

**THE MINUTES OF THE 645TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 13 MAY 2016
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
BOB THOMAS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Robert Thomas, AIA, chair
Duane Bumb, Commerce Department
Anuj Gupta, Esq.
Rosalie Leonard, Esq., Office of City Council President
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Thomas McDade, Department of Public Property
Rachel Royer, LEED AP BD+C
R. David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Betty Turner, M.A.

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Broadbent, Historic Preservation Planner II
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

Ryan Lohbauer, Stanev Potts
Stephen Potts, Stanev Potts
Michael Skolnick, PZS Architects
Jason Winig, Winig Properties
Stephen Varenhorst, Varenhorst
Steven Savitz, SRS
Ashley Hahn, PlanPhilly
Laura Blau, BluPath
Paul Thompson, BluPath
David Landskroner, Hightop Real Estate Development
Michael Phillips, Esq., Obermayer Rebmann Maxwell & Hippel
The Reverend Gerald Dennis Gill, Basilica of Sts. Peter & Paul
Rich Villa, Ambit Architecture
Megan Fitzpatrick, Ambit Architecture
Carol Huff
Celeste Morello
Rick Snyderman
Everett Abitbol
David Patchefsky
Larry Mangel
Janet Kalter

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Thomas called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Bumb, Gupta, Leonard, McCoubrey, McDade, Royer, Schaaf, and Turner joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 644TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to adopt the minutes of the 644th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 8 April 2016. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 APRIL 2016

Dan McCoubrey, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included applications for 2013 Mount Vernon Street, 421 Chestnut Street, and 520 N 15th Street. Mr. Thomas asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. None were offered. He then asked if anyone in the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. Michael Phillips, an attorney representing the owner of 2013 Mount Vernon Street, asked the Commission to remove that application from the consent agenda to allow for a discussion of the cladding material. Mr. Thomas removed the application for 2013 Mount Vernon Street from the consent agenda.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 421 Chestnut Street and 520 N 15th Street. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 2027 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Remove non-historic storefront and ramp; install exterior ATM with platform and ramp

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: AMCD Walnut St Assoc.

Applicant: Kerri Silsbe, Project Expeditors Consulting Corp.

History: 1855; storefront alterations

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9 and the 2012 approval.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a non-historic storefront and ADA ramp, and install an exterior automated teller machine (ATM) with platform, canopy, and ramp. In place of the glass storefront system, a cement plaster finished wall would be installed, with the ATM located in the center of the new wall. The canopy covering the ATM would extend five feet six and one half inches over the new platform. An ADA ramp would be installed in front of the ATM platform, bringing the new ramp out to a point flush with the front of the steps at the property next door.

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

The Commissioners discussed the application and concurred with the Architectural Committee's assessment that the proposed alterations were not compatible with the building or the historic district.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9 and the 2012 approval. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1606 CHESTNUT ST, UNIT 4

Proposal: Legalize roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Howard Winig Marital Trust, Winig Properties

Applicant: Jason Winig, Winig Properties

History: 1890; Isaac S. Miller Store; Albert W. Dilks, architect

Individual Designation: 9/12/1990

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 Standards 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize a deck constructed without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit. The existing deck sits just over seven feet back from the front façade, and the railing is highly visible at numerous locations along Chestnut Street and from both 16th and 17th Streets. The deck is accessed by a pilot house that appears to have been constructed between 2003 and 2004.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Jason Winig represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that Mr. Winig submitted a revised application, which was included in the meeting materials packet. The revised application proposed to set the deck back additionally from some facades. However, the revised design was not mocked up and, therefore, the staff was unable to determine whether it reduced the public visibility to an acceptable level. Mr. Winig stated that, in his opinion, the deck and dunnage were inconspicuous from the street. Mr. McCoubrey disagreed and opined that the entirety of the dunnage beam was visible as well as the deck railing. He suggested that the deck and dunnage should be set back an additional two sections of railing or about 10 feet from the front facade. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the width of the deck as constructed was acceptable.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application, provided the deck including the railing and dunnage are set back at least 10 additional feet from the Chestnut Street façade of the building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and the Roofs Guideline. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2013 MOUNT VERNON ST

Proposal: Construct two stories on approved one-story, rear addition and roof deck on rear ell
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: High Top Real Estate & Development
Applicant: David Polatnick, PZS Architects
History: 1859
Individual Designation: 11/6/1975
District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, 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, provided the addition is clad in a masonry material and the bay in wood based on the two-story side bay, and the rear windows are six-over-six in the historic section and one-over one in the new section, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story rear addition with a bay on the twin at 2013 Mount Vernon Street. The property is located mid-block in the Spring Garden Historic District, and the only public visibility to the rear is through a gate to a private alleyway on Wallace Street. The applicant previously obtained an approval at staff-level for a roof deck and pilot house, a one-story rear addition, and the reconstruction of a bay. This application proposes to demolish the rear masonry wall of the existing ell and to construct two stories above the approved single-story addition. The bay, originally proposed as a reconstruction of a previously existing structure adjacent to the rear masonry wall, would be constructed at the second story of the addition. All walls of the addition, including the second-story bay, would be clad in siding.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Leonard recused because the applicant is represented by an attorney who works at the same firm as her brother. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Attorney Michael Phillips, architect Michael Skolnick, and developer David Landskroner represented the application.

Mr. Skolnick stated that the Architectural Committee had recommended approval of the application generally, but had some concerns about the cladding for the addition. He stated that he was seeking clarity about the cladding. He asked the Commission if it would consider Hardiepanel or some other Hardie product that looks like stucco panels for the cladding on the addition.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application, provided the addition is clad in a masonry material including Stucco HardiePanel and the bay in wood based on the two-story side bay, and the rear windows are six-over-six in the historic section and one-over one in the new section, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 421 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Demolish penthouse; construct new penthouse

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Dan Wheeler

Applicant: Stephen Varenhorst, Varenhorst

History: 1857; Bank of Pennsylvania/Philadelphia National Bank; John M. Gries, architect; H.C. Oram & Co., iron work; additions, 1892, 1893; one story added, 1903, T.P. Chandler

Individual Designation: 6/24/1969

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

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the west side screen wall is reduced in height, with staff to review details including color selections, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a non-historic, sixth-floor penthouse and construct a new penthouse on top of the Bank of Pennsylvania building, a highly significant building on Bank Row in the Old City Historic District. The Historical Commission approved the existing penthouse, with a 10-foot setback from the Chestnut Street façade of the historic bank, in 2005. The existing penthouse was approved at a height of 13 feet 8 inches, with a small center pediment that reaches 19 feet 9 inches in height.

A similar application to the one now presented was reviewed by the Architectural Committee at the March 2016 meeting. The Committee voted to recommend denial, but with the following suggestions to improve the design:

- simplify the highly-articulated façade,
- reduce the overall height, with attention paid to the end walls,
- lower the front section of the penthouse, and add a set-back clerestory, and,
- change the color of the façade to gray or a color that will similarly fade to the background.

The revised drawings submitted for this review reflect the Architectural Committee's March 2016 comments, in addition to comments received from the Preservation Alliance's easement committee. The Chestnut Street façade of the proposed penthouse will be set back 13 feet from the front facade of the historic building, with vertical sun screens that will be set back 11 feet 5 inches from the façade. The flat-roof height was reduced to 14 feet 9 inches above the roof deck. The penthouse would open onto a deck at the front and sides of the building, and the existing glass railing would remain.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 141-43 N 04TH ST AND 319 CHERRY ST

Proposal: Construct additions and five-story building

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: John G. Traver Co. Inc., c/o Steven Savitz

Applicant: Ryan Lohbauer, Stanev Potts Architects

History: 1780

Individual Designation: 4/26/1966

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9. Mr. Cluver dissented.

OVERVIEW: This application seeks in-concept approval for the development of a parcel that includes 141-43 N 4th St and 319 Cherry Street. The eighteenth-century property at 141-43 N. 4th Street, which was individually designated in 1966 and categorized as Significant in the Old City Historic District inventory in 2003, would be retained and would become a stand-alone building once again. The primary question for this in-concept review is in regards to the rear three-story building and the vacant lot. The application proposes to construct a one and a half-story addition on top of the eighteenth-century school building, and five-story additions on two sides of an eighteenth-century school building at the center of the site. A one-story addition surrounding the school building would be demolished. The application also proposes to construct an L-shaped, five-story building on the site, which would be combined with a vacant parcel at 319 Cherry Street.

The structures at the rear of the property are not explicitly called out in the Old City Historic District inventory; however, research has confirmed that the three-story brick building is an eighteenth-century school building that was associated with the German Reformed Church on Race Street, and which was converted to a warehouse in the nineteenth century. The structure appears to have had a story added, and the rear is stuccoed, but the north elevation retains its brick watertable and Flemish bond pattern, and the original window and door openings are easily discernible. The razing or partial razing of the structure would constitute a demolition, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d).

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Ryan Lohbauer and developer Steven Savitz represented the application.

Mr. Lohbauer expressed his excitement over the evolution of the project, explaining that it is their second in-concept application. Over the past two months, he noted, they had worked hard to solicit feedback regarding the best way to treat the historic property. He noted that the project is challenging because there are a variety of opinions for achieving a successful development at the property. Mr. Lohbauer stated that he would like an opportunity to convince the Commission that the current proposal is compliant with Standards 2 and 9 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Mr. Lohbauer summarized the history of the site. He noted that it is in Old City, near 4th and Race Streets. The neighborhood, he explained, was developed in three main phases. The neighborhood began to develop in the mid-eighteenth century as a Colonial mixed-use, residential, commercial, and religious use neighborhood. Structure A on the site dates to that period, and there is no question of its significance. During this process, he continued, they discovered that structure C was a parochial school constructed in 1796 to serve the German Calvinist church directly to the north. He noted that the church was originally located at the corner of Sterling (now Orianna) and Race Streets, but was rebuilt in its current position in 1837.

The relocation of the church, he argued, altered the relationship between the church and the school building.

The second era of the neighborhood, Mr. Lohbauer continued, is a story of industrialization. As Philadelphia became the Workshop of the World, Old City rapidly industrialized. By the 1880s, industrialization had drastically changed the use of the neighborhood, and by 1917, very few residential uses remained around this particular site. Structures A, C, and the 1837 church were sold to the John Lucas Paint Company, which converted them to industrial uses. Mr. Lohbauer noted that the Lucas Company employed a common architectural strategy of consolidating parcels and connecting existing buildings to create usable space. Structure C was connected to the church building as well as structure A by a series of bridges, and suffered significant changes on both the interior and exterior. The original roof, which may have been a gable roof, was removed, and an additional story added. Dense columns were added in the interior to support its new use as a paint storage facility.

The third significant period in the neighborhood's history was the 1950's redevelopment era. Many of the industrial uses had left, and the Redevelopment Authority (RDA) made it a priority to rehabilitate the neighborhood. Their strategy for doing so, Mr. Lohbauer noted, was to demolish much of the industrial past and to highlight many of the Colonial and Federal-style buildings. The priorities included more parking. Evidence of Victorian buildings and alterations to Federal-style structures were removed. Mr. Lohbauer noted that there was a four-story factory building next to Structure A that was removed, as were additions to Federal-style buildings. Mr. Lohbauer noted that this is not a strategy that would be employed today, as it violates Standard 3 in creating a false sense of history.

Mr. Lohbauer summarized his argument, noting that the neighborhood has a long and complex history, and that it is important to take into consideration the entire arc of history at the site in determining an appropriate redevelopment of the parcel.

Mr. Lohbauer presented renderings of the proposed alterations to Structure C from its two primary angles of visibility. He noted that the current top story of Structure C is an addition with a low-sloped roof. He opined that it would have been easy to overlook the structure in the historic district inventory, as it is not highly visible. Mr. Lohbauer noted that the application proposes to restore many of the original details to the front or north elevation of the school building, Structure C. He commented that the Victorian industrialists would have been comfortable with the current proposal to reuse and add to the existing structures. Through massing and rooflines, he noted, the project emphasizes the original, historic structures, with all of the additions being deferential to the historic structures. He noted that the gable roofs harken back to the original school house roof. Finally, Structure 6, the leg along Orianna Street, feels like an addition to the interior complex. He noted that the goal is to create a single campus of buildings with deference to the historic components.

Mr. Lohbauer explained that the parcel is located in a CMX-3 zoning area, which allows for a 65-foot height, but that they listened to the comments at the previous meeting to lower the structure from six stories. He noted that they have lowered the structure by an entire floor, and per the Architectural Committee review, reduced it even further so that it is no longer the tallest building on the block or the adjacent blocks. All of the roof ridgelines fall below the church's ridgeline, and the Orianna Street roof slopes so that it is lower at the corner of Cherry and Orianna Streets than the ridgeline of the nearby gable-front buildings.

Mr. Lohbauer explained that they are creating roughly 32,000 square feet of multi-family space, which is approximately 25% less than is allowed by zoning. He noted that the context of the

neighborhood is actually tall and dense, and that it is just the changes made in the mid-twentieth century that give it a low density and height impression. Mr. Lohbauer noted that it is important that there is enough usable space on site to allow them to afford the restoration of the façade. Mr. Lohbauer opined that the zoning for the parcel is appropriate.

Mr. McCoubrey clarified that the Committee's opinion was that the no addition should be constructed on top of the historic school building, as it would raise the mass too high and potentially compromise the integrity of the historic walls below. He noted that, while they appreciate the level of research that has gone into the project and the discovery of the school building, the historic school is a very important building. He commented that the history of the building and its conversion from a school to an industrial use is currently evident in the single-story addition, but that to add an additional floor would destroy that context. The Committee, he noted, felt strongly that the overbuild and adjacent five-story additions subsume the eighteenth-century building. The Committee, he continued, contended that a four-story solution over the entire site would be more appropriate. Mr. Lohbauer responded that he understood the concerns, but suggested that the strategy of creating additions to unify sites and reuse buildings is a historic strategy unto itself. He noted that they tried to lower the height and keep the proposed additions and new construction as low as possible. Mr. McCoubrey responded that that is in deference to the intact eighteenth-century buildings on and adjacent to the parcel. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the industrial period was great, but that it was not exactly a strategy; it simply tried to maximize development to the greatest extent possible. He commented that that is not a strategy for today. Mr. Gupta responded that there is a five-story building across the street, and asked whether the context of taller development is already in place. Mr. McCoubrey replied that there are two-story structures along Cherry Street across Orianna Street from the site. Mr. Lohbauer noted that those properties are early twentieth-century anomalies. Mr. Gupta noted that there are several taller buildings on the nearby streets.

Mr. Lohbauer suggested that, if he had convinced the Commission that there was a historic context for this development, the Historical Commission should defer to the Planning Commission's zoning of the neighborhood as CMX-3. He opined that if it had been a priority to limit Orianna Street to five stories, it should have been zoned RM-1 or CMX-2. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the City does not spot-zone. Mr. Lohbauer responded that the street is not strictly residential, and that the existing buildings are the remains of an industrial corridor.

Mr. Thomas commented that the Old City Historic District celebrates the industrial history of the neighborhood. He noted that Society Hill had an industrial history, but much of it was erased in the mid-twentieth century. Mr. Thomas opined that the industrial scale is part of the district, and that that lends credence to Mr. Lohbauer's arguments. Mr. Gupta clarified that, since this project is in-concept, the applicant would still have to return to the Commission with a more detailed design. Mr. Thomas confirmed. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the question the applicant is trying to answer from the in-concept review is how much they can actually build. Mr. Gupta commented that the ultimate materials and appearance have just as much impact on compatibility with the district as massing. He opined that he did not feel the massing of the proposed construction was out of line with the context of the neighborhood or block.

Mr. Thomas noted that there are other difficulties with the lot, including the long party wall on the west side of the proposed construction along Orianna Street. Mr. Thomas suggested that the blank wall be treated handsomely. Mr. McCoubrey noted that this development would set a precedent for future construction along the block. Mr. Lohbauer responded that future developers of the adjacent parking lot would have to come before the Historical Commission, but the Commission's jurisdiction will be limited to review and comment. He noted that if the future adjacent development were to maximize their allowable zoning height of 65 feet, he

hopes that his proposed structure of five stories would provide a nice transition to the lower buildings along Cherry Street. Mr. Thomas questioned whether the lots on Cherry Street were vacant at the time of designation, noting that, if so, the Historical Commission's jurisdiction would be limited to review and comment. Ms. DiPasquale confirmed that they were. Mr. Thomas commented that in all likelihood, the vacant lot would be developed as a six-story building.

Mr. Schaaf reiterated Mr. McCoubrey's comments about the importance of the eighteenth-century school building. He opined that the current proposal does not celebrate that history, and that to add a floor and extend its mass to the east would disfigure the beauty that the building once represented. He noted that there is an opportunity not to disfigure the building any further, and recommended having it speak as an eighteenth-century building at least a little bit. He suggested that he would be willing to see a larger massing and more industrial character along Orianna Street in exchange for renovating the school building as an eighteenth-century building. He commented that there are nice mediations in terms of scale at 3rd and Race Streets. He noted that a mansard roof might establish another scale for a building that is four or five floors. He suggested that the proposed design could incorporate a shed roof with dormers to mediate the scale of the building. He noted that his chief concern is that the historic school building is not sufficiently addressed. Mr. Lohbauer responded that they want to celebrate and restore the school building, but that, considering the limited visibility, the north façade became the primary elevation to be restored. He noted that the other elevations were historically secondary and tertiary facades that were not visible from the public streets until the parking lots were created. He suggested that restoration of the north façade makes sense as it retains the most historic details and shows its historic connection to the church building.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that the Architectural Committee pointed out that the rooftop addition raises the cornice line of the school above that of the church, thus altering the relationship between the school and the church. Mr. Lohbauer replied that the way the church is positioned, set far back from Race Street, reduces the impact of the addition on top of the school building. Mr. Lohbauer opined that the cornice line and way the gable slopes will not feel like a major change in relationship; the school will still feel like a secondary structure to the church. Mr. McCoubrey disagreed with the assertion that the other facades were secondary or tertiary, noting that the building stood alone on its site with light and air on all sides. Mr. Lohbauer responded that, when there was air on the other three sides, there was also more distance between the church and the school. Mr. Lohbauer noted that by the 1860s, there was another building touching the corner of the school building.

Mr. Thomas asked for clarification of Mr. Schaaf's earlier recommendation for a mansard roof. Mr. Schaaf responded that he suggested a mansard for the new construction along Orianna Street, and corrected his earlier comment that a good historic example of a narrow corner property with a mansard roof is at 3rd and Arch Streets, not 3rd and Race.

Ms. Royer questioned the proposed ramp leading to basement parking, and asked whether that would be limited to underneath the addition. Mr. Lohbauer responded that six parking spaces would be required, and that the ramp and below-ground parking is one possible option. If they were to go for a full review, he continued, they would explore additional parking strategies. Ms. Royer asked for clarification as to whether the applicants would construct parking below the historic school building. Mr. Lohbauer responded that the structural engineer believes the school building needs to be underpinned, and if that is necessary, they would try to create an addition parking space underneath the school building. Mr. McCoubrey commented that questions of the necessity of underpinning were raised at the Committee meeting.

Mr. Thomas opened the floor to public comment. Carol Huff, a neighbor at 115-21 N. Orianna, stated that she purchased her home approximately 10 years ago because Orianna is a special street. She stated that she is in commercial real estate and has done many rehabilitation projects. She implored the Commission to consider the neighbor's concerns and to try to improve the area. She stated that no construction on the narrow site along Orianna would be appropriate because it would create a cavernous situation along what she called a cobblestone street. When the property was for sale a few years ago, she noted, a New York developer was interested in the property but was told that the site could not be developed. She stated that never in her wildest dreams did she think a building would be constructed on the site of the parking lot, and that she only found out about the project one day ago. She understood that the developer's real estate goal was to maximize the amount of structure, but that the proposed project does not take into consideration the feeling along the street. She opined that the goal of a rehabilitation project should be to the benefit, not the detriment, of the neighbors. She stated that a four or five-story structure would not be appealing, and would change the aesthetics of the street. She expressed her appreciation of the Historical Commission. Mr. Thomas asked what specifically Ms. Huff would like to see at the property, noting that the Commission looks at whether a project satisfies the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Ms. Huff responded that no structure along Orianna Street would be appropriate, as it diminishes the look of the street. Mr. Thomas reiterated that the Historical Commission's task is to review the project for its compatibility with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Mr. Thomas stated that, to tell a property owner that they could construct no building at all on a vacant lot, would not be consistent with the Standards. Mr. Thomas noted that, if the massing was approved today, the design of the structure would still need to be presented to the Commission at a subsequent public meeting. Ms. Huff stated that the Commission should consider the neighbors' light and air. Mr. Thomas responded that those are not Historical Commission concerns, they are zoning considerations, and that, per zoning regulations, the applicants could build a much taller building along Orianna Street.

Celeste Morello, who was in the audience for another matter, asked about the date of the school building. Mr. Lohbauer responded that it was constructed in 1796. Ms. Morello asked if it was historically certified, noting that it may be the oldest public school house in the city. Mr. Lohbauer responded that it was not a public school, but rather a parochial school for the German Calvinist church. He noted that it is not even the oldest school on the block; there is an earlier school building to the south along Cherry Street. Mr. Thomas stated that the age of the school building will certainly impact the Commission's recommendation.

Neighbor Rick Snyderman, resident of 301-03 Cherry Street, opined that the question at hand is the context. He opined that the structures being proposed are out of character with the neighborhood. He stated that the only real issue for the community is the long, narrow structure along Orianna Street that is completely out of character with the rest of the area. He suggested that the Historical Commission could find a middle ground between the community and the developers as to how that section of the development could be mitigated. He recognized that the architect attempted to do so by lowering the height of the structure, but opined that it still creates the opposite pattern to the rest of the buildings in the area. He reiterated the importance of context and the community's primary concern of the construction along Orianna Street. He opined that there is a more open-air quality at the north end owing to the church yard. He reiterated the importance of light and air, and that the new construction along Orianna Street would impact the street visually and physically. He opined that the design of the proposed construction does not have any of the character of the neighborhood. He suggested that the architect and developer reexamine the property in consultation with the neighbors. He stated that the other portions of the proposal, such as the historic school building, are not of much concern to the neighbors. He suggested that the Historical Commission take consideration of

the application. He opined that the registered community organization was not aware of the project, and that the Historical Commission should take that into consideration, and compel the applicant to hold a discussion with the community prior to reviewing with the application.

Everett Abitbol, recent resident of 115 N. Orianna Street, stated that he has a child who runs up and down the block, and that he selected this location after looking for an ideal property for 10 years. He stated that he has great neighbors, and that the proposed new building contradicts everything along so-called cobblestone Orianna Street. He stated that his biggest concern is the amount of time and effort the architect and developer put into understanding the site, but not into getting to know the neighbors. He suggested tabling the application until the neighbors had time to discuss the project with the developer.

David Patchefsky, resident of 315 Cherry Street, noted that the renderings in the application do not show the two and three-story buildings along Cherry Street. He opined that a five-story structure along Orianna and an addition on top of the historic school would put a lid on the bright and airy so-called cobblestone street.

Neighbor Larry Mangel at 317 Cherry noted that he had expressed his opposition to the project at the previous Architectural Committee review, held last month. He stated that he does not find it appropriate that someone would build on a driveway, opining that the vacant lot along Orianna is a driveway barely narrow enough for a car to drive down. Mr. Lohbauer responded that the lot is 15 feet 9 inches wide. Mr. Thomas noted that that is a standard building width. Mr. Mangel reiterated his opposition to the project, and stated his desire to nominate the school building as historic. Mr. Thomas and Mr. Farnham responded that the school house is already designated as historic and under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction.

Old City resident Janet Kalter stated her support for the statements previously offered by the neighbors.

Mr. Lohbauer noted that he had hoped that Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance would be in attendance at the meeting, as he had expressed his support for the design as proposed.

Mr. Thomas addressed the neighbors' suggestion that the Commission table review of the project. He stated that the Historical Commission operates under a clock, and has to act on an application in a timely manner or it is automatically approved. Mr. Farnham clarified that this is an in-concept application. When reviewing in-concept applications, the Historical Commission is merely providing advice to applicants. He noted that the Commission is not approving or denying an application that would lead to a building permit. Any decision made today is purely advisory. Mr. Farnham suggested that the Commission provide advice to the applicant, and not delay the review as the neighbors have advocated. Mr. Thomas stated that it is important that the Commission provide advice to the applicant. He encouraged the applicant to take the Commission's advice, as well as to speak with members of the community. Mr. Lohbauer responded that he would do so, and thanked the community members for their attendance at the meeting. Mr. Thomas asked if the project would need a zoning variance. Mr. Lohbauer responded that the proposed application is by-right. Mr. Thomas noted that, once that process was complete, the applicant would still have to return to the Architectural Committee and full Historical Commission to present a complete design, and would receive a formal review at that time.

Mr. Thomas asked the Commission members if they had any advice for the applicant. Mr. Gupta asked whether a setback from Orianna Street would be feasible. Mr. Lohbauer responded that it would be difficult to create any usable space with a setback as the existing width of the lot is

only 16 feet. He noted, however, that a setback from Cherry Street might be possible, and that they have sloped the roof to try to minimize the structure's presence at Cherry Street as much as possible.

Mr. Schaaf commented that many of the Architectural Committee's recommendations were sound. He agreed with the Committee's recommendation that development on the whole site be limited to four stories, and opined that an addition should not be constructed on the school house. He commented that many of Old City's narrow Belgian block streets have the density of three, four, and five-story buildings on either side, and which are still extremely appealing and pleasant streets to build on. He suggested that a four-story building with a shed or mansard roof and dormers might help break down the scale of a larger structure along Orianna Street. He stated that more energy should be put towards expressing the school house as a three-dimensional building that has credibility in its own right as a structure.

Mr. Schaaf suggested that the applicant explore eliminating parking altogether. Mr. Lohbauer agreed, responding that he would prefer not to have parking on-site.

Mr. Thomas commented that, as an architect himself, he has faced similar design challenges of long, narrow lots. He suggested that, if the development was limited to four stories, instead of constructing an apartment building, the applicant could explore the idea of townhouses. He noted that townhouses are a more efficient use of space with no common corridors or stairs, and respect the homes that are on the other side of the street. He opined that, by having multiple entrances, townhouses would create other neighbors who will become friends. He stated that many nice streets in the city that are narrow with historic paving have houses on both sides. He also noted that many former industrial structures have been divided into units with multiple entrances. He commented that, with a four-story approach, the design would create a shallow lot, and that instead of being 16 feet wide and 30 feet deep, units could be 16 feet deep and 30 feet wide, which provides more sunlight. Mr. Lohbauer responded that he likes that idea, but noted that there are additional challenges of doing a single-family approach on this lot that he would worry about. He suggested that he would like that kind of arrangement, and could create activity at the ground floor using three or four doors, but still retain the program of CMX-3. He noted that single-family homes not allowed in CMX-3. Mr. Thomas commented that they may not want to subdivide the lot because it would create sub-standard homes, but instead they could have a homeowners' association. Mr. Thomas commented that four-story homes used to be rare, but are now common. He suggested that the applicant could explore a number of different options, including a duplex, with two doors at the ground floor. He noted that the Commission's basic concern is the building's scale and relationship to the historic street and other buildings. Mr. Lohbauer stated that he understood, but noted there are other reasons that four stories may not be feasible. He commented that the discussion still had not fully addressed the way to reuse the interior of the block, or how to make the school building safe and compliant.

Mr. Lohbauer commented that, if four stories is the limit, the floor area will differ greatly from the theoretical maximum established by the Planning Commission. Mr. Thomas interrupted, noting that zoning and the Historical Commission's regulations and requirements routinely differ.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to approve in concept a redevelopment scheme for the site, provided that the new construction is limited to four stories in height and it keeps the school building with some amount of clarity surrounding it, and that new house types are examined for the Orianna Street portion of the development. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 520 N 15TH ST

Proposal: Construct third-story, rear addition with roof deck and pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Andy Hui & Anthony Hui

Applicant: Hao Li, Mimohaus Architects LLC

History: 1859

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the pilot house is reduced in height and length, and that the stucco of the addition's south wall is differentiated from the historical two-story wall below to indicate the building's historical massing, with the staff to review details including colors, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guidelines.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a third story with roof deck and pilot house at the existing rear ell of the building at 520 N. 15th Street. The property is located mid-block on the west side of N. 15th Street, within the Spring Garden Historic District; however, the property is abutted to the south by a one-story structure that would cause the party wall side of the proposed addition and pilot house to be visible from 15th Street. Though sloped toward 15th Street, the pilot house would span the addition's entire south wall, extending the wall above the roof of the main block.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 1722 PINE ST

Proposal: Rehabilitate building per passive house standards

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Paul Thompson & Laura Blau

Applicant: Laura Blau, BluPath Design Inc.

History: 1845

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to execute a deep energy retrofit of a four-story, four-unit historic property within the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District. By retrofitting the property, the applicant ultimately seeks EnerPHit certification, a retrofit standard of the International Passive House Association. Work to the front façade would involve installing new Passive House Certified windows, removing non-original shutters, and repointing brick. Work to the rear would include removing the ground-level bay and installing new shingles on the remaining second- and third-story bays, over-insulating the brick walls using a rainscreen EIFS system, installing Passive House Certified UPVC casement windows, installing a new cornice, and restoring the existing fire escape. At the roof, the existing wire-glass skylight would be replaced with a Passive House Certified skylight, existing mechanical systems would be removed, and the roofing material would be replaced.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architects and property owners Laura Blau and Paul Thompson represented the application.

Mr. Thomas discussed the need to address energy efficiency in historic structures, and noted that the National Park Service has issued a series of Preservation Briefs on the subject.

Ms. Blau gave a presentation that explicated the differences in energy efficiency standards, from Energy Star to Passive House, and focused on the science and approach to energy conservation outlined in the Passive House standards. She described the condition of the brick on the property's front façade as being in good condition and noted the restoration work she and her husband completed to date in this location. The windows, Ms. Blau continued, are to be replaced as part of the current proposal to retrofit the building. She explained that the windows are manufactured to simulate the appearance of double-hung windows; they are fused at the meeting rail, air sealed, triple paned with thermally insulated frames, and composed of wood. Ms. Blau stated that the current clamshell molding replaced the historic molding, and a non-functional screen track exists at the frame. She noted that the restoration would replicate the appearance of the historic windows and restore the character of the brickmold.

Ms. Blau presented several examples of renovations of historic properties to meet Passive House standards and remarked that the work was approved by the New York City Landmarks Commission. The examples included residences with Passive House certified windows, and thermographic imaging showed differences in efficiency of the retrofitted properties compared to typical historic houses.

Ms. Blau showed photographs of existing conditions at the rear of her property and indicated that the brick in this location is in poor condition. She added that the brick has absorbed significant quantities of water, which has contributed to mold and mildew at the interior. To attempt to mitigate the issues in the past, she continued, localized pointing was undertaken and sealants were applied; however, the problems have persisted. In the current application, Ms. Blau proposed to remove the non-original first-floor extension of a bay, remove the existing siding from the feature and clad it in a rain screen siding and shingles. She also indicated that the scope of work would include replacing the rear windows with Passive House certified windows, installing a self-supporting fire escape, and over-insulating the exterior walls with an EIFS system comprised of a vapor permeable liquid membrane, a raked rain screen, a drainage plane, and four inches of insulation. The system, Ms. Blau explained, would be attached to the brick using adhesive rather than fastened with screws. The rear of the property backs onto Waverly Street, which Ms. Blau argued is a service alley that accommodates parking and trash. She showed several photographs to illustrate the extent of stucco applied to the rears of other buildings along Waverly Street. Ms. Blau acknowledged that a balance between sustainability and preservation must be reached, but contended that sustainability carries greater weight.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the Architectural Committee members felt unanimously that the brick rear ell was a significant feature dating to approximately 1922. While there is a need to introduce energy efficiency into historic buildings, Mr. McCoubrey continued, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards indicate that this type of efficiency can be achieved by insulating on the interior of the building rather than the proposed exterior insulation that would cover the historic brick. Ms. Blau responded that insulating from the interior would require her to gut and rehabilitate the entire building and would be too costly, although she stated that the process would be possible at the first story. Ms. Blau also voiced her opposition to displacing current tenants in order to complete the retrofit.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that Committee members also felt that, if the exterior brick were in such poor condition that it precluded rehabilitation, then the EIFS system could be considered. However, he added that the Committee's general sentiment on the condition of the brick was

that it was in good condition, although he acknowledged that it would need to be repointed and potentially treated further.

Mr. Thomas stated that the Commission should expect to review more energy efficiency projects, and the Commission will be tasked with applying the Secretary of the Interior's Standards to these types of projects. He suggested researching the decisions comparable historical commissions have made on related proposals. Mr. Thomas discussed the designs and efficiency of various window types and elaborated on the context of the rear, emphasizing that it is a service alley. He opined about the leniency the Commission has taken in applying the Standards in past applications where the work would be visible along a public right-of-way that functions as a service alley. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the applicants' argument against interior insulation is based on an economic condition. Mr. Thompson and Ms. Blau added that insulating at the interior would destroy historic plaster moldings and finishes.

Mr. McCoubrey raised issues related to the EIFS system and voiced concern about its efficacy. Ms. Blau contended that a Passive House retrofit is science-based and predicated on durability to ensure the methods are successful. She argued in favor of the EIFS system, stating that the system contains a drainage plane, and that the wall would be studied to confirm that it is effective. She noted that, prior to any application of EIFS, the walls at the rear ell would undergo hygrothermal and thermal modeling.

Mr. Thomas noted that the issues described affect the rear of the building, and he inquired about the front façade. Ms. Blau replied that the insulation will be brought inside several feet at the party walls to prevent moisture issues at the juncture of the super-insulated walls of the rear ell and non-insulated party walls of the main block. Mr. Thomas noted that, unless there is a specific designation of a public interior, the Historical Commission does not regulate the interiors of buildings. Ms. Blau emphasized that her proposal to renovate the property is not a specific condition at a single building and encouraged the Commission to consider its wider impact on sustainability.

Mr. Thomas asked for public comment, of which there was none, and asked if there was any further discussion from Commission members or staff. Mr. Baron asked that the Commission address the application's proposal of changes to the front façade. Ms. Blau contended that the existing one-over-one double-hung sash are original to the structure. Mr. Baron responded that the windows were likely replaced early in the building's history and asked that the windows be returned to their original six-over-six pane configuration and that they match similar windows on the block. He also expressed concern over the appearance of the proposed Passive House certified windows. While Mr. Baron felt that the change in operability from sash to casement would be acceptable, he opposed the loss of clamshell molding, addition of a subframe, and change to the glazing. Ms. Blau and Mr. Thompson argued that the clamshell molding is not original to the building. Ms. Blau stated that it may date to the 1950s, when the sliding screen was likely installed. She commented that, when installing the proposed wood windows, she would replicate the original brickmold. Mr. Baron noted that because the building is part of a row, the original molding could be determined from a neighboring building. Mr. Thomas added that a compromise could be met to have the proposed windows imitate the appearance of the historic six-over-six sash while meeting the Passive House energy requirement and operating as casements. He suggested that the details be reviewed by staff.

Mr. McCoubrey asked whether the installation of the EIFS system, which would add approximately five inches to the wall exterior, would encroach on property lines. Ms. Blau answered that, at the rear wall, the addition of the EIFS system would bring the structure to the limit of the fire safety zone. She also stated that she would need to contact the Philadelphia

Streets Department and has had conversations with her neighbor about over-insulating at the party wall shared by their buildings.

Mr. Baron commented that Ms. Blau is proposing to remove the shutters, which are a non-historic configuration. He stated that the building's facade historically included shutters, and he asked the Commission members to consider whether Ms. Blau should be required to install the correct shutters if she is removing existing shutters. Ms. Blau responded that she would consider appropriate shutters.

Mr. Thomas asked if the Commission was ready to make a motion. He stated that the Architectural Committee had recommended denial, but he noted that he believed the Commission was attempting to find a compromise. Ms. Blau indicated that she felt there was not enough time to prepare her application to the Architectural Committee and also suggested that there was a technical misunderstanding about the EIFS system at the Committee meeting. She remarked that she included supplemental information on the technical aspects of her application to clarify those misunderstandings for the Commission.

Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the applicants should consider insulating in the interior of the building. He also suggested that the applicants could work with the staff to identify a window that would satisfy both historic preservation and energy efficiency requirements. Mr. Thomas noted that reconstructing the fire escape to be independent of the exterior wall makes sense. Mr. Baron again reminded everyone that the building originally had shutters. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the shutters should be replaced with historically appropriate shutters.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the EIFS insulation portion of the application, with the suggestion of installing the insulation in the interior, and to approve all other aspects of the application, provided that windows and shutters that accurately replicate the exterior appearances of the historic windows and shutters are installed, with the staff to review details. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 5 to 4. Messrs. Bumb, Gupta, McDade, and Thomas dissented.

OLD BUSINESS

Celeste Morello, who authored the nomination for the paintings in the dome of the Basilica of Sts. Peter & Paul at 209-25 N. 18th Street, objected to having to wait any longer for the Commission to consider her nomination. She insisted that the Commission amend the order of its agenda and place her matter before the other two remaining matters on the agenda. Mr. Thomas noted that others had waited patiently for their applications to be heard. He remarked that the architects representing the application for 2304 St. Albans Street had waited in good humor. He observed that providing a convenience for Ms. Morello would inconvenience the architects. Ms. Morello demanded to be heard next. Rich Villa and Megan Fitzpatrick, the architects, politely stated that they would defer to Ms. Morello, allowing her matter to be heard first. Ms. Morello again demanded to be heard. Mr. Thomas amended the agenda, taking Ms. Morello's nomination next.

209-25 N 18TH STREET, PAINTINGS IN THE BASILICA OF STS. PETER & PAUL

Nominator: Celeste Morello

Owner: Archdiocese of Philadelphia

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the paintings in the

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION, 13 MAY 2016

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

dome of the Basilica of Sts. Peter & Paul at 209-25 N. 18th Street satisfy Criteria for Designation E and J. Mr. Cohen dissented.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate five oil-on-canvas paintings in the dome of the Basilica of Sts. Peter & Paul at 209-25 N. 18th Street as historic objects and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the paintings, executed by artist/decorator Constantino Brumidi, satisfy Criteria for Designation E and J. The nomination argues that the paintings are significant works of art by an important designer, Constantino Brumidi, whose artistic production has significantly influenced the cultural development of the City, Commonwealth and Nation, and that the oil paintings exemplify the heritage of Philadelphia's Catholic community.

At its April 2016 meeting, the Historical Commission tabled the review of the nomination for 30 days.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Commission. Nominator Celeste Morello represented the nomination. Attorney Michael Phillips and the Reverend Gerald Dennis Gill, the rector of the Cathedral, represented the property owner.

Mr. Phillips stated that the Commission did not want to address First Amendment arguments that were presented at the previous month's Commission meeting, so he put those arguments in his written submission for this review. He stated that the City is not short on historic resources, but the objects in question are not resources of the City of Philadelphia, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, or the United States of America; rather, they are resources of the Catholic Church. They are the Church's to care for, protect, and maintain, and the Catholic Church does all three of those things extremely well.

Rev. Gill stated that the Cathedral Basilica is open to the public every day, with slightly different weekend hours owing to evening masses. He explained that the Cathedral Basilica is locked and alarmed when it is not open to the public. Mr. Phillips asked Rev. Gill about his duties and responsibilities as the curator. Rev. Gill responded that he is responsible for maintenance for the entire Cathedral Basilica campus, which includes preservation of the Cathedral, chapel and rectory. Mr. Phillips asked about Rev. Gill's role with respect to the care of the objects inside of the Cathedral Basilica. Rev. Gill responded that the objects are cared for in different ways. Stable elements are treated with care and professionals are brought in to assist in their care. Moveable items are handled personally. Mr. Phillips asked if Rev. Gill's position includes the care of all of the objects in the building, including the paintings. Rev. Gill responded that it is his responsibility to care for everything outside and inside of the building, no matter what it is. Mr. Phillips asked the purpose of all of the objects inside of the building. Rev. Gill responded that everything both inside and outside contributes to the worship of God.

Ms. Morello stated that the Archdiocese has failed to review the preservation ordinance and the process, and also failed to review the precedent of similar nominations regarding sacred art. Rev. Gill asked if her claim of failure applies specifically to the Cathedral Basilica. Ms. Morello responded that the failure was to understand the preservation ordinance and the Criteria under which the paintings were recommended by the Committee on Historic Designation.

Mr. Thomas stated that the Commission has to determine if the paintings are eligible for designation, based on whether they meet one or more Criteria for designation. Mr. Phillips responded that the Committee on Historic Designation only addresses whether the proposed objects meet one or more Criteria for designation, whereas the Commission has discretion regarding whether to designate. Mr. Thomas agreed. Mr. Farnham clarified that the

Commission's role has two steps when it is considering designating a property or an object. The first technical step is to determine whether the resource meets one or more Criteria for Designation. The Committee on Historic Designation advises the Commission on whether Criteria are met. If the Commission finds that the resource does meet this qualification, it should move to the second step. The second step is a policy decision. The Commission, not the Committee, determines whether a resource should be designated and subsequently regulated. He continued that the Commission has complete discretion, and could technically find that a property satisfies all ten Criteria for Designation, but could choose to not designate for any number of reasons. The question before the Commission is a policy question, as to whether it is appropriate to designate these paintings. Ms. Morello responded that recently a painting at Old Saint Joseph's Church was designated without any sort of contest, and also two paintings at Saint Augustine's Church. Mr. Farnham responded that Ms. Morello is correct, but that her statement is irrelevant; those designations do not set a precedent. He continued that the Commission considers each nomination separately, and the Commission is under no requirement to designate the paintings in question simply because they have previously chosen to designate paintings in Catholic churches. The Commission is acting in a quasi-legislative manner when it designates; it is not acting in a regulatory manner.

Mr. Thomas suggested that the Commission first consider the Criteria for Designation, because it cannot move onto the policy question until it determines that one or more Criteria are satisfied. Mr. Phillips responded that he would like to discuss the policy question. Mr. Thomas responded that the Commission has not yet commented on the Criteria question.

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and find that the nomination demonstrates that the paintings in the dome of the Basilica of Sts. Peter & Paul at 209-25 N. 18th Street satisfy Criteria for Designation E and J. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Thomas directed the Commission's attention to the policy question, whether to designate. Mr. Phillips commented that, prior to December 2014, there were only eleven objects listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. He stated that these objects include five horse troughs, the Founders Memorial Bell, the Pennsylvania Railroad War Memorial, the Wanamaker Eagle statue, Dickens and Little Nell statue in Clark Park, Dream Garden glass mosaic in the Curtis Center, and the WPA murals in the former Family Court building. He stated that Ms. Morello began nominating paintings within Catholic churches in December 2014, and the last three objects the Commission has designated as historic have all been paintings. He opined that this should not be the role of the Historical Commission.

Mr. Phillips referenced a question from Mr. Gupta at the April 2016 meeting, at which time Mr. Gupta asked about the difference between the regulation of the exterior of a building and an interior object. Mr. Phillips stated that the distinction is that the City of Philadelphia does exercise control over the exterior of every single building within the city limits. However, once one enters into a building, the personal objects are privately owned and that is where the distinction should be drawn and where discretion should be exercised. Ms. Morello questioned Mr. Phillips, asking him if the Cathedral is a public place. Mr. Phillips responded that it is closed to the public during certain hours. Ms. Morello responded that a person is never denied entrance into a church. Mr. Thomas commented that there does not need to be 24-hour access to a public interior for it to be historically designated, but noted that this is not an interior nomination. Ms. Morello questioned whether the historic designation would remain with the object if it were to be removed from its current location. Mr. Thomas responded that he does not know. Mr. Gupta asked about the qualifications for an interior designation. Mr. Farnham responded that the historic preservation ordinance authorizes the Commission to designate

publicly-accessible interior spaces, including but not limited to restaurants, movie theaters and churches. He noted that this interior space would be eligible, but reiterated that this is not an interior nomination. Mr. Phillips summarized that these paintings are private objects that are being cared for, and it does not make sense for the City to have jurisdiction over them.

Ms. Morello stated that her intent was to highlight the importance of the paintings resulting from Brumidi, the artist. Mr. McDade suggested that a plaque or historic marker would be a better solution; it would convey information to the public. A historic designation would protect the objects, but would not convey her information to the public. Ms. Morello noted that her nomination is long, and a visitor to Philadelphia would not have the time to read all of it. Mr. McDade responded that that is his point, and that a historic designation does not achieve what she is intending to achieve through this nomination process. Rev. Gill commented that he appreciates the process that has taken place during this review, and he wishes it could have happened at the previous Commission meeting, when the St. Augustine paintings were designated. Rev. Gill stated that the Cathedral Basilica conducts tours every day of the week. The historical information offered by Ms. Morello are provided at every tour, to every person who comes into the Cathedral; the history of these particular paintings are provided to visitors. There are also several students completing dissertation studies on these paintings. There are printed pamphlets that are given out to visitors that contain the historic information. Ms. Morello disagreed. Rev. Gill stated that the information provided in Ms. Morello's nomination is widely known. Ms. Morello responded that the information provided at the Cathedral is not extensive, and she expressed her feeling of being insulted on an intellectual level.

MOTION: Mr. McDade moved that the Historical Commission refuse to designate the paintings in the dome of the Basilica of Sts. Peter & Paul at 209-25 N. 18th Street. Mr. Bumb seconded the motion.

Mr. Gupta opined that the Commission is in a gray area, in that it does not have clear guidance on when to exercise jurisdiction and choose to not designate. He suggested that the Commission have a further discussion about the subject at a later date. Mr. Thomas responded that this is one of several issues that will be discussed at an upcoming special meeting of the Commission, which has yet to be scheduled. Ms. Turner stated that the Commission needs to be very clear on why it is taking a second vote during this review, and what the first vote means. She asked for clarity. Mr. Thomas responded that the Commission is Philadelphia's principal public steward of historic resources. As such, it can step in when no one else is taking care of an historic resource, or when an historic resource is threatened. In this case, the Commission has been assured by the owner that these objects are receiving excellent private stewardship. He commented that when the Commission chooses to designate something as historic, the designation adds additional burden on the staff. He stated that one of the issues the Commission is working through is the public perception that it is not doing enough. He suggested that when a resource is not at risk, the Commission should question if it is worth burdening the staff and the Commission with a designation. He stated that the Commission found that these paintings are historically significant, but it has not yet determined whether they should be designated and then regulated by the Commission. He opined that the Commission should choose to not designate in this instance, because the Catholic Church has been taking care of its historic assets for many years. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the Commission could reconsider the nomination if the Cathedral Basilica were to close or be under another sort of threat. Mr. Thomas affirmed this, and opined that the Commission should focus its attention where it is most needed at the present time, owing to its limited resources. He summarized that an answer to a question regarding why the Commission would not automatically designate a resource after determining it eligible for designation, could be that the owners made a presentation to show that they are already excellent stewards of the resource.

Mr. Farnham thanked Ms. Morello for bringing the paintings to the Commission's attention and meticulously documenting them, and noted that the Commission knows more about Catholic churches because of her work. He explained that, if the Commission chooses to not designate these paintings, it is not a reflection of her work. He suggested that the Commission work with Ms. Morello to find ways to celebrate and honor these important works of art, without necessarily exercising the Commission's regulatory authority.

ACTION: By unanimous vote, the Historical Commission adopted the motion proffered by Messrs. McDade and Bumb and refused to designate the paintings in the dome of the Basilica of Sts. Peter & Paul at 209-25 N. 18th Street.

ADDRESS: 2304 ST ALBANS ST

Proposal: Construct pilot house and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Anh Trah & Tom Halpin

Applicant: Megan Fitzpatrick, Ambit Architecture

History: 1869; Charles Leslie, developer

Individual Designation: 9/30/1969

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 Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck and stair house on the main roof of this row house. Owing to the size, configuration, and location of the house, any deck and stair house would be conspicuous from the public right-of-way. Moreover, the Commission has denied decks of this sort proposed for other properties on this row. Although there is a stair house at 2306 St. Albans, it was not approved by the Commission, has been in place for many, many years, and does not provide access to a deck. The Commission previously approved a rear deck for the building at 2304. The very consistent row of buildings, all of which are designated, would be adversely affected with the addition of a roof deck, which would be conspicuous.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architects Rich Villa and Megan Fitzpatrick represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the applicants constructed a mock-up of the deck and stair house. Using Powerpoint, he displayed photographs showing the stair house and the deck as seen during the site visit. He explained that these views were taken from 20th Street and showed that the additions would be highly visible.

Mr. Villa said that the mock-ups that they provided included an additional setback from the front façade to 12 feet behind the front wall, rather than 5 feet as proposed to the Committee. He said that there is an existing roof hatch currently in the location of the proposed stair house. He said that a stair house would be visible no matter where it was located or how it was configured, but that he was hoping to provide at least a railing so that there would be some safety for people going up to the roof. Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Villa about the dimensions of the proposed deck. Mr. Villa said that the deck would be 16 feet wide and 19 feet deep with the 12-foot setback. Mr. Thomas suggested that there is room to set back the railing even farther and still have a substantial deck. He suggested creating a modified motorized hatch in lieu of a stair house. He

said that a railing could be installed next to the hatch to help people access the roof safely. In this case, the stair house could be avoided entirely. Also, this solution would be less expensive.

Ms. Turner and Mr. Thomas suggested that, if the Commission denies the application, the applicants could work with the staff to develop a revised application with a deck and hatch that are less visible from the street. They suggested amending the size and location of the deck, the design of the roof access, and other aspects of the design.

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee deny the application, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

101A W GRAVERS LANE

Nominator: Jennifer Robinson

Owner: 101 Gravers LLC

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property, as amended to include 101A W. Gravers Lane only, satisfies Criteria for Designation C and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 101A W. Gravers Lane as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. At the time the Historical Commission notified the property owner of the consideration of the nomination, the property was known as 101 W. Gravers Lane. Since the initial notice was sent, the property has been subdivided into 101A, 109, and 111 W Gravers Lane. The proposed boundary in the nomination includes the 101A parcel only.

The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation C, H, I, and J. The nomination argues that the single-family residence, with the main block constructed by stonemason Lewis Headman in 1867 and 1868, is a well-preserved example of a vernacular interpretation of an architect-designed dwelling. The nomination also contends that the building is significant for being a visual landmark in Chestnut Hill, owing to its location on a corner lot, and that the site may be likely to yield information important in history, as the house sits approximately on the site of the former Union Chapel.

At its April 2016 meeting, the Historical Commission tabled the review of the nomination for 30 days.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Commission. No one represented the nominator or property owner.

Ms. DiPasquale stated that staff research into the site of the former Union Chapel determined that the demolished church building did not, in fact, stand on this property.

Mr. Farnham noted that the property owner, 101 Gravers LLC, indicated that it does not oppose a designation of the property.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property, as amended to include 101A W. Gravers Lane only, satisfies Criteria for Designation C and J, to designate it as historic, and to list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 12:34 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 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.