

**THE MINUTES OF THE 641ST STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 8 JANUARY 2016
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SARA MERRIMAN, ACTING CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sara Merriman, Acting Chair, Commerce Department
Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D.
Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP
Rosalie Leonard, Esq., Office of City Council President
Melissa Long, Office of Housing & Community Development
John Mattioni, Esq.
Thomas McDade, Department of Public Property
R. David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Robert Thomas, AIA
Betty Turner, M.A.

Jonathan E. 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

Pinchas Lando, Talmudical Yeshiva of Philadelphia
David Feldman, Right-Sized Homes, LLC
Sean Whalen, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Edward Mattio
Christopher Kelly
Patrick Hannigan, Gemini Design Associates
Henry Friedman
Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker + Partners, Architects
Nona Bergsten, Cecil Baker + Partners, Architects
Josh Kobylarz, Esq., Mattioni, Counselors at Law, Ltd.
Michael Mattioni, Esq., Mattioni, Counselors at Law, Ltd.
Adam Motolbano, Moto Designshop
James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Co.
Stuart Lacheen
Yao Huang, YCH Architects
Taylor Stevenson, YCH Architects
Mark Travis
John Marshall, Marshall Sabatini
Michael Salomone
Chris Carickhoff, Morrisey Design

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Merriman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Dilworth, Hawkins, Leonard, Long, Mattioni, McDade, Schaaf, Thomas, and Turner joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 640TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to adopt the minutes of the 640th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 11 December 2015. Ms. Long seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 15 DECEMBER 2015

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 2100 AND 2110 UPLAND WAY

Proposal: Construct residential building

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Talmudical Yeshiva of Philadelphia

Applicant: Yaakou Wilner, Wynnefield Maintenance

History: vacant lots

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Overbrook Farms Historic District, Contributing, pending

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a semi-detached twin residential building on open lots in the pending Overbrook Farms Historic District. The Historical Commission's jurisdiction over the application is Review and Comment.

The building would maintain the traditional setback from the street and would be sited to avoid disrupting views of the adjacent historic building. The building would be three stories in height with stone at the first floor and stucco above, like many of the neighboring buildings. The building would have numerous gables and double-hung windows, again like many of the neighboring buildings. Some materials, such as those of the windows and doors, have not been specified. Windows with exterior muntins, not sandwiched muntins, would be more in keeping with the district.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. School representative Pinchas Lando, attorney Sean Whalen, and architect Dave Feldman represented the application.

The applicants distributed copies of a revised architectural design for the proposed building. Mr. Whalen explained that they endeavored to implement the suggestions offered by the Architectural Committee. He stated that the gables and columns have been redesigned. He noted that they had always intended to use stone on all four facades, but that aspect of the design is now clearly depicted in the architectural drawings. Mr. Feldman described the revisions to his design including the changes to the gables, the inclusion of more stone, the deletion of the shutters, and the addition of a simple trim around the windows. Ms. Hawkins thanked the applicants for considering and incorporating the Architectural Committee's suggestions. She stated that she deemed the proposal much improved. Mr. Feldman stated that he is happier with the revised design.

Ms. Merriman asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on the application. No one offered comments.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to endorse the comments offered during the Architectural Committee's and the Historical Commission's reviews of the project. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 700 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct two-story rear addition with garage and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Xu Ru Gang

Applicant: James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Co.

History: 1970

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided there is no permanent trellis on the roof deck, the HVAC units are located on the flat roof of the new addition in an inconspicuous location, and the proposed single large garage door is changed to two single garage doors with square masonry punched openings instead of the arch, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear addition with garage and roof deck on this circa 1970 corner property located in the Society Hill Historic District. The building currently has a small two-story rear addition and two roll-up garage doors along S. 7th Street. The proposed alterations would extend the rear addition out to the property line using red brick to match existing, and a new garage door and pedestrian door would be located where the roll-up garage doors are currently located on the side of the building. Windows to match the existing would be located at the second floor of the addition. A roof deck with parapet wall, black metal railing and wood trellis is proposed for the roof of the addition.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Thomas recused, owing to his firm's involvement as the architects of the project. Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect James Campbell represented the application.

Mr. Campbell explained that the application has been revised since the time of the Architectural Committee meeting to reflect comments received by the Committee. Specifically, the mechanical units were relocated and the trellis was removed entirely. He stated that his concern is related to the recommendation for two smaller garage doors instead of one larger garage door. He noted that one large door would provide better visibility of 7th Street and therefore improve safety. He explained that the revised application shows the applicant's preferred option of one large garage door that looks like two punched openings. He distributed two photographs showing examples of similar garage doors in the neighborhood, which were approved by the Commission.

Ms. Hawkins stated that, although she appreciates the removal of the trellis and the relocation of the mechanical units, she personally feels that a single massive garage door is not appropriate because it deadens the streetscape and is out of context. She stated her preference for a pair of garage doors.

Mr. Schaaf asked about the brick pier option versus the post shown in the preferred option. Mr. Campbell responded that it is not actually a post in the preferred option, but rather a darkened section to make it appear as if it is a post. He clarified that it is actually part of the door, and

noted that the color of the post could be changed based on the Commission's preference. Mr. Schaaf asked if the Architectural Committee commented on the brick pier option. Ms. Hawkins clarified that this is a revised design in response to the comments received at the Committee meeting, and that the only example reviewed by the Committee was the original submission with one door in an arched opening. Mr. Schaaf commented that the brick pier looks too thin. Ms. Hawkins responded that the applicants are trying to fit too much programming into the space, which does not allow for a masonry pier of sufficient width.

Mr. Campbell provided studies for the three different garage door scenarios that showed visibility when pulling a vehicle out of the garage. He stated that two garage doors present a safety hazard. Ms. Hawkins responded that both garage doors can be opened at the same time to allow for greater visibility. Mr. Campbell showed the visibility study for that scenario, and stated that the brick pier blocks some visibility of the street. He reiterated the homeowners' preference for one large garage door to improve safety and ease of access. Ms. Hawkins asked about eliminating the pedestrian door to allow for more space. Mr. Campbell responded that they cannot eliminate the pedestrian door owing to the interior steps. Ms. Hawkins reiterated her position that having two garage spaces in Society Hill is a privilege and not a right, and that there are options to consider.

Ms. Merriman asked for public comment, of which there was none.

ACTION: Mr. Dilworth moved to approve the revised application presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting on 8 January 2016 with the applicant's preferred option for the garage door, with the staff to review details. Mr. McDade seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7 to 2. Ms. Hawkins and Mr. Schaaf dissented.

ADDRESS: 2116 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct roof deck with pergola

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mauro Guillen & Sandra Suarez

Applicant: Patrick Hannigan, Gemini Design Associates

History: 1870

Individual Designation: 5/7/1973

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck with pergola on the three-story rear ell of this property at the corner of Pine and S. Van Pelt Streets. The proposed deck would extend nearly the entire width of the rear ell, and would feature a structure covered in shingles that mimics the appearance of the mansard roof of the main block. A pergola would extend the length of the deck on its eastern half.

The staff recently approved the removal of a roof deck and pergola in this same location that was built by a previous owner about 1999. The Historical Commission had approved that deck in concept with some conditions. Specifically, the applicant was instructed to use steel supports, painted a dark color to mitigate their appearance, and to remove the skirt to reveal the slope of the roof. The applicant never returned for a final review, and the roof deck and pergola were constructed without Historical Commission approval or a building permit. The Historical Commission's staff recently approved an application to remove the illegal deck and pergola to

allow for the repair of the roof below the deck. At the time of the roof repair application, the staff informed the contractor that the Historical Commission never granted a final approval for the existing deck and pergola and they could not, therefore, be reinstalled after the roof repair without the Commission's approval and a permit.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Historical Commission. Contractor Patrick Hannigan represented the application.

Mr. Hannigan explained that the application has been revised since the time of the Architectural Committee meeting to reflect the comments provided by the Committee. Specifically, the pergola was relocated to the far side of the deck to minimize visibility, the skirt and planters were omitted, and the deck structure was exposed. Ms. Merriman asked about the proposed railing system, and explained that the Commission typically looks for railings to disappear, whereas the proposed railing system draws attention to itself. Mr. Hannigan responded that the original design had a planter in lieu of this railing, and that he is open to suggestions regarding the railing system. Ms. Hawkins responded that the revised design is much simpler than the original planter scheme, but the intent of the Committee was to recommend a simple black metal railing with no wood frame. She stated her preference for omission of the pergola.

Ms. Merriman asked for public comment, of which there was none.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting on 8 January 2016, provided the railing system is a simple black metal railing with no wood, and the pergola is not visible from any public right-of-way, with the staff to review details. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 117 LEAGUE ST

Proposal: Demolish rear, construct four-story addition with roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Einstein Investments LLC

Applicant: Casey Thompson, Morrissey Design LLC

History: 1815

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

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 and Section 1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore the façade of the existing three-story main block, demolish the rear ell of the building, and construct a four-story rear addition with roof deck. The majority of the work to the front façade, including the removal of the faux-stone cladding and installation of new wood windows, is approvable at the staff level; however, the application proposes to demolish approximately five feet of the roof slope, as well as the entire rear wall of the main block, and the rear ell. The application proposes to construct a four-story addition set back 3'-6" from the truncated main roof. The existing roof is front-sloping only, and runs for approximately twenty feet; therefore please note that the note on the drawing that the roof would be maintained to the ridge is inaccurate.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Owner Michael Salomone and architect Chris Carickhoff represented the application.

The Commissioners expressed confusion over inconsistencies in the architectural drawings.

Mr. Dilworth noted that there are no drawings that indicate the extent to which the proposed alterations would be visible from the street. Mr. Dilworth opined that none of the front roof would be visible from directly across the street. Mr. Salomone noted that there is a one-story garage across the street, along with a few new construction projects.

Ms. Hawkins expressed concern over the information presented, and the lack of consistency in the documentation. She contended that the proposed design was not clearly defined. The Commission should not approve the proposal because it would not know what it was approving.

Mr. Thomas discussed the section drawing, noting that it shows the roof being extended to accommodate the pilot house. He contended that, by extending the roof, it creates a huge void area above the ceiling at the top floor. He recommended that the applicant have the roof of the pilot house follow the stair line, which eliminates the void and reduces the potential for visibility and damage of historic material, as the entire pilot house would be located on the rear addition. Mr. Thomas noted that this could be achieved easily with the proper flashing and drainage. Ms. Hawkins agreed, stating that she is not comfortable with the extension of the main roof.

Mr. Dilworth asked why his fellow Commissioners would object to the proposed pilot house if it is not visible from the street. Ms. Hawkins responded that the Commission's jurisdiction extends beyond what is visible from the street. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Commission's concern is over damage or alteration to historic fabric, regardless of its location on the building and visibility from the street.

Mr. Thomas noted that there is no loss to living space by removing the pilot house extension from the main roof. He asserted that the pilot house should be a pilot house and nothing more. He stated that the existing roof structure should be left as it is. He noted that, by connecting the pilot house roof to the main roof as proposed, more rain water would run down on the main roof. He questioned whether the downspouts and gutters were sized for that additional storm water. Mr. Salomone opined that the original roof needs to be replaced because it takes on water. Mr. Thomas responded that that is the roofing. Mr. Dilworth opined that the roof does not strike him as a significant historic resource. Mr. Schaaf responded that the slope of the roof itself, with its single pitch, is significant.

Ms. Merriman opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the application, provided the front façade is rehabilitated based on evidence discerned from the removal of the faux-stone cladding, the addition is no taller than three stories, the pilot house is separate and distinct from, not an extension of, the main roof, and the pilot house is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, with staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 1. Mr. Dilworth dissented.

ADDRESS: 2010 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Demolish rear bay, construct seven-story addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Henry Friedman

Applicant: Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker and Partners

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 6, and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate an existing four-story brownstone building and to construct a seven-story addition behind it. The application proposes to demolish an historic rear metal-clad bay (called a porch in the submission), and to construct a seven-story addition from the end of the rear ell to the lot line at Chancellor Street. Along the Chancellor Street elevation, the proposed addition would be clad in brick for the first three floors, with the upper floors clad in metal or cementitious panels. The second-floor level would feature a metal Juliette balcony, and floors three through seven would feature balconies with glass railings. The east side elevation, which would be readily visible from Chancellor Street, would be clad in metal or cementitious panels and feature horizontal and vertical slit windows.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Thomas recused because his firm is consulting on the project. Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architects Eric Leighton and Cecil Baker, attorneys Michael Mattioni and Josh Kobylarz, and owner Henry Friedman represented the application.

Mr. Friedman discussed his interest in the historic building and his plan for executive suites in the building and addition. He noted his intention to provide an accessible entrance to the building along Chancellor Street and lighting to enhance the pedestrian environment. He noted that they would be pursuing state and federal tax credits.

Mr. Leighton discussed the necessity to add units in order to achieve the income to support 24-hour staffing. He also discussed the program of the building and accessibility.

Mr. Leighton described the rear bay proposed for demolition, noting that the first floor of the porch-like bay is original to the property, while the upper floors are later additions, as evidenced by the exterior windows and shutter hardware seen in the upper floors of the bay. He noted that their proposal is to remove the entire bay.

Mr. Leighton presented a further revised Chancellor Street elevation, noting that they removed one unit from the seventh floor of the proposed addition, creating a 16-foot setback, raised the brick to go above the third-floor opening, so that the base of the building has the scale of the adjacent building. The brick then steps down at the corner to bring the scale down even further. He noted that they eliminated the balconies and replaced them with metal Juliette balconies.

Mr. Leighton presented additional perspective renderings. He opined that the surrounding neighborhood is an area of mixed height. Mr. Leighton presented a video showing the context and the relationships of the existing building to the neighboring buildings.

Mr. Friedman reiterated his excitement about the building and neighborhood.

Mr. Schaaf noted that there is a section drawing on page 15 of the Commission's project booklets that does not show the revised configuration. He noted that the six-story elevation appears to be as tall as the buildings on 20th Street. Ms. Hawkins responded that the proposed building is an entire floor taller.

Ms. Hawkins stated that Philadelphia has a distinct pattern of streets, with spines along Market Street, the traditional commercial high-rise corridor, and Chestnut, Walnut and Locust Streets with residential high-rise buildings. In between those blocks, she continued, are the special, quiet places in Philadelphia, of which Chancellor Street is one. The built environment on Chancellor Street is not large; it is scaled down. It is a street of two to four-story buildings, and only includes one four-story building along the entire block. The front doors of many beautifully restored carriage houses face the street; they are front entrances. She emphatically stated that, in her opinion, the scale of the proposed construction is much too large. She noted that the Architectural Committee was generous in recommending four stories as a cap, and that it really should be capped at three. Although the revised design no longer proposes seven stories right on the street, she noted, it is still too large in the scale for the context, which is a tiny in-between street.

Mr. Baker, one of the architects, agreed with Ms. Hawkins, but noted that they struggle with the in-between streets, and that there are examples of successful interventions on those streets that do not take away from the character of those streets. He opined that the more important aspect of this proposal is that his client wants to save a historic building. In order to do so, he needs a backup of program and additional units. Mr. Baker opined that his boutique hotel would be a top-tier establishment. He opined that he does not see the penalty on Chancellor Street.

Mr. Dilworth noted that, if the building becomes a hotel, its lobby would become a public space. Therefore, he continued, the interior could be designated as historic. Ms. Hawkins asked if the owner is offering to allow the Commission to designate the interior public spaces, meaning that they would become under the full jurisdiction of the Historical Commission. Mr. Friedman responded that he would not object to designating the interior public spaces or incorporating public access into the building.

Ms. Hawkins reiterated her opposition to the addition along Chancellor Street, noting that, while it is lovely that the 30 guests staying in the hotel will enjoy the highest level of amenities and spaces, she does not believe it will be a public space, and that the Commission should not kid itself that this addition is for the benefit of the public in any way.

Ms. Merriman opened the floor to public comment. Architect Peter Feldman asked what zoning variances the applicant would need to obtain. Mr. Kobylarz, co-counsel for the applicant, responded that a variance would be required to use the property as "visitor accommodations," and another would be needed for parking spaces. He noted that nine or ten parking spaces would be required, but that the intent is to lease one or two parking spaces at the Rittenhouse Garage. Mr. Schaaf asked if any height variances would be required. Mr. Kobylarz responded that there is no height requirement.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the adjacent parcel, noting that the proposed side elevation would have windows, and asked whether those windows are allowable under construction code. Mr. Leighton responded that his client has been speaking with the adjacent property owner. The windows are not required to allow light and air into the dwelling units. He noted that his client is aware of the fact that the adjacent property owner can building on the adjacent parcel, thereby blocking the windows.

Ms. DiPasquale explained that a representative of the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission commented that the height of the proposed addition might negate the possibility of tax credits. Mr. Friedman responded that Ms. DiPasquale's claim is speculative; he may be able to obtain the tax credits with the proposed design. Ms. Merriman agreed, noting that Ms. DiPasquale's comment was based on a preliminary assessment, and added that the Commission's decision should not be predicated on whether the applicant obtains the historic tax credits. She noted that the applicant may have to make a choice if, in fact, the design precludes the possibility of tax credits. Ms. Hawkins asked the applicant if a failure to achieve the tax credits would impact the quality of the work to the exterior. Mr. Friedman confirmed that it would not.

Ms. Merriman opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

ACTION: Mr. Dilworth moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting on 8 January 2016. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 8 to 2. Ms. Hawkins and Mr. Schaaf dissented.

ADDRESS: 1957 LOCUST ST

Proposal: Install ADA ramp

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jeanne Chang

Applicant: Christopher Kelly, Integrity Construction and Development LLC

History: 1860

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 approval of the concept of an exterior ramp, provided it is without pickets on the guardrail and is executed in such a way that makes it reversible without adversely impacting the existing marble step, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install an ADA ramp at an existing storefront entrance on S. 20th Street. The ramp would be constructed of concrete and feature a metal vertical picket railing that would run parallel to the façade. Items 2 through 5 identified in the cover letter have been or will be approved at the staff level.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect John Marshall and contractor Chris Kelly represented the application.

Mr. Marshall supplied a revised drawing that showed the removal of the pickets from the ramp railing.

Ms. Merriman opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting on 8 January 2016, with the staff to review details. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2121 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Construct third-story addition with roof deck, reopen door opening and install door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2121 Walnut LLC

Applicant: Mark Travis, 2121 Walnut LLC

History: 1928; Eugene Stopper, architect

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 of the application for a rooftop addition and deck, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10; and denial of the door application, pursuant to Standard 6.

OVERVIEW: The first of this group of two applications proposes to add a third-floor, rooftop addition to the commercial building at the northwest corner of Walnut and Van Pelt Streets in the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District. The addition would be a stucco color to match the color of the limestone on the front façade. The addition would be set back 18 feet from Walnut Street and two feet from the Van Pelt Street façade. It would be visible from Walnut Street and also from Van Pelt Street to the north because the structure sits proud of the row of houses on that side of the Van Pelt block. The application proposes a deck on the Walnut Street side, which will also be set back from the facades. A parapet partially hides the addition and deck, but is not dimensioned in the application. The staff suggests that the addition is better detailed to be more compatible with the historic building.

The second application proposes to reopen an infilled doorway on the Van Pelt facade. The original door survives inside, behind the infill. The door has two tall vertical panels. The applicant proposes two door options, which are stock four panel doors. He wishes to use a metal or fiberglass door for security, which precludes matching the original. The proposed metal door is only available in a narrower size, which will result in substantial infill panels to either side.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the applications to the Historical Commission. Owner Mark Travis and architects Yao Huang and Taylor Stevenson represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that revised architectural drawings have been submitted that have taken into account some of the Architecture Committee's concerns. Better drawings have been provided that include section drawings and dimensions. Mr. Baron also noted that the parapet on top of the addition has been reduced to eight inches. He explained that the side door is now shown as a two-panel full-width door instead of a four-panel narrower door. Mr. Baron displayed photographs showing a mock-up the addition and deck railing, which the applicant constructed on the roof of the building. He pointed out that the construction of the townhouses to the east will hide much of the addition from Walnut Street. However, it will be visible from Van Pelt Street. Ms. Merriman stated that she was satisfied that most of the construction would be hidden from public view. Mr. Thomas asked if a header course of bricks would extend across the door lintel at the opening where the door is proposed for replacement. The architect confirmed that a header course of bricks will extend across the door lintel and that he will correct the architectural drawing to reflect it.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting on 8 January 2016, provided the deck railing is metal pickets, not glass, with the staff to review details. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 318 N LAWRENCE ST

Proposal: Construct one-story addition with roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 318 North Lawrence St

Applicant: Adam Montalbano, Moto Designshop

History: 1920

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee unanimously voted to recommend approval, provided the walls of the addition are located within, not on, the parapet, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9, the Roofs Guideline, and the Commission's 2004 approval.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rooftop addition on the small, former express delivery building at the southwest corner of Wood and Lawrence Streets in the Old City Historic District. This addition would be clad with panels and include a deck. It would be much smaller than the three-story structure approved by the Historical Commission for the site in 2004.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Adam Montalbano and property owner Edward Matteo represented the application.

Ms. Merriman asked the applicants for their reaction to the Committee's recommendation that the addition should be constructed within and not on the parapet walls. Mr. Montalbano explained that constructing the addition within the parapet walls would complicate the structural design. He asked the Commission to consider a setback for the addition from the outer planes of the building that was less than the width of the outer walls.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the application, provided the exterior plane of the façade of the addition is set back at least three inches from the exterior plane of the parapet, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 4354 CRESSON ST

Proposal: Remove storefront windows, install windows and door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Stuart Lacheen

Applicant: Michael Coyle, Rox Construction

History: 1860; Later storefront

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to modify an existing storefront by removing the large, plate-glass windows and installing residential double-hung windows. The recessed door, which sits at the back of a vestibule, would be brought all the way forward to the front plane of the storefront façade. The applicant should either retain and restore the storefront, or remove all vestiges of the storefront and restore the building to its pre-storefront appearance. The current

proposal would create a mixture of historic periods that never existed together. The application also proposes windows for the upper floors of the front façade. The upper floor windows should be uneven “cottage” windows.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Stuart Lacheen and contractor Michael Coyle represent the application.

Mr. Lacheen explained that they are trying to rehabilitate the building. The storefront windows are cracked and in poor condition. He explained that they seeking to return the first-floor use to residential from commercial use. They will restore the upper floor windows. He said that the neighbors on the block have all installed non-historic windows without Historical Commission approvals or permits. He asserted that he should not be held to a higher standard than his neighbors. Mr. Lacheen claimed that the projecting storefront, which extends out onto the sidewalk, was original because it has a basement. Ms. Hawkins asked about the date of the storefront; she asked if the staff had researched the date of the storefront using maps. Mr. Baron said that he had not, but he speculated that the rowhouse was built about 1840 in the plane of the other rowhouses on the block and, based on the pressed metal of the storefront, the projecting storefront was added about 1910. He said that the basement was probably also extended out under the sidewalk for a sidewalk hatch at that time. Mr. Thomas stated that the projecting storefront is not shown on the 1910 atlas of the city. Mr. Lacheen confirmed for Ms. Hawkins that there is a lintel at the bottom of the second-floor masonry holding up the upper-floor facade above the projecting storefront. Ms. Hawkins offered a compromise that would allow the residence to have necessary light and air while preserving the projecting storefront; she suggested installing residential sized and proportioned windows with the storefront. Ms. Merriman asked the applicants if they would retain the stucco. They said that they will but will paint it an appropriate color.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the application, provided three large one-over-one double-hung or fixed windows surrounded by wood or other appropriate infill material are installed at the storefront and cottage style 3-over-6 windows are installed at the third floor, and the retention of the storefront vestibule is considered, with the staff to review details. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

COMMENT ON NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATION

ADDRESS: ROUGHLY BOUNDED BY 4500-4900 BLOCKS OF MAGEE STREET, PRINCETON AVENUE, AND TYSON AVENUE, BY DISSTON PARK, AND BY THE 6900 BLOCK OF COTTAGE STREET, TACONY DISSTON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT HISTORIC DISTRICT

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the National Register nomination of the Tacony Disston Community Development Historic District. PHMC is charged with implementing federal historic preservation regulations in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, including overseeing the National Register of Historic Places in the state. PHMC reviews all such nominations before forwarding them to the National Park Service for action. As part of the process, PHMC must solicit comments on every National Register nomination from the appropriate local government. The Philadelphia Historical Commission speaks on behalf of the City of Philadelphia in historic preservation matters including the review of National Register nominations. Under federal regulation, the local government not only must provide comments, but must also provide a forum for public comment on nominations. Such a forum is provided during the Philadelphia Historical Commission’s meetings.

The nominator summarizes the historic district's statement of significance as follows:

The Tacony Disston Community Development Historic District is nominated to the National Register under Criterion A, in the areas of Community Planning and Development and Social History for its association with and important place in the history of Pennsylvania company towns. This intentionally and idealistically created community of workers not only supported the operations of the Disston's family company, Keystone Saw, located near the Tacony development along the Delaware River waterfront, but also operated as a tight-knit, self-sufficient "town within a city" that retained its own separate identity from its inception in the early 1870s into the period of the end of World War I. The character of the Tacony development in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was essentially suburban, and thus contrasted markedly with the nearly uninterrupted blocks of industrial workers' rowhouses being built in North and South Philadelphia in the period. The Disstons' development was differentiated from those surrounding it by the key, paternalistic control mechanism of a series of deed restrictions that promoted the sobriety of the Keystone workforce, kept competing industry and noxious activities at a remove, and supported moral conduct. The Tacony Disston development was built to serve one of the largest complexes in the city in an age when Philadelphia's economy was based on such heavy industry, yet it provided the Disston workers both with a sense of community and a measure of life in an elite suburb in its relatively low density, safe water supply, and other social and business amenities.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Commission recommend that the Tacony Disston Community Development Historic District is significant under Criterion A, for community planning, development and social history, and should be listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Hawkins recused, owing to her involvement with the preparation of the nomination. Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Historical Commission.

Ms. Merriman asked Mr. Farnham to restate the Commission's task with regard to such requests for comment from the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission. Mr. Farnham stated that the Historical Commission should offer a recommendation to the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission as to whether the nomination demonstrates that the proposed Tacony Disston Community Development Historic District satisfies one or more of the Criteria for Evaluation and thereby qualifies for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. He noted that the community spearheaded this nomination effort.

Ms. Merriman asked if anyone in the audience wished to offer comments on the nomination. No one offered comments.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved that the Historical Commission recommend to the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission that the Tacony Disston Community Development Historic District is significant under Criterion A, for community planning, development and social history, and should be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 10:45 a.m., Ms. Hawkins moved to adjourn. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and 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.

Section 1005(6)(d) Restrictions on Demolition.

No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building, structure, site, or object, or of a building, structure, site, or object located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.