

**MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE
OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**TUESDAY, 19 DECEMBER 2017
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-029
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dan McCoubrey, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP
Rudy D'Alessandro
Nan Gutterman, FAIA
Suzanne Pentz

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II
Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner I
Megan Cross Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

David Nordone, DNARCHITECTS
Megan Hingst
Lisa Armstrong, AK Architecture
Ross Weiss, Esq., Cozen O'Connor
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Adam Montalbano, Moto Designshop
Emily Schrider
Catalina Gonzalez
Mark Galbraith
Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association
Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch
Brandon Lutz, Harman Deutsch
Tom Chapman, Esq., Blank Rome
Steven Moore, Moore Design
Joe Shiavo
Duncan Anderson, Wawa
Kevin Tatlow, Bohler
Keith Braccia, PMC Property Group
Jonathan Stavin, PMC Property Group

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. McCoubrey called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. Mses. Gutterman and Pentz, and Messrs. Cluver and D'Alessandro joined him.

ADDRESS: 127 KENILWORTH ST

Proposal: Construct third-floor front and first-floor rear additions; enlarge roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Claudia and Christopher McGill

Applicant: Lisa Armstrong, A K Architecture, LLC

History: 1855; historic stable demolished in 1993; new building constructed in 1999

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct additions at the third-floor front and first-floor rear sections of the building and enlarge a roof deck on a building erected in 1999.

The Historical Commission designated the property in 1958. The building that stood on the property at the time was a mid nineteenth-century, two-story stable. Portions of the front façade of the building were demolished without the Historical Commission's approval about 1991. Violations were issued to owner, but the illegal work was not corrected.

In 1991, an architect submitted an application proposing to demolish the remainder of the building and erect a new building. On 12 June 1991, the Commission refused to act on the application because the architect did not submit a building permit application or provide evidence that the property owner had authorized the submission.

On 13 May 1993, the Department of Licenses & Inspections declared the remaining section of the stable to be Imminently Dangerous and ordered that it be demolished or repaired immediately. On 18 October 1993, the Historical Commission approved a permit application to demolish the building. The building was apparently demolished soon thereafter.

The property changed hands several times in the 1990s. In 1998, a new owner proposed to construct a building on the property that was very similar to the demolished two-story stable, but with a third floor set back three feet from the plane of the front façade. At the 14 October 1998 meeting of the Historical Commission, some Commissioners objected to the regulation of the property because the historic building had been demolished, and suggested that the Commission allow the property owners to construct a building of their choice. The Commissioners argued that there was no historic resource left to protect. Such a motion was made and seconded, but never voted upon. Ultimately, the Commission decided to remand the application to the Architectural Committee with the requirement that the applicants work with the staff and Committee to improve the application. On 13 January 1999, the Historical Commission reviewed and approved a revised application to reconstruct the two-story stable with a third floor and some modifications to the front facade. In July 1999, the Commission's staff administratively approved the roof decks.

The current application proposes to construct an addition at the third floor, extending the existing third floor forward to the plane of the front façade, infilling the three-foot setback from the front facade. The existing third floor is conspicuous from the public right-of-way; the third-floor addition would likewise be conspicuous. The application also proposes to increase the size of the roof deck and construct a small addition at the first-floor rear of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application. Architect Lisa Armstrong represented the application.

Ms. Armstrong asked to read a letter from the homeowners into the record. Ms. Gutterman replied that there was not time to read the letter into the record. Ms. Armstrong summarized the important points of the letter. She said that they are seeking to construct a small addition to the third floor in place of the recessed balcony. She stated that the recessed balcony is “an ongoing maintenance problem.” She pointed to her drawings of the front façade at various times in the history of the property. She stated that the reconstructed façade is very different from the historical façade. The proportions and the features have changed. The existing balcony, which is located between the front façade and the third-floor section of the house, is less than three feet deep. The wall at the front of the balcony prevents the owners from seeing the street from within the third-floor space. The owners would like to infill the balcony area, extending the third-floor section forward to the plane of the front façade. Ms. Armstrong explained that the new façade at the third floor would be set back slightly and acknowledged on the façade with a demarcation, creating what she called a “watertable” at the third floor. The new third-floor windows would allow the residents to see the street from the interior, making the building more livable and urban friendly. She again stated that the building that was constructed in 1999 is not an exact replica of the historic building, but is merely reminiscent of it.

Mr. Cluver asked if the new brick will match the old. Ms. Armstrong said that it would not because it is not possible to exactly match the brick. She stated that the new brick would be complementary and the difference would help to distinguish the change from the 1999 facade. Mr. Cluver inquired about the horizontal lines below the third-floor windows in the architectural drawing and asked why there are several lines. Ms. Armstrong said that her “watertable” will have only two planes of brick. She indicated that the new cap at the top of the façade will be a simple aluminum coping.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the pilot house will be enlarged. Ms. Armstrong said that it will be widened to allow for a wider stair. The current stair is too narrow. The Committee members and applicant discussed the size of the pilothouse. Ms. Armstrong explained that the existing party wall at the east at the pilothouse extends about one foot above the roof of the existing pilothouse; the new pilothouse will be enlarged up to the top of that party wall. Mr. Cluver concluded that the enlarged pilothouse would be about one foot taller than the existing pilothouse.

Mr. Cluver asked if the building is individually designated. Mr. Baron confirmed that the property was individually designated in 1958. Mr. Cluver asked why the Historical Commission retained jurisdiction over this newly constructed building after the historic building was demolished. He asked if the Commission retained jurisdiction to prevent the property owner from benefitting from the demolition. Mr. Baron responded: “That’s the idea.” Mr. Cluver asked if the property is in a historic district. Mr. Baron stated that it is not; it is individually designated only. Mr. Cluver asked if other buildings on the block are individually designated. Mr. Baron responded that some on the block are individually designated, but others are not.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked Ms. Armstrong why she proposed to infill the balcony area at the front of the setback third floor. Ms. Armstrong said that the owners want to infill the unoccupied space by bringing the third floor forward to the front facade. In addition to providing better light and views, extending the third floor would alleviate the need for a scupper and downspout that were installed to drain the balcony area. She stated that the three-foot setback balcony area at the third floor has led to serious, ongoing drainage problems. Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Pentz suggested that the drainage problem resulted from a lack of maintenance. Ms. Armstrong disagreed, stating that the design of the 1999 building was flawed.

Mr. Cluver asked why the original building was designated. He again noted that the property is not in a historic district. He asked if the building was designated for its two-story character. He asked if there is a reason for objecting to the small addition. He asked what the Historical Commission would be protecting by denying the request for a modest addition on a 1999 building. He asked if the documents related to the designation provide any information about what the Commission found significant about the original building back in 1958. Mr. Baron replied that the building was designated before the Commission employed nomination forms, so no specific information about the Commission's understanding about its significance is available. He stated that the original building was a mid nineteenth-century carriage house. He explained that the original carriage house had been altered for use as an automobile repair facility; a rectangular garage-door opening had been cut into the facade. When the building was rebuilt, an arched doorway was constructed in place of the altered, squared opening. Mr. Farnham stated that the Historical Commission's designation records indicate that this building was described as a mid nineteenth-century stable building at the time of designation. The other buildings in the area designated at the same meeting of the Historical Commission were late eighteenth-century and very early nineteenth-century rowhouses. The stable was an anomaly on that list of designated properties. Ms. Armstrong reported that the owners understand this property as a historically designated property with a non-historic house on it. Ms. Gutterman responded that the Historical Commission often reviews applications for new construction on historically designated properties. Ms. Armstrong questioned what standards would preclude a minor addition on a house constructed in 1999. Ms. Gutterman stated that the Commission would apply its usual standards related to scale and massing. She stated that the building would become too large for the area with the construction of the three-foot addition as well as the increase in the sizes of the deck and pilothouse. Ms. Gutterman stated that she objected to the construction of the addition, owing to its visibility from the street. Ms. Armstrong responded that the third floor is currently highly visible from the street. She also reported that the majority of the buildings on the block are three stories in height. Mr. Cluver replied that the other buildings are "low" three-story buildings. Ms. Gutterman stated that proposed building would look too large. Ms. Armstrong stated that they are proposing very minor changes to the pilothouse, which is barely visible from the street today. Ms. Gutterman responded that the pilothouse "is already a presence in my mind that is not comfortable."

Mr. Cluver stated that he does not understand why this property was designated. He elaborated, observing that he does not "know the real story about why this particular property was chosen" for designation. He stated that he does not know "if there was some compelling interest behind its two-story nature." Mr. Cluver opined that the proposed addition at the third story, "if done well," would not create "a detriment to the block or the building itself." He argued that he found no compelling reason to object to pulling the third story forward to the front façade. He noted that it is only set back a few feet now; adding a few feet to a 1999 building will not have a

detrimental effect on historic resources. He concluded that: "We're pretty much there already." Mr. Cluver stated that he would approve of the addition, but has some concerns about the proposed changes to the deck. He suggested relocating the front edge of the deck to the front edge of the pilothouse. Ms. Armstrong noted that the existing deck, which was approved by the Historical Commission, currently extends many feet forward of the pilot house. Setting it back as Mr. Cluver is suggesting would significantly reduce it in size from its current, approved condition. Returning to the discussion of the addition, Mr. D'Alessandro said that the current setback is important "when you are talking about proportions." Ms. Pentz said that the sense of the building as a former carriage house would be lost if the addition was approved. Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Gutterman agreed. Ms. Armstrong again pointed out that the current building, which was constructed in 1999, is not a true reconstruction of the original stable. Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Gutterman suggested a recommendation of denial. Mr. Cluver stated that he would agree with the suggestion, owing to some questions about the design, but noted that he does not object to extending the third floor forward to the plane of the front façade. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he agrees with Mr. Cluver and does not oppose adding to the third floor to bring it out to the plane of the front façade.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment, of which there was none.

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

ADDRESS: 321 S CAMAC ST

Proposal: Demolish one-story rear addition; construct two-story rear addition; cut parking entrance in rear wall

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Catalina Gonzalez and Mark Galbraith

Applicant: Adam Montalbano, Moto DesignShop Inc.

History: 1829

Individual Designation: 2/28/1961

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the rear wall and ell of an 1829 rowhouse on Camac Street and construct an addition. It also proposes to cut a parking entrance in a garden wall at the rear of the property on Fawn Street. This application presents a revised version of a design reviewed by the Architectural Committee in November 2017. This row house faces onto Camac Street; at the rear, a brick wall with pedestrian gate faces onto Fawn Street. Several designated houses face onto this block of Fawn Street. This application proposes to construct a two-story addition and green roof. The proposed addition has been modified to preserve the rear wall of the historic building. The new glass and stucco faced addition would be partially screened with a brick lattice wall and a trellis. The brick fence wall at the rear of the property would be largely demolished and replaced with wood doors.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Adam Montalbano and property owners Catalina Gonzalez and Mark Galbraith represented the application.

Mr. Montalbano summarized changes he made to the design since the earlier version of it was reviewed by the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission. He said that he has added large carriage doors in place of the brick wall along Fawn Street as well as a screening trellis on the east and north edges of the rear yard. He now proposes to add the addition while saving the original rear wall of the house. He is proposing red brick at the second floor of the addition and a window on the right side with more traditional small panes of glass. He explained that he is still proposing large panes of glass at the first floor, which is not visible from the street. He said that the last page of the drawings provides three-dimensional renderings of the views from Fawn Street.

Ms. Gutterman asked why the dormer trim would be altered. Mr. Baron explained that the staff is working with the architect to restore the dormers and windows to their original configurations. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the current windows are original. Mr. Baron said that the photographs in the file show that they have been changed since the mid-twentieth century. Ms. Gutterman asked about the placement of mechanical equipment. Mr. Montalbano said that the mechanical units would be placed in the rear yard, not on the roof. Ms. Gutterman opined that the doors and trellises on Fawn Street are too large. The top of the trellis is 11'-6" above grade. She also asked whether the original brick corbelled cornice of the house being covered. Mr. Montalbano said that the cornice would be retained but encapsulated. He said that the head heights are too low to retain the cornice as an exterior element and he thought that it would be weak point for water infiltration as well if left exposed. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the width of the first-floor doors. Mr. Montalbano replied that they will be about 13' wide on a wall that is 15' wide. Ms. Pentz asked about the large white band over the rear window in the rendering. Mr. Montalbano said that he is proposing a metal coping or a brick corbelled cornice. Mr. McCoubrey asked if they will retain the brick piers on the rear. Mr. Montalbano said that they would. Mr. Cluver expressed a concern about seeing the green roof, which he suggested might become overgrown with "volunteers." He requested a curb to hide the green roof. Mr. D'Alessandro expressed concern about seeing the skylight. He asked suggested a low-profile type so that it would be invisible to the public.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment, of which there was none.

Mr. Cluver suggested that the Committee offer a recommendation of approval of the addition, but denial of the modifications to the rear garden wall. He suggested conditioning the approval with a requirement to screen the green roof, to ensure that the skylight is invisible from the street, to detail the connection to the cornice of the main house, and to use corbelled brick on the cornice of the addition. Ms. Gutterman agreed.

Mr. Montalbano asked if the suggested denial of the change to the garden wall would include the trellis. Mr. Cluver stated that it would. Ms. Gonzalez asked the Committee to reconsider the denial of the alteration to the rear wall. She said that people defecate behind that wall and, if their property can open onto the sidewalk, they would take responsibility of maintaining it. The Committee members responded that they should take care of the sidewalk whether they have a gate onto it or not.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the modifications to the rear garden wall, but approval of the addition, provided the green roof is screened, the skylight is not visible from the street, the connection of the addition to the cornice of the house is detailed, and corbelled brick is used on the cornice of the addition.

ADDRESS: 318 S 4TH ST

Proposal: Demolish portions of building; construct addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Mary Morrisette

Applicant: Mary Morrisette

History: 1970; Nancy Brewster Grace House; Stonorov & Haws, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to demolish portions of the 1970 building at the corner of South 4th and Cypress Streets, which is classified as contributing in the Society Hill Historic District, and construct an addition to create a three-and-a-half story modern building, using some of the existing building as a base. The existing red brick first floor would be retained, but the majority of the remainder of the building would be demolished. Metal panels are proposed for a bay on the second and third floors that would wrap around to Cypress Street.

An in-concept application, which proposed to construct a three-and-a-half story colonial-style building at this site, was submitted for review in June 2017. The Committee recommended denial, and encouraged the applicant to submit an application to restore the existing building, rather than to demolish its character-defining features. The application was withdrawn prior to review by the Historical Commission.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, 10, and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the prohibition against demolition.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicant did not understand the prior recommendation from June 2017. Ms. Chantry explained that it is a different applicant for this proposal, and this applicant was provided the minutes from the June 2017 Committee meeting, but that application was withdrawn prior to review by the Commission. She opined that this application is responding to the denial of a Colonial-style building at this site, which is why a more modern building is now proposed. Ms. Gutterman agreed with the staff recommendation, and commented that the proposed design is not in keeping with the Society Hill neighborhood.

Ms. Chantry asked for additional comments to help the applicant move forward with a proposal that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, as this application was submitted in-concept in order to elicit comments about the concept. Ms. Pentz commented that this proposal is "not even close" to an acceptable design. Ms. Gutterman commented that a restoration of the

existing building can be approved. She commented that this proposal is too large, the materials are not right, the roofline is wrong, and the glazing is wrong. She concluded that, if the property owner wanted a building like the one being proposed, the owner should have purchased a different property. Mr. Cluver commented that achieving an appropriate design is particularly difficult, owing to this property's location at a corner. He noted that the Committee will often consider a rear addition, but there really is no rear in this case. The house was designed very much as a three-dimensional object, which makes it difficult to offer recommendations for alterations. Mr. McCoubrey commented that Oskar Stonorov is a significant architect and this building could conceivably be individually designated, although it currently is not.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment. Patrick Grossi, representing the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, supported the staff recommendation for denial. He commented that the building is a notable example of late-Modern infill housing in the Society Hill Historic District, and was designed by a notable firm. He commented that the proposed concept renders the building unrecognizable. He acknowledged that it is a fairly modest house in terms of size. He commented that maybe there is a way to introduce more living space toward the rear, but it would be highly visible on this corner property. He concluded that the design is not appropriate as proposed.

Ross Weiss, an attorney representing Herb Gunther, the next-door neighbor at 320 S. 4th Street, commented that his client shares a party wall with the subject property, and agrees with the staff recommendation and the comments of the Committee. He explained that Mr. Gunther has a concern that any repair or restoration should be consistent with the historic building. He commented that any addition to the rear would move a wall to where Mr. Gunther currently does not have a party wall, which would block his windows for the rear portion of his house. He referenced the Committee's minutes from June 2017 and noted that a discussion of enlarging the basement had occurred. He commented that Mr. Gunther would not oppose an enlarging of the basement, as long as there are no windows and no blockage of what Mr. Gunther has currently at his property.

Paul Boni, chair of the Zoning and Historic Preservation Committee for the Society Hill Civic Association, commented that his committee supports the staff recommendation, and referred to the building as important in the neighborhood. He commented that the second-floor window at the front of the house has been open for a very long time. He wanted this on the record in case someone claims damage to the house in the future, and it is related to this poor care for the building by the property owner. Ms. Chantry responded that the staff can investigate the concern and request an inspection by the Department of Licenses and Inspections if necessary.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, 10, and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the prohibition against demolition.

ADDRESS: 1907 PINE ST

Proposal: Demolish rear of building; construct three-story rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joshua D. Hingst and Megan Hingst

Applicant: David Nordone, DNARCHITECTS

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the rear wall, a portion of the roof, and approximately 12-16 feet of the interior structure of the rear of this three-story rowhouse and to construct a three-story rear addition. The demolition of one and two-story frame rear additions was approved at the staff level with the stipulation that no demolition of the rear masonry wall occur. After the removal of the rear additions, the applicant claims to have identified deficiencies with the rear masonry wall. The application proposes to rebuild the removed floors and a small portion of the rear wall in roughly their original locations and to construct a new three-story ell with a roof overbuild of 12 feet 4 inches. The addition, which would not be visible from the public right-of-way, would be clad in stucco.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9 and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the prohibition against demolition.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect David Nordone and property owner Megan Hingst represented the application.

Mr. Nordone explained that the demolition was done in phases in order to assess the structure. He distributed a letter from the structural engineer, who observed that the condition of the rear wall is poor, the masonry is in bad condition, and there are several major cracks. The wall has been compromised. The owner wishes to remove the rear wall in its entirety to make for a clean transition to the new addition. Mr. Nordone reminded the Committee that the rear of the building is not visible from the public right-of-way, and there are several rear additions on the block that are similar, although they vary in height, materials, and footprint. The goal is to provide the homeowners with a safe and stable property where they do not have to be concerned in the future about a wall that is in poor condition.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the need for the overbuild on the roof. Mr. Nordone explained that the original ceiling height on the third floor is 7 feet 2 inches, and the desire is to increase the height to 9 feet. He noted that the roof monitor is not original. Ms. Gutterman responded that she is not concerned about the roof monitor, but rather the overbuild on the original roof. She suggested that the bedroom have a higher ceiling, and then the height can drop down over the stair to avoid the overbuild. Mr. Nordone responded that the desire is to achieve a consistent 9 foot ceiling height and to simplify the massing. Ms. Gutterman responded that it is not simply a question of visibility, but also of the impact to historic fabric. Ms. Hingst explained that the new roof shape would be more of an extension of the existing roof, rather than a departure from the original form. She suggested that it is a better solution than what was done at neighboring properties. Mr. Nordone directed the Committee's attention to an aerial photograph which showed other nearby rear additions in various forms.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 19 DECEMBER 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Ms. Gutterman asked the staff if the concern related to demolition is only the rear wall, since the rear additions were already demolished. Ms. Chantry responded that she believes that to be the case, as the staff approved the demolition of the rear additions. Ms. Hingst commented that she and her husband purchased the house with the intention of restoration, and they are relying on the advice of professionals, who have recommended that the house is not structurally sound. Safety is the number one concern. She referenced another property on the block where the Commission approved the rebuilding of the front façade owing to structural concerns. Mr. Nordone noted that they are also stabilizing the building on the interior, all in the spirit of preserving the structure. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the chimney. Mr. Nordone confirmed that it is on their property. Ms. Pentz asked about the large crack that was referenced earlier. Mr. Nordone directed her to an interior photograph of the third floor. He explained that there are several structural issues with the wall, and it is out of plumb two to three inches. Mr. Cluver asked if the windows on the rear of the main block will now be in new locations. Mr. Nordone confirmed this, and explained that the existing windows are inset quite a bit more than the proposed three-foot setback on the rear ell. Ms. Gutterman asked if the entire wall is proposed for removal, including the chimney. Mr. Nordone confirmed this. Mr. Cluver noted that the addition is proposed for three feet off of the property line, and asked what the original setback was. Mr. Nordone responded that it was closer to four feet originally. Ms. Hingst referenced several other properties on Pine Street for which the Commission approved demolition of the rear walls, where there were no structural concerns, but rather only the desire to build a bigger house. She reiterated that that is not the case here, but that safety and structural stability are the concerns. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the rear wall is undeniably in failure. He stated that he accepts the removal of the rear wall. Ms. Pentz agreed, and noted that it is not visible from a public right-of-way.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment, of which there was none.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, based on the structural report, by a vote of 3 to 2. Mr. Cluver and Ms. Gutterman dissented.

ADDRESS: 429 AND 431 S 20TH ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition and roof deck; demolish one-story addition and construct townhouse

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 4507 Kingessing LLC

Applicant: Rotciver Lebron, Harman Deutsch

History: 1870; one-story pool addition constructed at 431 S. 20th Street after 1973

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate the front façade of 429 S. 20th Street and to demolish the rear roof slope and dormer to allow for the construction of a four-story addition. The application also proposes to demolish the adjacent one-story structure at 431 S. 20th Street and to construct a new four-story residence with a roof deck and garage entrance on Lombard

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 19 DECEMBER 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Street. The property at 429 S. 20th Street is classified as contributing to the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District; the one-story structure at 431 S. 20th Street is listed as an addition to 429 in the inventory. The one-story structure was erected at some point after 1973, when the lot was listed as vacant and open in permit applications.

Work to the front façade of 429 S. 20th Street would include removing the first-story pent eave addition, shutters, storm door, and dormer awnings; installing new one-over-one aluminum-clad windows; widening the first-story window opening; installing a new aluminum-clad transom over the entryway; and modifying the existing walk-down basement entrance to a window well. The rear addition would contain a small setback from the rear wall of the proposed new construction and would feature a deck with a glass guardrail at the fourth story. The rear wall would be clad in stucco and would contain a series of aluminum-clad casement windows and vinyl sliding-glass doors.

For the new four-story residence at 431 S. 20th Street, the application proposes gray brick, aluminum-clad windows, and an abstracted mansard that maintains the proportions and cornice lines of the S. 20th Street row. At the Lombard Street façade, the elevation includes patterned brick at the center of the building's massing, a three-story bay over a garage, and composite metal panel cladding that continues from the S. 20th Street mansard. The applicant has offered two options with differing window configurations. Option A includes a series of casement windows, while Option B features more traditional one-over-one double-hung sash windows at the S. 20th and Lombard Street facades. The rear of the addition in both options would consist of a solid wall of gray brick at the first story, aluminum-clad windows at the return of the bay, and vinyl door systems at the second and fourth stories. Access to the roof deck would be visible at this elevation and would include a stair from the fourth story to the roof. The deck would be enclosed by a glass guardrail system and would maintain a five-foot setback from the S. 20th and Lombard Street facades with no setback for a portion of the rear elevation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR 429 S. 20TH STREET: Approval, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9, provided:

- Wood six-over-six double-hung sash windows are installed at the front façade;
- A wood transom is installed at the entryway rather than an aluminum-clad transom;
- The rear addition extends three stories and terminates below the cornice line of the existing roof in order to preserve the historic roof slope and dormer.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR 431 S. 20TH STREET: Approval, provided that the cornice line is carried across the bay on the Lombard Street façade and that the roof deck railing is inconspicuous from all public rights-of-way, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Rustin Ohler represented the application.

Mr. Ohler distributed revised plans. Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Ohler to describe the revisions. Mr. Ohler stated that the changes relate mostly to the front façade of 429 S. 20th Street and incorporate the staff's recommendations as read in the overview, which includes six-over-six wood windows, a wood transom, and wood door, all with the staff to review details.

Mr. Cluver inquired about the thought process behind the gray brick. Mr. Ohler answered that the color was requested by the client, and that the client's true preference is for Option A of the two submitted options.

Mr. McCoubrey asked how the mansard roof at 429 S. 20th Street intersects with the mansard of the proposed new construction. Mr. Ohler responded that the mansard roofs of the entire row are not true mansards and contain a very minor incline, further explaining that the interior wall is completely vertical, while the exterior cantilevers out to the cornice. He approximated the roof to have a 10-inch slope and added that the mansard roof of the new building would align with the existing adjacent roof.

Mr. Ohler contended that the rear of the historic structure would not be visible from a public right-of-way, should the proposed building at the corner be constructed. He distributed photographs of the rear of the historic property, adding that there is an adjacent three-foot alley and three-story building abutting the property on Lombard Street. A roof deck, he continued, is proposed with a set back on 431 S. 20th Street and would contain a glass railing. He claimed that it would not be visible from a public right-of-way. He added that no deck is proposed on the historic structure and that the existing flat roof would remain.

Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the proposed work to the rear wall of the historic building. Mr. Ohler answered that the application proposes to demolish the rear wall and build a new three-story rear addition that steps up to a fourth-story addition. At the fourth story, he continued, a deck is proposed above the three-story addition. He reiterated that there would be no deck or addition above the existing structure.

Mr. McCoubrey asserted that the plans are difficult to understand without section drawings. Mr. Cluver also inquired whether demo plans were included, and Mr. Ohler replied that he did not submit them. The Committee members discussed the requirements for submitting demo plans.

Mr. Cluver asked why the staff did not view the removal of the rear façade as a demolition in this application, whereas it considered it a demolition in the previous application. Ms. Keller replied that the staff is recommending that the rear roof slope and dormer be maintained and not be demolished. Several Committee members stated the staff may not have been known the extent of demolition without having been provided with demolition plans.

Mr. Ohler remarked that the buildings were constructed in the 1870s and that the designation of the district came in 1995. The backs and even some of the fronts, he argued, have been significantly altered over time. He explained that there is a deck that cantilevers from the third floor, most of the rear windows have been infilled, and the back door has been replaced. Mr. Cluver responded that without any existing plans, it is not possible to understand those alterations.

Ms. Gutterman inquired how much space would be added by demolishing the rear wall of the historic structure and building the addition. Mr. Ohler replied that the addition would increase the depth of the building by approximately five feet.

Mr. Cluver referred the Committee to the two submitted options, observing that the difference includes paired windows versus single windows. Mr. Ohler reiterated that the owner prefers

Option A and that he would like to proceed with that option. Mr. Cluver stated that Option B would be more consistent with the district and asked if Mr. Ohler has any comments to the contrary. Mr. Ohler answered that the consistency issue is why he drafted a second option, as he thought it would be more appealing to the Committee.

Mr. McCoubrey noted the staff's suggestion that the cornice on Lombard Street would continue through the bay, but questioned why the bay projects into the mansard. He contended that a two-story bay below the roofline would be more in keeping with the character of the neighborhood. Mr. Cluver asked whether Mr. McCoubrey envisioned the mansard continuing across the top of the bay. Mr. McCoubrey affirmed.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR 429 S. 20TH STREET: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to incompleteness of the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR 431 S. 20TH STREET: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of Option B, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline, provided the following:

- the cornice continues across the entire Lombard Street façade;
- the bay is limited to the second and third stories and does not project into the mansard roof;
- the mansard roof maintains the incline of the adjacent historic building;
- the roof deck is set back further from the S. 20th Street façade, with staff to review the visibility of the deck and railing from the public right-of-way; and
- the deck railing is metal rather than glass.

ADDRESS: 150 S INDEPENDENCE W MALL

Proposal: Install signage and entrance doors

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Carlyle Revolution LLC, Atlantic Revolution LLC

Applicant: Thomas Chapman, Blank Rome, LLP

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

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install entrance doors and marquee for a new location of the Wawa convenience store. A single door on Chestnut Street would be removed and a double door would be inserted in the space. This would result in the demolition and partial salvaging of the decorative bronze and red granite elements. A new curved marquee would be attached to the masonry opening around the doorway. The sign would be comprised of the letters spelling "Wawa." These would be individual backlit aluminum boxes with acrylic faces. Ground-floor windows on S. 6th Street would be altered with a black frit to obscure the view into the store's walk-in refrigerator. Vinyl signs are proposed for the inside of the windows.

The staff finds the proposed conversion of the single door to a double door involves significant alteration of the decorative bronze and red granite elements, which are both distinctive materials. The staff suggests that utilizing the existing brackets for the proposed canopy may be a more appropriate installation technique.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the marquee and vinyl decals, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9. Denial of the proposed door alteration and new window glazing with black frit, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Tom Chapman and architect Trey Anderson represented the application.

Ms. Keller distributed copies of two letters regarding the proposal to the members of the Architectural Committee.

Mr. Chapman explained that his client was issued a permit for the convenience store use one month ago. The store will occupy approximately 7600 square feet. He noted that a previous tenant of the space had a marquee in the same location his client is proposing. He stated that the plans for the signage had already been submitted to the City Planning and Art Commissions, and that they are scheduled to be reviewed by the Art Commission's Sign Committee the following day.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if keeping the marquee within the width of the pilasters to frame the door arch rather than have it extend out had been considered, explaining that this would allow the existing brackets to be reused. Mr. Anderson responded that their design intent was to do just that. Mr. McCoubrey said that Drawing 09, Image A of the application made it look as though the marquee would extend beyond the pilasters. Mr. Anderson agreed and explained that the design intent was to reuse the existing brackets and if they could not be reused, install new ones in the same location. Ms. Pentz stated that on Image B of the same drawing indicates that the existing brackets would be demolished. Mr. Anderson responded that that note should have been updated based on comments from the staff. Ms. Gutterman said that even if the brackets could not be reused, the applicant should use the existing holes so as not to damage more masonry. Mr. Chapman noted that the electricity from the previous marquee was still in place. Ms. Gutterman asked about the material of the canopy and Mr. Anderson responded that it would be aluminum clad to match the existing storefront.

Ms. Gutterman asked if installing a wider door, but one that would not require removing the sidelights, had been considered. Mr. Anderson explained that according to code that was an option, but they were concerned about the volume of people expected at the store. Ms. Gutterman asked if installing an automatic door would help to avoid disturbing the existing sidelights. Mr. Anderson explained that their concerns were more about life safety and people exiting in the case of a fire rather than getting patrons in, which is why they wanted to install one of the sidelights in the middle of the frame to create two doors. Mr. Cluver asked if the issue was egress, would they need to provide a second means to which Mr. Anderson replied that the second required egress was provided at the back of the courtyard through the food service area. Mr. Cluver stated that he was not sure if the public would be able to use the food service exit. Mr. D'Alessandro interjected that they could use the lobby, to which Mr. Anderson responded that the building ownership had stated that they would not be allowed to use the

lobby. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he was against the proposed entrance. Mr. Anderson explained that, if the change to two doors was approved, it would match the existing configuration of the 6th Street entrance. Mr. Cluver asked Ms. Keller if she knew the history of the 6th Street entrance. She explained that she was presenting the project on behalf of another member of staff, so she was not familiar with the details. However, she thought that it was possible that there had been modifications made to entrances in the past.

Mr. Cluver asked about a note on Drawing 09 showing that the historic decorative metal would be reused in the new door configuration, but that the marble base would be replaced with new material. Mr. Anderson stated that, if the piece of marble that is removed could be reused, it would be, but in the case that it could not be, a matching replacement would be installed. Mr. Cluver then asked if the proposal for the Chestnut Street doorway was the same as the completed alterations to the 6th Street entrance. Mr. Anderson replied that that was true; however, he was unable to confirm whether the 6th Street door configuration was historic.

Mr. McCoubrey asked how the depth of the canopy had been determined. Mr. Anderson responded the depth was determined by the size of the structure required to support the canopy. Mr. McCoubrey stated that minimizing the depth of the canopy to the greatest extent possible would be beneficial and would also help their sign stand out more.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the marquee would be self-illuminated. The applicant responded that it would be internally lit, acrylic-faced, and edge lit. Upon request, Mr. Anderson further explained to Ms. Gutterman that edge lit means that about an inch of the edge of the letters in addition to their faces are also lit.

Ms. Gutterman requested clarification about the film that would be applied to the two windows on 6th Street. Mr. Anderson stated that they are proposing to install black film on two windows on 6th Street to block views of the refrigerator, which is located behind the windows. He noted that a white film is already installed on one window to block views of the restrooms. Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Anderson why they were proposing a black film when one window on 6th Street already had a white film. Mr. Anderson responded that black film is simply the standard that Wawa uses for their projects. However, they would not object to changing the color of the film to match the white on the other window. Mr. Cluver asked if the existing white film was chosen to create a glow or the perception of light to passersby at night. Mr. Anderson replied that it was his understanding that the white is actually a wall built in front of the window to accommodate the restrooms. Mr. Cluver asked if the white is translucent. Mr. Anderson stated that it is not; it is a wall, not simply film. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that a dark color would be better than a light color. Mr. Anderson clarified that the product they would use would be paint on glass rather than an applied film. Ms. Gutterman asked him if they were also proposing to apply a frit to the window in front of the future employee area on Chestnut Street and Mr. Anderson responded that that was an issue that they wanted to address. He stated that, for that specific window, rather than a black frit, they would like to use blinds set back approximately 18 to 24 inches from the window.

Ms. Gutterman asked how tall the "Wawa" letters on the marquee would be. Mr. McCoubrey responded that they are shown in the drawings as 2'-3" tall. Mr. D'Alessandro asked the applicant if there was any reason that the canopy needs to project beyond the column faces, to which Mr. Anderson responded that there was not a specific reason. He noted that the previous

tenant's canopy projected over the sidewalk and served as cover. However, Wawa does not want their canopy to project quite so far.

Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicants if an engineer had specified that 20 inches as the required depth for the fascia. Mr. Anderson explained that the specific proposal had not yet been engineered, but was reflective of other similar canopies that the company had designed. Mr. McCoubrey stated that, for this project, Wawa would need to have the canopy engineered to determine the depth required.

Mr. Chapman asked if the Committee needed more information on the height of the letters spelling "Wawa" on the canopy. Ms. Gutterman responded that they had adequate information; the letters will be 2'-3" tall.

Ms. Gutterman asked the applicants to confirm that the door proposal is shown on Drawing 09, not on Sign Detail 2. Mr. Cluver stated that the door in the sign detail looked like it was from an earlier concept and Mr. Anderson confirmed that that was correct. Mr. Anderson stated that they are proposing the door design on Drawing 09.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor for public comment, of which there was none.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided:

- the entrance door design shown on Drawing 9 is used; the door material is bronze; and the marble base is reused or replaced in kind;
- the existing canopy brackets are reused; the canopy stays inboard of the piers; the canopy dimensions are minimized and customized for the building; and the face of the sign aligns as much as possible with the face of the columns; and,
- the treatment for blocking the two windows matches that used on the existing adjacent blocked window.

ADDRESS: 130-34 ARCH ST

Proposal: Legalize windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Chancery Lane Partners

Applicant: Keith Braccia, PMC Property Group

History: 1852; stair tower added c. 1995

Individual Designation: 8/5/1976

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize new front façade windows located at 61-67 N 2nd Street (legally part of 130-134 Arch Street), which were installed without a building permit or the Historical Commission's review. The new windows consist of aluminum frames, an appropriate material, but have nine-over-nine sandwich muntins, which are inappropriate for this historic building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 19 DECEMBER 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Keith Braccia and Jonathan Stavin represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked Ms. Keller to describe the appropriate window type for the building. Ms. Keller stated that she and Mr. Baron investigated the building's history, but did not find any definitive documentation of the original windows. She stated that they concluded that one-over-one windows would be an appropriate window type for the building unless additional information comes to light. She stated that the nine-over-nine windows that were installed without approvals and permits are definitely not the appropriate windows. She added that sandwich muntins are never appropriate on historic buildings.

Mr. Cluver asked the applicants to explain their reasoning behind the window choice. Mr. Braccia acknowledged that his contractor failed to obtain the requisite building permit. He stated that they chose a darker color for the windows instead of the white of the older windows because the darker color seemed more in keeping with the building and the neighborhood. Ms. Gutterman asked if there was any sign of the original windows or frames before the current windows were installed. Ms. Keller responded that there was no sign of the original windows. The windows that were replaced were not the original windows. There was nothing left within the masonry openings. Also, no documentary evidence was found. Mr. McCoubrey asked whether removing the window grids would render the extant windows acceptable. Ms. Keller stated that removing the grids would make these windows acceptable; however, the grids cannot be removed because the muntins are sandwiched muntins, between the two layers of glass.

Joseph Schiavo, a resident and property owner in Old City, stated that he is concerned by the fact that PMC Property Group, a large and sophisticated property management group, undertook the work without permits or approvals. Even after an inspector for the Department of Licenses & Inspections instructed the window installers to discontinue the work because it was not permitted, the installers continued and completed the job. PMC Property Group knows that it should have sought and obtained the Historical Commission's approval in advance of undertaking the work, but it did not. PMC Property Group circumvented the permitting process. Legalizing these windows under these circumstances would establish "a blueprint" by which others could illegally install and then legalize windows. Mr. Schiavo explained that he complies with the Historical Commission's process; professionals should comply as well.

Ms. Gutterman stated that the Architectural Committee should never recommend legalization of work that was undertaken without the requisite permits and approvals.

Mr. Cluver asked the staff to explain what type of window would be acceptable. Ms. Keller stated that the windows should be one-over-one, not nine-over-nine. They should not have sandwiched muntins. She stated that aluminum-clad windows are acceptable in this circumstance. Mr. Cluver stated that the staff can provide the applicants with additional guidance. Mr. Stavin asked if the path forward is to submit a new application proposing one-over-one windows. Ms. Keller replied that she would be happy to help Mr. Stavin through the process. She stated that the applicants could revise their application to propose appropriate windows before the meeting of the Historical Commission. Mr. Stavin asked if two-over-two windows would be appropriate. Mr. Farnham responded that the staff would be happy to work

with Mr. Stavin on a revised application. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the applicants look for historic documentation of the original windows. Mr. Stavin acknowledged that the windows should not have been replaced with the needed approval and building permit.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

14-1005(6)(d) Restrictions on Demolition.

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

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.