

**THE MINUTES OF THE 649TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 9 SEPTEMBER 2016
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
BOB THOMAS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Robert Thomas, AIA, chair
Michael Fink, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Antonio Fiol-Silva, AICP, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C
Anuj Gupta, Esq.
Melissa Long, Office of Housing & Community Development
John Mattioni, Esq.
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Rachel Royer, LEED AP BD+C
R. David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Betty Turner, M.A.

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

ALSO PRESENT

Logan Dry, KCA Design Associates
Sean Whalen, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Brett Peamasky, Klehr Harrison
Julia Cohen, UPenn
Noor Jehan Sadiq, UPenn
Yuexian Huang, UPenn
Yue Wu, UPenn
Ian Toner, Toner Architects
Austin Lukes, UPenn
Mikayla Raymond, UPenn
Jim Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Co.
George Thomas, Ph.D., CivicVisions
Rebekah Yousef, UPenn
Tarma Wilson, UPenn
John Giganti, UPenn
Carey Jackson Yonce, Canno Design
Nicole Cabezas, Canno Design
Fon Wang, Ballinger
Ted Singer, Plumbob
Liz Volchok, UPenn
Katherine Randall, UPenn
Sara Gdula, UPenn
Ty Richardson, UPenn
Sara Stratte, UPenn

Liz Trumbull, UPenn
Molly Balzano, UPenn
Alberto Calderon, UPenn
Violette Levy, UPenn
Xialin Chen, UPenn
Kelsey Britt, UPenn
Annie Albert, UPenn
Rebecca Sell, Ascent restoration
Silvia Callegari, UPenn
Elizabeth Reynolds, UPenn
Kaitlyn Levesque, UPenn
Rev. Anthony, UPenn
David Hollenberg, UPenn
Arash Dadvand
Zara Bhatti, UPenn
Jim Cassidy, C2
Ellie Devyatlein, Frankford CDC
Tim Kerner, Terra Studio
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Oscar Beisert
Leon Chudzinski, Carlyle Development Group
Christopher Akes, Linode/Ballinger
David M. Still, Esq.
Kathy Dowdell
Tiffany Swank
Elizabeth Stegner, University City Historical Society
Hal Kessler, Mt. Alto Design
Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Glenn Werner, JKRP
Michael Koep, Greythorne Development
Plato Marinokos, Plato Studio
Liu Junlan
Richard Orlow, Esq.
Paul Horos

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Thomas called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Fink, Fiol-Silva, Gupta, Long, Mattioni, McCoubrey, Merriman, Royer, Schaaf and Turner joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 647TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Turner moved to adopt the minutes of the 648th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 12 August 2016. Mr. Fink seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

CONTINUANCE REQUESTS FOR NOMINATION REVIEWS

ADDRESS: 5129-35 FRANKFORD AVE, PENN FRUIT

Proposal: Request for 60-day Continuance
Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Owner: Rite Aid of Pennsylvania

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the continuance request to the Historical Commission. Attorney Sean Whalen represented the property owner.

Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that the Alliance supports the continuance request. Ellie Devyatkin of the Frankford Community Development Corporation stated that the Community Development Corporation supports the continuance request.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to continue the review of the nomination for 5129-35 Frankford Avenue for 60 days to the Historical Commission's meeting in November 2016. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 8330 MILLMAN STREET, VANNA VENTURI HOUSE

Proposal: Request for 60-day Continuance
Nominator: Kathleen Abplanalp and Emily Cooperman, Chestnut Hill Historical Society
Owner: David Lockard

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the continuance request to the Historical Commission. No one represented the property owner.

ACTION: Mr. Mattioni moved to continue the review of the nomination for 8330 Millman Street for 60 days to the Historical Commission's meeting in November 2016. Mr. Fiol-Silva seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 AUGUST 2016

Dan McCoubrey, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Thomas stated that he was recusing on the considerations of the applications for 720 Arch Street and 210 Church Street because his firm is involved with the applications. Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda, which included applications for 508-32 Walnut Street; 2012 and

2014 Rittenhouse Square; 249-53 Arch Street; 1629 Wallace Street; 720 Arch Street; 148 N. 3rd Street; 210 Church Street; and 521 S. Juniper Street. He suggested removing the application for 249-53 Arch Street from the consent agenda to allow for a discussion of the cladding for the proposed addition. Mr. Thomas agreed to remove 249-53 Arch Street from the consent agenda. 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: Ms. Turner moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for the applications 508-32 Walnut Street; 2012 and 2014 Rittenhouse Square; 1629 Wallace Street; 720 Arch Street; 148 N. 3rd Street; 210 Church Street; and 521 S. Juniper Street. Mr. Fink seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 508-32 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Install signage; remove window grilles

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jennifer Cooperman - Keystone Property Group

Applicant: Joel Darras, Ascent Restoration Consultants

History: 1914; Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company Building; 530, Edgar Seeler 1914; 520, Ernest J. Matthewson, 1930; 508, Mitchell/Giurgola Associates, 1971

Individual Designation: 9/25/1962

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the detached sidewalk sign, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10; denial of the removal of the historic iron window grilles, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9; and approval of either Option A or Option B of the signage package, with the following provisions, with the staff to review details:

- any signage attaches solely into the mortar joints and not the stone itself,
- any signage that is installed should be compliant with zoning, with no variances required,
- the number of banner signs is limited to four,
- the width of projecting banner signs is limited to approximately 24 inches, or proportional to the signage presented in the application, and
- the width of flat banner signs maintains a three to four inch reveal on either side.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert the ground floor of a former insurance building into a retail space. In order to attract a retail tenant, the application seeks a pre-approved signage package that would include banner signage and a detached street identifier. While the content of the signage would change depending on the tenant, the shape, size, materials, and attachment methods would not. For the banner signage, the application offers two options. Option A proposes flat-wall banner signs to be installed on two pilasters on the north elevation and two on the west elevation. Option B proposes projecting banner signs at the same locations. The banners would be made of a canvas or Sunbrella material, and attached by an anchored plate bracket into the mortar joints.

The proposed signage package also includes a low, free-standing, non-illuminated composite board sign supported by two posts that would not extend above the height of the watertable. The sign would be located adjacent to the primary entrance.

The application also proposes to remove the existing iron window grilles on both the north and west elevations. The intricate grilles are part of the original design by architect Edgar V. Seeler.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 2012 AND 2014 RITTENHOUSE SQ

Proposal: Demolish buildings; construct three-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Robyn Willner

Applicant: Timothy Kerner, Terra Studio, LLC

History: 1950; BP #31167-B, 8-25-1950

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Non-contributing, 2/8/1995

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish two existing non-contributing houses, and to construct a new single-family residence. The proposed new construction would be three stories in height, with a brick façade, limestone detailing, and a standing-seam metal mansard roof.

The Historical Commission approved an in-concept version of this application, pursuant to Standard 9, in July 2016. The current application is compliant with the parameters set in the in-concept approval.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 1416-22 FRANKFORD AVE

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Stablefish LLC

Applicant: Ted Singer, Plumbob LLC

History: 1891; Police Patrol Stable

Individual Designation: 4/8/2016

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9, with the following provisions:

- the design of the Front Street elevation is developed and materials identified for the Commission meeting,
- the gates and utility meters are not mounted to the historic building, and
- red brick is considered for the building to the north of the historic building.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story building to the north and rear of this recently-designated former stable building, which is situated on a large lot that extends from Frankford Avenue to N. Front Street. Historically, the stable was connected at the rear to a large police station that faced onto N. Front Street. The proposed new construction would be primarily free-standing, attaching to the stable solely at a rear two-story stairtower addition previously approved by the Historical Commission. The portion of the proposed new construction facing onto Frankford Avenue would be set approximately 6 feet 10 inches from the north elevation of the stable building, and would be designed as a modern expression of a traditional mixed-use rowhouse building. The application proposes three options for the cladding of the upper floors, in either red brick, tan brick, or limestone.

The rear portion of the addition would be set 5 feet 5 inches from the rear elevation, the depth of the stair addition, and would extend 38 feet in height.

The new construction shown in the renderings south of the south elevation of the stable building is not part of this parcel.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Ted Singer and developer Paul Horos represented the application.

Mr. Singer asked to be granted latitude for the design of the Front Street elevation, as its design would have no impact on the existing historic building. He stated that the area is not a historic district and the elevation in question is one block away from the historic façade facing Frankford Avenue. The two facades, the historic and new, will never be able to be seen together. Mr. McCoubrey explained that the Architectural Committee was concerned because there was no information provided about the materials for the Front Street façade. Mr. Thomas commented that the application could be considered an in-concept application, because it is missing information about materials. Mr. McCoubrey explained that the Committee agreed with the design for the Frankford Avenue elevations, but opined that the Commission should review the design for the Front Street elevation again. Mr. Singer asked for clarification on the potential effect that the Front Street elevation might have on the historic building, considering that the two will never be seen from the public right-of-way simultaneously or in relationship to one other. He asserted that the Historical Commission had no basis for judging the design of the Front Street façade. Mr. Thomas responded that it is all one parcel, and the entire property falls under the jurisdiction of the Commission. He commented that there is design freedom in this case, because the Front Street elevation is not seen from Frankford Avenue. Mr. Horos asked what the Commission would want to see. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the Committee was favorable about the entire concept, but needed more information about the Front Street elevation, including materials. Mr. Horos commented that they intend for the Front Street elevation to be more contemporary in style than the Frankford Avenue elevation. Mr. Thomas agreed with this design approach.

Mr. Fiol-Silva asked about the three material options for the Frankford Avenue elevation. Mr. Singer responded that they are amenable to the red brick option, which the Committee preferred. Mr. Fiol-Silva opined that differentiating the new buildings by using a different color material may be more successful. Mr. Singer responded that the Committee seemed to prefer the red brick. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the Commission can approve everything except the Front Street façade. Mr. Horos asked for clarification on whether that approval would only be for the red brick option for Frankford Avenue. Mr. Thomas responded that the Commission would have to be specific for a final approval. Mr. Mattioni questioned if that means that the applicant has to make the final material decision at this moment. The Commission could decide

that all of the proposed options are acceptable and then let the applicants decide. Mr. Horos commented that, since the project has to come before the Commission again for the Front Street elevation, they prefer to wait and submit the entire proposal at that time, which would include a decision regarding the material choice for Frankford Avenue. Mr. Thomas responded that the Commission could grant a conceptual approval at this time.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application in concept. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 150 S INDEPENDENCE W ML

Proposal: Replace exterior doors

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Abde Mahamedi

Applicant: Glenn Werner, JKRP Architects

History: 1923; Public Ledger Building; Horace Trumbauer, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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, but approval of new doors that are approximately 42 inches wide and have darker bronze colored perimeter frames on all four sides of the glass.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace an existing set of brass-framed vestibule doors with frameless glass doors. The existing doors are not original, however doors with full frames are appropriate to the building. The Commission has previously denied similar applications for butt-glazed doors on comparable buildings.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Glenn Werner and developer Leon Chudzinski represented the application.

Mr. Werner stated that he believes that the current swinging doors are replacements of the original doors, which were four-foot wide revolving door assemblies. The existing doors have a wide brass frame. Ms. Merriman asked if a photograph of the original doors is available. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff does not have a photograph of the original doors. Mr. Werner explained that evidence remains of the turnstile at the 6th Street entrance.

Mr. Chudzinski commented that the building has been an unsuccessful commercial building over the last 20 years, and he is now trying to reposition it to attract a younger, "tech crowd." He stated that he is being asked to contemporize the main entrance, and make it not feel as if it dates to the year 1923. Mr. McCoubrey questioned the description of the proposed doors as being frameless when the rendering appears to show a frame. Mr. Werner explained that there is a piece of brass outside of the existing door frame, to the left and right of each opening, which wraps around the wall assembly. That piece of brass will remain. He stated that there will essentially be the image of a frame within the bronze storefront decorative assembly. Mr. Chudzinski commented that it is not unlike what was done at the Hotel Monaco or Warwick. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the brass element at the bottom of the door. Mr. Werner responded that there will be a similar rail at the top, the sides of the doors would not have trim.

Mr. Thomas asked if this project is being done for ADA purposes. Mr. Werner responded that the existing doors are wide enough for ADA access, but are cumbersome, and not convenient for someone who is carrying packages. Mr. Thomas suggested the addition of a push button that would open the doors automatically. Mr. Werner responded that, owing to the vestibule, there are both exterior and interior doors to contend with. Mr. Thomas referenced a similar situation at 30th Street Station, which has a push-button operator.

Mr. Fiol-Silva commented that the rendering and drawing do not match. Mr. Thomas observed that the lights are turned off in the existing photograph, but are turned on in the proposed rendering, making the existing conditions look unrealistically dark. He commented that there are other ways to attract tenants. He stated that the Historical Commission is bound to apply the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for guidance on proposed rehabilitation. Mr. Chudzinski commented that the 6th Street entrance currently has doors that are not ADA-compliant. He added that they would like to make all entrances uniform in appearance. Mr. Thomas observed that the entrances are not viewed in relationship to each other, and so they do not necessarily have to have the same in appearance. Mr. Werner asked: if the revolving door assembly existed today, how would it be replaced? He opined that this proposal is appropriate. Mr. Chudzinski stated that the entrance needs to be welcoming to bring people into the space, and the 6th Street entrance needs to be updated to be ADA compliant. He opined that what was allowed for the former Gwynedd-Mercy space was "ridiculous" and he does not want to have a 1975 entrance in that space, an original entrance at the Lights of Liberty space, and a circa 1940 entrance at the location in question. He reiterated that all entrances should be uniform in appearance in order to increase marketability. He stated that this building was at 60 percent occupancy because it is a tough building in a tough location. The Commissioners noted that the building is adjacent to Independence Hall. Mr. Chudzinski stated that they have to provide an appropriate level of amenities for a 5-star hotel and high-end retail. He stated that these are the requirements of the attracted tenants. Ms. DiPasquale commented that the staff previously offered to approve a thinner-framed door, similar in size but with rails on the sides.

Ms. Merriman cautioned that the applicants cannot expect the Commission to approve the same doors for each entrance, when they are not presenting them as one application. The applicants are currently proposing to replace the doors at one entrance. Mr. Chudzinski responded that that is not his intention. He stated that the building is not certified, but they are considering getting it certified. Ms. Merriman asked if he is referring to the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. Chudzinski responded affirmatively. Ms. Merriman responded that the Commission believes it is already listed on the National Register. Mr. Chudzinski responded that he has done research, and it is not listed on the National Register. Others disagreed, stating that it classified as significant in the East Center City National Register Historic District. Ms. Merriman stated that the way to achieve uniformity of openings is to present to a plan for all openings to the Commission as one package. Mr. Chudzinski responded that he understands, but the focus is currently on this particular entrance in order to increase marketability of the Chestnut Street side. He once again referenced the doors at the Hotel Monaco as having been changed.

Mr. Fiol-Silva asked if the revolving doors were original to the building. Mr. Chudzinski responded affirmatively. Mr. Fiol-Silva continued that a revolving door would not have had such a heavy frame. Mr. Werner explained that the four-foot opening was infilled to get it to be three feet six inches. Mr. Fiol-Silva responded that, to return to the look of a revolving door, it would have been closer to what is being proposed, but not with shiny metal. He commented that having the historic drawings would be helpful to make the case. Mr. Chudzinski then stated that he has the original drawings, having found them in the building's attic recently. He stated that the drawings show the revolving door assembly. He stated that he would be happy to send the

drawings to the Commission. Mr. McCoubrey responded that those details would be extremely helpful to the Commission, and maintained that there is still insufficient information in the current application. He opined that a minimally framed door would be acceptable, provided it is dark bronze, not shiny brass, and that the existing shiny brass infill elements are removed and replaced with a bronze door with minimal framing. He stated that the original drawings can provide information about measurements of the minimal framing. Mr. Werner responded that the existing brass elements are not being removed because they are part of the wall assembly, but that they can modify the color to make it bronze. Mr. McCoubrey asked why those brass elements have to remain if they are not original. Mr. Werner responded that he is hesitant to specify a door that is wider than four feet. Ms. DiPasquale commented that the staff can approve a door that replicates the appearance of the historic door, or is in keeping with the character of the historic building. She stated that, if there is a photograph to show the original doors, and the applicant proposes new doors to match those in the photograph, then the staff can approve that application.

Mr. Thomas asked for public comment. Oscar Beisert commented that the Historical Society of Pennsylvania has photographs of the original doors. He stated that they may be part of the Penrose collection.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the application, but to authorize the staff to approve a revised scheme as defined by the Historical Commission at its 9 September 2016 meeting. Ms. Royer seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 249-53 ARCH ST

Proposal: Renovate building; construct addition on roof; install ADA ramp

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Christopher Aker, Atlantis Investments, LLC

Applicant: Fon Wang, Ballinger

History: 1907; Corn Exchange National Bank & Trust; Seaman's Institute; Newman & Harris, architects

Individual Designation: 1/6/1977

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the ADA ramp, but approval of the remainder of the revised application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline, provided:

- a mock-up to shows that the addition, railing, and mechanical equipment are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way,
- the elevator overrun is removed if determined unnecessary,
- the small addition between the elevator overrun and other penthouse is removed if possible,
- the railings are to be set back from the property line along the Betsy Ross House,
- the fascia panel above the doors on the addition is to be decreased in height to the greatest extent possible, and
- the addition is clad in metal panels with a matte grey finish.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rooftop addition and deck on the former Corn Exchange building, a Significant property in the Old City Historic District. The addition would be located on the rear of the building, along N. 3rd Street. The applicant submitted revised

drawings at the Architectural Committee meeting that significantly reduced the size of the rooftop addition. Since the time of the Committee meeting, the application was revised further by setting the railing back along the property line of the Betsy Ross House, and eliminating the ADA ramp by sloping the sidewalk. This revised application has changed the material from metal panels to red brick.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Christopher Aker and architect Fon Wang represented the application.

Ms. Wang explained that this latest revision proposes a change of the penthouse materials to red brick. She stated that the existing penthouses on the roof are also red brick, and presented a revised rendering. Ms. Merriman asked about visibility of the addition from a public right-of-way. Ms. Wang responded that the addition was set back so that it would not be visible from a public right-of-way. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the Committee's concern was related to visibility from the Betsy Ross House, but the application has been revised to address that concern. He suggested that the staff review a mock up to confirm that mechanical equipment is not visible from a public right-of-way.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the application as presented at the Historical Commission's 9 September 2016 meeting, with the staff to review details including a mock up of the mechanical equipment and other items that could potentially be visible from the Betsy Ross House courtyard. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 1629 WALLACE ST

Proposal: Restore front façade; rehabilitate building; construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1422 Front LLC (Michael Abramson & Alon Bentolila)

Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects

History: 1859

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9, provided that:

- the front basement windows are changed to the appropriate pane configuration;
- the mechanical equipment is not visible from a public right-of-way;
- marble features are not sanded during the paint removal process and that staff is consulted once the paint is removed to determine the final treatment; and,
- samples and mockups of each process are provided for the staff to review.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert an existing vacant shell into a five-family dwelling. The building is located within the Spring Garden Historic District, and the rear of the building is highly visible from N. 17th Street. The application notes that the front façade had been rebuilt in the recent past but that original elements remain. The work at the front façade includes restoring the cornice and marble base and installing new wood windows and a new wood door. The application also proposes to extend the existing three-story rear ell an additional 27 feet. The north and west façades of the addition, which would be visible to the public, would be clad

in brick, while the non-visible east façade would be stuccoed. New aluminum clad windows are proposed for the existing rear ell and addition.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 720 ARCH ST

Proposal: Construct loading platform and ADA ramp; install glass in existing doors

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Delancey Arch Associates

Applicant: Ryan Sell, Delancey Construction & Maintenance, Inc.

History: 1860; George S. Harris & Sons; Lit Brothers

Individual Designation: 6/30/1970

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: Yes

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@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, with the following comments:

- glass may be inserted into the upper panels of the doors to the proposed ADA entrance, but the transom and bottom panels should remain;
- if required, an ADA-compliant push button should be mounted to a freestanding post, not attached to the building;
- the marble step should be replaced in kind with the sidewalk to be sloped to eliminate the ramp and railing;
- graphic images should be used where the blackout panels are proposed; and,
- if technically infeasible to slope the sidewalk, a ramp may be installed with vertical pickets rather than mesh railing.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to create an ADA-accessible entrance and to install a loading platform at the western alley of the Cast Iron Building. The proposed changes are to accommodate a new U.S. Post Office. To allow for ADA accessibility, the application proposes to replace a deteriorated marble step in kind and to install a new ramp and railing at an existing eastern entryway along Arch Street. The Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia holds a façade easement on the building. At the Alliance's suggestion, the applicant has designed the ramp railing to match existing metal elements at the building's east façade. The application also proposes to replace wood panels with glass panels in the existing doors that would serve the ADA entrance. Black vinyl and rigid insulation board would be installed behind several windows and a door along the Arch Street façade. The proposed loading platform would be located at an existing loading area along the west wall. In addition to the platform, the application proposes to replace an existing roll-down garage door with swinging doors.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 148 N 03RD ST, UNIT C

Proposal: Construct roof addition with deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Ari Halbert

Applicant: Jim Cassidy, C2 Architecture

History: 1830; storefront added c. 1855

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a mockup demonstrates the addition and railing are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, with “inconspicuous” to mean that the visibility is consistent with the submitted drawings, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a fifth-floor addition and roof deck on top of an existing four-story building. The Architectural Committee reviewed a similar application at the July 2016 meeting. That proposal called for a long pilothouse arm extending out along the north side of the building, which would have been highly conspicuous from N. 3rd Street. That application was withdrawn prior to review by the Historical Commission. This revised design has removed the pilothouse arm, per the recommendation of the Committee, and has replaced it with a black metal railing. The addition would be clad in stucco, and the deck would feature two tiers, and would surround two new large skylights.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 160, 162, AND 164 N 02ND ST

Proposal: Demolish one-story buildings; construct mixed-use building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: TFC 2nd Street Holdings LP

Applicant: Nicole Cabezas, Canno Design

History: Parking lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish two one-story non-contributing buildings and construct a five-story mixed-use building at the corner of N. 2nd and Race Streets. The building’s primary facades would be composed of red brick, and feature large aluminum clad windows with cast stone sills. The N. 2nd Street ground floor would include an aluminum storefront system with awnings. A parking garage would be accessed via Race Street. A common roof deck and penthouse for roof deck access would be located on the rear half of the roof. Since the time of the review by the Architectural Committee, the applicant has revised the application to reflect comments received by the Committee. The changes include a taller parapet, narrower openings at the ground floor of the Race Street façade, planters located on the exterior of the building, a change in material to brick for the rear elevation, and a greater brick return at the side elevation.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Carey Jackson Yonce and developer Michael Koep represented the application.

Mr. Yonce explained that his revisions address all of the Architectural Committee's concerns except for the number of canopies along the 2nd Street elevation. He opined that the façade is uniform and the canopies should be uniform as well.

Mr. Schaaf clarified that the City Planning landscape buffer requirement, which was discussed at the Architectural Committee meeting, only applies to open-air surface parking lots, not parking garages. Mr. Yonce responded that the zoning regulators insisted upon it in order to obtain a zoning approval.

Ms. Merriman commented that the material choice for the garage opening on Race Street is unfortunate. Mr. Yonce responded that it is his intention to provide a door that one can see through for security purposes. Mr. Thomas stated that he understands the reasoning behind an open gate, and encouraged the applicant to look at a newly-constructed building on the 3200 block of Spring Garden Street, where there is a similar gate that is artistic in appearance.

Mr. Schaaf commented that there is an opportunity for another window on the first floor of the Race Street façade, where there is currently a blank panel, or the wall could jog at an angle to bring the panel into the commercial space. Mr. Yonce responded that he would be open to the idea of adding a window in that space.

Mr. Fiol-Silva commented that the garage opening is too wide, but noted that it may be difficult to park in the spaces. He opined that the Race Street façade is too auto-centric. Mr. Yonce responded that the parking is a zoning requirement.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that most of the comments from the Architectural Committee were addressed in the revised submission.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting on 9 September 2016, with the staff to review details including the blank panel on Race Street and the garage grills. Ms. Royer seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 210 CHURCH ST, UNIT 10

Proposal: Install ADA ramps

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Charles Lee

Applicant: Hal Kessler, Mt. Alto Design + Drafting

History: 1853; Upper stories burned 1944; reconstructed 1981

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, considering the existing litigation, provided the ramp is concrete and the railing is a simple galvanized steel design to meet code, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct two ADA ramps with railings at the storefronts located at 219 and 221 Market Street. The ramps would rise to 4 ½ inches above grade, and feature brick pavers to match the surrounding sidewalk. The 36 inch tall railings would be

wrought iron. The staff previously approved narrower ADA ramps with no railings at these entrances, but ongoing litigation regarding ADA access to these storefronts has resulted in this new proposal for wider ramps with railings, which the staff suggests falls outside of its approval authority.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 35 N 02ND ST

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Liu Junlan & Chan Jian Ji

Applicant: Kumar Perlote, Plato Studio

History: 1900

Individual Designation: 1/6/1977

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 voted to recommend denial.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a third- and fourth-story addition and to alter the N. 2nd Street façade to support commercial and residential functions. The building, located in the Old City Historic District, is adjacent to a parking lot at its north elevation. The existing structure is three stories at the N. 2nd Street façade and two stories toward the rear. The proposed addition would begin at the rear of the three-story main block, 45 feet from the front façade. While the third story would extend the entire length of the building, the fourth story would be constructed with a 25-foot break at the center of the building. A non-visible light court is also proposed. At the front façade, the application proposes to alter the existing storefront to include two doors and two one-over-one windows. The remainder of the storefront would be infilled with a brick to match the existing brick of the second and third stories.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Plato Marinokos and developer Liu Junlan represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the architect had submitted a modified drawing addressing many concerns of both the Architectural Committee and neighbors. Addressing concerns about the amount of demolition, the plans no longer show the removal of the interior floor joists, but rather they propose to sister the existing joists. The rooftop addition now shows more detail including a cornice and decorative lintels.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting on 9 September 2016, with the staff to review details. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 521 S JUNIPER ST

Proposal: Construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Claire Stidwell

Applicant: Kelly Ennis, Ennisnehez

History: 1835

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: @phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the deck has a vertical metal picket railing rather than a solid parapet wall, and that the pilohouse is sloped at the front to align with the slope of the roof, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck with pilohouse access on the rear of this corner property. The pilohouse would rise approximately 1 foot 8 inches above the peak of the front-sloping roof. The deck would be surrounded by a 42 inch stucco-clad parapet wall.

The staff notes that a condition of a previous Historical Commission approval to legalize several unpermitted alterations to the building including stuccoing the side was never satisfied. This approval, from December 2007, required the installation a solid wood beaded board fence and gate along Rodman Street; the fence and gate were never installed, but should be to bring the property into compliance.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 260 W JOHNSON ST

Proposal: Replace slate roof with asphalt-shingle roof

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Bryant Hatcher Group LLC

Applicant: Andrea Hatcher, Bryant Hatcher Group LLC

History: 1891; Edmund B. Seymour House; Hazelhurst & Huckel

Individual Designation: 9/14/1988

District Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install asphalt shingles on the entire roof of this building, which currently is covered primarily with original red slate. The contractor has provided two quotes for re-roofing the building to illustrate the cost difference between the desired asphalt shingles and new red slate and copper. The asphalt shingles, which the applicant prefers, are estimated to cost \$29,000. The red slate and copper would cost \$140,000; the new red slate and copper could be approved by the staff administratively.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Attorney David Still and roofer Tiffany Swank represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the applicant has presented several different roofing scenarios. He said that the Commission had approved a plan for a building on 23rd Street which allowed for tile

on the front slope and shingles on the other slopes as a compromise of appearance and price. In the spirit of that approval, he asked the applicants to price out a proposal that retained the existing red slate on the turret, installed red rubber faux slate on the front roof slope and red asphalt shingles on the other three slopes. Mr. Still, the attorney representing the property owner, said that this scheme would still cost about \$60,000 or double the cost of the initial all asphalt proposal. Mr. Still distributed information showing the current income and expenditures for the property and said that the owner could not afford to spend more on the roof. Mr. Thomas explained that the Commission has a Committee on Financial Hardship and urged the applicant to apply under that rubric. Mr. Still said that the insurance provider has notified the owner that the insurance coverage will be suspended if she does not install a new roof. Moreover, the building suffers from mold, owing to the deteriorated roof, which poses safety risks. He said that he and the roofer never received copies of the Architectural Committee's meeting minutes and recommendation. He asked for copies of the Architectural Committee's minutes as well as the minutes from this Historical Commission meeting. Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission's staff had sent the minutes to the applicant as listed on the building permit application, but that the staff could send the minutes electronically to Mr. Still as well.

Mr. Fiol-Silva asked about the architect of the house. Mr. Baron responded the firm of Hazelhurst & Huckle designed the house.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that, not only does the shingle not meet the Standards, but the application still calls for the removal of the decorative copper capping and the installation of asphalt ridges in spite of the fact that the applicants stated at the Architectural Committee meeting that they do not intend to remove the existing copper pieces. Ms. Swank and Mr. Still reiterated that they intend to retain and reuse all copper trim on the roof. They stated that they had already made that commitment.

ACTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to deny the application, with the suggestion that the applicant submit a financial hardship application. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 4309 MAIN ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition with pilot house and roof deck

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Philly Comfort Homes LLC

Applicant: Logan Dry, KCA Design Associates

History: c.1855

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Contributing, 12/14/1983

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the deck railing is metal pickets, the stucco is removed from the window heads, and the height of the pilot house is reduced by sloping the roof, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story addition behind an existing rowhouse. With the exception of the pilot house, the addition would be set below the cornice of the rear of the existing building. This addition would replace non-historic material at the rear of the existing building. The addition would have a stucco façade that would create a solid three-

story street frontage on Station Street. It would have a roof deck and stair house on the addition. The deck could be improved with a sloped stairhouse.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

Mr. Gupta excused himself from the remainder of the meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

ADDRESS: 101A W GRAVERS LANE

Proposal: Reconsider designation of property owing to missed correspondence

Nominator: Jennifer Robinson

Owner: John and Eva Tierno

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

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

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

At its 13 May 2016 meeting, the Historical Commission designated the property at 101A W. Gravers Lane as historic. After the Historical Commission meeting, the Commission's staff received an email from the property owner requesting that the Commission table the review to allow for discussions about a façade easement to progress. The email request had been sent prior to the Commission meeting, on 10 May 2016, but had not been received in a timely manner, owing to the Historical Commission's move and related computer problems. When alerted of the failure to receive the tabling request in a timely manner, the property owner requested that the Commission seek a remedy for the problem. At its 10 June 2016 meeting, the Historical Commission nullified its action of 13 May 2016 to find that 101A W. Gravers Lane satisfies Criteria for Designation C and J, to designate it as historic, and to list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places; and tabled the consideration of the nomination for 101A W. Gravers Lane to the Historical Commission's meeting on 9 September 2016. It took that action owing to the communications failure resulting from the office move and pursuant to the advice of the Law Department.

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

Mr. Farnham offered some additional background information to clarify the agenda item. He stated that the Commission did designate the property several months earlier, but, at the request of the owners, who did not receive the correspondence and were unable to attend the previous meeting, the Commission withdrew the designation and agreed to review the nomination at a later date. Mr. Farnham asked if the property owners or a representative were present. No one came forward. Mr. Farnham added that additional notice was mailed to the property owners to ensure that they were aware of the current meeting.

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

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

ADDRESS: 81-95 FAIRMOUNT AVENUE

Proposal: Designation

Nominator: Staff of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission

Owner: VMDT Partnership

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 81-95 Fairmount Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J.

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the rowhouses at 81-95 Fairmount Avenue as historic and list them on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that 81-95 Fairmount Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D and J. The nomination argues that the rowhouses are a rare surviving example of a once common building type of the early Philadelphia waterfront between Front Street and the Delaware River, and the row retains original early Federal-style characteristics despite a significant but sensitive Colonial Revival renovation in the early 1920s. The nomination further contends that 81-95 Fairmount Avenue exemplifies the cultural, social and historical heritage of the Northern Liberties community, having served as the Beach Street Mission, representing the first facility of the Guild House organization.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Schaaf recused. Ms. Long recused, owing to her husband's firm's employment at the law firm representing the property owner and excused herself from the remainder of the meeting. Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. Attorneys Michael Sklaroff and Richard Orlow and consultant George Thomas represented the nomination.

Mr. Sklaroff asked for clarification on the non-contributing aspect of the property. Oscar Beisert replied that the wagon house has been identified as non-contributing.

Mr. Orlow inquired whether the wagon house would be included in the designation, should the Commission designate the property. Commissioner Thomas suggested that the wagon house would not be included in the designation. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the building is not in a district and added that identifying the wagon house as non-contributing means it is not significant. Commissioner Thomas agreed that non-contributing typically carries that definition and means a structure fails to meet any criteria. Mr. Beisert added that the nomination did not propose to designate that specific structure and instead listed the wagon house as non-contributing.

However, the building, Mr. Beisert added, could potentially be classified as contributing. Mr. Sklaroff commented that the building could be classified as contributing if there were a district, but there is no existing or proposed.

Mr. Sklaroff stated that he served on the Commission for 12 years, with the honor of chairing it for five years. Never had a nomination, he continued, approached such a level of scrutiny and contained so many flaws. He added that this process has involved three different nominators and three separate nominations. Mr. Sklaroff presented several statements from the previous iterations of the nomination relating to the row's age and alterations. The third and current nomination, he noted, depicts the building as a serious and sensitive Colonial Revival renovation.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Thomas to discuss the physical qualities of the buildings. Mr. Thomas gave a presentation to the Commission and also indicated that he shares the concerns about the nomination with Mr. Sklaroff. Mr. Thomas described the row as "an incredible shrinking building" that continually loses original fabric. He presented his initial analysis, showing the loss of original doors to each unit, party walls, and shared chimneys. The building type, he continued, is not rare but is scattered across the city and can be found in Old City, Rittenhouse's west edge, and Society Hill. Mr. Thomas described the row as being a very ordinary building type from the early nineteenth century and contended that rareness should not be considered. He then showed the Commission an image in which he identified the removal of original material and stated that the renovation process, which saw the removal of the party walls, has resulted in the loss of all the original roof structure and dormers. The fabric that has been physically nominated, Mr. Thomas argued, is a few bricks, a couple of chimneys, and some proportions. He suggested that the end walls were parged with cement to cover damage to the brick caused by earlier sandblasting. At the first hearing regarding the nomination, Mr. Thomas noted, there was discussion of the row being incorporated into a historic district like that of Society Hill. Where the row stands, he continued, the context has been lost. Mr. Thomas explained the building's relative isolation as resulting from 50 years of the Philadelphia City Planning Department's aim at undoing an old industrial district and creating new opportunity for the city's future.

Mr. Thomas questioned whether the 1920s adaptive reuse of the building was a sensitive Colonial Revival restoration as the nomination states. He contended that colonial architecture is robust and three-dimensional, while Federal architecture is flat, linear, economical in service, and very different in aesthetic. In the case of 81-95 Fairmount Avenue, Mr. Thomas argued, one style was stacked onto another to create the current "hodgepodge." He cautioned against calling the reuse a restoration and contended that the 1920s adaptation resulted in a reconstruction of most of the building that resulted in the removal of all the original craft elements. With the exception of a few bricks, he continued, none of the original architectural character remains. Mr. Thomas showed a photograph of a row of neighboring buildings with simple rectangular doors, fanlights, and marble stoops. These buildings, he commented, were likely similar to the original appearance of 81-95 Fairmount Avenue. The nominated buildings, he continued, have an added door assembly and stand as a "Victorian hodgepodge of elements." He equated certain design elements to those of a Queen Anne Colonial Revival building located in Mount Airy and added that the architectural character had been cobbled together from a mill shop. The building exhibits a large fan light and odd sidelights.

Because of its lack of architectural integrity, Mr. Thomas questioned the row's ability to represent its past function as a Quaker mission. He argued that the extent of early-twentieth-century alterations negated the building's ability to convey that importance, since, he contended,

all of the features extant when the building served as a mission were subsequently removed and replaced. Mr. Thomas emphasized the change over time and loss of fabric through the juxtaposition of a current photograph and 1890s photograph and asserted that no argument for the building being the earliest or first could be made, owing to the lack of integrity. The building, he argued, is part of a large tradition of mission buildings located throughout the city and he presented data showing that 140 such missions were referenced in an 1880 survey by the Charitable Institutions of Philadelphia. By 1895, he added, 250 such missions existed, and many exist today. Mr. Thomas noted that the Friends Neighborhood Guild remains in the community, that their second building is extant, and that their current offices exist in the Robert Venturi-designed Guild House. Even earlier, he continued, were the Bethany Quaker Missions to the African-American community in the pre-Civil War era and the Methodist-organized Bedford Street Mission on Kater Street. Unlike 81-95 Fairmount Avenue, Mr. Thomas claimed, these mission buildings exist to tell a story. He summarized his sentiments by contending that the nominated property has lost so much integrity that it fails to communicate the original narrative, and the subsequent narratives are no longer expressed by the extant fabric.

Mr. Beisert responded that the nomination does not propose that 81-95 Fairmount Avenue is the oldest row of houses in Philadelphia or the neighborhood. The property, he continued, is immediately adjacent to the Delaware River, and a short block from the intact row Mr. Thomas showed. Mr. Beisert commented that the houses represent the type of building that historically populated the waterfront from as far south as Washington Avenue and added that, owing to the construction of I-95, most of that early architecture has been lost. He emphasized that 81-95 Fairmount Avenue comprises a row of houses, so the block remains intact, and suggested that passersby would assume the buildings were already designated. Mr. Beisert referred to comments previously stated about the row's lack of integrity as an "outrageous argument." Most changes made to the building, he continued, were done so by Thomas Sullivan, who owned the Terminal Warehouse Company. Mr. Beisert referenced a letter he provided to the Commission at a previous meeting that included a biography of Sullivan that described the 1920s reuse of the building. All neighboring warehouses, Mr. Beisert continued, should be woven into the development of the waterfront. Not designating the building and allowing demolition to occur, he contended, would cause the loss of the few remaining historic waterfront buildings. Mr. Beisert argued that the row should have been incorporated into the development plans for the three-acre site and urged the Commission to designate the property.

Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance indicated that he would reiterate comments he stated at previous Commission meetings when the property was discussed. He added that no one suggested that buildings were a representation of intact early Federal housing, even though the row does retain the form of early Federal houses. The row, he continued, is instead reflective of an evolving context and argued that the evolving context, or "hodgepodge," tells a story. He acknowledged that the building type is not unique to the nineteenth century, but asserted that the row is unique to the location and stands as a rare geographic survivor. Mr. Grossi stated that the objections presented previously are overly fixated on original material. Integrity, he commented, is not a required threshold for designation per the ordinance, although Mr. Grossi suggested that the row retains enough integrity and character to contribute to any future development at that location. He noted that the building represents the story of the early-nineteenth-century waterfront and serves as a unique example of early twentieth-century adaptive reuse. Mr. Grossi stated that the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia supports the nomination.

James Duffin, a contributor to the original nomination, reminded the Commission that the nomination only needs to satisfy one Criterion for Designation. One Criterion the nomination

satisfies, he argued, is Criterion A, which relates to a person of significance. Mr. Duffin asserted that Thomas Sullivan of the Terminal Warehouse Company carried significance for his Philadelphia business and that information on Sullivan and his company was presented in the nomination. Additional material, he continued, was also submitted to the Commission by Mr. Beisert. Mr. Duffin stated that in 1932 the Army Corps of Engineers completed a review of Philadelphia port facilities, analyzed all warehousing associated with port facilities, and presented statistics on the warehouses. At that time, Mr. Duffin continued, the Terminal Warehouse Company was the largest single warehouse company in Philadelphia, with sixty acres of warehouse space. He added that in a 1922 study by the Army Corps of Engineers, the company ranked third in number of warehouses owned, although it rapidly expanded within the decade, particularly with an acquisition of a warehouse facility built by the Reading Railroad at 401 N. Broad Street. Mr. Duffin explained Sullivan's roots, his work in Philadelphia ports as a teenager, his rise in the warehousing trade, and the establishment and growth of his company. By the time of his death, he continued, Sullivan left a bequest to Temple University to build what is today known as Sullivan Hall, Temple's signature building. Mr. Duffin stated that the Terminal Warehouse Company grew so large that when it was sold in 1949, according to the New York Times, it brought \$20 million, equal to approximately \$200 million today. He remarked that the building as it exists today is the building that Sullivan created. He then advocated for the significance of the building and of Sullivan.

Mr. Sklaroff responded that the original nomination represented to the Commission indicated that 81-95 Fairmount Avenue is the oldest intact row of houses in the immediate area. It was misrepresented, he claimed, and if it had been designated with no opposition, it would have promoted a false history. When thinking of significant Philadelphians, Mr. Sklaroff continued, the name Thomas Sullivan does not come to mind. He added that while Sullivan was very active and successful in warehousing, better examples survive that represent the memory of Thomas Sullivan. One such example, he explained, is the Sullivan building at Temple University. Mr. Sklaroff indicated that a second representative property is the N. Broad Street building, which remains intact. Finally, he concluded, there are two warehouses north on Delaware Avenue that are preserved and adaptively reused and that convey the magnitude of warehouses on Delaware Avenue. Mr. Sklaroff argued against encumbering 81-95 Fairmount Avenue with designation in order to represent the memory of Thomas Sullivan.

Mr. Thomas supported Mr. Sklaroff's sentiments, adding that he researched Sullivan and found information in a 1920 Who's Who in Philadelphia book that clarified Sullivan's role in the Terminal Warehouse Company. The information, he continued, indicated that Sullivan did not found the business in 1904, but that he was, in fact, an employee of Samuel Kerr, who was a major chemical dye operator along the Philadelphia riverfront. Kerr, whose business was in chemical shipping, Mr. Thomas stated, held dye offices and warehouses on Delaware Avenue. He added that Kerr founded the business that became the Terminal Warehouse Company and served as president into the 1920s. Mr. Thomas contended that Sullivan's narrative is distorted and asserted that the nomination is deeply flawed and largely written based on research that he and the property owner's representatives have uncovered.

Mr. Orlow again raised the issue of the wagon house's status and whether it would be considered non-contributing or whether it has historical significance. He stressed that the wagon house is not part of the application. Commissioner Thomas suggested that the wagon house is excluded from the nomination. Mr. Orlow requested further clarification on the building's status. Commissioner Thomas reiterated that the wagon house is excluded from the nomination and that only 81-95 Fairmount Avenue is under consideration for designation. Mr. Farnham clarified that, while the wagon house is part of the tax parcel and would be included in the designation of

the property, the Historical Commission would not assert jurisdiction over that building or other buildings identified as non-contributing. He added that the labeling of the wagon house as non-contributing indicates that the Historical Commission would not seek to preserve the building for historic preservation purposes. Mr. Farnham explained that, if the property is designated and the owner submitted a building permit application to demolish the non-contributing structure, the Historical Commission's staff would approve the application without referral to the Commission, since no claim has been made for the building's historical significance.

Mr. Sklaroff reiterated his position against the designation of the property.

Mr. Fiol-Silva commented that he has been studying the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and assessing the property and process with fresh eyes. He acknowledged that he is not familiar with the long history of the project, but enjoys deciphering the meaning behind the city's buildings. He stated that his first impression of the row was that it was an apartment building potentially constructed in the '60s or '80s. The building, Mr. Fiol-Silva continued, surprised him in some ways, because he felt it held a distorted narrative. He commented that a careful inspection of the material indicated the rigor required by the nomination in applying the various criteria. The process, he claimed, made apparent how compromised the property is. Mr. Fiol-Silva stated that, through all the iterations, it was hard for him to understand designating a building so muddled. He added that the process and integrity carry importance, because consideration needs to be given to the local context to determine if the property represents warehousing. To him, Mr. Fiol-Silva continued, the building did not represent warehousing. He reiterated that the building presents a muddled case, which he found troubling.

Mr. Mattioni remarked that he is not an architect or city planner and that Mr. Fiol Silva articulated his issues with the nomination fairly clearly. Should the property be designated by the Commission, Mr. Mattioni questioned what would be designated. Suggesting that the building has been compromised, he asked what measure would be used to determine the type of repair or alteration, should a building permit application be submitted in the future. He asked supporters of the nomination to answer his questions and stated that he would be interested in hearing why his sentiments are incorrect.

Mr. Fiol-Silva added that he is moved by the passion that motivates people to fight the battle to save the city's heritage. He again focused on rigor, adding that rigor lends credibility to an argument to allow one to stand on firmer ground. He acknowledged Mr. Beisert's passion for preserving historic buildings, but remarked that he needs rigor in his approach.

Mr. Farnham inquired whether it would be of assistance to the Commissioners to examine the nomination's various claims and the Criteria that are cited. Mr. Mattioni stated that it would be beneficial to have the Criteria explained. If there is a real reason for designation, Mr. Mattioni continued, he would like to hear it. Given the compromised nature of the property itself, he stated that some further explanation could be helpful.

Ms. Turner added that, in reviewing the Criteria on which the Commission bases designation decisions, she questioned whether 81-95 Fairmount Avenue does not very clearly meet at least one or more Criteria. She stated that she would support Mr. Farnham's offer to identify the Criteria with the arguments presented in the nomination in order to address the rigor issues raised by the property owners and several Commission members.

Mr. Farnham explained that the nomination cites four reasons why the property should be designated as historic. The row, he continued, historically comprised a group of Federal-era

houses. He summarized the exterior changes that have occurred over time, including the removal of doors and chimneys and the partial reconstruction of the façade. Mr. Farnham stated that the Commissioners would need to consider questions of integrity in determining whether or not the row currently qualifies as Federal-style buildings. Mr. Farnham read Criteria C and D for the Commissioners and explained that one could make the claim that the buildings represent the city's development around the port in the 1820s. He stated that, because the buildings housed port workers and at least retain the massing, shape, volume, and some of the architectural details of Federal-style houses, one could make the argument that they have significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the city, satisfying Criterion A, and largely overlapping Criterion J. There is also a claim, Mr. Farnham added, that the site functioned as a Friends' mission, which would again relate to Criteria A and J. Mr. Farnham reiterated his question to the Commissioners about whether, given the 1920s alterations, the buildings retain sufficient integrity to represent their late nineteenth-century appearance and former use when they functioned as the mission's headquarters. He discussed the claim made that the buildings hold an association with Sullivan, the port, and the warehousing industry, which would satisfy Criteria A and J as they relate to the 1920s conversion of the buildings into the headquarters for a large warehousing company. Mr. Farnham stated that the buildings have essentially remained in the same condition as when they were converted in the 1920s, so questions of integrity should not apply with regard to the buildings' capacity to represent Sullivan and his business. Finally, he continued, the nomination claims that the buildings are a significant example of Colonial Revival style architecture. These were Federal and not colonial buildings, he added, but the Colonial Revival style is a much more amorphous, broad style. Mr. Farnham stated that because these Federal buildings were converted into a Colonial Revival office building for a warehouse company, the claim could be made that they satisfy Criteria C and D. He noted that the buildings are idiosyncratic and do not necessarily characterize an environment, but they are representative of a distinctive architectural style and embody distinguishing characteristics of the Colonial Revival style that Sullivan imparted in the 1920s. Mr. Farnham explained that he is not advocating for or against designation and offered the information on the nomination's claims in order to clarify the questions the Commission needs to consider.

Mr. Sklaroff argued that the Criteria are very broad in their content and application, but acknowledged that Mr. Farnham fairly stated the potential arguments. Mr. Sklaroff contended that the Commission is strongest when it operates within the four corners of the historic preservation ordinance and presents a balance between private property rights and the interest of the community in preserving history. He asserted that, if the property contained an intact 1820s building, Mr. Orlow's company would not have purchased it for development and would not have presented to the City Planning Commission plans to transform the three-acre site. Mr. Sklaroff focused on the language of the Criteria for Designation, stating that the building needs to have a distinctive architectural style and not a "mishmash." He noted that the language defining the Criteria is present tense and questioned whether the building currently has the ability to reflect, embody, and exemplify. A coherent argument, Mr. Sklaroff stated, would be that the building no longer has significant character, no longer reflects the environment, no longer embodies distinguishing characteristics, and no longer exemplifies heritage. He contended that the Commission would be stronger in applying rigor to this case and concluded that the nomination, now in its third iteration, should not be accepted.

Mr. Beisert addressed a question to Mr. Farnham, asking if he knew of another similar row of Federal-style houses along the waterfront representative of the architectural style that was once very prominent in that area. Mr. Sklaroff interrupted to state that, as part of their presentation, they showed a row to the west on Fairmount Avenue, which is preserved and intact.

Commissioner Thomas stated that the Commission is considering only the block on which 81-95 Fairmount Avenue stands and that the Commission has seen a presentation on the context. Mr. Beisert again vocalized his question to Mr. Farnham. Mr. Farnham answered that no other row quite like the nominated property comes to mind but that there are many houses near the waterfront that were built in the same era. Mr. Beisert asserted that the row's roofline remains intact with original roof material, dormers represent each house, gable-end chimneys exist, the second-floor fenestration is intact, and many apertures along the first floor remain. While the doors have been infilled, he argued that much original fabric remains and the property continues to represent a row of Federal-style houses.

Commissioner Thomas responded that Mr. Beisert's comments are included in the nomination and added that the buildings are almost 200 years old. He asserted that buildings from that period rarely escape alteration and that many buildings on the Philadelphia Register have been significantly altered and could be called "mishmashes." Within a row at any number of historic districts, he continued, the doors have been relocated, and later alterations often acquire significance in their own right. Commissioner Thomas noted that significant character, interest, value, size, shape, location, and relation to the street need to be considered. He added that, to accommodate a new program, a number of properties requiring approval by the Commission, SHPO, and National Park Service have been altered, but those alterations have not diminished the value of the building as a contributing or individually designated structure. He acknowledged that the Commissioners would disagree on how much integrity needs to be retained in order for the property to meet Criterion A.

Mr. Sklaroff clarified that it is not his position that an altered building cannot be significant. The mere massing, he argued, which is quite clear in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and which might allow 81-95 Fairmount Avenue to contribute to a district, does not support an individual designation. Mr. Sklaroff contended that the Commission needs to consider designation based on extant material and asked whether the building presently satisfies all the Criteria identified. His position, he asserted, is that the building does not meet the Criteria, because it is not located within a district and does not exemplify an architectural style. Mr. Sklaroff criticized the Colonial Revival alterations and added that designation must be based on the case made in the nomination, and not simply on the building.

Mr. Fiol-Silva stated his appreciation for Ms. Turner's request to review the Criteria. He asked to untangle the confusion over the Federal and Colonial Revival aspects of the building and asked for a clear, defining reason for justifying the building's preservation. As a sleuth, he continued, he sees much material, including walls, chimneys, individual units with doors and stoops. Mr. Fiol-Silva also stated that the row was a community of houses where a number of people lived. Now, he continued, not only is the Federal style of the building illegible, the building sends the wrong cue. He equated that building to a "sucker punch" and gave an example of the integrity maintained by buildings in London. The nominated property, he continued, is a collective rather than an individual building and added that it retains none of the individual elements that define it as a Federal rowhouse. He commented that the structure appears to be an apartment building or institution with two common entrances and argued that the building does not satisfy the Criteria as a Federal row, warehouse, or example of fine Colonial Revival architecture. He contended that the building is not a good representation of any category, adding that there should be a solid foundation on which to apply rigor to explain the property's importance. Mr. Fiol-Silva reiterated the "sucker punch" metaphor and commented that he felt tricked by the building, because it has lost all integrity.

Mr. McCoubrey asserted that the opposite argument could be made and contended that, when observing the building, he immediately identifies a row of Federal townhouses that have been altered over time. The alteration, he continued, is part of a long history and evolution of a series of buildings that are 200 years old. He stated that he does not look strictly for purity, and noted that he certainly sees the building's original appearance. The building, he argued, could be restored quite easily, if desired. Mr. McCoubrey concluded by adding that a significant amount of original material remains.

Ms. Turner stated that she wanted to connect the balance between preservation and development and to clarify the role and responsibility of the Historical Commission and its primary duty in resolving the designation issue. Very often preservation and development, she continued, are approached as if they are a great engine. She noted that there should be some balance, because preservation and development are not mutually exclusive, and added that there should be some relationship between the two interests.

Mr. Duffin offered a technical correction for the record and stated that Thomas Sullivan became head of the Terminal Warehouse Company in 1916, a fact reported in his obituary. Mr. Duffin stated that the obituary appeared in the *New York Times* and is a testament to Sullivan's significance, since few Philadelphians have that honor. A biographical sketch of Sullivan, Mr. Duffin added, references 81-95 Fairmount Avenue and was published in the *Encyclopedia of Pennsylvania Biography*, a standard set of biographical books published from around 1900 until the 1930s.

Hal Schirmer asked whether a building is required to represent one period in time, or if it can be considered the "poster child" for adaptive reuse and development of the waterfront when previous owners modified the building to continue its use. He further inquired if the building needs to represent one architectural style. Commissioner Thomas recited Criterion A and reiterated that it is unusual for a building of this age not to have been altered. Many times, he added, the alterations reflect the development of the city.

Mr. Beisert stated that, when the property was placed on the market, it was described as a historic property. Commissioner Thomas stated that the term did not imply that the Historical Commission had designated the property as historic.

FAILED MOTION: Mr. Fiol-Silva moved to find that the nomination fails to demonstrate that the property at 81-95 Fairmount Avenue satisfies any of the Criteria for Designation and to refuse to designate it as historic or list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which failed by a vote of 4 to 4. Mses. Royer and Turner and Messrs. McCoubrey and Thomas dissented.

FAILED MOTION: Mr. McCoubrey moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 81-95 Fairmount Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, and J and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which failed by a vote of 5 to 3. Mses. Merriman and Royer and Messrs. Fink, Fiol-Silva, and Mattioni dissented.

FAILED MOTION: Ms. Royer moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 81-95 Fairmount Avenue satisfies Criteria for Designation A and J and to designate it as historic, listing it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which failed by a vote of 4 to 4. Ms. Merriman and Messrs. Fink, Fiol-Silva, and Mattioni dissented.

Mr. Sklaroff stated that he would consider the Commission's actions as a refusal to designate.

Mr. Grossi spoke out of order.

Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Farnham to explain the next steps in this review to the audience. Mr. Farnham stated that he would confer with the Commission's attorney before any final determination was reached, but stated that, in his opinion, the Commission failed to take any action and, therefore, the nomination is still pending before the Commission. He stated that the nomination would likely be listed on the agenda of the Historical Commission's meeting for October.

ADDRESS: 4056 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Designation

Nominator: Aaron Wunsch, Elizabeth Stegner, Oscar Beisert

Owner: Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania; 40th St Live Assoc. LP

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 4056 Chestnut Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. It is one of a row of twins at 4046-60 Chestnut Street. The nomination contends that the "restrained interpretation of the Italianate" twins satisfy Criteria for Designation A, C, D, G and J. The nomination argues that the twins, constructed between 1869-72 by Thomas H. Powers, are a group of houses that have significant value as part of the development of the twin housing type and the formation of West Philadelphia as a suburb for white-collar commuters. The nomination further contends that the twins are part of and related to a distinctive area, owing to their listing on the National Register of Historic Places as a contributing resource within the West Philadelphia Streetcar Suburb Historic District.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the nomination to the Historical Commission. No one represented the nomination, but the attorney representing the long-term lessee did submit a letter, which was distributed to the Commissioners.

Mr. Mattioni clarified that the letter submitted by the lessee's attorney does not say that the attorney does not oppose the designation, but rather that he would not appear at this meeting.

Elizabeth Stegner of the University City Historical Society commented that the Commission has already designated the properties at 4050, 4052 and 4054 Chestnut Street. She opined that this property is no different from those, and meets the same criteria.

ACTION: Ms. Royer moved to find that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 4056 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C, D, G, and J, to designate it as historic, and to list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

NATIONAL REGISTER COMMENT

3101-27 W. GLENWOOD AVE, HARRY C. KAHN & SON WAREHOUSE

Owner: IS Pyramid LP

Nominator: Heritage Consulting Group

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the National Register nomination of the Harry C. Kahn & Son Warehouse. 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.

According to the nomination, the Harry C. Kahn & Son Warehouse, located in Philadelphia's Brewerytown neighborhood, was constructed c.1922 in the commercial style by prominent Philadelphia architect, Leroy B. Rothschild. The nomination contends that the building is significant under Criterion A for its association with prominent twentieth-century furniture retailer, Harry C. Kahn and Son, which operated in Philadelphia between 1900 and 1961. The warehouse was an integral component of Kahn's furniture business, as it increased stock capacity for Kahn's Center City retail store, until Kahn's closed in 1961. The building was an integral link in Kahn's supply chain and enabled the company to deliver furniture to customers directly from the manufacturers, whose products were transferred by railcar at this location.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the National Register nomination to the Historical Commission.

Ms. Merriman commented that she is positively supportive of this nomination, as it is likely intended to allow the developer to seek the federal tax credit for the qualified rehabilitation of the building. Mr. Thomas commented that there is a recapture period of only five years for projects that take advantage of the federal rehabilitation tax credit, after which time there are no restrictions on what work is done to the building, which can sometimes result in unsympathetic changes to a building that underwent a qualified rehabilitation.

The Commissioners discussed the National Register nomination for 3101-27 W. Glenwood Avenue, the Harry C. Kahn & Son Warehouse, and concluded that they are supportive of it.

Mr. Thomas opened the floor to public comment, but none was offered.

13475 PROCTOR RD, MILL-RAE, RACHEL FOSTER AVERY HOUSE

Owner: Cranalieth Spiritual Center

Nominator: Molly Lester

OVERVIEW: The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) has requested comments from the Philadelphia Historical Commission on the National Register nomination of the Rachel Foster Avery House, known as Mill-Rae. 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.

According to the nomination, Mill-Rae, located in Far Northeast Philadelphia's Somerton neighborhood, was constructed in 1890 as a private residence for suffragist Rachel Foster Avery and her family. It is significant under Criterion A for its association with the women's suffrage movement in the United States. Local architect Minerva Parker Nichols designed the house with several bedrooms, large parlors, and sitting rooms to allow Avery to host meetings for various women's associations; in the late nineteenth century, such accommodations and gathering spaces for women's organizations were rare. Mill-Rae represents an unusual case of a building that was expressly designed to accommodate both a private function as Rachel Foster Avery's family home, as well as a public function as a locus for women's associations and activists. Rachel Foster Avery owned the house until 1905. The resource is significant in the Area of Social History for its use as a meeting site for several prominent suffrage activists as they advocated for women's suffrage, planned for their exhibits and conventions at the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition, and established a pension fund to support Susan B. Anthony (a personal friend and mentor to Avery) in her ongoing activism. Anthony was also a frequent guest at Mill-Rae. The resource is also significant under Criterion B for its association with Rachel Foster Avery, one of the nation's leading campaigners for women's suffrage in the late nineteenth century, and under Criterion C as a significant work of Minerva Parker Nichols, the first woman in the country to practice architecture independently. Mill-Rae was one of the earliest commissions of Nichols' independent practice, and it represents the characteristic design features and clientele of her formal career. The period of significance (1890 to 1905) spans the house's original construction, overseen by Minerva Parker Nichols, and the duration of ownership by Rachel Foster Avery and her family.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the National Register nomination to the Historical Commission.

Mr. Thomas commented that the building is certainly worthy of listing on the National Register. Mr. Mattioni agreed, stating that the building has an impressive history. The Commissioners discussed the National Register nomination for 13475 Proctor Road, Mill-Rae, the Rachel Foster Avery House, and concluded that they are supportive of it.

Mr. Thomas opened the floor to public comment, but none was offered.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 12:09 p.m., Mr. Mattioni moved to adjourn. Ms. Turner 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 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.