melissa Long, Office of Housing & Community Development
John Mattioni, Esq.
Thomas McDade, Department of Public Property
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
R. David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Robert Thomas, AIA
Betty Turner, M.A.

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

ALSO PRESENT

Peter Staz, Equinox
Matt McClure, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Sam Olshin, Atkin Olshin Schade
Sandra Pierantozzi
Neil Patterson
Kara Litvinas, John Milner Architect
Christina Carter, John Milner Architect
Paul Sehnert, University of Pennsylvania
Barbara Eberlien
Mathew E. Grubel
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Tom Barton, Barton Partners
Vincent Santamauro, Elfreth's Alley Association
Anne Fadullon, Dale Corp.
Jessica Senker, J&M Preservation
Karen Anderson, KRN Architecture
Francesco Sgrazzutti, Studiomado
Mary Daniels
Paul Boni, Esq., Boni Law
Frank Caladrino, Level 1 Fitness
Luke Wolfram, Lincolnshire Equity
Janet Kalter

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman, the chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners DiPietro, Hawkins, Leonard, Long, Mattioni, McDade, Merriman, Schaaf, Thomas, and Turner joined him. Mr. Sherman noted that the microphones were not working and asked that all participating in the proceedings speak loudly when addressing the Commission.

MINUTES OF THE 625TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to adopt the minutes of the 625th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 12 September 2014. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 SEPTEMBER 2014

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included an application for 4444 Cresson 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 offered comments.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee for the application for 4444 Cresson Street. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 400 S 40TH ST

Project: Construct five-story residential building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: OAP, Inc.

Applicant: Jonathan Weiss, Azalea Garden Partners, LP

History: 1853; John P. Levy House; Colonial Revival alterations and additions for David P.

Leas, 1902; additions for convalescent home, 1964, 1975

Individual Designation: 11/1/1973

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 spandrels between the second and third-floor windows are panelized and any rooftop mechanical equipment is screened, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's approval in concept of May 2012.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a five-story residential building at 400 S. 40th Street, at the corner of 40th and Pine Streets. The Historical Commission approved the demolition of the existing building, which it determined cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, and approved the new construction in concept in May 2012. The demolition is not the subject of this review.

The current proposal for final approval of the new construction is very similar to that approved in concept in May 2012. Minor revisions, some suggested by the Architectural Committee, have been made to the design since the last review. The window pane configurations have been updated, eliminating the very small panes of the earlier windows. The base of the building has been accentuated. String courses have been removed. The materials and colors have been updated. The number of balconies has been reduced. Additional information about light fixtures and other features has been provided.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Long recused, owing to her husband's employment at the law firm representing the applicant; she excused herself and left the room during the review of the application. Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. Attorney Matt McClure, architect Sam Olshin, Paul Sehnert of the University of Pennsylvania, and developer Peter Staz represented the application.

Mr. Farnham reported that the applicants had agreed to implement the two revisions recommended by the Architectural Committee. They will revise the spandrels between the second and third-floor windows to have panels and they will screen any rooftop mechanical equipment.

Mr. McClure introduced the members of the application team.

Mr. Sherman asked Ms. Hawkins if the Architectural Committee determined that the current application satisfies the Standards and other review criteria. Ms. Hawkins replied that, given that the applicants have agreed to implement the two recommended changes, the Architectural Committee has concluded that the application satisfies the Standards and other review criteria.

Mr. Olshin presented the design to the Commission using a Powerpoint presentation. He described the design, which has been updated slightly since it was approved in concept. He displayed the architectural drawings, detailing the project in plan and elevation. He displayed renderings of the proposed building. He pointed out the green roof and the relationship of the proposed building to the neighboring buildings. He discussed the landscaping. He described the mechanical equipment, which will be screened. He displayed photographs of the proposed materials and noted that he had samples of the materials with him, in case any Commissioner wanted to see them. He pointed out the colors and textures of the materials. He displayed information regarding the light fixtures, metal balconies, and other elements of the building. He displayed several drawings showing the relationship of the proposed building to the surroundings. He noted the relationships between cornice heights, window sizes, and other features on the proposed building and surrounding buildings. He offered more information about the landscaping including plant types.

Mr. Sherman invited the audience to offer public comments.

Matt Grubel of 4233 Regent Square, about six blocks from the site in question, presented a letter from his neighbor, Dr. Richard Tyler of 4238 Regent Square, and asked that it be read into the record. Mr. Farnham accepted the letter and read it into the record.

Dear Chairman Sherman:

I should like again to urge that the Historical Commission apply Section 14-1005, Regulation, (6)(e) Review Criteria (.4) of the Commission's ordinance to its review of the permit application for 400 South 40th Street.

This section provides "The compatibility of the proposed work with the character of the historic district *or with the character of its site, including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings, and the streetscape...* (emphasis added)." It is erroneous to hold that this applies legally only to local historic districts. If this were indeed the case, the word "or" would be superfluous. Rather it rests on the history of the Commission. Today, the Commission should apply the "or."

In 1955 — ten years before New York and eleven years before the National Historic Preservation Act — the City established the Philadelphia Historical Commission. Among the first commissions in the country with a citywide jurisdiction, it could designate only buildings. As the theory and practice of historic preservation evolved to include districts, the Commission responded by listing individually every building in a given area such as Society Hill, Old City, Spring Garden, Woodland Terrace and the 4000 block of Pine Street. This yielded, in effect, historic districts. Indeed, we called them "de facto districts." In 1984, the City recognized that many changes had occurred in historic preservation and enacted the present ordinance which has had yet some further amendment.

I think that I can write with some authority to the context and objectives of the 1984 ordinance and the "or" provision for "de facto" districts. I served as the Historian and Historic Preservation Officer from 1974 to 2005.

Thank you for your consideration of this letter.

Yours truly,

Richard Tyler

Mary Daniels interjected from the audience, contending that City officials are required to use microphones during public meetings. She asked the Commissioners to use the microphones. Mr. Farnham replied that the chair of the Historical Commission had already explained to the audience that the microphones were not working. Mr. Thomas added that anyone unable to hear could move closer to the meeting table.

Mr. Farnham responded to Dr. Tyler's letter. He explained that Dr. Tyler is making a distinction between his interpretation of Section 14-1005(6)(e)(.4) of the preservation ordinance and that offered by an attorney from the City's Law Department several years ago during a review for this property. The City attorney presented a narrow interpretation of the section, contending that the Commission was only bound to ensure that the proposed work was compatible with the site itself when considering individually designated sites that are not in a historic district. Dr. Tyler offered a broader interpretation, contending that the Commission was bound to ensure that the proposed work was compatible with the site itself as well as the neighboring structures, surroundings, and streetscape regardless of whether the site is individually designated or in a district. Mr. Farnham stated that the interpretation of that section is still open to debate, but

asserted that it is moot for this particular case because the Architectural Committee and Commission agreed to employ Dr. Tyler's broader interpretation in this case when it reviewed the proposal in concept in 2012. Mr. Farnham stated that the Architectural Committee and Commission found in 2012 that the proposed building, which is presented today in essentially the same form, is compatible not only with the site itself but also with the neighboring structures, surroundings, and streetscape. Mr. Farnham concluded that Dr. Tyler's letter is irrelevant because the Commission is applying the standard for which he is advocating in his letter. The Architectural Committee and Commission applied Dr. Tyler's standard in 2012 and the Committee applied it in its recent review and all found that the proposed building is compatible not only with the site itself but also with the neighboring structures, surroundings, and streetscape.

Mr. Grubel stated that the Commission has the prerogative to review the project at this time and accept or reject it. He asked how this building reflects and relates to the history of this site. He answered that the size and orientation of the building were wrong. He stated that the historic building faced 40th Street. The new building would face Pine. He explained that he had no historic photographs of the building to show the Commissioners, but noted that they had seen numerous photographs of the building and its surrounds during earlier reviews. He asked how the Commission could determine whether the proposed building was compatible with the rest of the block if they had not been presented with photographs of the block. He objected that the architect's rendering of the proposed building was not to scale and distorted the neighboring buildings. He described the building at 4000 Pine Street and contended that the architect's rendering was not accurate. He then discussed 4002 Pine. He claimed that the architect depicted it as rectangular, when it is square in shape. He objected to the depictions of other buildings as well. He returned to the building at 4000 Pine and again stated that its appearance in the architect's rendering was not accurate. He suggested that the Commission "take a walk down the block." He again objected that neighboring buildings were not depicted accurately in the architect's drawings.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she is a preservation architect with 25 years of experience, obtained three degrees from the University of Pennsylvania, is extremely familiar with the block in question, and has worked on preservation projects throughout the country. Disagreeing with Mr. Grubel, she concluded, in her opinion, that the proposed building is compatible with the site, neighboring structures, streetscape, and surroundings.

Attorney Paul Boni stated that he represents the Woodland Terrace Homeowners Association, Constellar Corporation, and Maryann Kurmlavage. He stated that his clients have opposed and continue to oppose the proposals to redevelop this site. He asked the Commission to deny the application.

Mr. Thomas stated that he holds Bachelor's and Master's degrees in architecture from the University of Pennsylvania and is very familiar with the area around 40th and Pine Streets, where he walks and rides his bicycle. He stated that he agrees with Ms. Hawkins and Mr. Farnham that the interpretation issue raised by Dr. Tyler is moot. He contended that not only the street facades but also the rear facades of the proposed building are compatible with the site and surroundings. He observed that many such schemes have blank rear walls, without windows. This proposed building is very sensitive to the site and surroundings. He observed that there is a very rich mix of single-family homes, twins, and apartment buildings in the area and the proposed building will fit well within them. He stated that all aspects of the design of the

new building including the scale have been designed sensitively. He stated that the building fits into its context.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided the spandrels between the second and third-floor windows are panelized and any rooftop mechanical equipment is screened, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's approval in concept of May 2012. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 109-31 N 02ND ST

Project: Reconstruct façade, construct six-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Patriot National LLC

Applicant: William Cargill, Patriot National LLC

History: 1958; National Products Building; Sabatino & Fishman, architects

Individual Designation: 11/8/2002

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, based on a need for additional study and refining of the architectural details and archaeological monitoring during construction if the caisson-type foundation is used.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a six-story, mixed-use building on a large, irregular lot that fronts on N. 2nd and Arch Streets, where the National Products building stands. The property was individually designated for its significant Modern-style orange tile façade, which runs along N. 2nd Street and wraps around onto the north façade along Flagpole Park. Behind the tile walls, the building is comprised of numerous older structures that have been greatly modified and are not considered historically significant. The orange tile walls of the National Products building are in very poor condition. This application proposes to dismantle and precisely reconstruct the tile walls using new and salvaged pieces. The buildings behind the tile walls would be replaced, not reconstructed, with a six-story building with public facades facing N. 2nd Street, Flagpole Park, and Arch Street.

The Commission has reviewed several applications for the rehabilitation of this site since the orange tile façade was designated in 2002. The Commission approved in-concept applications for similar projects at this site in March 2003, August 2004, and November 2006. In March 2007, the Commission granted final approval of a project that included the complete disassembly of the orange tile wall and its faithful reconstruction, and the construction of a new residential and commercial building behind the tile facades that would have been six stories on N. 2nd Street and 10 stories on Arch Street. At that time in 2007, the Commission concluded that the orange tile walls, not the buildings behind them, was the historic resource at this site and, owing to its poor condition, the orange tile walls could be dismantled and faithfully reconstructed with replica orange tiles as an alteration, not a demolition. That approved development would have also included an underground garage and 10 townhouses. In October 2011, the Commission granted final approval to a project that would have retained the orange tile wall, demolished all other structures on the site, and constructed a six-story, mixed-use building behind the orange tile wall very similar to the one now proposed. None of the approved projects was undertaken.

As proposed by the current application, the orange tile National Products façade on N. 2nd Street as well as the return along Flagpole Park would be dismantled and faithfully reconstructed using new tile and salvaged marble reveals, storefront systems, and signage. The proposed building behind the tile wall would be clad with grey, white, and orange metal panels and anodized aluminum window wall systems. It would include a column of orange tile to tie it to the historic base. The proposed building would be visually separated from the tile base by a recessed band of glass and panels. The parking entrance would be located on Arch Street.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. Preservation consultant Jessica Senker, architect Tom Barton, and project manager Anne Fadullon represented the application.

Mr. Farnham explained to the Commissioners that the design was updated in response to the Architectural Committee's comments. He also noted that the applicants have submitted a proposal for archaeological monitoring. He observed that documentation for both the updated design and the monitoring was included in the meeting materials packets provided to the Commissioners. He also noted that he had distributed a letter from the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum to the Commissioners at the start of the meeting.

Mr. Barton explained that the current proposal is very similar to a project that the Commission approved for the site a few years ago. He stated that the six-story height and footprint are identical, but the architectural treatment of the facades has been revised slightly. He reported that their earlier concerns about the deterioration of the tile have been confirmed as the tile has continued to fail. He stated that they are proposing, as had been approved earlier, to disassemble and precisely rebuild the tile façade using salvaged and new elements. He noted that they have identified a manufacturer who can duplicate the tile exactly. Turning to the design of the new section of the building, he stated that the design philosophy derives from the strong geometry of the mass of the building. He stated that they are not breaking the building up into smaller masses, but are celebrating the strong geometry of the single mass. He presented the revised design for the Arch Street façade, which was predicated on the Architectural Committee's comments. Mr. Barton explained that much of the orange was removed and replaced with gray, the mass was broken into smaller components, and the context was shown on the drawings. He noted that they made revisions to the color of the rear facades as suggested and also added detail to the plans regarding the perimeter wall near Elfreth's Alley. He noted that the Commission approved this exact design for the perimeter wall a few years ago.

Ms. Fadullon reported that some of the Architectural Committee members objected to the six-story height on Arch Street and then pointed out that the Commission had already approved a ten-story version of the building for Arch Street. She contended that a six-story height is appropriate for the context, especially in light of the fact that the Commission approved the same height, massing, and FAR for this site a few years ago. Ms. Hawkins asked if this would be a by-right development with regard to the zoning. Ms. Fadullon responded that that remains an open question; they have not yet received a zoning refusal.

Ms. Hawkins stated that some of the earlier designs for the Arch Street façade were more successful because the upper floors stepped back. She asked if the architects studied that option. Mr. Barton responded that they did study several designs for the Arch Street façade including some that stepped back; they also reviewed all of the earlier designs and concluded that the proposed design was the most successful.

Mr. Thomas asked about the protection of archaeological resources. Ms. Fadullon stated that they have hired an archaeological consultant since the Architectural Committee meeting, who has provided a proposal for archaeological monitoring and protection. She referred Mr. Thomas to the proposal, which was distributed to the Commissioners. She stated that archaeological resources will be protected. Mr. Barton stated that the archaeological plan is based on the plan approved by the Commission for 250 N. Christopher Columbus Boulevard.

Mr. Schaaf congratulated the architect on the current design, which he asserted was much more sophisticated than the design approved in 2011. However, he asked if the sixth floor of the Arch Street façade could be set back for one bay at the southwest corner. Mr. Barton stated that he was willing to consider the suggestion.

Janet Kalter, a neighbor, asked about the color changes to the Arch Street façade. Mr. Barton stated that they had removed some of the orange and white panels from the Arch Street façade and replaced them with gray panels as suggested by the Architectural Committee. He stated that they are still proposing orange at the entrance to identify the façade with the tile façade around the corner. Ms. Kalter stated that she appreciates the revisions.

Mr. Schaaf stated that he would make a motion to approve the revised design. Ms. Merriman asked if his motion would include a requirement for the setback on the Arch Street façade. Mr. Schaaf replied that it would not because Mr. Barton had stated that he would study and consider the suggestion. Mr. Barton confirmed that he would study and consider the suggestion. Ms. Hawkins stated that she would vote against such a motion because it did not have the setback requirement.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to approve the revised application as presented at the Historical Commission's meeting of 10 October 2014, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 8, and 9. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 10 to 1. Ms Hawkins dissented.

ADDRESS: 4444 CRESSON ST

Project: Amend approved plan for new construction to add fourth story

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Lincolnshire Equity LLC

Applicant: Luke Wolfrom, United Makers

History: 1880; demolished, 2013

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Manayunk Historic District, Contributing, 12/14/1983

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a wood cornice, fascia board, and shutters are installed, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: The Department of Licenses and Inspections determined that the historic building at this site was Imminently Dangerous and ordered its demolition. The staff approved a faithful reconstruction of the three-story building. The owner now seeks the Commission's approval to rebuild the rowhouse with four stories, not three. In light of the context, which includes the elevated railroad track, and other demolition and new construction in the area, a four-story rowhouse is compatible with the area.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 2409 PINE ST

Project: Renovate building, construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Susan and Steve Solow

Applicant: Adam Solow

History: 1835

Individual Designation: None

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

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story rear addition on a three-story row house located in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District. There is an existing two-story rear addition, the majority of which would be removed. The proposed addition would result in the removal of the rear slope of the roof of the main block including the dormer, portions of the rear wall of the main block, and part of a chimney. The addition would extend to align with the rear façade of the neighbor's property to the east. The Historical Commission has approved similar rear additions on this block at 2403 and 2405 Pine Street, owing to the lack of visibility of the new construction from a public right-of-way; however, these additions do not rise above the ridgeline of the roof of the main block, as this one does. This proposed addition would not be visible from the rear or sides; visibility of the addition from Pine Street would need to be determined with the review of a mockup.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architects Karen Anderson and Francesco Sgrazzutti represented the application.

Ms. Anderson distributed revised drawings to the Commission members, and explained that the revised drawings show no deck at the rear; however, the owner of the property would still very much like to have a deck as presented to the Architectural Committee. She noted that the proposed deck is not visible from any public right-of-way, and handed out a survey map to show decks in the immediate vicinity, several of which are highly visible. It was noted that the other decks may be illegal or on buildings that are not designated as historic.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the existing chimneys on the building, inquiring as to whether they will penetrate the existing roof to the same extent that they are penetrating now, and if the chimneys will be visible from the outside of the building in the same way that they are currently visible. Ms. Anderson responded that the chimney stacks will remain, and this project will not change the way that the public views the chimneys.

Ms. Hawkins explained that the Architectural Committee determined this project is excessive in terms of mass and scale. The recommendation from the Committee was for a two-story addition with a deck, or a three-story addition with no deck. Mr. Thomas asked the applicants to define the extent of their request for this review. Ms. Anderson responded that they are seeking approval for the design shown in the original drawings, which included a three-story addition

and a deck. She reiterated that the deck would not be visible from any public right-of-way, and that there are other decks in the neighborhood.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised drawings, dated 7 October 2014, showing a three-story addition and no deck, with the staff to review details. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1701 WALNUT ST, UNIT 1

Project: Renovate and paint façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1701 Walnut Acquisitions LP

Applicant: Cassandra Ryan, Two One Two Design

History: 1910; Allman Building; Baker & Dallet

Individual Designation: 3/3/1983

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

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 Standards 4 and 5.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to paint the marble elements of a storefront at 1701 Walnut Street, also known as the Allman Building. The Allman building was designed by the architectural firm of Baker & Dallet and constructed in 1910. In 1928, the ground-floor storefront was reconstructed by Magaziner, Eberhard & Harris. The 1928 storefront survives and has marble panels between the storefront windows. This application proposes to paint those marble panels to match the remainder of the storefront. The staff has recently approved the painting of the metal trim of the storefront for this project, but declined to approve the painting of the marble. The marble is a distinctive feature of this storefront and, if possible, should be restored, not painted.

The Preservation Alliance holds an easement on the property.

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

The Commissioners discussed the application and agreed that it did not satisfy Standards 4 and 5.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 4 and 5. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2034 FAIRMOUNT AVE

Project: Replace storefront

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Neil & Sandra Patterson

Applicant: John Gibbons, KSK Architects Planners Historians, Inc.

History: 1859

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted 5 to 1 to recommend denial.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace an existing primarily non-historic storefront with a new Queen Anne storefront with a bay window and cornice. An extant sheet metal cornice, likely dating from the early twentieth century, would be removed and replaced with the Queen Anne cornice. The staff previously approved a design that would have fully reconstructed an Queen Anne storefront in keeping with the design of the building, and resembling that of several other historic storefronts along Fairmount Avenue. After receiving cost estimates for that design, the applicant decided to pursue a simplified bay window, but install the new Queen Anne cornice.

The staff contends that the metal cornice has acquired significance in its own right, and that it should only be removed for a fully reconstructed Queen Anne storefront. As presented, the design is an amalgamation of styles. The staff recommends retaining the existing metal cornice and installing a compatible storefront which would include a large flat storefront window with transoms or reconstruction a true Queen Anne storefront.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owners Neil Patterson and Sandra Pierantozzi represented the application.

Ms. DiPasquale noted that a salvaged storefront cornice had been donated to the applicants, who may be able to incorporate it into the design, thereby savings some money. Mr. Patterson noted that they had just learned that morning about the donation.

Mr. Patterson commented that they would love to be able to go forward with the original design that was approved at the staff level, but it was cost-prohibitive. Mr. Sherman asked if the applicant was utilizing Storefront Improvement Program grant money. Mr. Patterson confirmed that they are.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the applicant felt comfortable working with staff to develop a true Queen Anne style storefront. Ms. Pierantozzi noted that they would love to have a historic-looking façade in keeping with the block, and would do whatever was necessary to develop an appropriate storefront, but that the cost for a real Queen Anne style storefront was too high. Ms. Hawkins asked whether the donated cornice may offset that cost. Mr. Patterson responded that he did not believe that the donated cornice would bridge the gap entirely. The custom windows, the applicants noted, were very expensive and resulting in the gap.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants to explain exactly what they were seeking with this application. Mr. Patterson responded that they were seeking to use stock windows as opposed to custom windows in a storefront bay window. The door approved at the staff level was nearly

\$4000, he noted, and they would like to use a door that is less expensive. Ms. Hawkins explained that design approved at the staff level is a full Queen Anne composition, which actually replicates a neighboring storefront and resembles something that might have existed on this building. She added that there is no evidence as to historic storefront at this building. The extant copper cornice, she continued, is actually an early twentieth-century storefront cornice. The concern with the current application, she noted, is that a Queen Anne cornice is being used with a twentieth-century bay window, with a base of tiles that is neither Queen Anne nor twentieth century.

Mr. Patterson commented that he had been surprised that several members of the Committee had recommended creating a modern storefront. Ms. Hawkins commented that part of the reason for that recommendation was because of the use of tiles, noting that tiles were primarily a twentieth-century storefront treatment.

Ms. Merriman asked if the applicant had considered restoring the existing cornice. Mr. Baron interjected, noting that the existing cornice is too shallow to provide an overhang for a bay window.

Ms. Hawkins noted that one place for flexibility would be the door, which is easily changeable, while a storefront window is more permanent.

Mr. Sherman opened the floor to public comment. There was none.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standard 9, but to authorize the staff to approve an application for a storefront that does satisfy Standard 9. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1831 DELANCEY PL

Project: Construct addition, alter rear ell, add roof decks and garage door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Barbara Eberlein

Applicant: Christina Carter, John Milner Architects, Inc.

History: 1858

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the front windows, but approval of all other aspects of revised application, provided that the rear chimney is retained and the third-floor deck is set back from the chimney, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application, as revised, proposes numerous alterations to the building, including:

- Replacement of all rear windows;
- Reconfiguration of several rear windows to create uniformity;
- Addition of a window on the first floor of a rear addition;
- Cutting down of one rear third-floor window and installation of a door for a new deck;
- Partial infill and partial cutting down of a fourth-floor window for the installation of a new door for a new deck;

- Addition of French doors to the existing first-floor west wall facing the courtyard;
- Re-siding of the kitchen wing with new 5.5” Hardi-siding;
- Addition of one story onto an existing two-story rear elevator wing and cladding of the wing with new 5.5” Hardi-siding;
- Removal of an existing CMU garden wall along the alley and replacement with a roll-down garage door/gate for a new courtyard parking space;
- Removal of portion of the first-floor side and rear walls of the rear ell to accommodate the new courtyard parking space, and addition of new windows along the new inset wall.

The original application included the replacement of the front windows with incorrect details, but the applicant withdrew that portion of the application and agreed to work with staff to develop the correct details. The applicant also agreed to retain the rear chimney, which was proposed for removal on the original application, and to set back the fourth-floor deck from the chimney.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Christina Carter, designer Kara Litvinas, and owner Barbara Eberlein represented the application.

The Commission discussed the revised application and decided that it satisfies the Standards.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application as presented at the Historical Commission’s meeting of 10 October 2014, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 10:31 a.m., Ms. Leonard moved to adjourn. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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 8: Archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

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.

DRAFT