

**THE MINUTES OF THE 667<sup>TH</sup> STATED MEETING OF THE  
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 9 MARCH 2018  
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET  
BOB THOMAS, CHAIR**

**PRESENT**

Robert Thomas, AIA, Chair  
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D.  
Mike Fink, Department of Licenses & Inspections  
Steven Hartner, Department of Public Property  
Melissa Long, Division of Housing & Community Development  
John Mattioni, Esq.  
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C  
Rachel Royer, LEED AP BD+C  
R. David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission  
H. Ahada Stanford, Commerce Department  
Betty Turner, M.A.

Jonathan E. Farnham, Executive Director  
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III  
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II  
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner I  
Megan Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner I  
Leonard Reuter, Esq., City Law Department

**ALSO PRESENT**

Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
Dennis Carlisle, OCF Realty  
Julie Berson, Kleinbard LLC  
Kevin Orndorf, Orndorf & Associates, Inc.  
Ori Feibush, OCF Realty  
Greg Vizza, Esq., Blank Rome  
Steve Perzan  
Chris Reed, Tantilillo Architecture  
George Yu  
Lotus Yu  
Lou Filippone, Graboyes  
Jonathan Broh, JKRP Architects  
Jennifer Whary, JKRP Architects  
Oscar Beisert, The Keeping Society of Philadelphia  
J.M. Duffin  
Aaron Wunsch, University of Pennsylvania  
Pip Campbell  
Teresa Walker, GEHA  
Sean Whalen, Esq., Vintage Law

Richard Gettlin, 100 Block Van Pelt Residents Association  
Joseph Ianoale  
Amanda Korson  
Kelly Edwards, ACH

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Thomas called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Commissioners Cooperman, Fink, Hartner, Long, Mattioni, McCoubrey, Royer, Schaaf, Stanford and Turner joined him. Mr. Thomas announced that the Historical Commission had met in executive session to discuss a legal matter with its legal counsel.

**MINUTES OF THE 666<sup>TH</sup> STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**ACTION:** Ms. Turner moved to approve the minutes of the 666<sup>th</sup> Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 9 February 2018. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**CONTINUANCE REQUESTS**

**ADDRESS: 801-15 N 4TH ST AND 319 BROWN ST**

Name of Resource: St. Agnes Roman Catholic Church, Parish House, and School

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: St. Agnes-St. John Nepomucene Parish/Archdiocese of Philadelphia

Nominator: Northern Liberties Neighbors Association/The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Farnham presented the continuance request to the Historical Commission. Oscar Beisert stated that, as the nominator, he concurs with the continuance request proffered by the property owner.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to continue the review of the nomination for 801-15 N. 4<sup>th</sup> Street and 319 Brown Street to the May 2018 meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission. Ms. Royer seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ADDRESS: 6369 GERMANTOWN AVE**

Name of Resource: "Genteel Two-Story Stone Dwelling"

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: TVC PA 6365 Germantown Avenue LLC

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

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

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Farnham presented the continuance request to the Historical Commission. He observed that the property owner is requesting continuance and remand to a future Committee on Historic Designation meeting. Mr. Thomas noted that the Historical Commission typically continues the reviews of nominations to specific meetings, not simply to meetings at undefined points in the future. Oscar Beisert stated that, as the nominator, he concurs with the continuance request proffered by the property owner.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to continue the review of the nomination for 6369 Germantown Avenue and to remand it to the April 2018 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ADDRESS: 6365-67 GERMANTOWN AVE**

Name of Resource: Richard and Sophia Thewlis Bew Store and Residence  
Proposed Action: Designation  
Property Owner: TVC PA 6365 Germantown Avenue LLC  
Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia  
Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Farnham presented the continuance request to the Historical Commission. He observed that the property owner is requesting continuance and remand to a future Committee on Historic Designation meeting. Oscar Beisert stated that, as the nominator, he concurs with the continuance request proffered by the property owner.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to continue the review of the nomination for 6365-67 Germantown Avenue and to remand it to the April 2018 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ADDRESS: 208-10 REX AVE**

Name of Resource: William L. Hirst/H. Louis Duhring Residence  
Proposed Action: Designation  
Property Owner: Virginia, William, and Hewson Baltzell  
Nominator: Chestnut Hill Conservancy  
Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Cooperman recused from the review, owing to her relationship with the Chestnut Hill Conservancy, the nominator. Mr. Farnham presented the continuance request to the Historical Commission. He observed that the property owner is requesting continuance and remand to a future Committee on Historic Designation meeting.

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to continue the review of the nomination for 208-10 Rex Avenue and to remand it to the April 2018 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation. Ms. Royer seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ADDRESS: 2101 WASHINGTON AVE**

Name of Resource: Howell & Brothers Wallpaper Hangings Manufactory  
Proposed Action: Designation  
Property Owner: 2101 Washington Real Estate  
Nominator: Dennis Carlisle  
Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2101 Washington as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. The nomination argues that 2101 Washington Avenue is significant under Criterion A in the area of development and culture as the site Howell

& Brothers Wallpaper Hangings Manufactory, which was first constructed on this property in 1865. As one of the most successful wallpaper manufacturers during the second half of the nineteenth century, the company transformed the methods for manufacturing wallpaper in the United States while simultaneously influencing American interior design. Howell & Brothers Wallpaper was the first American wallpaper manufacturer to utilize machine-made wallpapers, and at one point the largest wallpaper factory in the country. The nomination asserts that 2101 Washington Avenue satisfies Criterion J, owing to its influence on the growth of Washington Avenue as an industrial corridor and its representation of Philadelphia as a domestic and international manufacturing center, first as the Howell & Brothers Wallpaper Hangings Manufactory, and followed by the John Wanamaker Department Store Furniture Warehouse and the Frankford Chocolate Company.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Thomas stated that the nominator is requesting withdrawal of the nomination from the designation process and the current owner is requesting a continuance. Mr. Thomas stated that once a property is nominated, the Historical Commission welcomes input from the public, from a property owner, from anyone, but it is the Commission's decision how to move forward.

Sean Whalen of Vintage Law introduced himself as the representative of the equitable owner, OCF Realty. Mr. Whalen then introduced Dennis Carlisle, the nominator of 2101 Washington Avenue. Mr. Whalen stated that they hoped for a withdrawal of the nomination and that Mr. Carlisle can speak to his conversations with staff and why he believes that is warranted. Mr. Whalen stated that he wished to speak and that he believes that anything other than a withdrawal is futile at this point, including that the building had been previously designated imminently dangerous by the Department of Licenses & Inspections as of last July. Mr. Whalen detailed the poor condition of the building and provided copies of the Department of Licenses & Inspections violations to Commission members. A copy of a letter and report from Orndorf & Associates Inc., Structural Engineers dated 9 February 2018 were passed out to Commission members. He noted that different parties, including Historical Commission staff, have been invited to visit the property to observe the condition.

Mr. Carlisle stated that he wished to withdraw the nomination and resubmit with a more focused nomination so that the building can be appropriately re-developed. Mr. Carlisle is now an employee of OCF Realty and is presently working on the 2101 Washington Avenue redevelopment project. Mr. Whalen spoke at length regarding the deteriorated condition of the building. He advocated for the withdrawal due primarily to the building condition and the structural engineer's report. Mr. Whalen also stated that Mr. Carlisle is now working for OCF Realty. Mr. Whalen also noted that the nomination should not be prejudiced due to the withdrawal request.

Ms. Cooperman contended that the Committee on Historic Designation had not had a chance to review the merits of the nomination yet. Mr. Farnham stated that the current property owner attended the 14 February 2018 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation and requested a continuance. Mr. Farnham continued that he met with the equitable owner, Ori Feibush of OCF Realty, who is under contract to purchase the property. At that meeting, Mr. Feibush extended an offer for staff and others to tour the property and see the condition.

Mr. Mattioni questioned granting a withdrawal without further consideration of the nomination. He noted that the continuance was the most rational thing to do despite the building's condition.

Ms. Cooperman contended they had just received the Orndorf report and had not had time to consider it. Mr. Mattioni also noted that the nomination had only been submitted in December 2017.

Mr. Thomas stated that the nomination was submitted and reviewed by staff and remanded to the Committee on Historic Designation. Mr. Thomas inquired to Ms. Cooperman as to the nature of the questions that led the Committee on Historic Designation to recommend a continuance.

Mr. Cooperman stated that the Committee on Historic Designation responded to the property owner, Jake Ketchum, who stated at the 14 February 2018 meeting that he had just learned of the nomination and wanted some time to consider it. Because of this, the Committee on Historic Designation felt it was appropriate to recommend continuance.

Mr. Thomas contended that he had an issue because he would like to read what was presented but did not feel there was time at the current meeting. He also remarked that it is not unheard of that a nomination is revised.

Mr. Thomas stated that his predilection would be to continue the nomination and that, once the nomination is presented to the Historical Commission, the Historical Commission has a responsibility to the public as well as to the owner to consider things carefully. Mr. Thomas noted that the Commission does not have enough information right now to really understand what is going on with the building. Documents should be posted online so the public can review them.

Mr. Cooperman contended that the Committee on Historic Designation could make an expert recommendation on which portion of the property is appropriate for designation, once the Committee on Historic Designation has time to evaluate all the information submitted.

Mr. Whalen stated that, given the discussion, he suggests a continuance to the next Committee on Historic Designation, without a decision on the withdrawal or prejudice thereto. Mr. Whalen continued that the closing will happen this month and that the Department of Licenses & Inspections and staff will visit the site and all will be fully informed. He noted that this will put the matter back in front of the Historical Commission in May 2018.

Mr. Reuter requested that Mr. Whalen clarify for the record whether he represents OCF Realty. Mr. Whalen responded that he represents OCF Realty, who is the equitable owner. Mr. Reuter inquired if anyone representing the current owner is present. Gregory Vizza from Black Rome LLP stated that he represents the current owner and the owner has no issue with continuance of the nomination.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to continue the consideration of the designation of 2101 Washington Avenue and remand it to the April 2018 meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

## **THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 14 NOVEMBER 2017**

Dan McCoubrey, Chair

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

Mr. Thomas introduced the Consent Agenda, which included an application for 724 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. Mr. Thomas asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. None were offered. Mr. Thomas asked if anyone in the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. None were offered.

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 724 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **AGENDA**

#### **ADDRESS: 2409 PINE ST**

Proposal: Construct roof deck with pergola

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Adam Solow

Applicant: George Little, GeorgeLittle.Design

History: 1835

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 Standard 9, the Roofs Guideline, and the Commission's 2014 approval of a three-story rear addition without the deck.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a roof deck with pergola on the rear of this two-story rowhouse located in the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District. The proposed deck is located on top of a new three-story rear addition, which the Commission approved in 2014. For the 2014 approval, an application was submitted for demolition of the rear roof slope and rear dormer, and construction of a three-story rear addition with roof deck. The Committee determined the massing and scale to be excessive, and recommended denial of the application, with the recommendation that it be revised to be a two-story addition with deck, or a three-story addition with no deck. The application was revised to show a three-story addition with no deck, and the Commission approved the revised application. This new application is essentially requesting the remaining portion of the application that was not approved by the Commission in 2014, with the argument that the historic fabric at the rear of the building was lost with the 2014 approval, and the deck is likely to not be visible from a public right-of-way.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Adam Solo and architectural designer George Little represented the application.

Mr. Solo stated that he is a student of historic preservation and restored house in Cuenca, Ecuador. Since he purchased this house on Pine Street, he has removed the paint and repointed the façade. He distributed photographs of other decks in the neighborhood, some of which can be seen from the street and have pergolas. He said that they look like Toll Brothers projects. Mr. Thomas responded that the Historical Commission appreciates the work he has done on the house. The decks of which he complained may be outside the district, built illegally, or built before the Historical Commission had jurisdiction over the properties. He asked Mr. Solo

to explain how his proposed work meets preservation standards. Mr. Solo said that he would have been happy to work with the Architectural Committee, but they received their notice letter too late to attend the meeting. He said that he has a large family. His wife is Venezuelan and they had 12 people living with them. They built the addition on their house within the “as of right” zoning envelope. He said they removed a rear addition, the rear roof, and a dormer to construct the new addition to make room for the family. Mr. Thomas said that the Historical Commission approved the addition. Mr. Solo said that he is concerned that he is being punished now for work he did in the past. Mr. McCoubrey said that the Architectural Committee is not punishing him, but is merely upholding the terms of the negotiation to approve his addition in 2014. He explained that the Historical Commission gave Mr. Solo the choice of a two-story addition with a deck or a three-story addition without a deck during the earlier review. Mr. Solo chose the three-story addition with no deck, which the Commission approved. Mr. Solo responded that the addition has a flat black roof that is an appropriate spot for a deck. He stated that he is willing to remove the pergola from the proposal, if that makes the difference. He claimed that it will not be seen. Mr. Thomas said that this is a question of massing and visibility. Mr. Mattioni asked for a clarification. He asked why the Commission would revisit a question it had decided in 2014. He said that there are flat roofs all over the City on most rowhouses. Mr. Little pointed to another house in the neighborhood that not only has a visible roof but also new façade. Mr. Thomas looked at the photograph and said that the Commission would never approve such a visible deck on the main roof of a house.

Ms. Royer asked about the high portion of the deck proposal in front of the pergola. Mr. Baron pointed to the built in high-back couches and the HVAC units sitting forward of the deck. She asked Mr. Solo if they could adjust these elements to deal with the tightness of the sightline and possible visibility from the street. He said that they could make adjustments. Mr. Thomas asked about the 2014 deck design and how the current design compares to it. Mr. Solo said that the original design had a pilothouse but this one has a pergola. He said that he would be glad to pay the City more tax for this amenity. Mr. Thomas said that perhaps Mr. Solo could use a membrane in place of deck structure and some planters to act as guard rails. Mr. Reuter responded that a deck without railings would not satisfy the building code. Mr. Fink agreed. Mr. Solo said he has small children and would want the safety of a railing. Mr. Thomas agreed. Mr. Schaaf wondered if it is not a slippery slope to negotiate a design with an applicant and then not honor the previous agreement. He asked how the Commission can enter into negotiations if it will not uphold them. Mr. McCoubrey said that, typically, the Commission does not approve of the demolition of the historic sloped roof and dormer. He said that the Commission in this case compromised with the homeowner and allowed him to remove this historic fabric for needed space but did not allow him to build a deck on the main roof. Mr. McCoubrey said that the Architectural Committee considered the issue anew and unanimously recommended denial. Mr. Thomas said that the Commission is reconsidering the proposal. He explained that, if the Commission decides to maintain its earlier decision, it is not a form of punishment.

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the application, pursuant to Standard 9, the Roofs Guideline, and the Commission’s 2014 approval of a three-story rear addition without the deck. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7 to 4. Mses. Cooperman, Long, Stanford, and Turner and Messrs. McCoubrey, Schaaf, and Thomas voted in favor. Ms. Royer and Messrs. Mattioni, Fink, and Hartner dissented.

**ADDRESS: 724 S 2ND ST**

Proposal: Replace rear wall and construct additions

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2nd & Monroe LLC

Applicant: George Konel, JKR Partners, LLC

History: 1795

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

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

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the metal roof is scaled to match an historic roof with a pole gutter; the front door is restored and the garage has an open gate; the HVAC equipment and decks do not expand beyond those shown in the application, and the lighting is developed before the Historical Commission meeting, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a third-story addition on top of the existing rear ell of this individually-designated building, which would be consolidated into a larger new construction project to the north on currently vacant lots. The proposal requires the removal of the rear wall of the existing building, which has already been severely compromised by previous work. The existing front façade, party walls, and half gambrel roof and dormer would be retained. The proposed new construction would form an L around the rear and north side of the existing building, and would be three-stories in height, rising slightly above the height of the historic building. The rear of the property is landlocked, and would not be visible from any public right-of-way. The front façade of the building would be restored to its historic appearance.

**ACTION:** See Consent Agenda

**REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 14 FEBRUARY 2018**

Emily Cooperman, Chair

**ADDRESS: 2854 AND 2870 WILLITS RD**

Name of Resource: Holme-Crispin Park and Thomas Holme-Crispin family burial ground

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: City of Philadelphia

Nominator: Joseph Menkevich

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation unanimously voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2854 and 2870 Willits Road satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, G, H, I and J.

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2854 and 2870 Willits Road as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the Holme-Crispin Park and Thomas Holme-Crispin family burial ground satisfy Criteria for Designation A, B, G, H, I, and J. The nomination argues that the site is associated with Thomas Holme, Surveyor General to William Penn, who mapped the City of Philadelphia, and as such, is associated with an event central to the founding of the Commonwealth. The nomination further contends that the distinctive public square has contained a burial ground for over 300 years,

where, in 1864, the Trustees of the Lower Dublin Academy erected an obelisk monument for Thomas Holme's gravesite in the Crispin family burial ground, which is worthy of historic designation as an early public monument. Lastly, the nomination argues that the site may be likely to yield information important in pre-history or history, owing to the park's location within a significant watershed, known to have supported Native American activity and travel routes, and as the site of early colonial dwellings and outbuildings, since demolished, associated with laborers and farmers.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. No one represented the nomination or the property owner.

The Commissioners discussed the nomination and agreed that it made a cogent case for the satisfaction of the Criteria for Designation. Mr. Thomas opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2854 and 2870 Willits Road satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, G, H, I, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ADDRESS: 1430 N BROAD ST**

Name of Resource: Charles E. Ellis House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Palace Mission, Inc.

Nominator: Staff of the Philadelphia Historical Commission

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, [laura.dipasquale@phila.gov](mailto:laura.dipasquale@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted unanimously to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1430 N. Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E and J.

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1430 N. Broad Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation D and J. The nomination argues that the mansion and its carriage house, constructed in 1890-91 for streetcar magnate and philanthropist Charles E. Ellis, is significant under Criterion J as an exemplification of the history of North Broad Street as an avenue for the exuberant homes of Philadelphia's *nouveau riche* of the Gilded Age. Under Criterion D, the nomination argues that the property is significant as an excellent example of Richardsonian Romanesque design, popular among the *nouveau riche* of this era.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. No one represented the property owner.

Mr. Thomas opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

Mr. Thomas commented that he has had the privilege of giving tours of this property several times, and that it is significant not only for its association with Charles E. Ellis, but also the Palace Mission, also known as the Peace Mission established by Father and Mother Divine. He explained that followers of the Peace Mission still live in this house, which is lovingly maintained. He noted that they nominated their own property Woodmont in Gladwyne to the

National Register, and it is now a National Historic Landmark. Ms. Cooperman suggested that Criterion A would be applicable to this property for its association with the Peace Mission. Other Commissioners agreed.

Mr. Thomas noted that this property and its neighbors on Broad Street, 16<sup>th</sup> Street, and Jefferson Street are part of the North Broad Street Mansion National Register Historic District. He explained that designating the property would mean that it was on both the Philadelphia and National Registers.

**ACTION:** Mr. Schaaf moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1430 N Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, E, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ADDRESS: 1805-07 E YORK ST**

Name of Resource: Western Saving Fund Society of Philadelphia

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Dimitrios and Melissa Tsiobikas

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, [laura.dipasquale@phila.gov](mailto:laura.dipasquale@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1805-07 E York Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J.

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1805-07 E York Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former Western Saving Fund Society building, constructed in 1916, is significant under Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination argues that the building is a fine example of the Neo-Renaissance or Italian Renaissance palazzo style that became popular for bank buildings in the early twentieth century. Under Criterion E, the nomination contends that the building is significant as the work of the prominent firm of Furness, Evans & Co. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the property is significant for its role as the first branch office of the Western Saving Fund Society.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. Oscar Beisert represented the nominator, the Keeping Society of Philadelphia. No one represented the property owner.

Ms. Cooperman explained that the Committee on Historic Designation had disagreed with the nomination's assertion that the property is significant under Criterion E as the work of Furness, Evans and Co., as it is not an example of the type of work for which the firm is famous. Nevertheless, the Committee felt that it was significant under other Criteria.

Mr. Thomas opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1805-07 E York Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Royer seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ADDRESS: 1106-14 SPRING GARDEN ST**

Name of Resource: Woodward-Wanger Co.

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Greenway Plaza LLC

Nominator: Callowhill Neighborhood Association

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1106-1114 Spring Garden Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D.

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1106-1114 Spring Garden Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D. The nomination argues that the Woodward-Wanger Co. building (also known as the The Lawsonia Building), constructed in 1929 as a warehouse and office building, is significant under Criterion D as a distinctive example of the Colonial Revival Style as applied to a commercial and industrial building. Under Criterion C, the nomination argues that 1106-1114 Spring Garden Street reflects the environment of commercial and light industrial building design as influenced by Colonial Revival style during this period in Philadelphia. It should be noted that the building is a shell; the rear section of this building was recently demolished and the openings created by the demolition were boarded, but not permanently sealed.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. Nominators Oscar Beisert and Kelly Edwards of the Callowhill Neighborhood Association represented the nomination. No one represented the property owner.

The Commissioners discussed the nomination. Mr. Thomas opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1106-1114 Spring Garden Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ADDRESS: 625 S DELHI ST**

Name of Resource: William and Letitia Still House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: F & J Homes LLC

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 625 S. Delhi Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, I, and J.

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 625 S. Delhi Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the property satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J. The nomination states that the building, named the "William and Letitia Still House & Underground Railroad Way Station" by the nominator, "represents the life and work of the important African American abolitionist,

businessman, leader on the Underground Railroad, historian, writer, and civil rights activist William Still." Still's 1872 book, *Underground Rail Road*, is identified as "the only first-person account of African American activities on the Underground Railroad." The nomination also argues that the building served as an important stop for enslaved people as they passed through Philadelphia as they sought freedom.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Schmitt presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. Oscar Beisert and Jim Duffin of the Keeping Society represented the nomination.

Mr. Beisert introduced himself and Mr. Duffin. Mr. Duffin said that he had helped work on the nomination and was available to answer any questions, but first he wanted to make a few general remarks. He stated that the research on this project was an incredible uncovering of Philadelphia history, and that it was an incredible example of the richness of the hidden history that is in our city. He said that he had heard about the work of William Still for years and his work in relation to Philadelphia history, but that he had never heard of a physical site that was still surviving. He went on to say that for years, people had talked about a site on Delhi Street, but they did not actually know where it was. Mr. Duffin remarked that it was the scene of the very famous, public media sensation of 1855, of the Johnson escape, which was when William Still and Passmore Williamson helped Jane Johnson and her children obtain freedom as they were passing through Philadelphia with their owner. Mr. Duffin explained that Passmore Williamson was imprisoned for 100 days because he refused to give her location, and that Jane Johnson and her children spent their very first night of freedom at the house on Delhi Street before she and her family traveled on to New York. He remarked that William Still became a national figure as a result of his participation in the escape, and that having a physical site that is connected to his work helping countless people seeking freedom that can be pointed out to people is incredible. Mr. Duffin concluded his remarks by reading a quote from a letter of support written by Lonnie G. Bunch III, the Director of the Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of African American History and Culture.

Mr. Beisert commented that the historic preservation ordinance authorizes the Historical Commission to advise the Mayor, not only about properties that should be designated, but about properties that should be purchased by the City or that could use funding. He stated that he imagined that this type of a recommendation happened so rarely, and even if they could come up with money to restore the façade, it would be an incredible addition to the landmarks in Philadelphia. He went on to say that he did not think that the fact that the façade had been altered changed the significance of the building; however, the Historical Commission should consider making a recommendation to the Mayor. Mr. Beisert said that, when you walk down the street and look at the building, despite seeing a later façade, the original marble steps are still there, and imagining that Harriet Tubman may have stood there when she arrived from Maryland is incredible.

Mr. Duffin said that the side façade that faces the parking lot would be a perfect place for a mural about William Still and the Underground Railroad, adding that the Institute for Colored Youth building, which later became Cheyney University, was right next door. Mr. Beisert commented that the Institute for Colored Youth building is not locally designated.

Mr. Thomas asked if the owner was present, to which there was no reply. He said that he thought Mr. Duffin's and Mr. Beisert's comments were very interesting, and that it would be important to involve the owner in discussions about what kinds of funding or grants might be available, depending on the use of the building. Mr. Thomas thanked Messrs. Duffin and Beisert

for their work on the nomination, and asked if there was any further discussion, to which there was no reply.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 625 S. Delhi Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, B, I, and J, and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **ADDRESS: 1821-27 RANSTEAD ST**

Name of Resource: The Musical Art Club

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Bian and Lia Yu

Nominator: The Keeping Society of Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, [laura.dipasquale@phila.gov](mailto:laura.dipasquale@phila.gov), 215-686-7660

**COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION:** The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1821-27 Ranstead Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J.

**OVERVIEW:** This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1821-27 Ranstead Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination argues that the former Musical Art Club building, constructed in 1917, is significant under Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J. The nomination contends that the building is significant under Criterion J because it represents Philadelphia's musical community at an important point in its history. Under Criterion E, the building is significant as the work of Price & McLanahan, a local architectural firm whose experimental work influenced the development of Greater Philadelphia, Atlantic City, and the Midwest. The building's unusual style embodies the culmination of Price & McLanahan's evolution of a "protomodernist" architecture, while still featuring Arts and Crafts elements utilized in their early work, satisfying Criteria C and D.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. Oscar Beisert represented the nominator, the Keeping Society of Philadelphia. George and Lotus Yu represented the property owners.

Mr. Yu read from the letter that he submitted to the Commission. He explained that his family has owned the Musical Art Club at 1821-27 Ranstead Street since 1989. He noted that the architectural firm of Price & McLanahan designed the building in 1916. He explained that he and his wife love the building, particularly because they live in Swarthmore, where architect Will Price is a local hero. He noted that Swarthmore is where Will Price was born, lived, and practiced architecture, and that he and his wife are familiar with many of Price's buildings. He observed that when they purchased the Musical Art Club building, they wondered why the building was not on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. He opined that, at that time, he called the Historical Commission and spoke to Mr. Baron, who informed him that the building was not nominated as part of a district because of its location, perhaps owing to the fact that the block lacked continuity, character and significance. He noted that the 1800 block of Ranstead Street was intentionally excluded from the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District when it was formed.

Mr. Yu continued that, having spent 24 years of architectural practice on the building's top floor, he realized why this section of Ranstead Street has such a negative impact on his building. The Musical Art Club building backs up onto a narrow, dead-end alley serving the back sides of six restaurants and high-rise condominiums, three parking lots, and there are 16 large trash dumpsters littering the short street. The townhouse next door is occupied by a 24-hour "massage parlor." In the past years, the City has raided this business multiple times, only to see it resume practice, as usual, in a matter of weeks.

He explained that the historic building is situated among garbage dumps infested with cat-size rats and a "cathouse" next door. Yet, he and his wife have continued to persevere and maintain this building in the best ways they could afford. Because of these appalling conditions of the street, they have had a hard time attracting long-term tenants to fully occupy the building. Although there is a tenant occupying the basement, the main floor has been vacant for 21 out of their 28-year ownership. Their architectural firm had occupied the third floor until 2013, when they merged with another firm, causing their relocation to the suburbs. After they had vacated the floor, they could not find a single tenant for five years. At this time, the building is still two-thirds vacant. Now Mr. Yu and his wife are retired. They have been operating this building, subsidized with their fixed income. Even though, while occupying the building, they were disappointed the building was not historically certified, because they still personally felt its historical significance. Throughout the years, they had recovered numerous artifacts. At the main floor, formerly the "Club Room" and the entry Lobby, hidden above the acoustical ceiling, they uncovered and restored the badly damaged original barrel vaults." He noted that they have also uncovered, hidden behind drywall, the monumental fireplace, which is absolutely beautiful. He observed that someone might suggest that the building is not nice enough, which is why it is not rented, but that is not the case. He noted that the Commissioners would be proud of the building.

Mr. Yu commented that, contrary to the nominator's claim that the building is in "good" condition, it is not in good condition. He directed Commissioners to the materials he submitted. Six years ago, he explained, the north parapet on the roof almost collapsed. It cost around \$135,000 to dismantle and repair the damage, because to the north of the building is a three-foot alley which does not allow for a crane or scaffolding. Presently, above the beautiful front façade, he continued, due to rust and ice-jacking at the lintels and relieving steel beams, the south parapet and its flashing have deteriorated, causing continuous water infiltration. To keep the building sound, it will eventually be necessary to dismantle this parapet, replace its internal flashing and rusted steel work, and then, reconstruct the brick parapet. Without adequate rental income, he continued, he and his wife must defer this repair work indefinitely.

Mr. Yu explained that three and a half years ago, they had reluctantly entertained the idea of selling the building. They have had three offers to purchase the building by developers who were contemplating assembling a larger footprint for new development. The property is zoned CMX-5 with 1200% FAR. Since last fall, after learning of the proposed nomination, the potential buyers have withdrawn their interest, because they were interested in tearing the building down. As architects, he and his wife have always hoped to convince a sensitive developer to readapt the existing building into the new development without tearing it down.

He opined that Mayor Kenney's encouragement last year, "for people to see preservation and development as partners in urban growth," was extremely meaningful.

He expressed his wife's and his earnest intention in speaking with the Commission. He noted that they are not there to convince the Commission not to designate the building as a historic landmark, but rather, to go a step further to help sustain the livelihood of this beautiful building. He explained that the Musical Art Club is struggling to survive, because there is a lack of interested tenants to breathe life into it. The dreadful street environment is denying oxygen to this building. The Musical Art Club is like a muted piano, sitting idle without sound. What good is the piano, if it cannot play music? We believe the act of preservation is fundamentally different from the act of conservation. Conservation implies a concerted effort towards sustaining the possibility of life on a long-term basis. Just to preserve a lifeless building is like embalming a lifeless body. To conserve the Musical Art Club, it would require a combined creative effort of private and public endeavors. Within the prestigious Rittenhouse Square District, the 1800 blocks of Ranstead and Ludlow Streets are the two missing links. There is great potential for imaginative development, bringing new and old structures together by further injecting vibrancy to this part of Center City; thus offering Philadelphia the opportunity of increasing its tax base.

He expressed his fear that someone would disregard his honest appeal because this might not be considered a part of Historical Commission's responsibility. But he hoped that the make-up of this body of Commissioners is to encourage the diverse talents of various City departments to exercise their influence for not only saving the Musical Art Club, but also for the greater good of Philadelphia.

Mr. Yu opined that to just label the Musical Art Club as a "landmark" within an abysmal and unsafe environment, and then walk away, is not enough to fulfill the Commission's noble mandate: "To strengthen the economy of the City by enhancing the City's attractiveness to tourists and by stabilizing and improving property values"; and to "foster civic pride in the architectural, historical, cultural, and educational accomplishments of Philadelphia."

Mr. Yu laid out the following requests for Historical Commission in collaboration with various City Departments and the Center City District to act upon the following:

1. To deny illegal businesses such as those questionable four or five massage parlors existing on Ranstead and Ludlow Streets. (Ref. Philadelphia Code, Chapter 10-608)
2. To regulate the sanitary conditions and refuse management. (Ref. Philadelphia Code, Chapter 10-700)
3. To repair and to improve appearance and quality of street amenities.
4. To pave way for imaginative residential and commercial development harmonious with the historical structures.

He noted that he expects if they presented an economic and structural analysis of the property in its existing state and situated within an appalling street's environment, this would demonstrate to the Commission that a hardship exemption is warranted. But, he explained, they do not want to do that. It is another bureaucratic exercise that would cost a lot of money and time and, which in itself would be a financial hardship for himself and his wife. As the building owners, he continued, and he and his wife do not have the means and power to change the surroundings. Nevertheless, they are confident that, with the Historical Commission's willingness to help, if the neighborhood is cleaned up, it will bring back life to the street and to the Musical Art Club, and allow them as owners to receive the level of rent necessary to maintain the property. He requested that the Commission to defer placing the property on the Philadelphia Register until such time as the City satisfactorily resolves items 1 and 2 above.

Mr. Thomas thanked Mr. Yu for his comments, and asked if there were any questions from the Commissioners or the public or the nominator.

Mr. Beisert agreed with Mr. Yu that there are many of the narrow streets, called alleys, that are not just the rears of larger buildings, and which are undervalued and are the streets that make the city incredibly special. In other cities, he commented, there are alley surveys and people try to preserve the feeling of alleys. He observed that Philadelphia has so many incredible streets, and noted that he shares in the owner's concerns about this street and many others of the amazing narrow streets, the number of which are unparalleled in other cities. However, Mr. Beisert asked the Commission to move forward with designating the building. He noted that it is an incredibly significant building. He directed the Commissioners to page 11 of the nomination, the period photograph of the building, noting that most of the fabric in the photograph is still there. He noted that, while the current photograph is not the most flattering of the building, the design of the building is a very unusual, if not completely unique, example of Price & McLanahan's protomodernism while also featuring Arts and Crafts details. He explained that there are so few buildings like this in the city in terms of this style, and opined that it almost looks like a building one would find in Europe. He argued that it is architecturally too important to leave on the backburner. He suggested that if Mr. Farnham or other City officials could assist in bringing Mr. Yu's concerns about this street along to the appropriate officials, that would be amazing. He noted that it probably would be easier from the inside than it is for a property owner. He stated that the building absolutely should be designated, as it represents a larger movement that was happening at the time that it was built and it must be preserved.

Mr. Yu responded that his request for the Commission to defer action is not a trick he is trying to play, but that he really wants the City to act on it, and as soon as the City does something about the street, he and his wife will welcome the honor. He argued that it is shameful for anyone wanting to honor this building to allow the street to destroy the building. He noted that a lot of work has to be done. He explained that he is getting quotes from the masonry preservation companies to restore the façade. He noted that he even wants to restore the arched windows at the front, the woodwork of which is still there, and is absolutely beautiful. But they cannot afford it currently. He argued that the cost to restore the building would be over half a million dollars. He noted that the parapet will last for maybe another 10 years. Another portion of the parapet is bulging. If the building is designated, they could not just take it down, they would need to reconstruct it, and that is outrageously expensive. If he has tenants there, he would love to spend the money to fix up the building. He reiterated that the street is a disgrace. He explained that he is looking for Elfreth's Alley, he just wants to the Commission to help him turn the smelly street into Smedley Street. He noted that Europe understands how to maintain buildings and small streets, but argued that the United States does not. He reiterated his desire for the Commission to defer so someone can put pressure on someone else to get something done. He commented that Ludlow and Ranstead Streets are like the Red Light district of Philadelphia, but that if it is going to be a Red Light district, it should be like the one in Amsterdam, which is beautiful. He begged the Commission to help him, noting that he has contacted the Department of Licenses & Inspections and the Streets Department, and they have run him around. He noted that he even contacted his Councilman, who told him that it is not his responsibility. He wants the Mayor to know what is going on. He is proud of the building, and does not want developers to destroy it. But a 12-story building is planned for the neighboring lot, and they are going to put a loading dock right next to his building. He noted that he has asked the developers if they are going to have a trash compactor and they have said yes, but he does not know. He noted that the new building will have a restaurant, so there will be even more dumpsters next to his building.

Mr. Thomas responded that Mr. Yu brings up a larger issue. Mr. Thomas explained that he mapped most of the city's alleyways for what is now DCNR in 1976 and put together a tour, which was published. He noted that one can walk from river to river along the city's small streets, and it is an incredible resource. He observed that one can look at two blocks of the same street, and one street is planted and wonderful and the other has dumpsters, but the architecture might be the same. He noted that, many years ago, the City decided to put in pedestrian-scale lighting on Sansom Street. Some people thought that it was a huge waste of money, but the streets have turned around in a way that most people never could have imagined. Mr. Thomas explained that many of the streets that are known colloquially as "dumpster alleys" have incredible architecture. Juniper Street between Sansom and Chestnut used to be a street no one would walk down, but now that the Hale building is being renovated and things are being cleaned up, so people will start using it again. If the clean up happened along Ranstead Street, property value would skyrocket. Mr. Thomas opined that this building is very special for a number of reasons, but there are also other issues that need to be addressed. Mr. Yu noted that he pays Center City taxes and to the Center City District, which takes care of Chestnut Street, but not Ranstead Street. He noted that he contacted Center City District about the street, and they told him that the person in charge of cleaning the street will text them when he has been there, and Mr. Yu asked her, "have you been there?" and she said, "Well, no." He argued that the block needs a critical mass of development and owners to make this street nice. Fortunately there is a house being built, but there are vacant cavities everywhere on the block. He reiterated that he has told developers he does not want them to demolish his building. He noted that there is a developer who wants to buy up the block, and he hopes that he is a sensitive developer. He noted that a prospective developer would not have to build on top of his building, but suggested that it would be nice to have a high-rise on Ludlow that could use the roof of the Musical Art Club as a green roof garden. He noted that any high-rise development would need that light and air, and this could be the perfect place to provide that relief. Mr. Thomas noted that there are a lot of lost opportunities that could be regained. Mr. Thomas agreed that the block should be cleaned up.

Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia commented that there are two different questions at hand. One is the historical merit of this building. He noted that Will Price was a hugely prominent Philadelphia-based architect at the turn of the twentieth century, who is revered in Wallingford and Swarthmore and beyond, but there are not many of his buildings standing in Philadelphia other than this one. On the other hand, there is a question of the environmental conditions in which the building sits. He argued that, while everyone is sympathetic to that issue, those environmental factors are not relevant as to whether the building belongs on the Philadelphia Register. He noted that he was one of the founding staff members of the Center City District in the early 1990s, when much of Center City was like this little block of Ranstead Street. But in the 25 years since, they have turned around much of Center City. He acknowledged that is one persistently difficult block. Mr. Steinke noted that he has long-time friends at Center City District, including the Executive Director, and offered to convene a meeting to discuss the Yus' concerns and to use whatever pull he might still have there. Finally, he suggested that Mr. Yu's comment about the potential of the hotel and restaurant on the vacant lot next door may represent the catalyst for turning the block around. Mr. Yu responded that, unfortunately, the developers are planning a loading dock right next to his building. Mr. Steinke replied that he understands that, but it would, if successful, bring positive activity to the block and make this property more valuable. He reiterated that the external, environmental issue is not part of the Commission's purview. He stated that the Preservation Alliance supports the designation of the property. Mr. Yu took issue with Mr.

Steinke's position that the environmental factors are not relevant: everything is relevant, he opined. He noted that Ranstead Street is a dead-end street, and eventually it will all be built up, and will be even more dumpsters. He stated that it requires something much stronger. He reiterated his preference for "conservation" over "preservation," as the former is about keeping a property alive. He reiterated that he wants to make a statement and see someone do something about this block. He challenged Mr. Steinke to take action rather than just talk.

Aaron Wunsch of the University of Pennsylvania commented that, in addition to the building's merits and the problems surrounding the block, there is an opportunity to work with the Center City Residents' Association. He opined that for those Commissioners who feel they have heard extraneous information, there are third parties such as Center City District and Center City Residents' Association who can address some of these problems. Mr. Mattioni responded that Mr. Wunsch should not put words in the Commissioners' mouths; he had not heard one Commissioner comment that what they have heard today is irrelevant. Mr. Thomas noted that the Commission understands that this is an individual nomination and that it is not part of the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, but it is close to it. He commented that, if it was part of a district, the environmental factors would be more significant, but that does not mean that the Commissioners are not sensitive to the economic factors of this building and its context. Mr. Yu commented that, if the Commission designates the property and he sells it, someone is going to find a way to tear it down. He noted that he would talk to anyone he needs to about it. Mr. Beisert commented that the perfect example that Mr. Thomas gave was the Hale Building. If that building had not been designated, it may have been torn down. If this building is not designated, it may happen here, too. Mr. Thomas commented that he has made some notes because this is an issue that is of personal interest to him, and he also serves on the Task Force and is a topic that he could bring up there. He noted that it is an important question to determine what is holding things back. Mr. Yu commented that he has talked to the Planning Commission, and they do not have any plans for the block.

**ACTION:** Ms. Cooperman moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1821-27 Ranstead Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, E, and J, and to designate the property as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**ADDRESS: 2108 SANSOM ST**

Proposal: Construct third-floor addition with pilot house and decks

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joseph Ianoale and Amanda Korson

Applicant: Joseph Ianoale

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@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 and the Roofs Guideline, provided:

- the railing at the roof deck of the addition is eliminated and the railing instead extends from the north wall of the pilot house;
- the parapet at the front of the addition is lowered 12 to 18 inches;
- no furnishings project above the height of the guardrail; and
- a mock-up demonstrates that the addition will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a third-story addition on a two-story former carriage house in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District. The addition would be designed to mimic qualities of the modern neighboring structure at 2101-07 Walnut Street; the addition's brick cladding and window and door openings would resemble the cladding and fenestration of the adjacent structure. The application also proposes to construct a deck at the front of the addition, as well as a roof deck, pilot house, and pergola above the addition. The front deck would contain a five-foot setback, with the front façade of the addition set back an additional five feet.

At its 26 September 2017 meeting, the Architectural Committee reviewed a similar application for a third-story addition with decks at the property. In reviewing the previous application, the Committee commented that the addition and front deck were too conspicuous, owing to their height and minimal setback. The Committee also requested punched openings at the windows and doors. In the current application, the height of the addition has been greatly reduced by reconstructing much of the existing roof in order to support the load of the addition. The fenestration has also been modified to reflect the Committee's request for punched openings. However, the deck and addition maintain the same setback as shown in the previous application.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Joseph Ianoale represented the application.

Mr. Ianoale stated that he began the Historical Commission review process nine months ago and since then has realized several iterations of the design. He has had several different meetings with the staff and the Architectural Committee as well, to refine the project and present the best project that fits within the fabric of the neighborhood. Mr. Ianoale listened to all the Commission's requests and believes they have accommodated them appropriately. Mr. Ianoale requested approval of a design that they feel is a fair and reasonable compromise, an acknowledgement that their application fulfills everything that the Commission has required. He stated that he hoped that their preparation, time, money, and commitment up to this point

demonstrated the level of diligence, care, and importance of this project to them and to have it built to the proposed specs.

Mr. Thomas asked if there are any other questions or comments. He inquired about the Architectural Committee's review. McCoubrey concurred with the staff's recommendation that the proposed, revised design was very responsive to all the comments that came from the Committee and the Commission.

Mr. Thomas inquired again if there were any other questions or comments from the Commission or the public. A member of the public volunteered to speak. Richard Gettlin stated he lives on Van Pelt Street, right around the corner from 2108 Sansom Street. Mr. Gettlin is the president of the small resident's association on Van Pelt, the 100 Block Van Pelt Residents Association. He noted that Mr. Ianoale shared his proposed plans the association during the design and review process. The association has discussed the project and is in full support of the proposed design.

**ACTION:** Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 9 March 2018, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

**ACTION:** At 11:30 a.m., Ms. Long moved to adjourn. Ms. Cooperman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

#### **STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES**

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.