

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

**TUESDAY, 26 MAY 2020
REMOTE MEETING ON WEBEX
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:16:00

After some technical difficulties, the Chair called the meeting to order at 9:23 a.m. The following Committee members joined him:

Committee Member	Present	Absent	Comment
Dan McCoubrey, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair	X		
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP	X		
Rudy D'Alessandro	X		
Justin Detwiler	X		
Nan Gutterman, FAIA	X		
Suzanne Pentz		X	
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP	X		

The following staff members were present:

- Jon Farnham, Executive Director
- Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner I
- Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Megan Cross Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons were present:

- Jay Ferraro
- Eric Leighton
- Susan Wetherill
- Craig Robert Lewis
- Gabriel Gottlieb
- Brian Thrippelton
- Beverly Chandran
- Neil Sklaroff
- Elisabeth Klawunn
- Ryan Furlong
- Kathy Dowdell
- Greg Mastalerz
- Josh Wilson
- Patrick Grossi

Paul Steinke
Tim Shaaban
Gregory Peluso
Dan Dougherty
Erica Antoine
Keith Mock
Robert Kramer
Jennifer Robinson
Kimberly Morrell
Paul Boni
Michelle Shuman
Mike Feinberg
Jessica Hamman
Michelle Rosenstein
Ben Patane
Matthew Albitz
Michael Manfroni
Marcin Szkotak
Jonathan Doran
Chris Carickhoff
Justino Navarro
Steve Olszewski
Gregory Heleniak
Tuong Huynh
Ann DiLucia
Lorna Katz
Darryl Williams
Ryan Lohbauer
Stephan Potts
Keith Mott
Eric Quick
Rustin Ohler
Janice Woodcock
Jamie Lovell
Luca Segato
Allison Lies
Michaelle Bond
Jay Farrell
Jim Cassidy
Ed Eimer
Sean McCauley

AGENDA

ADDRESS: SW CORNER OF 13TH AND LOCUST STREETS

Proposal: Relocate section of subway entrance; salvage and store section of subway entrance

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia; Delaware River Port Authority

Applicant: Gregory Mastalerz, Sowinski Sullivan Architects

History: 1952; PATCO Speedline Subway Entrance

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Cast-Iron Subway Entrances Historic District, Contributing, 3/8/2019

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

In 2019, the Historical Commission designated the Cast Iron Subway Entrances Thematic Historic District, which includes historic entrances, ranging in date from 1928 to 1955, located along several subway and trolley lines throughout the city. As part of that designation, the Historical Commission maintains jurisdiction over the cast iron railings, granite curbs, and any historic auxiliary components, such as lamp standards, signage, and integral and free-standing light fixtures. The Historical Commission does not exercise jurisdiction over the steps, handrails, walls below the curbs, or any underground features.

This application proposes to reconfigure the subway entrance at the southwest corner of 13th and Locust Streets to provide ADA accessibility. The entrance was created in 1952 as part of the Locust Street Subway line, which is now part of the PATCO system. All of the station's entrances retain the original cast iron railings. The southwest entrance would be removed to allow for the installation of an elevator, and the railing would be salvaged and reused to replace non-original railings elsewhere within the PATCO/SEPTA transportation system.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Salvage portion of existing cast iron railing at southwest corner of 13th & Locust PATCO station and relocate it to 10th and Locust Streets.
- Demolish and infill existing stair.
- Construct elevator.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Accessibility Guideline: Recommended: Providing barrier-free access that promotes independence for the disabled person to the highest degree practicable, while preserving significant historic features.*
 - The current subway entrance would be demolished to allow for the installation of an elevator leading to the concourse that would provide ADA accessibility at the station. Portions of the existing railings would be removed from their current location and reinstalled at a nearby PATCO entrance to replace non-original railings. Remaining portions of the entrance would be salvaged and stored for future use. Due to the salvaging and reuse of the railings, the work complies with this standard and is necessary in the public interest.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to the Accessibility Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 00:16:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Greg Mastalerz and engineer Erica Antoine represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler asked whether the Committee is to comment on the design of the new entrance or only the removal and modification of the existing railings.
 - Mr. Farnham answered that the Committee is making a recommendation on the removal of the existing railings and the relocation to the 9th/10th and Locust Street station and the removal of the above-grade portion of the stair. He clarified that the stair that extends below grade remains outside the Historical Commission's jurisdiction. He suggested that the Committee consider the above-grade portion of the stair, the railing and curb, as an object. The design of the new elevator enclosure is not within the Historical Commission's purview.
- Mr. Mastalerz explained that the work proposed for the 12th/13th and Locust Street station is part of a larger, ambitious initiative by PATCO to create accessibility at all its stations. He noted that six stations currently do not have full accessibility, but, that at the end of this project, PATCO will be the first legacy public transit agency with complete ADA accessibility. At this time, he continued, two stations have been completed on the New Jersey side. He added that the 12th/13th and Locust Street station is the most complicated of the six to bring up to ADA accessibility standards, mainly owing to the dense urban context with a multitude of beneath-grade utilities and old infrastructure. There were limited opportunities, he continued, to install an elevator to connect the street level to the station level below. Mr. Mastalerz remarked that the only viable option is to remove the stair at the southwest corner of the intersection to avoid the critical utilities and to mitigate the impact of a large elevator footprint on pedestrian circulation. He stated that the plans illustrate the clearances around the elevator and emphasized that it is critical to remove the stair to allow for adequate pedestrian circulation around the elevator. In addition to removing the stair, he added, the curb line would be modified to further mitigate the elevator on the streetscape at this location. He acknowledged that the cast iron railing system is a contributing historic resource and that the proposal includes salvaging the railing and relocating it to an existing entrance on the PATCO line at the 9th/10th Street station. He noted that one side of the 9th/10th Street railing, the tube railing, is non-original and would be replaced with the historic railing from the 12th/13th and Locust Street station.
- Mr. Cluver asked why the southwest corner of this intersection was selected and whether the other corners were considered.
 - Ms. Mastalerz replied that all four corners of the intersection were considered and studied in great detail. He added that the proposed location was selected owing to the presence of critical underground utility infrastructure that would be impacted at other corners, among other factors. On the south side of Locust Street, he continued, several parking spaces from a parking lane would be eliminated to add street frontage to the sidewalk and help preserve the pedestrian circulation.

- Ms. Stein questioned whether the new elevator position, immediately in front of the northeast corner of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania building, could be shifted since it is in such close proximity to the historic structure.
 - Mr. Mastalerz answered that he is very limited in the position of the elevator owing to the infrastructure below and the geometry of the utilities directly beneath. He remarked that there would be a visual impact on the building, adding that he shares Ms. Stein's concern. To help mitigate the visual impact, Mr. Mastalerz stated that the elevator would be clad in clear glazing to allow for sightlines through the structure.
- Mr. Detwiler agreed with Ms. Stein and Mr. Cluver, adding that what is so characteristic about the station entrances is how they connect and defer to the buildings to which they are attached or adjacent. He stated that the elevator, even with its transparency, will block the Historical Society's Palladian window at this iconic corner at 13th and Locust Streets. He observed that only part of the historic railings would be salvaged and moved to another entrance along the PATCO line. He questioned what would happen to the cast iron return or end rail of the entrance.
 - Mr. Mastalerz responded that he studied the entire PATCO system to investigate whether there would be an appropriate location where the end railing could be installed. He commented that one does not exist. Instead, he continued, he is proposing to dismantle the end railing, salvage it, and store it for possible reinstallation if damage occurs or if an acceptable application presents itself in the future.
 - Mr. Detwiler responded that that plan is crucial to an approval of the application. He then noted the newel post should receive the same treatment and asked that any piece be salvaged, documented, and stored for possible reuse.
 - Mr. Mastalerz agreed.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the louvers on the proposed elevator.
 - Mr. Mastalerz replied that the louvers are appropriately sized to accommodate the elevator equipment, adding that the elevator generally is minimally sized to the extent allowable by the equipment that needs to be installed within it. He further explicated that the equipment driving the elevator is stored below grade.
 - The Committee and applicant discussed various design details of the elevator. The Committee concluded that the Historical Commission does not exercise jurisdiction over the elevator, which is located in the public right-of-way.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked how PATCO catalogs and stores the material.
 - Mr. Mastalerz responded that he can follow up with PATCO on specific details, but he noted that the organization is headquartered in Lindenwold, New Jersey, where they store their train car equipment. He commented that PATCO is very organized and properly maintains its equipment.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The cast iron railings and curbs were designated by the Historical Commission in 2019. The railings at the southwest corner of 13th and Locust Streets were installed in 1952 as part of the Locust Street Subway line, now part of the PATCO system.
- The application proposes to eliminate the existing subway entrance at the southwest corner of the intersection to create an ADA accessible entrance at the 12th/13th and Locust Street station.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The Historical Commission's jurisdiction is limited to the work proposed to the cast iron subway entrance and does not extend to the proposed elevator, situated in the right-of-way.
- The application proposes to salvage all portions of the historic railing system. The largest piece of railing would be installed at the 9th/10th and Locust Street station, while the return and newel post would be documented and stored by PATCO. The work satisfies the Accessibility Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the unused portions of the railings are documented, photographed, and properly stored, with the staff to review details, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Accessibility Guideline.

ITEM: SW Corner of 13th and Locust Streets					
MOTION: Approval, with conditions					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman				X	
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5			1	1

ADDRESS: 1810 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Construct 19-story addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1810 Chestnut Street Development LLC

Applicant: Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker & Partners

History: 1923; Samuel T. Freeman & Co. Auction House; Tilden & Register

Individual Designation: 1/1/3000

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

On 15 March 2019, the staff notified the property owner of 1810 Chestnut Street that the Historical Commission would consider a nomination for the Samuel T. Freeman & Co. Auction House and determine whether to designate the property as historic. At the time of notice, the owner had intended to sell the property and subsequently requested to continue the review of the nomination, which remains pending, while a sale of the building was finalized. The sale of the property to 1810 Chestnut Street Development LLC was recently finalized, and the property has remained under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction since March 2019.

At its July 2019 meeting, the Historical Commission reviewed an in-concept application submitted by Cecil Baker & Partners on behalf of the new owner to construct a 14-story addition above the existing six-story building. The Historical Commission approved that application, owing to the extensive plans for the development of the property already in place at the time notice of the nomination was sent. The original proposal included an 18'-6" setback from Chestnut Street and a 24'-3" setback from Sansom Street. The current application proposes to significantly increase the Sansom Street setback to 70'-6" and to increase the height of the addition by five stories, bringing the total height of the overbuild to 19 stories. The addition would feature glass and metal window walls, smooth and textured fiber cement panels, poured concrete, and brick. Demolition would be limited to a portion of the elevator overrun at the roof and select portions of the building where structural columns would be inserted. The remainder of the historic structure would be retained.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct 19-story addition

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *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.*
Though the addition is not compatible in massing, scale and proportion, the application proposes to retain much of the historic building's exterior envelope, including the primary Chestnut Street façade, Sansom Street façade, and east and west elevations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff defers to the Historical Commission to determine whether the application for the 19-story addition is in compliance with the July 2019 in-concept approval.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 00:46:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Eric Leighton and Cecil Baker, attorney Neil Sklaroff, and owner Tim Shaaban represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Leighton summarized the changes to the current application from the in-concept application that was approved by the Historical Commission in July 2019. He noted that setbacks at both the Chestnut and Sansom Street facades have increased, with a more substantial setback from the Sansom Street façade. He commented that the lost square footage resulting from the increased setbacks would be introduced at the top of the building through the addition of five stories. He explained that the other change to the application is to the balconies, which are no longer projecting forward from the façade and are instead carved into the façade. He stated that on the south side of the building, balconies are located at the lower floors, and on the north side of the building, the balconies are located at the northeast and northwest corners. He then identified where roof terraces would be located. Mr. Leighton noted that the existing elevator overrun that is part of the historic building was originally proposed to be removed in the in-concept application that the Historical Commission approved. He explained that the west side of the overrun has a painted graphic of the Freeman's Auction House logo and that this application seeks to preserve that element and utilize part of the brick structure in the new design. He then discussed the materials selected for the overbuild, including fiber cement panels, window walls, and the exposed concrete core.
 - Mr. Baker added that he and his team were careful to maintain the symmetry of the tripartite configuration at the front façade. Mr. Leighton clarified that the addition includes a centralized glass spine at the centerline, and the balconies step at one side of the overbuild, then flip to the other side further up the façade.
 - Mr. Shaaban stated that the increased setback from Sansom Street was derived from stakeholder groups, residents at 10 Rittenhouse, and neighbors concerned about the proximity of the overbuild on Sansom and Chestnut Streets. He reiterated that height was added to the building to compensate for the increased setbacks.
- Mr. McCoubrey observed that the elevator overrun contains a glass enclosure that extends fairly high.
 - Mr. Leighton responded that the proposal would leave enough of the existing brick on the northwest wall to turn the corner and support the west wall with the graphic. He added that the remainder of feature would consist of a glass enclosure of a similar mass and noted that the existing elevator overrun has very few openings, aside from a small window and louver which are not conducive to quality indoor space. He explained that the overrun would be replicated in glass at a portion of the north and east elevations. He then identified where the proposed terraces would be located, including one over the elevator penthouse.
- Mr. Cluver commended the applicant for retaining portions of the elevator overrun, but expressed concern over the amount of mass that would be lost. He stated that

- the feature has presence and understood as an elevator overrun. When two-thirds of the north façade is removed, he continued, the feature becomes difficult to read and looks like a wall rather than a mass. He recommended including glass on the east side but asked that more or all of the mass on the north elevation be maintained, as it impacts the feature's historic character. He then inquired how the eighth-floor terrace would relate to the existing elevator overrun.
- Mr. Leighton answered that a glass guardrail would need to be inserted. He clarified that the floor level in the proposed eighth floor would be adjusted so that the existing west and portion of the north wall of the elevator overrun could be used as a guard. In that case, he added, no glass would be needed above the brick wall. He noted that if more brick were to be retained on the north wall, then it would become a parapet and no glass would be inserted at that elevation either.
 - Mr. Cluver observed that on the west façade a part of the existing brick and concrete structure appears to be painted or stuccoed. He questioned whether the plan would include stucco removal.
 - Mr. Leighton replied that the stucco appears to be a ghost from a previous adjacent building. He added that his team has not discussed how to address that area and whether or not to expose the brick behind.
 - Mr. Cluver requested clarification on the three fiber cement panel and elastomeric coating colors at the west façade. He expressed concern over the light color of the elastomeric coating, which he cautioned could be a reflective surface.
 - Mr. Leighton responded that the elastomeric coating would be applied at the concrete elevator, stair, and core of the building where it is intended to be articulated as concrete. He contended that it may not be as bright as Mr. Cluver believes. He clarified that the fiber cement panels are two rather than three colors, because two panels are the same color with different textures. Like the structure of the existing building, Mr. Leighton continued, he is expressing where the column lines of the new building would be located through the vertical bands created by one color of the fiber cement panels. At the floor line, he added, the alternate color is proposed. Ultimately, he explained, the horizontal and vertical grid consists of smooth-textured fiber cement panels in different colors. He commented that the infill panels would have a ribbed finish in a vertical orientation, though the orientation would be rotated in several locations.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated that in reviewing the documents, it was difficult for him to understand the location of the balconies and how they read. He requested that the applicants provide additional drawings that show more shadow to the Historical Commission. He noted that the Chestnut Street renderings are fly-overs and asked that renderings showing the relationship of the new building to the old from a pedestrian's perspective would be more helpful.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro inquired about the open egress stair and what material would be proposed for the infill.
 - Mr. Leighton responded that brick to match the existing building would be proposed, though he envisioned it being recessed to signal the modification.
 - Mr. Cluver questioned the difference in windows at the south elevation and asked what window type would be installed at the sixth story.
 - Mr. Leighton answered that he believes some windows have been replaced over the years but that any new replacement would be consistent in appearance with the original industrial windows. The next phase, he

continued, would be to study what exists of the historic building and its condition. He added that as much material as possible would be retained.

- Mr. Cluver opined that the application was submitted for final approval and commented that it seems that there are many details, particularly related to the original building, that need to be considered.
 - Mr. Shaaban clarified that the intention is to rehabilitate the existing structure, though the purpose of the historic structure's interior space has yet to be fully determined. With regard to the windows, he continued, the intent would be to work with staff to replace any compromised openings to match the historic windows. He argued that not much of the existing structure is unknown.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired about the increase in overall height of the proposed addition from the height of the overbuild approved in-concept.
 - Mr. Leighton replied that in meetings with the near neighbors, primarily residents of 10 Rittenhouse, individuals expressed concern that the overbuild was in close proximity to their north-facing windows. In an effort to both maintain the square footage and distance the overbuild from its southern neighbor, he continued, he relocated the square footage lost at Sansom Street to the five additional floors above the original fourteen that were proposed. He compared the height of the proposed building to 10 Rittenhouse, noting that the proposed building would be lower than its southern neighbor.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that he is pleased to see that the principal elevations and side facades will be mostly retained, adding that this project could have taken a much different shape if it were not under the review of the Historical Commission. He commented that the setback from Sansom Street is reasonable justification for some additional height. He further remarked that he has no objection to the overbuild but is most excited by the retention of the principal facades and hopes it will be a successful project.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Historical Commission approved an in-concept application for a 14-story addition at its July 2019 meeting. The current application proposes a 19-story addition.
- This application proposes to significantly increase the setback of the overbuild at the Sansom Street elevation.
- Most of the historic structure would be retained, though a portion of the elevator overrun would be demolished. Full demolition of the elevator overrun was previously proposed and approved as part of the 2019 in-concept application.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application satisfies the July 2019 Historical Commission approval.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Historical Commission's 12 July 2019 approval of an in-concept application, provided the following:

- most of the existing elevator overrun's north elevation be retained, with glass permitted on the east elevation;
- the color of the elastomeric coating on the west elevation is darker in color; and

- all elements of the existing historic building are further considered.

ITEM: 1810 Chestnut St MOTION: Approval, with conditions MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman		X			
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5	1			1

ADDRESS: 1901-05 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Modify entryway; install ATM

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rittenhouse Plaza, Inc.

Applicant: Richard Seitchick, Joe Freidman Construction Corp.

History: 1926, Rittenhouse Plaza, McLanahan & Bencker, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

Significant in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, Rittenhouse Plaza stands prominently at the northwest corner of Rittenhouse Square. The 22-story, 19-bay apartment building was designed in an H-shaped plan by McLanahan & Bencker. The Walnut Street elevation is defined by two large, symmetrical wings that flank a central courtyard. The ground-story of each wing contains a commercial space featuring two storefront windows with a central decorative recessed entryway. This application proposes to make modifications to the easternmost entryway and to one storefront window on the 19th Street elevation.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install glass door system to enclose eastern Walnut Street entrance;
- Remove non-original door to create ADA-compliant entrance;
- Install ATM at existing 19th Street window.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

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

- This application proposes to enclose the easternmost entrance of the Walnut Street façade. The entrance is one of a pair of symmetrical recessed entryways on the Walnut Street elevation that features decorative marble paneling with bronze-framed windows and doors. With the installation of a new door system in the plane of the façade, the decorative features of the recessed entry would become interior space and the function of that space would be altered. The work does not comply with this standard.
- Within the recessed entryway, the application proposes to remove a non-original door with a sub-frame and install a new ADA-compliant cased door within the existing bronze frame. The removal of the existing door and sub-frame and the installation of historically appropriate door that fits into the historic frame complies with this standard.
- This application also proposes to install an ATM at an existing window on the 19th Street façade. The non-original metal guardrail would be removed and the glazing would be replaced with an aluminum panel in a powder coated finish mounted within the existing frame. The work is reversible and complies with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the enclosure of the Walnut Street entryway, but approval of the remaining work, provided a historically appropriate door with no sub-frame is installed at the Walnut Street entrance, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 01:23:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Josh Wilson and Dan Dougherty represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver asked for clarification on the staff recommendation at the Walnut Street entrance.
 - Ms. Keller responded that the staff recommendation is for denial of enclosing the currently open exterior vestibule space, but approval of replacing the doors beyond.
 - Mr. Cluver stated that if the work to the exterior is denied, then the work beyond would not be applicable, since the proposal is to remove the existing doors and leave cased openings. He noted that doors are not proposed at the interior entryway.
- Mr. Wilson clarified that the interior doors would be removed to provide new cased openings to allow for wheelchair accessibility. With the current door and frame, he continued, the width is only 32 inches. He commented that by removing the interior non-original doors and sub-frames and maintaining only the historic frames, the clearance would be 35 ½-inch entry and would provide enough width to enable a wheelchair to pass through.
- Ms. Stein questioned whether a second door on the 19th Street façade could be used as an accessible entrance and asked the applicant to describe what currently exists.
 - Mr. Wilson answered that the door functions as the main entryway to the bank, adding that he would need to confirm whether it is ADA compliant.

- Ms. Stein commented that in historic buildings only one accessible entry is expected, adding that spaces are typically approached holistically to select a door that could work best as the accessible entrance. That door, she continued, may need an automatic operator to allow customers to enter. She contended that the 19th Street door would be simpler to retrofit than the one on the Walnut Street entrance.
- Mr. Wilson confirmed that the door is 33-inches wide, and Mr. Cluver remarked that it would be ADA compliant. Mr. Wilson acknowledged that the door would be sufficient.
- Mr. Cluver observed that the rendering shows very muted tones at the ATM panel and noted that elsewhere the application states that the color is to be determined. He asked whether the intent is to use the muted tones presented in the rendering.
 - Mr. Wilson responded that the intent is to match the color of the building and to blend in and complement the historic structure. He added that he is not trying to make the ATM stand out against the existing façade.
- Ms. Stein inquired about the plan for the ironwork at the window where the ATM is proposed. She stated that it seems like it should be preserved so that if one would like to remove the ATM in the future, the grille could be reinstalled.
 - Mr. Wilson replied that the ironwork could be stored in the building by the landlord, so that it can be reinstalled in the future.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro asked why the ironwork would not be retained in place and incorporated into the design.
 - Ms. Keller clarified that the staff believes that the ironwork has no historic value and was installed as a protective measure. She noted that it is not uniformly installed around the building.
 - Mr. Wilson explained that the plans would call for the removal of the ironwork owing to ADA purposes. The ATM, he continued, would need to be set at a certain height for accessibility reasons, and the ironwork would have interfered with the use of the ATM.
- Mr. Detwiler contended that the installation of the ATM causes the loss of the massive window. He observed that the ATM itself is less than a quarter of the opening and asked whether it would be possible to split the opening and install a window above. He reiterated that it is a large amount of infill for a small component. He further noted that when using the ATM, a customer would need to stand on the metal grate in the sidewalk.
 - Mr. Wilson responded that he is speaking with the landlord to see if the grate can be removed; if not, he stated that he is proposing to replace it with an inset Bilco door on which concrete can be poured to achieve a more uniform appearance. He opined that the door may have functioned as a coal chute, because coal was stored in the basement below. He then agreed that the opening could be split to allow the ATM to be located at the bottom with a window above. He explained that a secure room for the ATM would be located behind the opening and a window would not allow daylight into the space, but instead would only allow it into that secure room.
 - Mr. Detwiler argued that the panel proposed with the ATM is essentially a large sign and cautioned that a future sign could be more garish.

- Mr. Cluver stated that he prefers the opening to read as a single window, contending that a horizontal mullion would go counter to all the other windows on the façade.
- Mr. Detwiler agreed but argued that the panel is too large of an intervention for such a small modification.
- Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with Mr. Detwiler, adding that the ATM and First Trust signage takes over the whole facade.
- Mr. Wilson asked whether spandrel glass would be acceptable. The Committee agreed.
- Ms. Stein questioned whether the ATM could be shifted north on 19th Street to the next window. She further noted that it would eliminate the issue with the grate in the sidewalk. Other Committee members agreed.
 - Mr. Wilson responded that it could potentially move to the adjacent window.
- Ms. Stein stated that it seems the Committee has reached a consensus on the ATM and asked to address the proposed changes at the Walnut Street entrance. She commented that, based on the staff recommendation and earlier Committee comments, the Committee would not be inclined to approve the proposed entrance. She inquired whether it would be acceptable to retrofit the 19th Street door to be the accessible entrance.
 - Mr. Wilson responded that the commercial tenant on the opposite side of the courtyard enclosed the entryway with a security gate that remains closed at night. He argued that the system he is proposing has a very narrow frame with glazing to allow pedestrians to appreciate the finishes in the vestibule area. He added that the existing security gate would be closed at night.
 - Mr. Cluver countered that the security gate still allows an individual to understand the vestibule as open to the street and contended that a glass door system is fundamentally different. Other Committee members agreed.
- Mr. Dougherty stated that he represents First Trust Bank and that he would be willing to accommodate the Committee's requests regarding the modifications to the ATM design. Of the Walnut Street entrance, he commented that the plan would be to retain the integrity of the entire vestibule space, including the existing marble and frames. He explained that the goal would be to make this entrance, the main entrance to the bank, ADA accessible by eliminating the interior doors which are difficult for people to maneuver. He noted that the iron gate would be retained. He then questioned the reason for the staff's recommendation of denial of the glass door system.
 - Ms. Keller answered that the staff contends that the open vestibule is a historic feature of the building and that enclosing it would change its spatial characteristics. She noted that the Historical Commission maintains jurisdiction over the building's exterior and that enclosing the entry might reclassify the vestibule as interior space.
 - Mr. McCoubrey added that the open entryway is an important and character-defining feature of the building.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The open entryway and vestibule at the Walnut Street façade are character-defining features of the building.
- An ATM and an aluminum panel with the First Trust Bank logo is proposed in the second window at the 19th Street elevation and would replace the opening's current glazing.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Enclosing the Walnut Street entryway would alter a character-defining feature and change the function of the space. An accessible entrance could be created at an existing 19th Street door. The proposed work does not comply with Standard 9.
- The ATM should be moved to the adjacent window north on 19th Street, and spandrel glass should be used instead of the proposed aluminum panel. The modified design would comply with Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the Walnut Street entrance alterations, but approval of the ATM, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9, provided the following:

- the ATM is installed at the third window on N. 19th Street rather than the second window;
- spandrel glass is inserted into the opening rather than an aluminum panel; and
- the existing iron railing at the window is retained and stored on site.

ITEM: 1901-05 Walnut St					
MOTION: Denial of the Walnut Street alterations; approval of a modified ATM design					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 2100 DIAMOND ST

Proposal: Construct two-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia Department of Public Property

Applicant: Michelle Shuman, Capital Projects Division

History: 1875; Buildings demolished c. 1997

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Diamond Street Historic District, Contributing, 1/29/1986

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a new building for the 22nd Police District, located on vacant lots within the Diamond Street Historic District. The Diamond Street Historic District was listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places in 1986. At the time of the designation, buildings classified as contributing in the district inventory, which were in very poor condition, stood on these blocks. Not long after the designation of the district, the Department of Licenses & Inspections cited these buildings as “imminently dangerous” and the blocks of houses were demolished, resulting in the vacant lots that are present today. In 2001 and again in 2018, proposals were reviewed by the Commission to amend the historic district boundaries to exclude these vacant lots. Owing to community opposition, the Commission took no action in 2001, and denied the application to amend the boundary in 2018. Therefore, the Commission retains plenary jurisdiction over the review of building permit applications for these lots which have been vacant for approximately 20 years and are located at the far western edge of the historic district.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct two-story building and associated parking lots and public plazas.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *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 work 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.*
 - The proposed building is compatible with, yet differentiated from, the historic district. It is located at the far western end of the district, and as such, it is not seen within the context of the traditional red brick and brownstone rowhouses that defines the district to the east. The building façade incorporates ornamental brickwork found on residential buildings in the district but with a gray brick. The overall massing, size, and scale appears to be appropriate for the historic district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 01:52:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Project Manager Michelle Shuman and architect Keith Mock represented the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 MAY 2020

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA’S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked about the selection of the white and gray material palette compared to the red brick context of the historic district.
 - Ms. Shuman responded that their initial renderings used red brick, but it felt heavy and out of place in this specific context. The lighter palette provided a lighter feeling for the municipal building.
 - Mr. Detwiler suggested incorporating either red brick or brownstone color in a subtle way.
 - Mr. McCoubrey commented that the building is a good design, but that adding some color would help.
 - Mr. Mock explained that this site is essentially by itself at the far end of the historic district, in the center block of three blocks, and therefore is isolated from the context of the historic district. Elements of historic buildings were incorporated into this building, but in modern ways. He explained that it is also important that the site functions as an open green space.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the flatness of the façade when compared to the depth found on many historic buildings.
 - Ms. Shuman responded that they did not want to imitate the historic buildings, and that they wanted this to read as a new building. For that reason, they focused on the textural aspects as something that is achievable with modern construction types and budgets.
 - Mr. Detwiler commented that there are subtle ways to pick up on cues from the neighborhood. He suggested having the bands of lighter brick project slightly, or incorporating a slightly-projecting cornice.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about visibility of rooftop mechanical equipment.
 - Mr. Mock responded that the equipment is low-profile and the parapet will also obscure visibility.
 - Ms. Stein suggested that section drawings for rooftop mechanical units should be provided to the staff.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed building and site are on vacant blocks at the far western end of the Diamond Street historic district.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed building is compatible with, yet differentiated from, the historic district. The overall massing, size, and scale appears to be appropriate for the historic district, satisfying Standard 9. However, the color palette and façade details can be adjusted to make the building more compatible with the historic district.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as presented, but approval provided renderings showing additional color schemes, the introduction of depth to the façade, and sections to show rooftop mechanical

equipment, are provided for review by the Commission, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 2100 Diamond St					
MOTION: Denial as presented; approval of a revised façade per discussion					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 4101-05 LUDLOW ST

Proposal: Construct addition; renovate church building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: St. James Pentecostal Church

Applicant: Matthew Albitz, L2P

History: 1886; Monumental Baptist Church; David S. Gendell, architect; 1914

Individual Designation: 2/10/2017

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to adaptively reuse the interior of this church building and construct a four-story addition for use as a rock climbing gym. The building is currently vacant and in poor condition. The property was designated as historic in 2017, under several Criteria for Designation including Criterion I for potential archaeological significance. There was significant confusion as to the location of the archaeological potential and whether there was ever a cemetery at this site, and the Committee on Historic Designation voted to exclude Criterion I when it made its recommendation regarding Criteria for Designation because of that lack of clarity in the nomination. However, the Historical Commission voted to include Criterion I without further discussion to clarify the concerns of the Committee. Therefore, Criterion I for archaeology is applied to the entire designated parcel.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Convert church building interior for reuse as rock climbing gym.
- Construct four-story glass and metal panel addition on vacant land at Ludlow Street side of property.
- Repaint red brick façade
- Various other façade and roofing work, which is approvable at the staff-level.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 MAY 2020

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *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 work 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.*
 - The proposed work to the exterior of the church building satisfies Standard 9. The proposed addition is clearly differentiated from the old, and has been located on the site such that the bell tower remains prominent and the roof slope will remain. The addition appears to be slightly lower in height than the peak of the main gable. The staff recommends that the applicant explore holding the addition back further a short distance so as to allow for the bell tower to turn the corner. The staff additionally suggests that metal panel may not be the most appropriate material for the side of the addition, and that other material options are explored.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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.*
 - The proposed addition appears to allow for the retention of the Ludlow Street side façade, so that if the addition were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property would be unimpaired.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided a Phase 1A Archaeological Resources Survey is conducted, the existing red paint on the brick is removed rather than repainted, an alternative material is considered for the side of the addition, and holding the addition back a small distance to allow the bell tower to turn the corner is explored, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 02:19:40

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Matthew Albitz and attorney Craig Robert Lewis represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Lewis explained that the building is proposed for reuse as a rock climbing facility. Following feedback from the Commission's staff and the Preservation Alliance, the proposed addition has been pulled back so that the corner of the bell tower is now visible. The proposal is now to excavate down so that the roped climbing portion will start at the basement level and the bell tower's entrance can serve as the main entrance to that space. Mr. Lewis acknowledged that it is a unique and ambitious project with many challenges to be faced in preserving the building.
- Mr. Albitz explained that the existing windows are in disrepair and many are broken. He stated that the plan is to preserve them in place with storm windows. He observed that some of the existing doors will need to be replaced, and the wrought iron railing may also necessitate replacement.
 - Ms. Gutterman cautioned that the storm window system will need to allow for venting; otherwise further damage could be caused to the stained glass.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the existing frames and windows should be scraped and painted prior to installation of the encapsulation.

- Ms. Gutterman stated that the word “encapsulation” should be changed to “protection.”
- Mr. Albitz explained that the original proposal called for the addition to be pulled up to the front of the building. It is now held back and will also allow for an ADA entrance, which the building does not currently have.
 - Mr. McCoubrey asked if it is possible to keep the addition away from the corner of the bell tower.
 - Mr. Albitz responded that it is disengaged from the corner with this application, as shown in the plan, but it would be extremely difficult, programmatically, to pull it back even further. He noted that it is only adding 900 square feet, and it will be glass at that area so one would be able to see the corner of the tower.
 - Mr. Lewis agreed that there is an operational issue if it is pulled back any further. He explained that the addition needs to come to the location where there is an existing entry in the church building.
- Ms. Gutterman asked how the glass wall will be attached to the masonry wall.
 - Mr. Albitz responded that there will be a small connector piece of curtain wall with a minimal mullion.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the wall of the addition that will be sitting on the exterior wall of the church. He expressed concern about water coming down the church roof into this area. He suggested that the applicant provide a section drawing through that area, as well as a roof plan. He stated that he would prefer to see the entire bell tower disengaged from the addition.
 - Mr. Albitz responded that he can provide those additional drawings, and they are aware of the drainage concerns and will be investigating that further.
- Mr. Lewis stated that they understand that they are obligated to conduct the archaeological survey.
- Mr. Cluver asked about proposed signage.
 - Mr. Albitz responded that the new sign would replace the existing sign in the same location and footprint. It would likely be a plain, painted sign, which would not be lit.
- Mr. McCoubrey commended the applicants on a great reuse proposal for this building. He suggested that the bell tower should stand independently, and the addition should slide behind the wall and not engage it. He noted that this would simplify the waterproofing details.
- The Committee agreed that this proposal is a great reuse for this property.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Kathy Dowdell commented that this proposal is an interesting adaptive reuse of a challenging building type, and that holding the addition back to allow the corner tower to retain its prominence is important. Her comment was neither received at the time nor conveyed to the Committee members, applicant, or public because it was sent via a private Webex Q&A that was not being monitored.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The existing building is in poor condition but retains a prominent corner bell tower.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- With minor adjustments or clarifications, the proposed work to the exterior of the church building, including the proposed addition, does not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property, satisfying Standard 9.
- The proposed addition allows for the retention of the Ludlow Street side façade, so that if the addition were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property would be unimpaired, satisfying Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, provided:

- a Phase 1A Archaeological Resources Survey is conducted;
- paint removal versus repainting is reviewed with staff;
- the addition sits behind rather than connecting into the side of the bell tower;
- existing windows are repainted before an appropriate storm window system is installed;
- the sign band is not lit and does not have motion;
- proposed roof drainage is clarified; and,
- existing doors are retained, or replaced in a manner consistent with other doors on the tower.

ITEM: 4101-05 Ludlow St					
MOTION: Approval with conditions					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Guttermann	X				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 4328 MAIN ST

Proposal: Construct three-story mixed-use building with roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Baker Street Partners LLC

Applicant: Christopher H Carickhoff, AIA, Studio C Architecture LLC

History: 1925; demolished 2016

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a three-story mixed-use building with roof deck on Main Street in the Manayunk Historic District. The historically designated building on this site was demolished in 2016, after it was declared imminently dangerous by the Department of Licenses

& Inspections. The Historical Commission approved a three-story commercial building with roof deck including two pilot houses on this site in 2017, and a revised design in 2019. That façade design was more industrial in appearance than the current proposal. That building was not constructed, and the property has since changed ownership. This proposed design features a painted panel storefront with red brick on the upper stories. The rear of the building will be visible from the Manayunk Towpath, and features a stone masonry base to account for floodplain requirements, with a painted panel storefront at the first story and vinyl siding on the upper stories.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct three-story mixed-use building on Main Street in Manayunk.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *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 work 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.*
 - The proposed building is compatible with Main Street Manayunk Historic District's streetscape materials, massing, features, size, scale and proportion. The staff suggests that the applicant reconsider the use of vinyl siding for the side and rear.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the vinyl siding is changed to an alternative material, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 02:46:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Chris Carickhoff represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. D'Alessandro suggested cladding the side and rear in stucco, masonry, or metal, rather than siding.
 - Mr. Carickhoff responded that his client would prefer a change to stucco.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the setback of the front roof deck and its potential visibility from Main Street.
 - Mr. Carickhoff responded that the deck is set back from the property line five feet, and the additional one-foot six-inches is accounting for the projecting cornice.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the cornice detail, and stated that he appreciates it being utilized as a solid parapet.
 - Mr. Carickhoff confirmed that the cornice is providing a solid guard at the front and both sides with its height.
 - Ms. Chantry noted that the two prior Commission approvals for this site included front decks that were not set back a great distance.
 - Others noted that the Standards require decks on historic buildings to be inconspicuous, but do not prescribe the visibility of decks on new construction.

- Mr. D'Alessandro suggested cladding the pilot house in flat metal panels rather than siding.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the height of the pilot house. He suggested a reduction in height as much as possible to allow for the minimum code clearance.
 - Mr. Carickhoff responded that it can be reduced in height by several inches.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the location of rooftop mechanical equipment.
 - Mr. Carickhoff responded that the units will not rise higher than the parapet.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed building is compatible with Main Street Manayunk Historic District's streetscape materials, massing, features, size, scale and proportion, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the vinyl siding at the side and rear is changed to an alternative material such as stucco, the height of the pilot house is reduced, and metal panels are used instead of siding on the pilot house, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 4328 Main St MOTION: Approval, with conditions MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 1509 GREEN ST

Proposal: Construct three-story rear addition; pilot houses; and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1918 Fairmount Ave LLC

Applicant: Joanne Thieu, Studio C Architecture LLC

History: 1859

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to add a three-story rear addition, roof deck, and pilot houses to 1509 Green Street, a row house constructed in 1859 and a contributing property to the Spring Garden Historic District. This scope also includes extensive interior work to rehabilitate the building for use as a 4-unit multifamily property.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish small rear addition, rear wall, and pitch roof of historic ell.
- Construct three-story addition to extend rear portion of three-story ell.
- Construct new flat roof over full ell (existing and new).
- Construct two pilot houses and roof deck on rear ell.
- Install mechanical units on front of main block and rear ell.
- Install new windows at rear of property both in existing openings and new construction.
- Construct two basement egress openings.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - The brick on the main block rear wall and rear ell will remain in place, and the extension of the ell will be a compatible material in order to satisfy Standard 2.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed addition extends the three-story portion of the ell and is compatible to the historic ell in height and width, satisfying Standard 9.
 - Drawings for the front pilot house do not provide sufficient information for review as there is no information included on a front roof deck. Owing to a lack of information, the pilot house and its future roof deck cannot be fully evaluated to determine if these elements comply with Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent construction or related new construction will be undertaken in a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - The proposed work removes a limited area of historic fabric and could be restored in the future, satisfying Standard 10.

- *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.*
 - The proposed front pilot house could comply with Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline if additional information about the front pilot house and roof deck were provided. A physical mock-up is also recommended to evaluate if roof deck and pilot are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the historic brick is maintained on the rear ell and the extension is a compatible material, the front pilot house is eliminated, rear pilot house and mechanical equipment are not visible from public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, 10, and Roofs Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 02:58:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Christopher H Carickhoff represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Cluver asked if the rear ell is brick.
 - Mr. Carickhoff confirmed that the historic rear ell is red brick. He noted that the rear extension on the ell is in poor condition and is not sure if it even has a foundation. Mr. Carickhoff explained that the historic ell is brick and the small extension proposed for demolition is constructed of stucco and wood.
 - Mr. Cluver said that, typically in a case such as this, an addition would be brick or stucco.
 - Mr. Carickhoff responded that his client would prefer stucco if the Committee is amenable to that.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if there is a way to save more of the rear ell. She inquired if the extension was being taken down for structural reasons or based on owner preference.
 - Mr. Carickhoff replied that it is owner preference and that there are no structural issues. He noted that the extension they are taking down is approximately 8 feet in length and is in poor condition. He clarified that this area is a more recent extension to the historic ell.
- Ms. Gutterman asked how much of the historic ell would be removed.
 - Mr. Carickhoff responded that there would not be much removed and the majority would remain.
 - Ms. Gutterman pointed out that on page 6 of the application it looks like a lot of the ell's rear wall would be removed.
 - Mr. Carickhoff confirmed that this is true as their intention is to make a more open concept interior floor plan in the bi-level unit.
 - Mr. Detwiler noted that the rear wall of the historic ell is being mostly left in place on the first floor.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if the roofline of the historic ell was changing.
 - Mr. Carickhoff replied that the ell's roof is currently pitched toward the open side yard and they plan to level the roof to accommodate the new roof deck.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked if it was necessary to change the roof line.

- Mr. Carickhoff said that they could build the deck on top of the existing roof. He added that the owner wanted a roof deck in this location.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if there was a chimney located between this property and the adjacent property.
 - Mr. Carickhoff responded that it is documented on page 5 and 6 that it will be removed. He continued that this is potentially something they could work around.
 - Ms. Gutterman said that the chimney could be kept on the roof and take out the chimney in the interior areas below. She explained that they would just need to make sure the chimney is structurally supported below the roof. Ms. Gutterman added that the applicant should confirm the chimney is not being shared with the adjacent property.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the scope of window replacement. He requested accurate documentation of the historic windows, documenting the profile, dimensions, and other key details.
 - Mr. Carickhoff replied that they are not planning to replace front windows, only the rear windows.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro and Mr. Cluver asked that he check the drawings and make sure all window notes are accurate.
- Mr. Detwiler recommended updating the submission for the Historical Commission meeting noting that it would be helpful to show the existing rear elevations not just the proposed elevations.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicant to address the staff's concerns about the front pilot house.
 - Ms. Mehley said that the staff was concerned about a pilot house being placed on the front block and that there were no plans submitted for its associated roof deck.
 - Mr. Carickhoff responded that the front pilot house will not be on the main block. He noted that both pilot houses will not be visible from the public-right-of-way. Mr. Carickhoff explained that his client wanted to move the project through the Historical Commission review more easily, so they removed the front deck from the scope of work.
 - Mr. McCoubrey asked if the front pilot house would be built on the front wall of the historic ell.
 - Mr. Carickhoff confirmed that it would be built on this wall.
 - Mr. McCoubrey asked if front wall would be built up to create a level deck.
 - Mr. Carickhoff confirmed that it would.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Justino Navarro, Spring Garden Civic Association and Spring Garden Community Development Corporation, inquired about the recent removal of three front windows from 1509 Green Street and noted that he sent a photograph of the open windows to the staff. He also expressed concern about projects in Philadelphia historic districts that place gas and electric meters on the front of buildings and asked if this a matter that the Committee can assist with. Mr. Navarro requested that 1509 Green Street's existing service and meters remain in their existing locations as part of this project. He concluded by stating that they 100% support the staff recommendations on this application including the removal of the front pilot house.
 - Mr. Farnham asked Mr. Carickhoff to address the public comment regarding the removal of the front windows.

- Mr. Carickhoff replied that it is not in the scope of this project and it is possible that the owner may be handling it as a separate project and permit application.
- Mr. Farnham said that the staff can investigate and see what has been approved for this address.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The historic rear ell will remain but an extension to the ell will be demolished.
- The applicant is proposing stucco for the new proposed extension.
- The removal of an existing chimney is part of the scope of work.
- The proposed front pilot house will be built on top of the front wall of the historic ell.
- The application does not include a roof deck. Based on the location of the front pilot house, the future roof deck would be located on the main block.
- This scope of work includes replacement of windows at the rear of property only.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The brick on the main block rear wall and rear ell will remain in place, and the extension of the ell will be a compatible material, satisfying Standard 2.
- The proposed addition extends the three-story portion of the ell and is compatible to the historic ell in height and width, satisfying Standard 9.
- Drawings for the front pilot house do not provide sufficient information for review as there is no information included on a front roof deck. Owing to a lack of information, the pilot house and its future roof deck cannot be fully evaluated to determine if these elements comply with Standard 9.
- The proposed work removes a limited area of historic fabric and could be restored in the future, satisfying Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the historic brick is maintained on the rear ell, the extension is a compatible material, the front wall of the rear ell is not raised or built on, the front pilot house is eliminated, rear pilot house and mechanical equipment are not visible from public right-of-way, and chimney is not removed, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, 10, and Roofs Guideline.

ITEM: 1509 Green St					
MOTION: Approval, with conditions					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 717 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Add front steps to basement and railings, alter window and door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: RHS 218 LLC

Applicant: Raydrian Wyche, Wyche Construction

History: 1860

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a new front basement stair and main entrance to the lower basement level at 717 Walnut Street. The proposed change will create a separate rental space in this area of the building. The existing basement entryway is not code compliant for the intended use as a separate rental unit. The north side of the 700 block of Walnut Street currently has six buildings (including 717 Walnut St) with basement entry stairs of different forms. None of these basement entryways are recent additions to the buildings in this row.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct new, code compliant basement entrance to allow for entrance to separate rental space.
- Remove perpendicular basement entrance stair and construct new transverse stair.
- Remove basement window to create pass through entry space. Install new window in second basement window opening.
- Construct new set back entry way and door in basement area.
- Add guardrail extension to first-floor main entry stairs.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - The addition of a new 4' wide basement stairs directly adjacent to the historic front entry stair negatively impacts the historic character of the façade; therefore it is not compatible with Standard 2. The enlargement and reconfiguration of the existing entrance, if similar to 713 Walnut Street, would be more compatible with Standard 2 (see attached Images 6 and 7).
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The size, mass, and position of the proposed basement stair does not meet Standard 9. In addition, the drawings suggest that the historic main entry stair (to the first floor) would be altered to accommodate a handrail extension. This would also not be compatible with Standard 9

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial as shown, pursuant to Standard 2 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 03:27:55

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- No one represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked if there were any other basement stairs on this block of Walnut Street that have the same orientation as the stairs proposed in this application.
 - Mr. Cluver replied that 703 and 707 Walnut Street have similar stairs. He noted this information was included with the application materials.
- Mr. Cluver asked if the 703 and 707 Walnut Street basement stairs were approved by the Historical Commission or if this work was done before designation.
 - Ms. Mehley responded that the staff believes these changes were made prior to the designation of the historic district.
- Mr. Cluver said that the steepness of the existing basement stairs at 717 Walnut Street is a concern and inquired if the applicant proposes a commercial or residential use.
 - Ms. Mehley replied that no specific use is given in application or provided by applicant.
 - Mr. Cluver noted that the existing stairs appear dangerous and lead to the window closest to the steps. He pointed out that if the steps were extended toward the other window there might be a better chance at making this work.
- Mr. Cluver commented that by running the steps perpendicular to the building would require too many changes to the existing façade, such as the main entry handrail, and would have a real impact. He noted that he agrees with the comments raised in the letter from the Society Hill Civic Association.
- Mr. Detwiler pointed out the headroom in the basement entry area is also a major concern. He asked if the application was proposing to take the window completely out.
 - Ms. Mehley responded that this is correct. The application shows that the window would be removed, and the window opening would serve as a pass-through space and then you would get to the new entry door.
- Mr. Detwiler observed that other basement stairs on this block have a door in this location but still questions if the head height meets code.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked if this is a main entrance or main egress to this unit because it looks like an emergency exit rather than an entrance.
- Mr. Detwiler said there are many application questions that the Committee does not have answers to and there is no applicant to provide answers.
 - Ms. Gutterman replied the Committee needs to review the application based on information they have.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Lorna Katz, representing the Society Hill Civic Association (SHCA), said that based on her assessment there is no way the proposed design can be code compliant. The SHCA supports using the existing basement stair so it does not compete with the main first floor entry. She pointed out that there are utilities in the sidewalk area that raise questions as well. An email summarizing their comments was submitted, on behalf SHCA by Paul Boni to the Historical Commission on May 22, 2020.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed change to the direction of the basement stair and related modifications would significantly alter the historic character of the front façade.
- Re-use of the existing basement stairs should be explored.
- The proposed design may not meet code requirements or take into account potential impact to underground utilities.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The addition of a new four-foot-wide basement stairs directly adjacent to the historic front entry stair negatively impacts the historic character of the façade; therefore, it does not satisfy Standard 2.
- The size, mass, and position of the proposed basement stair does not meet Standard 9. In addition, the drawings suggest that the historic main entry stair to the first floor would be altered to accommodate a handrail extension; therefore, it does not satisfy Standard 9

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

ITEM: 717 Walnut St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 62 W QUEEN LN

Proposal: Rehabilitate building, construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Ruggerio Plante Land Design/56-64 Queen Lane Associates LLC

Applicant: Jim Cassidy, C2 Architecture

History: 1810

Individual Designation: 3/29/1966

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

The building at 62 W. Queen Lane was constructed about 1810 and an 1895 historic map documents the existence of a rear ell. The rear ell appears in 1950s and 1960s photographs but

was likely demolished in the late twentieth century. A 1972 record from the Department of Licenses & Inspections indicates that the building required critical repairs, owing to violations. The building is in very poor condition today.

This application proposes to rehabilitate the surviving main block and construct a new two-story rear addition. The design of the rear addition includes a two-story hyphen that extends from the main block and connects to wider two-story section. The new hyphen is located in the general area where the demolished ell originally stood. A window well with enlarged basement window would be added for egress at the front façade.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Rehabilitate the historic main block.
- Construct a new two-story rear addition.
- Add egress window.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - The plans indicate the historic main block will be rehabilitated with historically appropriate materials and detailing. The proposed addition is located at the rear of the property where the historic ell originally stood.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The architectural features and proposed materials of the new addition are compatible with the historic building. The mass, size, and scale of the rear ell are compatible while the addition's roof form differentiates it from the historic main block.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent construction or related new construction will be undertaken in a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - If the proposed addition is removed in the future, the historic section would retain its essential historic form and integrity.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 03:39:20

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Jim Cassidy represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant to talk about the shape of the new addition's roof as well as the lack of windows on the side of the addition. She inquired if this was because they are party walls.
 - Mr. Cassidy confirmed that the east elevation is on the property line, but the west elevation does have windows that are set back, owing to the code requirement to have at least a three-foot setback from the property line. He continued that the shape of the roof was purposeful to differentiate it from the roof of the original building.
- Mr. Detwiler pointed out that the section drawing (A3.0) shows there is nothing really happening in the rear addition roof area.
 - Mr. Cassidy responded that this section is fairly undeveloped and contemplates using trusses for framing out the roof. Mr. Cassidy continued that the intention is to reflect to volume of the roof in the spaces below.
- Mr. Detwiler stated this is a very small but nice project and noted that he is familiar with the poor condition of the building. He inquired about the restoration of the front building and asked if the applicant was doing anything in terms of recreating what was once on the historic front façade, adding that he does not see a pent roof over the front door or shutters. Mr. Detwiler asked about the door and windows.
 - Mr. Cassidy replied that the original windows exist on the second floor, so they are going to match that window profile and plan to work with staff on these details.
- Mr. D'Alessandro expressed concern that the project is not a rehabilitation as described and pointed out that the scope of work includes the demolition of the entire third floor interior.
 - Mr. Cassidy responded that the third floor is really a half floor (4'-4'6" in height) and one cannot stand up correctly on this floor. He stated that were imagining that this space would be open from the second floor below.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro stated they should not remove the third-floor joists since they tie the walls together.
 - Mr. Cassidy replied that the joists would remain.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro continued to voice concern about the overall structural integrity of the historic building, noting that the demolition drawings should have been included with the application package. He added that the third floor should not be removed without a structural report and the means and methods for the demolition work.
 - Mr. Cassidy stated there was no plan to demolish the floor framing of the third floor. He confirmed they have an engineer on the project.
 - Others noted that the Historical Commission has not authority to regulate the interior and relies on applicants and the Department of Licenses & Inspections to ensure that structural issues are addressed. If the interior work has no impact on the exterior appearance of the building, it is not within the Historical Commission's purview.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about the hyphen roof and the way it partially engages the historic building's rear eaves line. He inquired if they could hold this down to below the cornice level.
 - Mr. Cassidy responded that unfortunately they are pretty tight on the ceiling heights, noting that the ell or hyphen ceiling heights are only 7'6" and 7'9". He continued that the connection with the eaves is a product of having to match the

ceiling height on the ell. Mr. Cassidy stated that he understood Mr. McCoubrey's comment.

- Mr. Detwiler asked if a grate will go over the basement egress window located on front façade.
 - Mr. Cassidy replied that there will not be a grate as the egress is within the property line and does not impede on the sidewalk.
 - Mr. Detwiler inquired if there was a code requirement for this. He continued that he was familiar with some that have a metal grate with a hinge that pops up. Mr. Detwiler recommended the applicant look into this.
- Mr. Cluver stated he was following up on Mr. McCoubrey's comment about the ceiling heights and wondered how the rear cornice could be preserved.
 - Mr. Cassidy responded that he was concerned they could not get decent ceiling heights. He added that he did not see the original ell when it was standing but noted that when you look at the historic photographs it does not look like there was a rear cornice.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that it would be better if the new addition roof would not extend as high as the historic building's roof. He continued that it is important that the front historic building is primary while the new wing is secondary.
 - Mr. Cassidy responded that he agreed with this comment and that the rear roof is approximately one foot lower than the historic building's roof.
- Mr. Cluver suggested that the front of the new addition's roof pitch could match the pitch of the historic building's roof so that at least half of it has some resonance with the existing building.
 - Mr. McCoubrey commented that the proposed roof looks like a skylight.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro added that it looks very industrial.
 - Mr. Cassidy pointed out that roofline will not be visible from the street as there is a neighboring building that is very close and there is proposed construction for the adjacent parcels. He added that the visibility of the rear addition and roof will be limited from sidewalk and street view.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- No public comment.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The historic front building will be rehabilitated based on existing historic materials, details, and historic photographs.
- The architect will limit the connection between the hyphen and rear eaves of historic building as much as possible.
- The visibility of the new addition from the public-right of way will be limited, owing to the existing building directly west of the property and proposed new development directly east of the property.
- The architect should determine if a metal grate or similar protection is required by code for the front basement egress window.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The plans indicate the historic main block will be rehabilitated with historically appropriate materials and detailing. The proposed addition is located at the rear of the property where the historic ell originally stood. The proposed work satisfies Standard 2.

- The architectural features and proposed materials of the new addition are compatible with the historic building. The mass, size, and scale of the rear ell are compatible while the addition's roof form differentiates it from the historic main block. The proposed work satisfies Standard 9.
- If the proposed addition is removed in the future, the historic section would retain its essential historic form and integrity, satisfying Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a structural engineer confirms that the structural integrity of the building will be maintained, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

ITEM: 62 W Queen Ln					
MOTION: Approval, with conditions					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

Ms. Gutterman and Ms. Stein excused themselves and left the meeting.

ADDRESS: 1935 DIAMOND ST

Proposal: Construct three-story building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: DSW74 LLC

Applicant: Rotciver Lebron, Harman Deutsch Ohler Architecture

History: 1889; Willis G. Hale, architect; Demolished 2018

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Diamond Street Historic District, Significant, 1/29/1986

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes construct a three-story mixed use building with three residential units and one commercial space at 1935 Diamond Street. The building that historically stood on the site was constructed in 1889 as part of an original row of 10 brick houses (1921-1939 Diamond Street) and attributed to architect Willis G. Hale. The building was demolished in 2018 as part of the Department of Licenses & Inspections Demolition Program. Of the original 10 row houses, only four are extant, 1921, 1923, 1937, and 1939 Diamond Street.

Historically, the property featured an elevated front porch mirroring that of its neighbor to the west, pointed arch upper-floor windows, and an overhanging balcony.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 MAY 2020

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

The proposed building approximates the overall form and floor levels of the historic building, but with considerably simplified detailing. Owing to the property's zoning as CMX-2 (Commercial Mixed-Use), which allows for a combination of commercial and residential units within an area that is primarily residential, the proposed design features a cut down, ADA-accessible commercial ground floor unit.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct three-story mixed-use building with first-floor commercial space.
- Clad building in brick veneer, stucco, and fiber cement lap siding with an asphalt shingle roof.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The general massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the proposed new construction are compatible with the neighboring buildings and district. Historic design details and materials should be further explored to satisfy Standard 9.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent construction or related new construction will be undertaken in a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - The proposed work satisfies Standard 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial as proposed. Details and materials should be further explored, including first floor entrance, third floor balcony, window openings, and cladding materials of the side and rear elevations, to satisfy Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 04:02:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Rustin Ohler and Eric Quick and owner Darryl Williams represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Ohler explained that the historic building that stood on the property was demolished by the City prior to his client's ownership of 1935 and 1937 Diamond Street. He noted that he is currently working with the Historical Commission staff on a rehabilitation of the building at 1937 Diamond Street. He noted that, of the historic building at 1935 Diamond Street, two chimneys and a front porch pilaster remain, and are being incorporated into the new design. He explained, however, that they are not trying to reconstruct the historic building.
- Mr. Ohler explained that the building code requires them to provide an ADA accessible entrance for a commercial space, and that there is not room for a ramp on the interior or exterior, which is why they are proposing to have an entrance at grade

- rather than a porch as there was historically. He noted that the entrance is set back from the street and in the plane of the historic façade and the neighboring building.
- Mr. Ohler described the historic and proposed fenestration. He explained that they are proposing to install two windows on the second floor that are approximately the same size and location as the historic windows, but that the historic windows were projecting triangular bays within arched openings. He noted that the third floor originally had some architectural balconies, but that they are not proposing to recreate those since this is a new building.
 - Mr. Ohler noted that they are proposing cement board lap siding for the side and rear elevations, but that they are open to an alternative material such as stucco.
 - Mr. Cluver questioned the depth of the brick return on the east party wall.
 - Mr. Ohler responded that the brick returns one or two feet beyond the depth of the porch, approximately 12.5 feet.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro expressed concern over the use of siding. He opined that this is a masonry block, and that the building should appear to be of masonry construction with either brick or stucco party walls, rather than frame siding.
 - Mr. Cluver commented that the second-floor windows have a traditional rowhouse punched openings appearance while the house next door has a ganged window opening and bay.
 - Mr. Ohler responded that the buildings on this block are all different from one another and that the historic building had two openings. He noted that they tried to maintain the original fenestration pattern.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked whether they could use pointed top windows to mimic the openings of the historic building to reduce the boxiness of the proposed facade.
 - Mr. Ohler responded that they could look into that.
 - Mr. Detwiler questioned the aluminum storefront system.
 - Mr. Ohler responded that the storefront would be aluminum and the upper floor windows aluminum clad.
 - Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the horizontal elements of the storefront fenestration should better align with those of the neighboring property, and that it may be more appropriate to continue the base of the building with a sill.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed that there should be more of a connection between the commercial and residential entrances of the property.
 - Ms. DiPasquale asked whether the commercial space is a zoning requirement and whether it is the applicant's desire to have a commercial space or whether they would be seeking a zoning variance.
 - Mr. Ohler responded affirmatively, noting that they are not planning to seek a variance.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- All that remains of the historic building at 1935 Diamond Street that was demolished in 2018 are two chimneys and a front porch pilaster.
- The Historical Commission has full jurisdiction over the proposed construction.
- The new construction generally compatible in terms of scale, massing, materials, and features with the adjacent properties and historic district.

- Lap siding is an inappropriate material for the characteristically masonry historic district, and that stucco would be a more appropriate material for the cladding of the side and rear elevations.
- The ground-floor commercial storefront system should be reworked to better relate to the residential entrance, to incorporate horizontal elements that align with those with the windows of the neighboring property, and to include a sill that aligns with the masonry base of the building rather than extending glass to the ground.
- The second-floor windows should be enhanced to reduce the boxiness of the upper floors, possibly through the use of pointed-arch windows.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed new construction is differentiated from the old and does not destroy historic materials that characterize the property, with some modifications to the storefront, second-floor fenestration, and side elevation materials, will be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the historic district, satisfying Standard 9.
- The proposed new construction will be undertaken in a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the property and its environment will be unimpaired, satisfying Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as presented, but approval provided the lap siding is replaced with stucco, elements of the storefront system better align with the neighboring property and adjacent residential entrance, and the second-floor windows are better defined, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ITEM: 1935 Diamond St MOTION: Denial as presented MOVED BY: Detwiler SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver	X				
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman					X
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein	X				X
Total	4				3

Mr. Cluver excused himself and left the meeting.

ADDRESS: 2100-02 LOCUST ST

Proposal: Replace 18 windows; legalize 11 windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joel and Stella Freedman

Applicant: Gregory R. Heleniak, Esq., Zarwin Baum

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 MAY 2020

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

History: 1889; Henry Louis Jr. House; R.G. Kennedy
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, Significant, 2/8/1995
Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

Located at the southwest corner of Locust and S. 21st Streets, 2100-02 Locust Street is a single-family dwelling, and is listed as a Significant building in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District.

In July 2018, the Historical Commission's staff witnessed contractors completing the replacement of all windows on the property and the panning of the original window frames, and requested that the Department of Licenses & Inspections issue a violation for the work.

In July 2019, the Historical Commission reviewed an application to replace nine of the illegal windows with appropriate windows and to legalize the installation of the remaining windows and metal panning. At that meeting, the Historical Commission denied the application, finding that 2100-02 Locust Street is a prominent corner property and the windows that were installed are on highly-visible street frontages, not secondary elevations; that the finish of the metal windows and panning is shinier than the historic painted wood windows; that the replacement windows were installed within the original frames and build down the window opening; that legalizing the inappropriate replacement windows would be unfair to other property owners who have sought the Commission's approval and complied with historic preservation standards and would set a bad precedent; and that the Historical Commission could consider a replacement schedule, but that ultimately all windows would need to be replaced.

This application proposes to replace the windows at the basement, first, and second floors, and to retain and legalize the metal windows and panning at the third and fourth floors. The staff notes that, while the previous application would have removed non-historic infill at the tops of three basement windows, the current proposal retains the build-down of these windows owing to the confirmed and assumed presence of mechanical equipment. This application proposes to install two-over-two, double-hung windows in the remaining space below the infill. As such, three of the proposed basement windows do not replicate the historic appearance. The staff suggests that the bottom sash of the replacement windows in openings with existing mechanical infill replicate the proportions of the historic windows, with the meeting rails aligning with those of the historically appropriate windows. This would allow the mechanical infill to be removed in the future and a new top sash to be installed without the replacement of the bottom sash.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize replacement of historic wood windows with metal windows and metal cladding at third and fourth floor.
- Replace illegal windows with historically-accurate windows at the first, second, and three basement window openings.
- Install double-hung wood windows below non-historic infill in three basement window openings.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*
 - The property owners did not demonstrate that the windows that were removed were beyond repair. The new metal windows do not match the old in design, texture, or materials. The new

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the restoration of the windows at the basement, first, and second floors, provided the bottom sash and meeting rail location of the three basement windows replicates the historic appearance, but denial of the legalization of the remaining windows, pursuant to Standard 6 and the Historical Commission's July 2019 decision.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 04:16:28

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Gregory Heleniak and architect Janice Woodcock represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Heleniak provided background on the project, explaining that the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission previously reviewed an application for legalization and window replacement, which was denied. He noted that his client appealed the Commission's decision to Board of Licenses and Inspections Review (BLIR), where they submitted a revised application. He opined that the BLIR saw merit in the revised application to replace certain windows as a compromise and suggested that the application be reviewed by the Historical Commission.
- Mr. Heleniak explained that the initial work was done illegally purely because of a lack of understanding by the property owner of the Historical Commission's requirements. He opined that they have come up with what they feel is a compromise that meets preservation standards, increasing the number of windows they are willing to replace with wood windows from 4 to 9 to 13 to 16 to 18 of the total 29 windows and are making a good faith effort to comply. He argued that to require the replacement of all 29 windows would be wasteful and expensive, and the requirement to replace all of the windows would create a hardship on the owner.
- Mr. Heleniak explained that they are asking for the third and fourth-floor windows to be allowed to remain, opining that they comply with the spirit of Standard 6 in their design, color, and visual qualities, if not in their material. He opined that visibility from the street creates the same aesthetic and is compatible with the district. He explained that the windows were replaced in an effort to restore and maintain the property as a single-family home.
- Ms. Woodcock opined that the owners have "been through a lot with the City," and that this proposal does what it needs to do to protect the public interest. She explained that the proposed approach would correct the problem with the windows in regards to their type. In the basement, where sliders were installed, they are proposing to put back double-hung windows. At the first floor, where an arched-top window had been turned into multiple units, they are proposing to restore to original

- configuration. And they are proposing to reinstall the curved glass bay windows which had been replaced with flat glass windows.
- Ms. Woodcock opined that it is difficult to distinguish between the old windows and the new in the photographs, and that it would be difficult in person from 35 feet away to tell that there is no form to the window molding. She conceded that the planing removes some of the original round shape of the window frame and builds the window down slightly.
 - Ms. Woodcock acknowledged the Commission's concern that allowing a building such as this to have a non-complying component will set a precedent, but she opined that this is an unusual property. She opined that very few Center City properties have 29 street-fronting windows. She acknowledged that replacing the windows without Historical Commission review or approval was a big mistake and the fix will also be big. She opined that replacing 18 of the 29 windows will teach the owner a lesson and send a message to other owners that the Historical Commission is serious about its work, but is also reasonable.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro asked how long the owner has owned the property.
 - Mr. Heleniak responded that the owners purchased the property in April 2018 and that the window replacement was part of the owner's attempt shortly after purchase to renovate the house. He opined that the windows were in a fairly deteriorated condition.
 - Mr. Detwiler noted that what is unfortunate is that the frames are thicker and the visible glass reduced. He explained that the third floor reads as part of the same mass and elevation as the first and second floors and that the windows of the three floors are aligned. He suggested that if he were to consider a compromise, he would consider allowing the fourth floor windows to remain, since it is visually different than the lower three floors. He opined that it would look top heavy to have thicker frames and sash on the third floor over the second and first. He argued that the building is listed as Significant in the district, not Contributing, and that the effort that everyone is going to is worthy of the building's importance to the district. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed.
 - Mr. McCoubrey explained that the Architectural Committee is here to help the Historical Commission understand how the proposal complies with the Standards and opined that this project does not.
 - Mr. Heleniak disagreed, opining that it is their position that the replacement windows on the third and fourth floor are the same type and color as the original windows and comply with the spirit of Standard 6 as they are comparable in design, color, and texture with the historic windows. He noted that they do not match the historic windows in materials, which in Standard 6 is a secondary consideration, "where possible." He opined that the Commission has flexibility to recognize that the windows at the third and fourth floor comply with the Standard.
 - Mr. McCoubrey disagreed.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro asked why the windows could not have been restored, noting that no documentation was provided to show their deteriorated condition.
 - Ms. Woodcock agreed that the client was naive and reiterated Mr. Heleniak's comments that the windows would be the correct type and the windows closest to the public view would be restored to their original condition. Ms. Woodcock opined that the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission have discretion and the standards are not that every property be "completely perfect."

- Mr. McCoubrey argued that, given the prominence and significance of this property, it is difficult to legalize work that was done improperly and that does differ from the Standards.
- Mr. Heleniak remarked that if his client had understood the procedures of the City and restrictions on the property when they purchased it, they would have complied, but unfortunately they were new to the city and moved forward with the intent to preserve and restore a home that needed attention. He reiterated that replacing 18 windows is more than a compromise to get it on the right track and honor the work of the Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The windows at 2100-02 Locust Street were replaced without the Historical Commission's review or approval and without a building permit.
- No materials were provided that demonstrate that the original windows were in severely deteriorated condition,
- 2100-02 Locust Street is a prominent corner property, and the windows that were installed are on highly-visible street-frontages, not secondary elevations.
- The replacement windows do not match the historic windows in design, finish, or materials.
- Owing to the build down of the windows, allowing the third-floor windows to remain would create a visual top-heaviness to the building since the third-floor reads as part of the same mass as the first and second floors and the windows align.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The property owner did not demonstrate that the windows that were removed were beyond repair, and the installed windows do not replicate the historic windows in design, texture, or materials, and therefore do not satisfy Standard 6.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the restoration of the windows at the basement, first, and second floors, provided the bottom sash and meeting rail location of the three basement windows replicates the historic appearance, but denial of the legalization of the remaining windows, pursuant to Standard 6 and the Historical Commission's July 2019 decision.

ITEM: 2100-02 Locust St MOTION: Approval of restoration, with conditions; denial of legalization MOVED BY: D'Alessandro SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman					X
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein					X
Total	3				4

ADDRESS: 135 S 18TH ST

Proposal: Install and replace signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rittenhouse Realty Assoc

Applicant: Stephan Potts, Stanev Potts Architects

History: 1913; McIlvaine & Roberts, architects

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace existing signage at the ground floor and install new signage at the third story.

The Architectural Committee and Historical Commission reviewed an application for branding-related improvements in the fall of 2018. At that time, signage proposed for the rooftop and for the third story at the S. 18th and Walnut Street facades was denied.

The current application proposes to limit the new signage to the Walnut Street side at the third story. Black painted steel letters with LED backlighting would be installed through the mortar joints.

The ground floor signage proposed for replacement would maintain the size and appearance of the existing signage; only the letters would be changed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 04:40:50

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Stephan Potts represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McCoubrey asked if the applicant had anything to add to the staff's overview.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 MAY 2020

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Mr. Potts responded that their client was returning with this application because they still had concerns about the public's ability to easily identify the hotel and tenant spaces with the existing signage.
- Mr. D'Alessandro expressed concern with any kind of drilling into the masonry to attach signage. He remarked that the application materials did not provide enough information about the details of the new sign installation. Mr. D'Alessandro said he did not object to the proposed location of the sign. However, he was not comfortable with any drilling into the stone or with the proposed illumination.
 - Mr. Potts responded that he shared Mr. D'Alessandro's concerns with drilling holes into the façade of the building. He suggested that it was for this reason that it would be essential to work very closely with the staff on the details of the installation process, as he had on other projects over the last 20 years.
- Mr. Detwiler shared Mr. D'Alessandro's concerns about the proposed penetrations in the façade, and asked how electricity would be routed to the signage.
 - Mr. Potts explained that the proposed location was chosen in part because of the entablature that would serve to obscure the visibility of any conduit used to illuminate the sign.
- Mr. D'Alessandro reiterated his opposition to drilling into the façade. He said that the applicant would need to provide a detailed installation template that could be reviewed and approved by the Architectural Committee.
 - Mr. Potts replied that he thought that having the staff review an installation template was a very good idea, but having the Committee review a template for drilling was excessive.
- Mr. McCoubrey told the applicant that he understood the client's need for additional branding and had no objection to the proposed location of the new sign. He added that the staff could diligently review the installation details and could remand it to the Architectural Committee if there were any concerns.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- No public comment.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Despite proposing to attach the new signage through the mortar joints, there is still concern about the damage that could be done to the stone during the installation process and the potential for water infiltration in the future.
- Illuminating the signage further complicates the installation process and the potential for damage to the façade due to the penetrations needed to accommodate wiring.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Though there was concern about penetrating the façade, the proposed location for the new signage was acceptable.
- The staff could remand the details of the signage and lighting details to the Architectural Committee if there were any concerns with the applicant's means and methods.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, in particular a template for the sign and lighting installation to the building façade, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 135 S 18th St MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Detwiler SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman					X
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein					X
Total	3				4

ADDRESS: 2225 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Construct three-story multifamily building at rear

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Wizard Way LLC

Applicant: Ryan Lohbauer, Stanev Potts Architects

History: 1875

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a three-story multifamily building with roof deck in the rear yard of 2225 Spruce Street. A portion of the rear yard area from 2223 Spruce Street has been consolidated into the lot of 2225 Spruce Street. The building will front onto Manning Street, which has a mixture of apartment and single-family entrances, rear yards, parking spaces, garage doors, and rear walls of buildings on this block, all of varying heights and setbacks. The proposed building is clad in painted brick. The ornamental window surround is inspired by the cornice detail at 2223 Spruce Street.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct three-story multifamily building fronting Manning Street.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *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 work 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.*
 - The proposed building is compatible with the historic district's materials, massing, size, scale and proportion. The window surround details differentiate the building from the old. The staff suggests that the applicant consider the inclusion of a cornice to define the roofline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 05:04:18

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Ryan Lohbauer represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler asked the applicant what material was proposed for the decorative window surrounds and why they were proposing to paint the brick rather than build with a tan-colored brick.
 - Mr. Lohbauer responded that the window surround would likely be a sturdy, rot-resistant wood product. He explained that the reflectivity and sheen of a painted brick façade were different than using a light colored, non-painted brick.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that painting brick was not a good idea since it could lead to problems with moisture in the future. He asked about the height of the parapet above the third-story windows, noting that it was high. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the applicant drop down the height of the parapet and instead design a discrete railing to block the view of the proposed roof deck.
- Mr. McCoubrey and Mr. Detwiler agreed that the height of the parapet as proposed made the design appear as though a cornice had been stripped off of the building.
- Mr. Detwiler said that there was one view in the materials where the proposed building looked significantly higher than the others on the street, so anything to reduce the parapet would be helpful. He also echoed Mr. McCoubrey's concern with painting brick.
 - Mr. Lohbauer responded that he understood the concerns and believed that they could reduce the parapet enough to address them.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the applicant consider holding back the decorative window surrounds enough to reveal the edge of the brick. Mr. Detwiler agreed with this idea and suggested that the applicant consider creating a mock-up to show the staff in the field to see how it all really came together.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he thought the decorative window elements should be made of metal instead of wood because otherwise they would deteriorate too quickly.
 - Mr. Lohbauer replied that he understood Mr. D'Alessandro's concern with wood. However, there were many newer products available that were much more durable than wood. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with this point.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- No public comment.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposal to paint the new brick façade was not appropriate and could lead to moisture problems in the future.
- The overall height of the proposed structure appeared taller than the buildings on the block.

- The material used for the decorative window surround should be chosen carefully so that it does not deteriorate.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The design intent of the painted brick could be achieved by selecting the right brick and mortar color combination.
- Lowering the parapet and using a discrete railing to enclose the roof deck would help improve the overall mass and height of the building.

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

- a natural brick is used rather than a painted one;
- the window surround detail is fabricated in a composite material resistant to rot;
- the window detail is set back in the openings to reveal the side of the brick;
- the height of the building is reduced as much as possible;
- the parapet is eliminate and a railing is used instead.

ITEM: 2225 Spruce St MOTION: Approval with Conditions MOVED BY: Detwiler SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman					X
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein					X
Total	3				4

ADDRESS: 1618-22 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Paint building, add rooftop structure, windows and signage, rehabilitate storefront

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Gazit Horizons LLC

Applicant: Luca Segato, Eimer Design

History: 1933; WCAU Building; Harry Sternfeld, architect

Individual Designation: 8/6/1981

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Megan Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to renovate a 10-story Art-Deco style building with office space in the upper floors and retail space at the ground floor. It proposes to construct one-story rooftop structure and pergola on a lower portion of the building, behind the taller front portion of the building. It proposes to cut new window openings and install windows in the side facades,

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 MAY 2020

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

continuing the existing window pattern and replicating the existing window type. The application proposes to restore the entrance area at the western edge of the storefront and replace non-historic doors. The application proposes to paint the façade of the building. Historically, the building was faced with random, small blue glass chips set in a stucco-like bed. From a photograph included in the application, it appears that about 30% of the façade surface was blue glass and 70% gray stucco. At some point before the designation, the façade was stuccoed, obscuring the blue glass chips in a coating of smooth stucco. At that time or later, the new stucco surface was painted blue as an homage to the hidden blue glass chips. The application proposes to paint the façade a grey-white color. The application proposes to add signage on the side facades and on a tower at the peak of the front façade. The building originally had a light mast at the peak of the front façade. Most of the mast was removed before designation. This application proposes to add signage to the truncated light mast. The application also proposes interior work, which is not within the jurisdiction of the Historical Commission.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct one-story rooftop structure and pergola.
- Cut new window openings and install windows.
- Restore entrance and replace doors.
- Paint façade.
- Add signage.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *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 6 requires that the replacement element match the historic color. The blue color, first from the glass chips and now from the painted stucco, is arguably its most distinctive feature.
 - The restoration of the blue glass door surround and the new doors comply with Standard 6.
- *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 work 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.*
 - The proposed new doors, windows and penthouse/pergola are compatible with the buildings materials, massing, size, scale and proportion.
 - The change in color for the building from its original blue to gray-white would remove a character-defining feature of this building and one of its primary Art Deco characteristics. However, the impact of the change in color is mitigated by the fact that the building has been stuccoed. Moreover, the original background material, the stucco bed of the blue glass, was grey.
 - The proposed signage on the side facades is extremely large and not in character with the building.
 - The WCAU sign on the truncated light mast creates a false sense of history.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of all aspects of the application except the signage and paint, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN WEBEX RECORDING: 05:24:10

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Luca Segato and Ed Eimer and developer Alison Lies represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler commented that there are few buildings in the city where color is as integral to the design and significance as this one. Mr. Detwiler said that he believed there was a way to change the color of the façade to more closely reflect the original blue glass finish that the applicant showed on Page 7 of their packet without going as far as they were currently proposing with the off-white. Mr. Detwiler also encouraged the applicant to embrace and honor the way-finding inherent in the color of the building.
- Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with Mr. Detwiler's comments.
- Mr. McCoubrey said that he appreciated the applicants' willingness to take on the best, wackiest Art Deco building in the city. He suggested that the applicant has an opportunity to perhaps better reflect the original blue-glass chip stucco finish. Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that the sample photograph of the original finish appears light and glittery, so perhaps they could refine their choice of color to convey this original intent more successfully.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that he found the proposed changes to the storefront to be sensitive. However, the proposed signage is too big.
- Mr. Detwiler asked the applicant to clarify if the overbuild was to be set back because he observed two different planes on two different drawings.
 - The applicant confirmed that the west elevation as depicted on Page 13 of the application materials was accurate.
- Mr. Detwiler recommended that the overbuild be set back as much as possible and added that he was not bothered by the proposed pergola.
- In response to Ms. Robinson's public comment, Mr. Detwiler asked the applicant about the original design of the storefront.
 - Mr. Segato responded that his understanding was that the storefront has been redesigned in the early 1980s. He added that he had not been able to locate sufficient archival evidence of the original storefront enough to be used as a model.
- Mr. Detwiler recommended that the applicant attempt to replicate the original storefront as best as possible. He suggested that the applicant work with the Preservation Alliance and the staff of the Historical Commission to research additional archival resources. Mr. Detwiler remarked that he was more in favor of this approach than simply moving forward with a typical storefront system.
- The members of the Architectural Committee agreed that the archival image on Page 3 of the application materials seemed to indicate a horizontal rail at the storefront.
- Mr. D'Alessandro agreed with Mr. Detwiler's comments and suggested that the applicant begin his research at the Athenaeum of Philadelphia.
- Mr. Baron of the staff commented that on Page 3 of the application materials, the archival image in the middle shows that the building itself looks dark and the

ornamentation appears light. He further explained that since the ornaments are silver, they appear more on the light side. Mr. Baron opined that the applicant's goal of making the ornamentation stand out more would therefore be better achieved through the use of a darker façade, as is reflected in the archival images.

- Mr. Detwiler suggested that if the applicant conducted a paint analysis, the original color palette of the building façade and ornamentation would like reveal the kind of contrast they were looking to achieve.
 - Jennifer Robinson informed the members of the Architectural Committee that she believed there were documents related to a previous paint analysis in her files at the Preservation Alliance. However, owing to the COVID-19 shutdown, she had not been able to access them.
 - Ms. Lies replied that ownership would welcome the opportunity to look at any previous paint analysis or archival information that could be provided to them.
- Mr. Detwiler expressed enthusiasm for such a collaboration. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that this level of analysis should be included in any motion made.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Jennifer Robinson of the Philadelphia Alliance for Greater Philadelphia informed the Architectural Committee that her organization holds an easement on the façade of the building. She said that her committee had reviewed the proposal and added that the easement was quite specific in calling out that the blue color was a critical component of the building. At the time the easement was put into place in the 1980s, the language called for the blue color to be restored. Ms. Robinson said that her easement committee had no objection to the proposed new window openings as long as the new windows are consistent with the existing windows in size, material and color. Ms. Robinson added that she believed it could look more balanced if the doors at 1618 Chestnut Street matched the doors at 1622 Chestnut Street, but overall had no objection to the storefront proposal.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- There are few buildings in the city where color is as integral to the design and significance as this one.
- The original intent of using a darker façade color to contrast and highlight the lighter ornament color could be used here to effectively achieve the desire of the applicant.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The use of paint analysis and archival research to more accurately match the original color and storefront conditions of the building will help this proposal achieve the owner's goals and will make this an excellent historic preservation project.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the signage and paint and approval of the remainder of the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9, with the following conditions:

- A paint analysis and investigation is conducted to determine the building's original accent colors and to more closely match the blue color of the original finish;
- The storefront doors match as closely as possible the original design;
- The plane of the overbuild of the stair at the west façade as well as the plane of the pergola are set back behind the plane of the parapet.

ITEM: 1618-22 Chestnut St MOTION: Approval with conditions MOVED BY: Detwiler SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman					X
Suzanne Pentz					X
Amy Stein					X
Total	3				4

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 05:56:30

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 3:06 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

- Minutes of the Architectural Committee are presented in action format. Additional information is available in the audio recording for this meeting. The start time for each agenda item in the recording is noted.
- Application materials and staff overviews are available on the Historical Commission's website, www.phila.gov/historical.