

**THE MINUTES OF THE 575TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

9 JULY 2010

**ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
Leslie Benoliel
Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D.
Dominique Hawkins, AIA, LEED AP
Susan O. W. Jaffe
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President
John Mattioni, Esq.
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Daniel Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections
David Schaaf, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Joan Schlotterbeck, Department of Public Property
Robert Thomas, AIA

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Preservation Planner III
Erin Cote, Preservation Planner II
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II

Leonard Reuter, Assistant City Solicitor

ALSO PRESENT

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
David Sharrow, Ray Angelini, Inc
Bob Poston, IBEW 98
Jennie Li
Cathy Harris, Mural Arts Program
Amy Johnston, Mural Art Program
Eric Dean
Robert Esposito
Jane Golden, Mural Arts Program
Frank Conlin
Richard Rosene
Jerry Roller, JKR Partners
Jonathan Broh, JKR Partners
Alon Barzilay
Seth Turner, Mural Arts Program
Carmalita Martell
Erin Rudolph-Williams, Mural Arts Program
Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association

Matt Tomeo, Mercury Solar Systems
Cornelia Soifer
Joe Schiavo
Marissa Parker, Esq.
Steve Fischer, Baby Blues BBQ
Michael Loonstyn
Jessica Litt
Don Doyle
Bevan Lawson, PE

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. Commissioners Benoliel, Dilworth, Hawkins, Jaffe, Leonard, Mattioni, Merriman, Quinn, Schaaf, Schlotterbeck, and Thomas joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 574TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the minutes of the 574th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 11 June 2010. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 JUNE 2010

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONTINUANCE REQUESTS

415 S. Croskey Street, to September 2010
725 Walnut Street, to August 2010
668 N. 19th Street, to August 2010

Mr. Farnham presented the continuance requests to the Commission.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to continue the application for 415 S. Croskey Street to the Commission meeting in September 2010; the application for 725 Walnut Street to August 2010; and the application for 668 N. 19th Street to August 2010. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

CONSENT AGENDA

1830 Rittenhouse Square
512 Spruce Street
2204 Mount Vernon Street
232 Christian Street
2001 Mount Vernon Street
203 S. Sartain Street
1606 Chestnut Street
105 Manton Street

Mr. Farnham presented the Consent Agenda to the Commission. Mr. Sherman asked if any Commissioners or members of the public wished to comment on the Consent Agenda. Ms. Merriman requested the removal of 1830 Rittenhouse Square, 512 Spruce Street, and 2204 Mount Vernon Street from the Consent Agenda to the Agenda.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for 232 Christian Street, 2001 Mount Vernon Street, 203 S. Sartain Street, 1606 Chestnut Street, and 105 Manton Street. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1830 RITTENHOUSE SQUARE

Owner: Richard W. Rosene

Applicant: Richard W. Rosene

History: 1912

Designation: individually designated, 5/4/1972

Project: Construct penthouse addition

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Gutterman moved that the Architectural Committee recommend approval of the application, with the staff to review details, provided the addition is redesigned so that:

1. all new window openings have square heads;
2. the addition has piers at the corners, and perhaps intermediate piers;
3. the addition has a simple metal cornice;
4. any new masonry is limited to the base of the addition with metal above; and,
5. and the terrace railings are simple, light, open, and metal.

Mr. Evans seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a penthouse addition with deck. The addition would face south and would not be visible from Rittenhouse Square. The addition would be minimally visible from the blocks directly adjacent to the property owing to the height of the building. The deck would not be visible, except from a very great distance. The applicant proposes to clad the addition with a cast material to match the color of the terracotta found in the upper stories of this building. The application also proposes to enlarge the flanking windows facing south. One would be converted into French doors to access the deck.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Developer Richard Rosene and engineer Joseph Graci represented the application.

Ms. Merriman stated that she believes that the revised design satisfies the Committee's recommendation.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to approve the revised design as presented to the Commission on 9 July 2010, with the staff to review details. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1326-28 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: 1326 Chestnut Street Associates; Barzilay Development

Applicant: Jonathan Broh, JKR Partners

History: Keystone National Bank, 1887, extended to Sansom Street, 1891, Willis Hale, architect
storefront altered c. 1900, c. 1920, c. 1940, c. 1960

Designation: Individually designated, 12/6/1973

Project: Rehabilitate front façade, construct entranceway

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Evans moved that the Architectural Committee recommend approval, provided the glass railing above the storefront is removed, with the staff to review details including the replacement stone, pursuant to the Commission's February 2010 approval in concept, Standard 9, and the Storefronts Guideline. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: In December 2009, the Historical Commission approved an application to rehabilitate the Keystone National Bank building at 1326-28 Chestnut Street as a hotel with restaurant at the first floor. During that review, the Commission elected not to approve the proposed restoration of the Chestnut Street façade and installation of a glass canopy at the Chestnut Street storefront, but instead asked the applicants to submit a revised design for that section of the project. In February 2010, the Commission reviewed a revised design. That in-concept application proposed to restore the masonry and add a glass entrance canopy at the front façade that would refer to the c. 1900 storefront by including an image of the historic storefront in laser-cut stainless steel, etched glass, or an applied graphic. The Commission did not approve the storefront with the historic image, but it did grant an in-concept approval to a glass and masonry storefront.

The current application proposes to clad the base of the turret or stair tower at the western edge of the front façade with rusticated masonry that is compatible with the historic masonry. It also proposes to erect a masonry-clad frame for the storefront that would have the same massing as the lost c. 1900 storefront. The storefront would be fenestrated with a frameless glass and stainless steel curtain wall system. A glass railing and glass logo sign would mount to the top of the storefront. The storefront would have a metal base.

The Storefronts Guideline in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines is on point. It states:

Storefronts Guideline: Recommended: Designing and constructing a new storefront when the historic storefront is completely missing. It may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the size, scale, material, and color of the historic building.

The building was designed by famed architect Willis Hale and constructed in 1887 for the Keystone National Bank. In the early 1890s, Hale added to and extended the building to south to Sansom Street in the same style. The storefront on Chestnut Street, which served as a barometer of prevailing taste for a century, has been replaced numerous times. The building originally had a rusticated stone, arched entranceway with gable at Chestnut Street that was appropriate for the bank, but not for the building's later retail uses. The original entranceway was removed and replaced with a one-story, balustraded, Beaux-Arts storefront about 1900 by Hale when he built the Garrick Theater to the west. The Garrick was stylistically related to the Hale Building and created an ensemble with the central stair tower or turret linking the two buildings. The c. 1900 storefront was removed and replaced about 1920 with a two-story,

Renaissance storefront with a tile roof. The c. 1920 storefront was removed and replaced with a streamlined, Art Moderne storefront matching the neighboring Woolworth Building when the Garrick was demolished about 1940. The c. 1940 storefront was removed and replaced with a Modern storefront about 1960. Although altered, the c. 1960 storefront remains in place today.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Developer Alon Barzilay and architect Jonathan Broh represented the application.

Mr. Schaaf noted that, when the historic storefront is missing, the Standards allow for a reconstruction of a historic storefront or the construction of a new, compatible storefront. He asked Mr. Farnham if a storefront that was in part a reconstruction and in part a new, compatible storefront would satisfy the Standards. Mr. Farnham stated that he believes that any compatible storefront that resides on that spectrum that runs from a pure reconstruction to a completely new design would meet the Standards.

Ms. Merriman stated that the Commission had given detailed guidance to the applicants and they have followed the guidance precisely. She advocated for the approval of the proposal. Mr. Schaaf agreed.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance introduced himself. He asked if the Commission had received his letter opposing the application. Mr. Farnham replied that he had emailed the letter and attached report from the Alliance's consultant to the Commission members as soon as it was received on 8 July 2010 and had also provided hard copies of the letter and report to the Commission members at the start of the meeting. Mr. Gallery asked the Commission to deny the application. He contended that the Commission should require the applicants to reconstruct one of the historic entrances that this building had because photographic evidence of all of them survives. Mr. Gallery explained that he had hired Bonnie Mark, who reviewed tax credit applications for the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission until she was laid off earlier this year, to assess the proposed storefront design. He reported that she reviewed the design and concluded that it does not satisfy the Standards. He claimed that the proposed design is neither a reconstruction nor a new design, but is a hybrid design. He asserted that it must either be a pure reconstruction or entirely new. He observed that the revised design now shows the doors positioned asymmetrically on the front façade; he observed that none of the historic designs had asymmetrical doors. He insisted that the doors of this new storefront should be located as they were historically. He objected to the fact that the storefront glass would be located in front of masonry, making the glass difficult to clean. He added that moving the doors to the east, as was shown in the revised plan, makes the storefront "much less desirable." Finally, he claimed that the design does not propose a storefront; "it is just a big piece of glass." He asserted that the c. 1900 storefront would be perfect for a hotel. He asked the Commission to save this building by denying the application.

Mr. Broh distributed copies of his original design for the storefront, which proposed attaching an all-glass, contemporary box to the front of the building. He observed that he is not currently proposing this design. He reported that Bonnie Mark, Mr. Gallery's consultant, had determined that this all-glass design satisfied the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and had approved it while she was still a reviewer at the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission. He stated that that earlier approval and her current report for Mr. Gallery entirely contradict one another. He noted that she now objects to an aspect of the design for the Juniper Street façade even though she approved it earlier. Mr. Broh also noted that the c. 1900 storefront was not entirely

successful design, but had the appearance of being pasted on as an afterthought. He contended that it was not the perfect model for a new storefront, as Mr. Gallery had claimed. He also noted that he had made the suggested revision to allow the storefront glass to be cleaned where it intersects with the masonry.

Ms. Hawkins, the chair of the Architectural Committee, agreed with Mr. Broh that the design had been revised according to the Architectural Committee's suggestions and recommendations. She noted that, for example, the Committee had suggested shifting the doors to the east, creating the asymmetrical condition to which Mr. Gallery had objected. She stated that the front doors are now symmetrical with the windows above, which is the desired symmetry on the overall asymmetrical façade. She agreed that the proposed storefront was not the historic storefront, but she claimed that the proposed storefront would not have a negative effect on the historic building. She concluded that it was a contemporary storefront on a historic building, but it was compatible and therefore meets the Standards.

Mr. Sherman asked if the applicants intended for the new masonry at the storefront to match existing masonry when clean. Mr. Broh answered that they would match the cleaned historic masonry. Mr. Barzilay stated that his team would work with the Historical Commission and other regulatory agencies on the masonry color.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to approve the revised design as presented to the Commission on 9 July 2010, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 11 to 1. Ms. Jaffe dissented.

3402 & 3404 SANSOM STREET

Owner: 3404 Sansom Street Associates

Applicant: Betty Mon

History: c. 1870

Designation: individually designated, 12/6/1979

Project: Alter façades including adding signage, awnings, and shutters

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Cluver moved that the Architectural Committee recommend denial of Sansom Street façade alterations including the signage, awnings, shutters, and light fixtures, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9; approval of the front fence and rear signage, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Gutterman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This application has been revised since the Architectural Committee meeting. The new proposal incorporates some of the Committee's recommendations, but not all. The applicant proposes to rehabilitate two former residential row houses into a single restaurant at ground-floor. The revised application proposes to install copper awnings over the main entrance only. The copper awnings over the windows as originally proposed have been removed. Also, the proposed shutters on all the windows have since been removed. Instead, the applicant proposes to install fabric awnings with decorative iron spears for support. There are no installation details for the fabric awnings, but it appears from the drawing that the awnings would be attached to the stone façade. The applicant also revised the proposed light fixtures. The revised fixtures are now more in keeping with the style and character of the building. The fence did not change from the previous proposal. However, the proposed fence had always been a compatible element. The greatest alteration to the façade on Sansom Street would be the

addition of an illuminated sign. The design of the sign did not change from the original proposal. The applicant now only proposes the 7 foot tall sign instead of the 10 foot tall sign. The applicant noted in his cover letter the sign for La Terrace Restaurant, which is a few doors to the west of this location and part of the same row of buildings. The staff conducted a research on La Terrace sign and concluded that it was an illegal sign. The restaurant received a zoning approval for the sign but it never received a building permit or Historical Commission approval. The staff will request violations be issued for this sign and it should not be used as a model.

The applicant also proposes alterations to the rear, which faces a service alley, yet it is widely used by patrons. The applicant proposes a blade sign and wall sign on areas of the building that are non-historic additions or greatly altered portions of the building. In order to expedite the project, the staff granted an approval for interior work and rear façade alterations on 7 June 2010. The approval by the staff included new windows in the non-historic addition at the rear of the building. The rear signs were not reviewed or approved at the staff level.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Business owner Steve Fisher and designer Eddie Bitton represented the application.

Mr. Bitton explained his revisions to the design made since the Architectural Committee meeting. He noted that the revised sign would project less than four feet from the face of the building and would be eight feet tall, which, in his opinion, was more in keeping with the building. Ms. Merriman inquired whether the other signs on the block, such as those at the White Dog and Black Cat, were legal signs. Mr. Danta stated that those signs are legal, but the projecting sign at La Terrace is not. Ms. Hawkins thanked the applicant for the revisions, which incorporated the Committee's recommendations. Ms. Hawkins noted that the awnings should be attached to the wood of window frames, not the stone cladding on the façade. She reiterated her concerns regarding the proposed projecting sign. She felt that an internally illuminated sign on this location was inappropriate given the scale of the street, which sees mostly pedestrian traffic. Mr. Thomas concurred with Ms. Hawkin's comments regarding the sign. He also noted that such a sign would set a negative precedent for the neighboring businesses. It would disrupt the scale and change the nature of the row. Mr. Thomas also opined that the proposed lantern may not be the most appropriate. Mr. Danta noted that the applicants originally proposed a medieval style fixture. Currently, the building has Arts & Crafts style lanterns.

Ms. Merriman concurred with Ms. Hawkin's comments regarding the proposed illuminated sign. She stated that she would encourage the applicant to choose a sign that is more in keeping with the neighboring, legal signs on the row. She observed that the sign proposed for the rear façade was more appropriately scaled. Mr. Bitton was receptive to Ms. Merriman's comments. He explained his design for the sign. He noted that he had designed the signage for the Hard Rock Café on Market Street in Philadelphia. He stated that they wanted to inject that same energy for Baby Blues BBQ. He remarked that differentiation from the neighboring businesses was a key concept for the project. He pointed out that the Chicago Theater sign had been an inspiration for this sign. He stated that energy and excitement are the two elements behind his design.

Mr. Danta requested clarification on the elevation drawings for Sansom Street, where vertical lines are shown in between the ground-floor windows. Mr. Bitton clarified that the lines represent banners that would be installed if the proposed illuminated sign is denied. He also clarified that the banners would be eliminated if the Commission approves the illuminated sign. Mr. Schaaf

stated that the scales of neighborhoods where the signs at the Chicago Theater and Hard Rock Café Philadelphia are located are very different from the scale of this block of Sansom Street. Mr. Thomas concurred and stated that the sign must be scaled and designed appropriately to its setting. He contended that the proposed sign is not appropriate to the setting. Mr. Bitton stated that the proposed sign was less of a sign and more of a "concept communication tool." He acknowledged the criticisms of the proposed sign and asked the Commission to define a sign that it could approve. Ms. Hawkins stated that the existing legal signs on Sansom are appropriate. She stated that the Commission would approve a similar sign.

Mr. Schaff requested a clarification on the copper awnings over the main door. He asked if the awnings would have internal illumination. Mr. Bitton answered that they would not.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised design presented to the Commission on 9 July 2010, provided the sign for the Sansom Street façade is not internally illuminated, is reduced in size so that it is no larger than the projecting sign approved for the rear façade, and is located above the first-floor window heads and below the second-floor window sills, with the staff to review details. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

512 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: Natalya Lerner

Applicant: Joe Serratore

History: c. 1820

Designation: individually designated, 4/30/1957

Project: Construct rear fourth-floor addition.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Pentz moved that the Architectural Committee recommend approval, provided a transition element is added between the old brick and new stucco and the new windows are trimmed in a traditional manner, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Evans seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear fourth-floor addition. The roof of this house has been modified. The addition would enclose an existing open deck area on the rear slope of the roof. The addition would be clad in stucco. The addition would be minimally visible from the public right away.

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

Ms. Merriman asked if the revised window trim complied with the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Ms. Hawkins replied that the revised window trim is compliant with the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised design as presented to the Commission on 9 July 2010. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2204 MOUNT VERNON STREET

Owner: Andrew Kleeman

Applicant: Matt Tomeo

History: c. 1875

Designation: individually designated, 12/5/1974

Project: Install solar panels.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Gutterman moved that the Architectural Committee recommend approval, provided the panels are not located within 12 inches of the eaves, ridges, and hips; the panels are all aligned on the roof; with the staff to review details including wiring and connections. Mr. Cluver seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install solar panels on the former carriage house of the Bergdol Mansion. The panels would be installed on the eastern slope of the imitation standing-seam hip roof. The Commission approved the faux standing-seam metal roof several years ago. The applicant proposes to install the panels directly onto the surface of the roof between the standing seams without disrupting their pattern.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Matt Tomeo represented the application.

Mr. Danta stated that he considers the revised application to be in compliance with the Architectural Committee's recommendation. Ms. Hawkins agreed.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised design as presented to the Commission on 9 July 2010. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

413-15 GASKILL STREET

Owner/Applicant: Jessica Litt

History: 1903, Jewish bath house

Designation: individually designated, 1/22/1963

significant in Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Legalize replacement of windows

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Gutterman moved that the Architectural Committee recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This application seeks to legalize vinyl windows. The owner inherited several properties on this block including this building. She claims that she was unaware of their designations as historic. She replaced the character-defining windows on the front of this building with vinyl windows. She claims that the old windows were in poor condition. She states that replacement wood windows will cost \$3,000 including labor.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. The owner Jessica Litt represented the application.

Ms. Merriman stated that the Commission would set a negative precedent if it legalized inappropriate windows at the first-floor, front façade of a designated building. She noted that the

Commission has a longstanding record of denying such applications. Ms. Merriman contended that, if replacing the windows would impose a hardship, then the applicant should submit a hardship application.

Ms. Litt explained that she does not presently have the funds to replace the windows. She reported that she is attempting to sell two other properties on the street; once they are sold, she will have the money to replace the vinyl windows. She expressed concern about her finances because only one of her properties is producing rental income. She also expressed concern about a potential real estate tax increase in 2011. She stated that the neighborhood is dangerous. She claimed that she did not want the properties, but inherited them. She proposed to paint the illegal windows to give them a more historic appearance. Mr. Sherman stated that she could sell the building with the violation with the understanding that the new owner would correct it. Mr. Baron suggested that Ms. Litt could propose a schedule for the replacement of the windows that would provide enough time to sell the other properties. Mr. Reuter explained that an appeal of the Commission's denial of the legalization would stay any enforcement of the violation during the appeal period.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1701-7 SPRING GARDEN STREET

Owner: Electrical Mechanics Association

Applicant: Robert Sharrow, contractor

History: 1939, major alterations and addition including pitched slate roof in 1961

Designation: contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Legalize/Approve Solar Panel Installation on roof

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Evans moved that the Architectural Committee recommend denial. Mr. Cluver seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install solar panels on most slopes of the complex roof of this Colonial Revival union hall at 17th and Spring Garden Streets in the Spring Garden Historic District. The installation of the solar panels has already begun. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued an electrical permit for the installation and the contractor started the project. The Department does not refer electrical permits to the Commission. During an inspection, a building inspector determined that the project requires a building permit as well as the electrical permit. Upon application for that permit, the applicant was referred to the Commission.

The roof on this building is a cross gable with multicolored slate and is visible from both Spring Garden and 17th Street. Fasteners have been attached to the roof; pieces of slate were notched to allow for the attachment. No solar panels have been installed yet. The solar panels are grey.

The Roofs Guideline of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines allows for rooftop additions including solar panels, provided "they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features." The National Park Service's Interpreting the Standards Bulletin 52, *Incorporating Solar Panels in a Rehabilitation Project*, likewise notes that "the installation of solar panels

should conform to guidance regarding rooftop additions, i.e. that they be minimally visible, to avoid altering the historic character of the building.” This application proposes the installation of solar panels on several slopes of this complex roof, which dates to 1961. To satisfy the Standards, solar panels should be “inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.”

The inventory for the Spring Garden Historic District dates this building to c. 1922 and classifies it as contributing. That construction date is incorrect. In 1939, the southern arm of the current building was constructed. It was a Colonial Revival style building with a flat roof and parapet. In 1961, the northern arm of the building was constructed in the same Colonial Revival style. At that time, the parapet was removed and the slate roof with centered gables was added. The architectural drawings for this major renovation show that the new pitched roof was added over the flat roof, which was retained in place. The period of significance for the Spring Garden Historic District is 1850 to 1930. Therefore, this building, which was constructed in 1939 and significantly altered and added to in 1961, after the period of significance, was mistakenly classified as contributing owing to an error in professional judgment.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Union representative Robert Poston and contractor Robert Sharrow represented the application.

Mr. Farnham pointed out that the staff distributed seven articles for the Commission’s general edification related to the review of solar panels proposed for historical buildings. Mr. Farnham then distributed two photographs of the building in question taken between 1939, when it was built with a flat roof, and 1961, when the large addition and pitched slate roof were added. Mr. Farnham also explained that he met with Commissioner Fran Burns of the Department of Licenses & Inspections and her deputy to discuss the permitting of solar arrays. For the short term, a building permit will be required for all solar installations. In the longer term, the Department and the Mayor’s Office of Sustainability will develop a fast form that will allow for the expedited review of some solar panel applications. Some solar arrays will not require building permits, but all solar projects for historically designated buildings will require the Commission’s review.

Ms. Merriman stated that it appears that the building is wrongly classified in the district as contributing. It was constructed nine years after the end of the period of significance and was then modified significantly in 1961. The roof in question dates to 1961 and is clearly non-historic. She asked how the review should be conducted in light of this new information. Mr. Farnham suggested that the building should be reviewed as a contributing building until the Commission has officially reclassified it in the district inventory, but he noted that the pitched slate roof could be treated as a non-historic alteration to a historic building.

Ms. Merriman observed that the applicants did receive an electrical permit. She stated that the Department of Licenses & Inspections had the opportunity to require a building permit, but did not. She opined that the panels will not be appropriate for the building, but the owner followed the correct steps and cannot be held responsible after the fact. Mr. Farnham cautioned that a building permit may have been required for this project. He suggested that the applicants should clarify whether they were ever informed of that requirement. Ms. Merriman asked Mr. Quinn to explain the Department’s review process for such an application. He said that the different types of permits are obtained separately and the issuance of an electrical permit does not preclude the necessity of obtaining a building permit. Mr. Sherman stated that it appears that the panels were treated as an appliance like an electric water heater when they were permitted. Mr.

Mattioni stated that the electrical permit issued for the project clearly states that additional permits including a building permit may be required. He asserted that the owner held the responsibility of determining whether a building permit was needed.

Mr. Poston showed a sample of the panel. Mr. Sharrow provided additional details. He stated that they will be inconspicuous.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the roof will be difficult to maintain with the panels over the slate. She also stated that the angled panels will not align with the valleys and ridges on the roof, creating an awkward appearance.

Mr. Thomas stated that the Commission must ensure that the Department requires a building permit and, therefore, a Historical Commission review, whenever mechanical or electrical equipment is added to the exterior of a historic building, changing its appearance. He also opined that the Commission should find ways to support projects that make historic buildings more energy efficient. Mr. Sherman agreed. He contended that the Commission must not relegate historic buildings to obsolescence. He noted that the owner has a responsibility to maintain the roof with or without the solar panels.

Ms. Merriman remarked that this is a unique situation, which will not set a precedent. She advocated for approval.

Mr. Farnham stated that the work could be considered to be in accordance with the Standards because the roof is a non-historic addition to the building.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to find that the pitched slate roof is a non-historic addition constructed in 1961 and to approve the application as an alteration to a non-historic addition, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

410 S. PERTH STREET

Owner: Eric E. Dean

Applicant: Nick Meli Jr.

History: c. 1970

Designation: contributing to the Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Remove siding and install granite tile

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Gutterman moved that the Architectural Committee recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Ms. Pentz seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove the corrugated metal siding on the first floor and replace it with black granite tiles. All four houses in this row retain the corrugated metal siding at both the first and second floors. The corrugated metal siding is original and a character defining feature for this row.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Commission. Property owners Eric Dean and Robert Esposito represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the Architectural Committee found that the corrugated siding is a character defining feature, and that its removal would not be appropriate. She stated that the Committee suggested painting the siding as a way of improving the look of the property.

Mr. Dean asked why his property was considered historic when it was built in 1970. Mr. Baron explained that the property was classified as contributing to the Society Hill District. Ms. Merriman explained that the property fits into the period of significance for the district and that the redevelopment era of the 1950s, 60s, and 70s is considered an important time for the district.

Mr. Dean stated that the Commission has allowed some buildings on Addison Street at the intersection of Perth Street, buildings that are the rears of Pine Street properties, to be altered in a way that is inconsistent with the rest of the street. Mr. Baron stated that there is some flexibility when it comes to rear of buildings and that the current application deals with the front façade. Mr. Esposito stated that every building in this row of once-identical buildings now has a different doors and light fixtures.

Mr. Dean stated that the siding, which the Commission believes to be metal, is, in fact, not metal. He is concerned that he will not be able to find the same material to replace the panel in kind. He stated that he simply wants to improve his property.

Mr. Dilworth stated that the Commission has applied different, less strict review standards for proposals for redevelopment era properties. He stated that he was confused about the Commission's review of redevelopment era properties. Several Commissioners disagreed with Mr. Dilworth, contending that the Commission uses the same Standards for all contributing properties, regardless of their date of construction. Mr. Dean stated that he had observed unsympathetic changes to similar properties throughout the district and wondered why he could not make this improvement to his property.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the siding is a design feature that takes up at least twenty-five percent of the front façade and is a defining element of the building; the granite tile would not be appropriate. She added that materials are available to simulate the look of the original panel. Mr. Thomas concurred, stating that he understood the applicant's desire to improve the property, but the proposed treatment would detract from the historic building. He contended that the granite tile would significantly change the appearance of the front façade.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

569 N. 20TH STREET

Owner: Gary Bromley

Applicant: Andy Barreras

History: c. 1886

Designation: contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Construct rear addition

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Gutterman moved that the Architectural Committee recommend denial, owing to incompleteness and pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Evans seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a third-floor rear addition on top of a two-story rear portion of the building. The addition would be clad in stucco. The proposed roofline would be higher than the existing building roofline. The drawings provided do not include a rear elevation or plans.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Commission. No one represented the application.

The Commission members agreed that the proposal did not meet the Standards and the application was incomplete.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, owing to incompleteness and pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1718-20 NORTH STREET

Owner: Don Doyle

Applicant: Michael Loonstyn

History: c. 1926

Designation: contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Demolish garage, construct three-story building

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Gutterman moved that the Architectural Committee recommend denial, pursuant to Section 14-2007(7)(j) of the historic preservation ordinance. Mr. Cluver seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a garage that is classified as Contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District, and construct a three-story building in its place. The applicant has neither claimed nor provided the documentation to support a claim that the building cannot be adaptively reused or that its demolition is necessary in the public interest. Rear sections of the building have collapsed and the Department of Licenses & Inspections has cited the building for Unsafe conditions, but the applicant has not claimed that the Department is requiring the demolition of the building to abate the Unsafe conditions. The applicant submitted a very similar application in December 2009. The Architectural Committee recommended denial of that application because it provided no justification for the demolition of the Contributing building. The applicant withdrew that application before it was presented to the Commission.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Commission. Developer Michael Loonstyn, engineer Bevan Lawson, and property owner Donald Doyle represented the application.

Mr. Loonstyn distributed revised plans to the Commission.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the Architectural Committee did not review the plans for the new construction and that the Committee recommended denial owing to the demolition without a showing of hardship or public necessity.

Mr. Schaaf asked if this application is premature and if it should be referred to the Committee on Historic Designation for rescission or reclassification. Mr. Farnham agreed that application for new construction is premature. This application proposes to demolish a contributing building and the preservation ordinance is clear in that the Commission cannot approve a demolition unless the applicant demonstrates hardship or necessity in the public interest. Also, the Commission and the Department of Licenses & Inspections entered into a memorandum of agreement many years ago that allows for the Department to issue a demolition permit in cases when a building is "Imminently Dangerous" and threatening the public's safety. There has been no demonstration of an Imminently Dangerous condition and the Department has not issued an Imminently Dangerous violation. The Commission cannot review the new construction until the question of the demolition of the contributing building is answered. Mr. Schaaf suggested that the property owner could propose reclassifying the building to noncontributing, which would allow for the Commission to approve the demolition. However, there has been no such request.

Mr. Doyle stated that the property was not historical when he bought 12 years ago. He claimed that he was never notified that it was designated. He stated that he has not maintained the property and it has deteriorated. He stated that that the 85 percent of the roof has collapsed and the front wall is falling down, endangering pedestrians. He opined that there is not much of the building left. The windows have been infilled with cinder block.

Mr. Sherman stated that it appears that the property owner is making a case to de-designate the building. He asked the staff to explain the process. Mr. Farnham replied that, once the rescission request was submitted, the owner would be notified of the impending reviews and then the Committee on Historic Designation and Historical Commission would review the request at public meetings. Mr. Sherman asked how long the process would take. Mr. Farnham responded that it would take about 90 days, depending on when the rescission request was received. Mr. Farnham stated that all of the options and processes were explained to the applicant in December 2009. He asserted that the owner's claims of delay should not be accepted, given that the owner knew or should have known about his options seven months ago.

Ms. Merriman examined the designation photograph from 2000 and current photographs of the building and stated that it appears that the property owner has allowed the building to decay. Mr. Doyle stated that he has not maintained the building. Ms. Merriman stated that the building has been neglected, with the collapsed roof and falling bricks. Mr. Doyle stated that there was nothing wrong with the façade when he purchased the property. He stated that it is a financial hardship right now because he is in debt and owes \$21,000 to his supply company and large amounts of money to his aunt's and wife's 401(k) accounts. Also, the bank recently foreclosed on his son's house in Virginia. He stated that he is trying to sell the property so that Mr.

Loonstyn can construct his building and improve the neighborhood. Mr. Doyle stated that he did not understand how the Commission could oppose this application to demolish the building.

Mr. Sherman asked if the sale of the property is contingent upon gaining approval to demolish this building. Mr. Loonstyn responded that it is. Mr. Sherman stated that the property owner could have pursued one of the appropriate avenues months ago. Mr. Doyle stated that he never knew that. Mr. Farnham stated that he provided the necessary information to pursue a demolition to Mr. Loonstyn seven months ago, in December 2009.

Bevan Lawson, a structural engineer, stated that he examined the building, which he considers a threat to the general public. He stated that he believed that, rather than having the building de-designated, the Department of Licenses & Inspection could deem the building "Imminently Dangerous." Mr. Sherman asked if a Department inspector had visited the building. Mr. Doyle stated that an inspector visited the building and the Department wants the building demolished. Mr. Sherman asked if the Department issued a demolition order. Mr. Doyle stated that they had. Mr. Farnham stated that the building had only been cited as "Unsafe," not "Imminently Dangerous." The way to correct an Unsafe violation is to abate the Unsafe condition. The memorandum of agreement between the Department and the Commission states that the Department may issue a demolition permit without the Commission's review when the Commission and Department agree that a building is Imminently Dangerous and cannot be feasibly repaired. Such a determination has not been made in this case.

Mr. Farnham stated that he revealed all this information to Mr. Loonstyn at the December 2009 Architectural Committee meeting. This issue could have been resolved during the intervening seven months if the owner had acted responsibly. Mr. Loonstyn stated that he withdrew from the agreement of sale during the intervening months because the neighborhood association did not approve his plans. He added that he recently re-entered into an agreement of sale based on the new designs approved by the neighborhood association. Mr. Farnham stated that the responsibility is the property owner's. Mr. Doyle, not Mr. Loonstyn, failed to act responsibly.

Mr. Sherman stated that he understands that there may be time constraints owing to financing, but there is a procedure for reclassification. The Commission cannot approve the demolition today, but the Commission can give the property owner some guidance about the timeline and information about these procedures. Mr. Doyle stated that, if he is returns to the Department for a demolition permit, they are going to refer him to the Commission and the Commission is just going to deny the permit again. Mr. Sherman stated that Mr. Doyle must comply with the procedures. If he continues to ignore the Commission's advice, he will only waste his time and the Commission's. He suggested that the applicant submit a request for reclassification or de-designation. Mr. Farnham stated that that is one option the owner could pursue. The financial hardship option would be another option. That would involve the submission of a financial hardship application, a review by the Committee on Financial Hardship, and then review by the Commission. He could pursue both options simultaneously. The financial hardship option would be roughly a month faster. Another option is to make the claim that the demolition is necessary in the public interest. And lastly, if the building is truly dangerous as his engineer claims, then he should ask the Department to make that determination. He stated that there are four avenues here and any one of these avenues could have been pursued months ago.

Mr. Reuter stated that the applicant will not be automatically issued a demolition permit even if a building is deemed Imminently Dangerous. He stated that, even after the Imminently Dangerous

determination is made, the Department and the Commission still have to determine whether the building can be feasibly repaired. Mr. Farnham concurred and stated that the severity of the dangerous condition has to be such that the Department requires the demolition immediately.

Mr. Sherman asked Mr. Farnham to provide prospective timelines for the four options so that the property owner knows what to expect. Mr. Farnham stated that the timeline depends on which avenue taken and how long it takes the applicant to prepare the submissions. He stated that is unrealistic that the applicant could submit the requisite material for any avenue to appear before the Commission next month. He stated that all options would require at least 60 to 90 days for preparation, submission, and review. He stated that one of the staff members could meet with the applicant and property owner to discuss the process and the required materials for the submissions of each option.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Section 14-2007(7)(j) of the historic preservation ordinance. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

232 CHRISTIAN STREET

Owner: Cornelia and Jesse Soifer

Applicant: Cornelia Soifer

History: c. 1764

Designation: individually designated, 6/28/1966

Project: Install front door

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Gutterman moved that the Architectural Committee recommend approval of a solid wood Dutch door without glass, with the staff to review details. Mr. Cluver seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes two options for front door replacement. The applicant prefers to install a six-panel Dutch door with the top two panels glazed. The second option would be a storm door with two louvered panels. The appropriate door for this house would be a solid six-panel door.

ACTION: See the Consent Agenda.

2001 MOUNT VERNON STREET

Applicant: Rob Vahey & Corey Weiser-Vahey

Owner: Corey Weiser

History: c. 1859

Designation: individually designated, 11/6/1975

contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Demolish bay, construct addition, alter openings, restucco garden wall

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Cluver moved that the Architectural Committee recommend approval of the demolition of the side bay and construction of a one-story addition, provided the window proportions are adjusted and the cornice does not extend beyond the plane of the main facade; approval of rear door and window alterations; denial of side window infill, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Gutterman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations to the first-story exterior. It proposes to demolish a side bay and construct a one-story addition in its place. The existing bay appears to have been built in the 1920s and lacks the fine detail of the historic second-story bay of this building. The proposed addition would be flush with the main block, clad in painted wood recessed panels, and include six-light casements and a wood cornice. Infill of a side window on the rear ell is also proposed. In the rear, the applicant proposes a partial infill of a masonry opening and installation of French doors and a window.

In April 2010, a violation was issued for installation of a multi-colored mural on the stucco side wall along 20th Street without Historical Commission approval or a permit by the Department of Licenses and Inspections. This application proposes to correct the violation by rebuilding and recoating the wall.

ACTION: See the Consent Agenda.

420 S. VAN PELT STREET

Owner: Peter McCleary

Applicant: Sonja Bijelic & Vojislav Ristic

History: c. 1865

Designation: contributing to Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District, 2/8/1995

2100-block Addison Street included in Historic Street Paving District, 12/9/1998

Project: Legalize partial installation of fence and parking gate

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Gutterman moved that the Architectural Committee recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9, Site Guideline, and the failure to demonstrate authorization of the property owner(s). Mr. McCoubrey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: The rowhouse at 420 S. Van Pelt Street is located at the northwest corner of Van Pelt and Addison Streets. This application proposes to install a wood fence with horizontal slats and a roll-down metal parking gate to the south of this building, parallel to the south wall of the rowhouse along the curb line at Addison Street. The fence and gate would be located four feet south of the southern boundary of this property and would enclose the sidewalk that runs along the north side of the 2100-block of Addison Street for the entire depth of this property. The rowhouse is contributing to the Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District and the 2100-block of Addison Street is designated as part of the Historic Street Paving Thematic District.

The work was started without the Historical Commission's approval, a building permit, or the Streets Department's approval. Portions of the brick sidewalk have been removed and footings installed. The frame for the roll-down gate has been installed. The Department of Licenses & Inspections halted the work in May 2010 after a neighbor filed a complaint.

Note that the submitted site plan is inaccurate. It shows the southern property line at the curb line of Addison Street. The deed clearly states that the property is 16 feet wide; the rowhouse itself is 16 feet wide. The sidewalk is not part of the 420 S. Van Pelt Street property. The staff confirmed this fact with the Survey District.

During a site visit on 15 June 2010, the staff observed a new wood deck with trellis on the rear ell. The horizontal wood railing on the new deck matches the proposed fence. Although this ell had a deck at one time, aerial photographs show that it there was no deck on the ell in 2009. This deck was added without the approval of the Historical Commission or a building permit from the Department of Licenses & Inspections. The staff will request a violation for the illegal deck.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Hawkins recused from the review owing to her relationship with the applicants. Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Architect Vojislav Ristic represented the application.

Mr. Thomas asked Ms. Sell to clarify the revisions made since the Architectural Committee. Ms. Sell explained that the original design proposed the installation of the fence and gate at the curb line, fencing in the sidewalk area. The new proposal moves the gate and fence to the rear along the property line. Ms. Sell stated that the work that has already begun will need to be undone and the sidewalk repaired. Mr. Thomas noted that a stair to the building exists in the sidewalk area beyond the south wall of the house. Ms. Sell confirmed that the stair is an existing condition and the south wall of the house is on the property line. Mr. Ristic stated that he researched the history of this portion of Addison Street and believes that this piece was never owned by the City because in 1896 the owner's application to have the street added to the City Plan was denied. He referenced a clause in Pennsylvania "road law" that states that streets that are not on City maps are shared by the adjoining property owners. Mr. Ristic added that in there is no mention of the alley in previous deeds. He stated that this application was not meant as a land takeover. Rather, the motivation of the owner is to protect the property from public destruction, vandalism, litter, loitering, and parked cars. Mr. Farnham observed that the alley is not deeded to the property owner. Mr. Reuter noted that, owing to an easement on the alley, no one property owner can claim any part of the alley without the consent of all abutting property owners.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to approve the revised design as presented to the Commission on 9 July 2010, with the staff to review details. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

203 S. SARTAIN STREET

Owner: Erin Randolph-Williams

Applicant: Jane Golden

History: c. 1830

Designation: individually designated, 2/28/1961

Project: Install Mural

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Cluver moved that the Architectural Committee recommend approval, provided that the barge board of the gable is differentiated from the mural, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Ms. Pentz seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to paint a mural on the north-facing stucco façade of the building at 203 S. Sartain Street. This façade faces a community garden. The staff suggests that the barge board of the gable be painted a solid, contrasting color, so as to differentiate it from the mural and retain the definition of the building.

ACTION: See the Consent Agenda.

300 S. FAWN STREET

Applicant: Jill Morrone

Owner: Megan Smith and Jeannie McMullen

History: c. 1860

Designation: individually designated, 2/28/1961

Project: Install third-story rear and roof decks

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Mr. McCoubrey moved that the Architectural Committee recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guidelines. Ms. Gutterman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install decks at the third-story and roof levels of this corner property. The third-story deck would be supported in part by wood piers extending to the ground. A rear window would be cut down for access. A spiral stair from the lower deck is proposed to access the roof deck. The roof deck is proposed to come to the edge of the roof and would occupy more than three-quarters of the roof. The decks will be highly visible from Fawn and Cypress Streets.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. No one represented the application.

The Commission members agreed that the proposal does not comply with the Standards and Guidelines.

ACTION: Ms. Leonard moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guidelines. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

17 N. 3RD STREET

Owner: ELD Leasing Corp, Shalom Vaturi

Applicant: Carmelita Martell, store tenant

History: c. 1835

Designation: individually designated, 12/31/1984

contributing to Old City Historic District, 12/12 2003

Project: Legalize dome awning at corner

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Gutterman moved that the Architectural Committee recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Evans seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: The applicant has installed a dome awning on this corner storefront and now seeks to legalize it. Two shed-type awnings that would fit between the piers and preserve the visibility of the vertical piers would be more appropriate.

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

The Commission members agreed that the proposal does not comply with the Standards.

ACTION: Ms. Leonard moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Schlotterbeck seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

200 MARKET STREET

Owners: Sandra Schwalb and Andrew Ullman, Trustees

Applicant: Ray Brogden, Robert Rosen Associates

History: remnant of older building reconstructed c. 1955

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

Project: Construct second-floor addition, reface facade

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Gutterman moved that the Architectural Committee recommend denial. Mr. Cluver seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter and add to the building at the southeast corner of 2nd and Market Streets for use as a restaurant. An application for this project, submitted by a different architect, was approved in concept in November 2008. Since that time, the project has been revised and improved. The basic elements have not changed, including a second-floor addition and deck. The first floor has been improved with exposure of some old elements such as a cast-iron corner column. The windows are now larger and more vertical than originally proposed, which is more in keeping with rhythms and proportions in the district. The architect is proposing brick veneer tiles to cover the first-floor walls including both cinderblock and original brick areas.

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

Mr. Baron explained that the architect provided an alternative design, which he distributed to the Commissioners. The new design features a stuccoed first floor and enameled metal panels at the second floor.

Ms. Hawkins asserted that the new design addressed many of the concerns of the Committee. She thought, however, that the rendering provided too little detail for a final approval. She recommended referring the design to the Architecture Committee for an additional review. The Commission members discussed the merits of tabling versus an approval in concept. They concluded that an approval in concept was the best course.

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

1606 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner/Applicant: Howard Winig

History: 1890, Albert Dilks, architect

Designation: individually designated, 10/12/1990

Project: Install vestibule gate

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Gutterman moved that the Architectural Committee recommend approval, provided the gate is revised to better fit the opening and existing mounting holes are reused, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Pentz seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a metal gate to restrict access to the alcove that leads to the front entrance to the building. The gate would be installed to prevent inappropriate activities from taking place in the alcove. At one time, the building had such a gate, but it was a later addition that has since been removed. The building has other metal work, for example at the base of the storefront window. A gate in this location would meet the Standards, but the shape and simplicity of the proposed gate are not appropriate. The gate should mirror the shape of the opening and, perhaps, include ornamental elements like those at the base of the storefront.

ACTION: See the Consent Agenda.

105 MANTON STREET

Owner: Mike McCann

Applicant: Joe Serratore, architect

History: wood house, c. 1828; demolished with Commission approval, 6/24/85

Designation: individually designated, 3/30/1965

Project: construct new three-story house on site

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Evans moved that the Architectural Committee recommend approval and suggest that the front bay be removed and replaced with two double-hung windows in punched openings at each floor, the side bay be shortened, the window proportions be improved, and the lintels be extended beyond the openings, with the staff to review details. Ms. Gutterman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a new house on this vacant lot at the corner of Manton and Front Streets in Pennsport. A wood-framed, half-gambrel house built about 1828 stood on the lot at the time of designation on 30 March 1965. The Commission approved the complete demolition of the house on 24 June 1985. The City of Philadelphia was the owner of the building at the time of demolition and the demolition permit application is stamped "City ordered demolition and/or stucco." A zoning permit for the demolition was issued in 1976.

The property is individually designated and is not located in a historic district. The new building would share a party wall with the designated building at 1110 S. Front Street. The Law Department advises the Commission that it must base its decision regarding this application on the direct impact of this project on historic fabric at this property, 105 Manton Street, and not on its indirect impact on surrounding properties, designated or not. Owing to the demolition of the historic building, the new building will have no impact on historic resources at the site itself.

ACTION: See the Consent Agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to adjourn at 11:53 a.m. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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 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.

Site Guideline: Not Recommended: Introducing new construction onto the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color, and texture; which destroys historic relationships on the site; or which damages or destroys important landscape features.

Storefronts Guideline: Recommended: Designing and constructing a new storefront when the historic storefront is completely missing. It may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the size, scale, material, and color of the historic building.

§14-2007(7) (j) No permit shall be issued for the demolition of an historic building, structure, site or object, or of a building, structure, site or object within an historic district which contributes, in the Commission's opinion, unless the Commission finds that issuance of the permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the 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 [the] 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.