THE MINUTES OF THE 627TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

FRIDAY, 14 NOVEMBER 2014
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR

PRESENT
Sam Sherman Jr., chair
Anuj Gupta, Esq.
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
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker Partners
Dan Kayser, Cecil Baker Partners
Cecil Baker, Cecil Baker Partners
Justino E. Navarro, Spring Garden Civic Association
Carey Jackson Yonce, Canno Design
Yiwen Zhang, Canno Design
Matthew Mowrer, CVM
Gabrielle Canno, Canno Design
Donna H. Mueller
John Loonstyn
Yao-Chang Huang, YCH Architects

CALL TO ORDER
Mr. Sherman, the chair, called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Commissioners Gupta, Hawkins, Leonard, Long, Mattioni, McDade, Merriman, Schaaf, Thomas, and Turner joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 626TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the minutes of the 626th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 10 October 2014. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

DRAFT

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 OCTOBER 2014

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included applications for 2000-02 and 2004 Sansom Street and 954 S. Front 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:** Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 2000-02 and 2004 Sansom Street and 954 S. Front Street. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 500-06 WALNUT ST

Project: Construct 26-story residential tower
Review Requested: Review and Comment
Owner: 500 Walnut Partners, L.P.
Applicant: Rod Werner, Scannapieco Development Corporation
History: vacant lot
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Non-contributing, 3/10/1999
Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented that the façade along Walnut and 5th Streets should have more punched openings and a more solid, masonry-like character consistent with the historic district and the rear half of the proposed building, and that the applicant should further address the materials as they relate to the National Park Service agreement.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a 26-story, multi-family residential tower on a currently vacant lot. The inventory for the Society Hill Historic District lists the property as non-contributing to the district, but, contradicting that classification, indicates that it also has archaeological potential. The site was undeveloped at the time of designation and, therefore, it appears that the Commission's jurisdiction is review-and-comment. Several structures on the site were demolished in 1992, before the creation of the Society Hill Historic District. The massing of the proposed building has been determined in conjunction with the National Park Service and other interested parties to protect views of Independence Hall from the Liberty Bell. The project has received zoning approval.

The new tower would include 40 residential units and various amenities, a ground-floor commercial unit along 5th and Walnut Streets, and below-ground, automated parking, with curb cuts along both 5th and St. James Streets. The proposed building materials are glass and metal curtain walls, with areas of stone cladding at the base. The upper floors include a mix of metal-frame windows and multi-story window walls.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architects Cecil Baker and Eric Leighton represented the application.

DRAFT

Mr. Sherman noted that the Commission's jurisdiction is limited to review-and-comment only, but asked whether the applicant had made any modifications to the design according to the Architectural Committee's recommendations. Mr. Baker presented the project using boards. He showed the proposed materials and numerous details including those of the terrace level. He noted that along 5th and St. James Streets, the building has punched openings with grey metal panels and a dark grey limestone base, while the upper stories and return from Walnut Street to 5th Street are primarily composed of curtain walls in a clear glass with a slight green tint.

Ms. Hawkins thanked the applicant for providing materials samples, but noted that the scale of the architectural drawings on the boards made it difficult to fully understand the proposal. A major aspect of the Architectural Committee's comment, she continued, related to the desire to see more of a punched-opening vocabulary at the Walnut and 5th Street corner. She noted that the proposal still seemed to present a curtain wall construction at the base, which was not consistent with the Architectural Committee's comments. Mr. Baker responded that the upper floors of the base of the building remained of curtain wall construction owing to the fact that potential clients would want floor-to-ceiling glass in their condominiums.

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

Mr. Schaaf noted that, aside from the question about punched openings at the base, he felt that the design of the building was beautiful and would be an excellent addition to the Society Hill Historic District. He agreed with the staff's comment that this building was appropriate for this particular site, if not elsewhere in the district.

Mr. Thomas concurred with Mr. Schaaf, noting that this particular block within the Society Hill Historic District is unusual, and that changes have occurred over time there, many of which would not be permitted today. He noted that the setbacks that preserve views from the Liberty Bell, the scale and massing, and the contemporary aspects of the building are appropriate and do not negatively impact the district.

Mr. Sherman commented that there is an interesting procession of architectural styles along that block.

Ms. Hawkins commended the architects, noting that the portion of the building she would recommend reconsidering is just one small portion of a much larger, elegant design.

> **ACTION:** Ms. Hawkins moved to comment that the proposed building is generally compatible with its context, but that the design of the façade along Walnut Street should be restudied. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

DRAFT

ADDRESS: 2322-32 GREEN ST
Project: Demolish non-contributing building; construct 10 single-family dwellings
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: How Properties
Applicant: Carey Jackson Yonce, CANNO Design
History: 1948; St. Francis Xavier Convent
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Non-contributing, 10/11/2000
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@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, provided the following conditions are satisfied:

1. the Green Street cornice is constructed as revised, with the demarcations between units;
2. the second- and third-floor fenestration on Pennsylvania Avenue is made more consistent;
3. the decks are moved back on the buildings and mechanical equipment is fully screened from view;
4. the units on Pennsylvania Avenue are demarcated with control joints or some other device;
5. the entry-door design is studied;
6. the railings are moved back from the front facades;
7. the privacy fences between the decks are tapered down near the front facades; and,
8. the reduction of the sizes of the penthouses is studied.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the demolition of a non-contributing building and the construction of ten townhouses. Seven of the townhouses will face Green Street and three will face Pennsylvania Avenue. Parking will be accessed through a common driveway on Pennsylvania Avenue. Because of grade changes, the houses on Green Street will be three stories tall at their front facades and four stories at the rear. The houses will be faced with brick; the ground floors of the houses on Pennsylvania Avenue will be clad in stone. The houses on Green Street will have terraced front yards and two-story front bays with large metal windows. The houses on Pennsylvania Avenue are set closer to the street. The houses will have rooftop decks with stair houses. The site is located at the southwest corner of the historic district, on the boundary of the district. Most of the buildings of the 2300-block of Pennsylvania Avenue are listed as non-contributing to the district.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Carey Jackson Yonce and developer Gary Jonas represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins commented that the revised design is much improved from the initial design that was reviewed by the Architectural Committee, noting that all recommendations are accounted for with the exception of reducing the sizes of the penthouses and perhaps grouping them together. Mr. Yonce responded that they did consider that recommendation and they were able to make the penthouses incrementally smaller. He noted that they added window to the penthouses as well. Along Green Street, the roof decks were moved to the rears. On Pennsylvania Avenue, the roof decks remain at the fronts of the buildings, but the railings have been set further back. He explained that the views from this location are too great to not take advantage of them.

Mr. Sherman commended the architect on the design.

Mr. Schaaf asked if the penthouses are pilot houses, and encouraged the applicant to review Section 14-604(5)(c) in the Philadelphia Code to determine whether they are allowable under the sections of the Code regarding size and use. Mr. Yonce acknowledged that they may require a variance, owing to the proposed scope of the pilot houses.

Mr. Thomas noted that the townhouses have elevators, and asked about accessibility from the outside for someone who cannot go up or down steps. Mr. Yonce responded that disabled persons will be able to enter through the garages. Mr. Thomas suggested that Mr. Yonce consider alternative means of accessibility as options for buyers who may need it.

Mr. Sherman asked for public comment. Justino Navarro stated that the Spring Garden Civic Association is in support of the project.

> **ACTION:** Mr. Thomas moved to approve the revised application as presented at the Historical Commission's meeting of 14 November 2014, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2135 WALNUT ST, VARIOUS UNITS
Project: Legalize window replacement and masonry painting, coating, and cleaning
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: various
Applicant: Matthew Mowrer, CVM Construction Managers
History: 1916; Walnut Street Apartments; Clinton & Russell, architects
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler 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 denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 7.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the legalization of the installation of vinyl windows in the masonry openings of all floors of this multi-unit building. Over the years, the Historical Commission has reviewed applications from individual unit owners to replace windows in this building. The Commission denied an application for vinyl windows for this building in November 2005 and has approved several applications for the appropriate wood windows for this building. The staff met last year with a contractor representing the condominium owners as a group to discuss the replacement of windows. At that time, the staff explained the review process and provided a copy of a photograph showing the historic windows to the contractor. However, no application was submitted and the window replacement was undertaken without permits or approvals. In August 2014, the staff witnessed vinyl windows being installed and requested that the Department of Licenses & Inspections issue violations to every unit owner. In addition to the vinyl windows installed in the masonry openings, some unit owners installed vinyl windows in the bay windows. The new vinyl windows have sandwiched muntins and vary substantially from the appearance of the historic windows. The applicant's letter claims that a staff member verbally approved the windows; no approval, verbal or otherwise, was granted. Moreover, no permit was obtained; the Department of Licenses & Inspections requires permits for window replacement in multi-unit buildings. In addition to the window replacement, limestone on the building has been painted brown and some brick was cleaned and coated without permits or approvals.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. Construction managers Dan Kayser and Matthew Mowrer represented the application.

Mr. Mowrer stated that CVM Construction Managers has a long history of working on designated buildings in Philadelphia and following the correct approval process with the staff of the Historical Commission, so it is not clear to him why they failed to obtain the necessary approvals for this particular project. He explained that the project manager who was assigned to this project is no longer with the company. He asked not for legalization of what has been done, but for the opportunity to correct the violation. He suggested that the option to modify the existing vinyl windows to make them more compatible would be appreciated, but the windows will be removed and replaced if required by the Commission. He noted that the process of working with the staff and redesigning the windows will take several months, and the work would ideally not take place until the spring of 2015, after the colder winter months.

Mr. Thomas asked about the vinyl windows that were installed in several bay windows. Mr. Sherman responded that those vinyl windows were installed by individual condominium owners, and not by the applicant, and that this review is limited to the windows installed in punched openings by the applicant. Mr. Sherman questioned how to address the multiple violations for window replacement that were done by individual condominium owners. He asked if the condominium association will have to come forward at some point to address this issue, and asked if the Historical Commission should notify the condominium association of the non-compliant conditions. He assumed that the condominium association may be responsible for approving all work to the exterior of the building. Mr. Thomas suggested that the Historical Commission could create a guidebook for the condominium owners of 2135 Walnut Street that would explain what the Historical Commission staff can approve in terms of replacement windows. Mr. Farnham agreed with this suggestion, noting that the Commission has created standards for several other large condominium buildings with multiple owners.

> **ACTION:** Ms. Hawkins moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standards 6 and 7, but to suspend enforcement for one year to allow for the replacement of the windows in punched openings and the correction of the masonry work. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2311 PENNSYLVANIA AVE
Project: Demolish non-contributing building; construct 4-story single-family dwelling
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Loonstyn Properties JB, L.P.
Applicant: Tommy Tran, J T Ran Expediting
History: 1968
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Non-contributing, 10/11/2000
Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660
ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a two-story non-contributing building in the Spring Garden Historic District and construct a four-story single-family dwelling in its place. The building in question as well as most of the buildings on this block are classified as non-contributing in the district. As originally proposed, the building would have been clad in brick, but

is now proposed to be clad in cast stone. It would have metal false mansard roof, which would hide the proposed roof deck.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté resented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Yao-Chang Huang represented the application.

Mr. Huang explained that he is building this house for himself and his family. He noted that most of the houses on the block are non-historic and non-contributing. He displayed architectural drawings and a model for the Commission. He stated that the mansard would block any views of the deck. He also noted that there is no pilot house; the deck would be accessed directly from living space. He noted that the house was originally proposed as all white in color with a white, powder-coated, standing-seam roof. He stated that, in response to comments from the Architectural Committee, he has abandoned the white color scheme, even though he liked the idea of a white house on Pennsylvania Avenue, and has moved to a color scheme inspired by the nearby Philadelphia Museum of Art and the Barnes Foundation. The proposed color is now the color of Kasota stone. The roof and window frames will now be light grey in color. Some of the glass will be clear and some frosted. Mr. Thomas suggested holding the sample of the stone against a white piece of paper to see the true color of the stone.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the Architectural Committee had concerns about inconsistencies between the architectural drawings and also between the drawings and the model. She asked the architect to confirm that the inconsistencies had been resolved. Mr. Huang stated that the revised plans and model are consistent. Ms. Hawkins stated that the applicant had addressed the Committee's concerns, which related to color as well as consistency. She stated that she would move to approve the revised application.

Ms. Turner asked for confirmation that the application proposed both the demolition of the non-contributing building and the construction of the new building. Mr. Sherman stated that it did propose both. Mr. Farnham confirmed that it was acceptable to propose both in one application.

Joan Boyer, who owns an adjacent property, stated that she just learned about the project. She observed that her house and those around it are non-contributing to the historic district. She stated that, even though they are non-contributing, she was told that the designation would protect her property from something like "this big white thing." She asked for a definition of "non-contributing." Mr. Sherman replied that non-contributing buildings are buildings within a historic district that are unrelated to the historical significance of the district; for example, they may have been built after the period of significance of the district. Ms. Boyer stated that her block is a gateway to the historic district. She asked if the proposed building is appropriate for the historic district, even the non-contributing row, given its bright colors. Ms. Merriman stated that, although the Commission has not yet voted on the application, it appears that several Commissioners consider the proposed building to be in compliance with preservation standards for new construction in historic districts. Ms. Boyer asked the applicant about the deck. Mr. Huang stated that it would be located at the fourth-floor level. Ms. Boyer referred to the collapse caused by new construction at 1904 Spring Garden Street and stated that she wanted assurances that the construction adjacent to her building would be properly undertaken. Mr. Sherman stated that her concern is valid, but is outside the purview of the Historical Commission; he stated that the Department of Licenses & Inspections is responsible for ensuring that construction is undertaken safely. Mr. Thomas agreed. Ms. Boyer asked Mr. Huang when the construction would begin. Mr. Huang responded that he is still selecting contractors. Ms. Boyer asked Mr. Huang if the house would have a basement. Mr. Sherman

interjected that the applicant and the neighbor should meet and discuss the project outside the auspices of the Historical Commission. Mr. Huang and Ms. Boyer agreed to meet.

> **ACTION:** Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application as presented at the Historical Commission's meeting of 14 November 2014, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2000-02 SANSOM ST, 2004 SANSOM ST
Project: Install mural
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Midwood Investment & Development; John Coccone, Demcor II
Applicant: Kate Jacobi, Mural Arts Program
History: 2000-02 Sansom St, 1965; 2004 Sansom St, 1850
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995
2000-02 Sansom St, Non-contributing; 2004 Sansom St, Contributing
Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660
ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the bargeboard on the party wall is painted to match the cornice and other trim on 2004 Sansom Street, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Section 6.15.a of the Rules & Regulations.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a mural on the stuccoed party wall between 2000-02 and 2004 Sansom Street in Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District. The mural would not be placed directly on or obscure historic fabric.

> **ACTION:** See Consent Agenda

DRAFT

ADDRESS: 954 S FRONT ST
Project: Construct roof deck
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: 360 M LLC
Applicant: Hui Yan Zhen, 360 M LLC
History: 1840
Individual Designation: 6/24/1958, 5/31/1966
District Designation: None
Staff Contact: Kim Broadbent, kim.broadbent@phila.gov, 215-686-7660
ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the railing is metal, the deck is set back to the mid-point of the building and a minimum of five feet off of the side elevation, and the deck surface is not built up, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guidelines.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck on the main block of a three-story building. The proposed deck is set back ten feet from the front of the building and five feet from the north side of the building. It is accessed via a spiral staircase from a small deck at the rear of the property. The staff reviewed a mockup onsite to determine visibility from the public right-of-way. While the railing would not be visible from directly in front of the building on S. Front Street, it would be visible at an angle when standing across the street to the north on a grassy knoll.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 211 S SARTAIN ST
Project: Legalize windows
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Walter N. Gavula
Applicant: Walter N. Gavula
History: 1825
Individual Designation: 2/28/1961
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 the legalization of vinyl windows on all three floors of the front façade of this early brick rowhouse. The owner claims that he installed the windows shortly after he bought the property in 2000. His argument to the Commission primarily regards a lack of notice about the historic designation. He contends that he did not know that the property was designated as historic and, in fact, the former owner did not disclose the historic designation to potential buyers including the current owner on the mandated disclosure form. However, the Commission has routinely held that property owners are responsible for identifying and complying with all regulatory restrictions on their properties before undertaking construction work at those properties.

DRAFT

Violations for inappropriate windows were issued to this property as well as five other properties on the block after another owner on the block complained about being cited for the installation of vinyl windows. That owner inquired why she was being singled out when many other properties on the block had vinyl windows. The complaint prompted staff to survey the block and to issue violations to all of the properties where vinyl windows had been installed without a permit after designation.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Walter Gavula and Joseph Polinski represented the application.

Mr. Gavula explained that the disclosure form he received when he purchased this property in September 2000 did not indicate that the property was designated as historic. He had an inspection done at that time that showed that the windows needed replacement. He was unaware of the property's historic designation until he recently received the violation in the mail. Mr. Polinski commented that they did not modify the historic window openings, but rather retained the same style as the previous windows, only changing the material from wood to vinyl.

Ms. Merriman asked Mr. Farnham if there was a recent mailing to all property owners of designed properties that was intended to remind or inform them of the historic status of their property. Mr. Farnham responded that in May of 2010, the Historical Commission notified all owners of properties listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places that those properties were designated as historic. The letters were mailed to the property if owner occupied or to the owner's address if it differed from the designated property. Mr. Gavula responded that he does not remember receiving this letter in 2010. Mr. Farnham responded that the Commission would gladly provide Mr. Gavula with a copy of that letter, and noted that the letter would not have precluded this situation, considering that the letter was sent ten years after the vinyl windows were installed.

Ms. Hawkins commented that the installation of the vinyl replacement windows did not require the modification of the window openings. She noted, however, that the sidelights do not match the muntin pattern seen in a historic photograph. She also noted that the wood trim has been capped, and shutters have been installed that are not appropriate. She asked if these other items are part of this discussion, and Mr. Gavula responded that the violation was issued for vinyl windows only. Ms. Hawkins commented that the fourteen-year-old vinyl windows will likely only last for another five years, and that the Commission should consider a timeline when it comes to replacement, since the windows will likely need replacing within the next several years. She also encouraged the applicants to install appropriate shutters.

Mr. Sherman commented that the historic designations of properties is now widely available, but it was not fourteen years ago. However, buyers must be diligent when purchasing properties. Mr. Farnham commented that it is the property owner's responsibility to understand any restrictions that are placed on a property.

Mr. Polinski stated that the opposite or west side of the block is not on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, and asked if there was a way to remove their property from the Register. Mr. Sherman responded that that is an entirely different conversation and noted that the staff can provide information about the process.

Mr. Sherman suggested that the windows be replaced when needed. Other Commission members disagreed and suggested that the Commission require their replacement within the next four or five years.

Mr. Farnham clarified that, if the Commission denies the application but suspends enforcement for four or five years, the staff will ask the Department of Licenses & Inspections to withdraw the current violation, owing to the extended time period proposed for compliance. He stated that a note will be placed in the file for this property, which will alert the staff to follow up on the window replacement at the appropriate time.

> **ACTION:** Ms. Merriman moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standard 6, but to suspend enforcement for a period of four years to 14 November 2018, by which time the appropriate windows must be approved by the Historical Commission and installed, with the staff to review details. Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 244-46 S 21ST ST
Project: Legalize sidewalk and steps, install railing
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: 244-46 Associates LLC
Applicant: Alessandra Corso, 244-46 Associates LLC
History: 1882; James Spear House; Addison Hutton, architect
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District, Significant, 2/8/1995
Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660
ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5 and 6.

OVERVIEW: The applicants seek the legalization of the demolition of the historic brownstone stair and bluestone sidewalk and their replacement in concrete. Recently the management of this building received a notice from their insurance company that their sidewalk and stairs were in deteriorated condition. They hired a contractor to make repairs and obtain all necessary permits. Unfortunately he did not seek a building permit and finished the work this August.
The new stair is concrete rather than brownstone and does not follow the design of the old stair. Similarly the bluestone sidewalk has been replaced in white concrete. The staff recommends that the application be denied and that the stoop be rebuilt in brownstone and the sidewalk rebuilt in bluestone. The applicant may have recourse with the contractor.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham explained to the Historical Commission that the applicant is requesting a one-month continuance to the December 2014 meeting. No one represented the application.

> **ACTION:** Ms. Hawkins moved to continue the application for one month to the Historical Commission's meeting of 12 December 2014. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 10:18 a.m., Ms. Hawkins moved to adjourn. Mr. Mattioni 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 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.

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.

Rules and Regulations Section 6.15 Murals

6.15.a Policy

6.15.a.1 This policy applies to murals and other similar forms of outdoor visual art.

6.15.a.2 Murals shall not be placed directly upon historic fabric.

6.15.a.3 Murals shall not be placed in a manner that obscures historic fabric.

6.15.a.4 The Philadelphia Historical Commission, its committees, and staff shall not consider a mural's content as a part of its review of any application for a building permit, but may consider size, scale, and relationship to the historic context.