

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

**TUESDAY, 24 JANUARY 2017
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-029
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

PRESENT

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

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

ALSO PRESENT

Mark Merlini, Brickstone
John Pringle, Stantec
Thomas Foley, Stantec
Jose Hernandez, JKR Partners, LLC
Greg Cauterucci, JKR Partners, LLC
Sean Whalen, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Liz Scott, OCF Realty
Sara Pasch, Bluecadet
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
David Pachevski
Carry Mangel
Kate McGlinchey, Old City District
Job Itzkowitz, Old City District
Jim Curry, Owner's Rep, Inc.
Tom Collins, Phoenix Masonry
Steven Cohen
Michael Salomone
Angela Trusko
Elsbeth Brown
Janelle Snyder, Esq.
Natalie Walker
Thomas Crumlish
Michael Phillips, Esq., Obermeyer
Chris Van Der Velde, Awbury Arboretum
Stanley Krakower, Esq.
Stuart Rosenberg
John Christinzio
Giuliano Apadula

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 JANUARY 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Keith Braccia, PMC Property Group
Jonathan Stavin, PMC Property Group
Ori Feibush, OCF Realty
Carol Silver
Stephanie Gregorzek

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. McCoubrey called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Ms. Gutterman, Pentz, and Stein and Messrs. Cluver and D'Alessandro joined him.

ADDRESS: 1524-34 SOUTH ST

Proposal: Retain historic façade; construct mixed-use building and seven townhouses
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: The Royal on South Street, LP
Applicant: Jose Hernandez, JKR Partners, LLC
History: 1920; Royal Theater; Frank E. Hahn, architect
Individual Designation: 9/7/1978
District Designation: None
Preservation Easement: Yes
Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to amend an approval to construct a mixed-use, residential and retail, building at the Royal Theater on South Street. In July 2015, the Historical Commission approved the demolition of all but the front façade of the Royal Theater and the construction of a mixed-use building behind and beside the historic façade, extending back to Kater Street at the rear. A new developer has stepped in to undertake the project and proposes to amend the approved design in two ways. First, the front façade adjacent to and above the historic theater façade has been redesigned. Second, the mixed use building has been reduced in size and seven townhouses are now proposed at the rear along Kater Street. The theater façade would still be restored. The parking for the complex would still be accessed from Kater Street.

The amended design shares many similarities with the approved design. However, the redesigned façade on South Street appears to encase and surround the historic façade more than the earlier façade, detracting from the independence of the historic façade and exacerbating its appearance as a two-dimensional, not a three-dimensional, object. A change in rhythm, materials, and/or coloration of the new façade above the historic façade may minimize the impact of the new construction on the historic resource.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the South Street façade is redesigned, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jose Hernandez and attorney Sean Whalen represented the application.

Mr. Whalen described the project. He described the property and its frontages on South and Kater Streets. He explained that, as previously approved, everything but the historic façade will be demolished. The historic façade will be maintained and restored. He noted that the approved demolition is ongoing. Mr. Whalen explained that the approved project consisted of one large

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 JANUARY 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

apartment building running from street to street. The proposed project would consist of an apartment building on South Street and townhouses on Kater Street. He opined that the revised plan is improved over the approved plan.

Mr. Hernandez introduced the Committee to the architectural drawings and renderings. He provided information about the context within which these buildings would be constructed.

Mr. Cluver asked about the setbacks of the various sections of the front façade from the historic façade. Mr. Hernandez stated that the sections in black immediately adjacent to the historic façade are set back from the plane of the historic façade the thickness of the historic façade, about 30 inches. The setback above the third floor to the main façade is 7'-7". He stated that the retail space "holds the historic façade in place" and the multi-family residential units are in the "background." Mr. Cluver asked if the units above the historic façade have balconies or terraces on top of the historic façade. Mr. Hernandez responded that there is no outdoor space associated with those units. They do not have balconies or terraces. Mr. Cluver asked if there were any railings or "anything like that" associated with the space above the historic façade. Mr. Hernandez stated that there is not. There is no occupied, outdoor space above the historic façade. Mr. Cluver asked about the entrance to the east of the historic façade. He asked if the canopy stays "nestled" within the property line. Mr. Hernandez stated that the canopy extends over the sidewalk about one foot beyond the property line. Mr. Cluver asked about the pergola-like structure at the top of the back façade on the west that is not included on the east. Mr. Hernandez stated that they included it on the west but not on the east to try to break the symmetry, to break down the scale and keep the new building from looking too monolithic.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that the historic façade has returns on the sides of the facades that are not entirely shown on the renderings. He asked whether the returns would be retained and how the historic theater related to the buildings to its sides originally. Mr. Hernandez pointed out a control joint on the side of the historic building that denotes the break between the headhouse and the auditorium. He stated that they would retain everything back to the control joint including any cornices and other returns. He explained that the new façades to the east and west would abut the historic façade at that control joint line. He observed that the existing windows on the sides of the headhouse would be shifted north toward South Street. Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Hernandez to confirm that he is retaining the ornamental stone returns on the headhouse and leaving them exposed. Mr. Hernandez stated that he is retaining and exposing the returns. Ms. Stein asked about the depth of the returns. Mr. Hernandez stated that they are 30 inches deep. Ms. Gutterman asked about the setback from the dark gray façade of the new building to the lighter gray façade behind it. Mr. Hernandez stated that the light gray is about 8 inches behind the dark gray.

Mr. Gutterman asked if the architects considered any colors other than black for the framing sections of the new façade. The applicants responded that they would happily consider alternate colors. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he found the black to be "jarring."

Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the applicants had presented the details of the front façade to the staff. Mr. Farnham responded that the Historical Commission approved the overall restoration plan for the front façade, but the staff has not yet reviewed the details. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the staff had visited the building. Mr. Farnham responded that he had been in the building and looked very carefully at all of the elements. He explained that some of the historic windows and doors survive behind the boarding and are visible from the interior. He also noted that the original architectural drawings of the front façade survive and will be used to guide the restoration. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the application proposes to replace the windows, not

restore them. Mr. Farnham replied that the extant windows are in significant disrepair and could not be restored. They will be replicated. The applicants agreed. Mr. D'Alessandro asked how they could be undertaking the restoration of the front façade now without final approvals. Mr. Hernandez stated that they are not now restoring the façade. The only work occurring now relates to the demolition at the rear, which was prompted by a violation from the Department of Licenses & Inspections and which has been approved by the Historical Commission. The front façade is being braced and the rear is being demolished. Mr. D'Alessandro observed that the architectural drawings call for replacing the windows "in kind." He contended that that does not mean that the new windows will match the historic windows. Others disagreed and stated that that is exactly what the note indicates. Mr. Whalen stated that they have been working very closely with the staff and have every intention of continuing to work with the staff on the details.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the signage proposed for the pilasters on the historic façade. Mr. Hernandez stated that the building originally had a large marquee. He stated that they decided not to rebuild the marquee because it hid the details of the façade. He explained that they are proposing the banners instead of a marquee or canopy or awnings. Ms. Gutterman asked if they are seeking approval of the signage. Mr. Hernandez stated that they planned to work out the details of the signage with the staff. Ms. Stein stated that the signs would block views of the façade. Mr. Whalen stated that they have not worked out the details of the signs; the signs shown on the drawings are placeholders. He stated that they will seek the staff's approval once the signs are fully designed. He also noted that the signs will need the Art Commission's approval.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the setbacks of the new façade from the historic façade in the approved scheme. Mr. Farnham noted that a plan and rendering of the approved scheme were included in the meeting materials. Although not dimensioned, the setbacks are indicated on the plan. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the massing of the proposed is similar to that of the approved. Mr. Hernandez observed that the currently proposed building is set back farther than the approved. Ms. Stein stated that the approved setback looks to be about 20 feet. Mr. Hernandez noted that that setback occurs at some floors at the side wings, but the approved setback of the new construction on the historic façade itself is actually less than is currently proposed.

Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia noted that the Alliance holds an easement on the façade. The Alliance's Easement Committee is reviewing the proposal. He contended that the current scheme obscures the historic façade. The impact may have to do with color and materials. He asked the architect to consider other colors and materials.

Mr. Cluver suggested that the Committee consider the Kater Street elevation. Ms. Stein stated that the Kater Street elevation is appropriate in scale and massing. She suggested that the metal panels that extend down to grade might become a maintenance problem. She suggested a masonry material at grade.

Mr. Cluver stated that he would offer a recommendation of approval with several comments. He stated that the proposed setback was acceptable because it maintained the street line and was in keeping with the approved setback in the earlier plan. He contended that the proposed color for the black sections of the South Street façade, adjacent to the historic façade was not appropriate and should be less assertive or aggressive. He suggested that the pergola should be removed from the black section of the façade to the west of the historic façade; the section on the west should match the one on the east. He stated that any balconies that might be included on top of the historic façade should not be occupied. He stated that the returns of the stone ornament on the sides of the historic façade should be retained, not removed. He stated

that the banner signs in the approval are not sufficiently detailed for an approval. Ms. Gutterman stated that a recommendation should include Ms. Stein's comment that metal panels should not be used at ground level because they are not durable enough for use in such an environment.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the banner signs, owing to incompleteness, but approval of all other aspects of the application, provided the color of the black sections of the South Street façade is revised; the open façade-pergola element is removed from the black section of the façade to the west of the historic façade; the stone trim returns on the sides of the historic façade are retained; and metal panels are installed above a masonry base, not at grade, on Kater Street; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADDRESS: 701-39 MARKET ST

Proposal: Install canopy with signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Independence Center Realty LP

Applicant: Mark Merlini, Brickstone Realty

History: 1859; Lit Brothers Store; various buildings, 1859-1906

Individual Designation: 5/26/1970, 6/30/1970

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application for final approval proposes a canopy with video screens and signage at the main entranceway to the Lits Brother Store, which is located at about the midpoint of the 700-block of Market Street. A large, non-historic, canvas canopy stood at the main entranceway until recently, but it has been removed. In January 2017, the Historical Commission approved an in-concept application for the canopy as currently proposed, provided the video screens were not included on the outer and front sides of the piers supporting the canopy. The Commission approved of the video screens on the inner sides of the piers as well as the underside of the canopy roof. At the January Historical Commission meeting, the applicants agreed to remove the screens from outer sides of the piers; however, those screens are depicted on the drawings in the current application because the application was submitted before the Commission met in January.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the video screens are deleted from the outer sides of the piers as agreed upon at the January 2017 Historical Commission meeting, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's approval in concept of January 2017.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects John Pringle and Tom Foley and building owner Mark Merlini represented the application.

Mr. Pringle distributed a set of architectural drawings with additional details. He stated that the section of the façade in question did not have an entrance in 1980, before the building was rehabilitated using historic tax credits. When the building was renovated in 1986, an entrance was installed where the canopy is now proposed. He stated that one of the two metal storefront piers proposed for alteration in this application was constructed at that time. The other was earlier, but not necessarily original. He explained that a large canvas canopy was installed in the 1980s and was recently removed. Mr. Pringle showed several iterations of the canopy design in

which they sought to account for the comments from the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission.

Mr. Pringle stated that they have removed the video screens from the outside of the piers supporting the canopy, as the Committee suggested. He also noted that the piers supporting the canopy have become slightly narrower as they have developed the design. He explained that they have worked very hard to align the interior and exterior video screens. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that they are still showing video screens on both sides of the piers, even though the Committee rejected that idea. The other Committee members disagreed and corrected that the current proposal has screens on the insides of the piers only, as the Committee recommended. Mr. Pringle agreed, explaining that the drawing Mr. D'Alessandro was speaking of had been withdrawn.

Ms. Pentz asked about the structural drawings of the bracing of the piers or columns supporting the canopy. Mr. Pringle explained the various details showing the bracing of the canopy to the structure of the building. He explained that this method will allow them to reduce the sizes of the foundations in the sidewalk. Mr. Cluver objected to the columns projecting into the right-of-way. Mr. Pringle stated that they are meeting the 12'-6" sidewalk width requirement. He added that they have not changed the projection into the sidewalk over that approved in concept. The Committee members discussed the details of the column design. Mr. Pringle noted that the 1986 metal storefront panels that will be removed can be stored and reinstalled if the canopy is ever removed. Mr. Cluver suggested that the canopy piers should be centered on the existing storefront columns. Mr. Pringle explained that it was not that easy. There are many details to work out to ensure that everything fits together. Mr. Cluver suggested that the video screen locations inside the entrance could be revised to align with the exterior. Mr. Pringle stated that it is not that easy; there are many existing conditions that they must account for such as the locations of the window frames. The video screens cannot simply be adjusted back and forth. Mr. Cluver stated that he was very concerned about maintaining symmetry. Others questioned why symmetry was necessary or important. Mr. Cluver said that it was his "symmetrical brain speaking." Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the canopy should either be independent of the building or integrated into it, but should not be somewhere in between. Mr. McCoubrey suggested not trying to align it with everything, but to let it be independent.

Ms. Gutterman stated that she is concerned that the canopy will tie into the building's structure. She asked if the applicants could provide a report from a structural engineer stating that the building could support the canopy. Mr. Pringle stated that they have an engineer working on the design. He assured the Committee that they would verify that the canopy would stand up without damaging the building. The engineer will confirm the structural stability of the final design. He explained that tying back into the building's structure obviates the need to construct larger foundations in the sidewalk for the piers. He also explained that the flashing of the canopy will work better with the scheme that they are proposing. He stated that they would install metal panels in the transoms above the canopy. He noted that the transoms also date to 1986. Mr. Cluver stated that he preferred the January 13 rendering, not the revised rendering. Ms. Stein stated that she was not opposed to thinner columns, as long as they are symmetrical.

Mr. Pringle stated that they have reduced the height of the Lits Brothers sign as requested from 6 feet to 4'-10".

Mr. McCoubrey stated that he prefers the thinner columns. He noted that, even in the version preferred by Mr. Cluver, everything did not align. He opined that not everything needs to align. He stated that the canopy columns should either be more slender or the same width as the

storefront piers. Mr. Pringle explained the decisions that led to the height and the thickness of the canopy. He observed that there are many restrictions and requirements.

Mr. Cluver objected to a “little bump-out” on the outside of the piers. He stated that “there is some fussy detailing that I can’t quite resolve here.” He asked the architect to consider again that detail. Mr. Pringle explained that the step to which Mr. Cluver is objecting resulted from a request from the Architectural Committee at one of the earlier reviews to make the columns appear narrower. He reminded the Committee that during one of the many earlier reviews, it had complained that the columns were too wide. The step reduces the visual size of the column. Ms. Pentz objected that some of her fellow Committee members were “splitting hairs at this point.” She observed that some on the Committee were concerning themselves with minute details that typically do not grab the Committee’s attention. She stated that she finds all revisions of the canopy discussed to be compatible with the historic building, which is the Committee’s mandate. She stated that Mr. Cluver should “defer to the architect’s preference” with these minor details.

Mr. Cluver suggested recommending approval of the design shown in the rendering titled “January 13 Feedback: LED Display on Interior Face Only.” He stated that he believes that the piers supporting the canopy should slightly thinner and the video screens inside and outside the building should align. He stated that the existing metal panels may be removed. He stated that he prefers the version with the flashing to the metal transom panels, not the built-out version. He encouraged the architect to get the pier to read as a three-dimensional object. Mr. McCoubrey stated that they should support the narrower piers. Mr. Cluver agreed.

Ms. Gutterman asked why it is not possible for the pier of the canopy to align with the column on the building. Mr. Pringle explained that the requirements to remove the screen from the outside face of the pier and to align the screen on the inside face of the pier with the screen in the vestibule caused the design of the pier to change slightly. Ms. Gutterman wondered why the pier could not be centered on the column behind it. She then apologized for “muddying the waters.” Mr. Pringle stated that he understood the comments of the Committee would detail the design with those comments in mind.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that he considers the proposal to tie the canopy back into the structure of the building to be acceptable.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the design shown in the rendering dated January 13, provided the piers are slightly thinner and read as three-dimensional objects, the vertical video screens inside and outside align, and the canopy is flashed to metal transom panels, with the staff to review details.

ADDRESS: 6316 CITY AVE

Proposal: Construct multi-family building

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: 6300 City Line DP Partners LP

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects, P.C.

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Overbrook Farms Historic District, Non-contributing, pending

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a five-story apartment building on a vacant lot at the corner of 63rd Street and City Avenue in the pending Overbrook Farms Historic District. Apartment buildings of similar height and massing to the proposed building stand on the two adjacent lots. Located at the edge of the historic area, the surroundings are quite varied with a train station with large parking lot and commercial structures on the opposite side of the street. The design could be improved with a stronger element rather than a void at the corner. However, in its present form, the building is differentiated from but compatible with surrounding buildings in terms of massing, scale, rhythm, and materials.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The proposed building satisfies Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Stuart Rosenberg represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Rosenberg to clarify the information about the planes of the façade. Mr. Rosenberg said that the dominant plane is brick and stone. The glass plane is recessed approximately 8 to 12 inches. The bays project approximately 6 to 8 inches and will not have roofs. Ms. Gutterman asked if the deck railing will be set back. Mr. Rosenberg responded that both the railing and the HVAC units will be set back. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the older adjacent building to the west is being restored. Mr. Rosenberg replied that it would be restored but under a separate application. Ms. Stein recommended including a parapet to help hide mechanical equipment. Mr. Cluver opined that the bays were too randomly placed. He also recommended making the beltcourse the same height on both facades.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented that a parapet should be included to hide mechanical equipment and the beltcourses should be adjusted to be the same heights.

ADDRESS: 319 CHERRY ST

Proposal: Construct six-story building on existing parking lot

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: John G. Traver Co.

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg, Stuart G. Rosenberg Architects, P.C.

History: parking lot

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: The Historical Commission has recently reviewed several applications for the development of the property that includes a building on 4th Street, a historic school building with later additions behind the 4th Street building, and a vacant lot running south from the school building along Orianna Street to Cherry Street. This application only pertains to the new construction on the vacant lot at Orianna and Cherry

The site in question is considered an “undeveloped” site in a historic district, so the Commission’s jurisdiction is limited to Review-and-Comment jurisdiction. For new construction on undeveloped sites in historic districts, the historic preservation ordinance gives the Historical Commission the authority to offer non-binding comments on the construction, but not the authority to approve or deny that construction.

The application proposes to construct a six-story building with an open space fronting on Cherry Street. The building would feature a glass façade facing Cherry Street and a wall of regular punched windows facing Orianna Street. The west wall, which would be a party wall, would be stuccoed. The massing ignores the Commission’s earlier recommendation to limit the building on this site to four stories in height to ensure compatibility with the surrounding historic district. The application does not identify the proposed materials or colors.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The proposed building fails to satisfy the Standard 9 and the Historical Commission’s approval in concept of May 2016.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Stuart Rosenberg and owner Herb Brandt represented the application.

Mr. Baron asked Mr. Rosenberg whether the new building will be held away from the wall of the garage at the back of the adjacent lot. He also asked whether the pent eave will be removed from the garage, allowing the new building to block the entry to the garage. Mr. Rosenberg responded that they will be removing the pent eave and blocking the entry to the garage.

Mr. McCoubrey questioned the open area on Cherry Street and asked if this was proposed to meet zoning requirements. Mr. Rosenberg responded that they are proposing a yard surrounded by a brick fence at the Cherry Street end of the lot in order to meet the zoning requirement for open space and to provide light for some of the properties on Orianna Street. Ms. Stein asked if this would allow the project to be built without a variance. Mr. Rosenberg responded that that is correct.

Mr. Rosenberg explained that the east façade would be clad in a red brick masonry wall for four floors with a glass curtain wall above. The south wall would be a glass curtain wall rising up to an open balcony at the 6th floor. The west wall would be stuccoed with a decorative

arrangement of expansion joints. Mr. Rosenberg noted that the north wall has not yet been designed.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether there would be roof decks. Mr. Rosenberg responded that there would not be a roof deck but rather a series of Juliette balconies on Orianna Street.

Ms. Stein questioned the placement of mechanical units. Mr. Rosenberg responded that those units would be set on the roof right behind the aluminum parapet wall that would rise up on the Orianna Street side.

Mr. Cluver asked if the intent of the project is ultimately to connect with a structure on the 141-143 N. 4th Street lot. Mr. Rosenberg responded that that is unknown at this time.

Mr. McCoubrey opined that it would be better for the district if the building was set along the street wall of Cherry Street with the yard on the north end. Ms. Stein opined that the walls read like wallpaper because the brick does not wrap around the corner or onto the sixth floor. Mr. Rosenberg replied that it was his intent to make it look like a series of disassociated planes. Mr. McCoubrey opined that it would be better to use the sixth-floor balcony to create a setback to minimize the massing of the building.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment.

Job Itzkowitz, the director of the Old City District, noted that this is his fourth time testifying and that he still finds the building too large in scale for this street. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the Committee still agrees. Neighbor Rick Snyderman opined that, although the applicants have met with the neighbors, they have been totally unresponsive. He said that the City restored the cartway of Orianna Street, which is one of the few stone streets and that he is concerned about the effect of the construction of this large building on that street. He stated the building is totally out of scale and will block the only entrance to the adjacent garage.

Mr. Cluver asked if the removal of the pent eave from the garage and the effect on the garage gives the Historical Commission full jurisdiction over the project.

Neighbor David Pachevski said that the building is out of proportion with the street and that the developer has not engaged with the neighbors. He stated that the developer plans to provide parking for this project in the "Parkominium" to meet the parking zoning requirement but that that parking is more than 1000 feet away, and therefore fails to meet the zoning code.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Committee commented that the proposed building fails to satisfy Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's approval in concept of May 2016.

ADDRESS: 2027 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Remove storefront; install ATM with infill

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: AMCD Walnut St. Assoc.

Applicant: Stephanie Gregorzek, Project Expeditors Consulting Corp.

History: 1855; storefront alterations

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the existing storefront and construct an exterior automated teller machine or ATM. The Historical Commission denied an application for an external ATM at this storefront in May 2016, but did approve the existing internal ATM configuration. This application proposes to fill in the glazed storefront area with cast stone to resemble brownstone and create a recessed vestibule to house the ATM. This treatment neither restores the residential appearance of the building nor preserves its later history with the storefront.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Project expeditors Carol Silver and Stephanie Gregorzek represented the application.

Ms. Gregorzek explained that she had applied previously to create a new switchback ramp and an ATM in the center of the storefront. She explained that this was denied by the Committee and Commission, but she was asked at that time if the ramp could be eliminated and the ATM moved to the right side of the facade. This proposal is in response to that suggestion.

Ms. Gregorzek stated that the current proposal retains the existing ramp and creates a recessed vestibule on the right of the façade to house the exterior ATM. She stated that another objection of the Commission was the previously-proposed large red awning, which has now been reduced in size and placed only over the exterior vestibule. She cited three other exterior ATMs in the city to establish precedent. She explained that the problem with the interior vestibules is that homeless people gain access and sleep in them, which deters banking customers from entering the interior vestibule to use the ATM. Ms. Stein responded that it is likely that homeless people would still occupy this proposed deep-set vestibule, although it was noted that it is not climate-controlled like the interior vestibule.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the existing ramp can be eliminated, should an exterior ATM be approved. She suggested that the exterior ATM should align with the façade or have only a minimal setback of approximately one foot, and that the awning could provide additional protection from the elements. Ms. Gregorzek responded that she does not know if it is possible to eliminate the ramp. Ms. Gutterman objected to the proposed large stone pier in the middle of the storefront. Mr. McCoubrey asked about programming for the room behind the new storefront. Ms. Gregorzek explained that it provides the access to service the ATM. Ms. Gregorzek stated that they are required to have a five-foot landing per code requirements. She opined that bringing the ATM forward may necessitate significant changes to the grade of the sidewalk. She noted that the existing ramp provides ADA access to the residential entrance, but Ms. Gutterman commented that the original intention of the ramp approval was to provide ADA access for the ATM. Mr. Cluver commented that the ramp railing may not be code-compliant,

which may afford the opportunity to remove the ramp, opening up more design options. He admitted that the applicant may find that the only solution is the solution that she currently has.

Ms. Gregorzek asked about retaining the existing non-historic storefront but installing the ATM into the glass. Ms. Gutterman suggested she work with the staff to devise with a new storefront pattern that has a darker frame and that may darken the interior of the vestibule. Ms. Gregorzek commented that the storefront would have to be tinted so that the interior servicing space is not visible from the exterior. She asked for clarification on the Committee's recommendations. Ms. Gutterman opined that an exterior ATM is acceptable, as long as it is only set back approximately one foot rather than the proposed five or six feet. She commented that the awning would still need to be reconsidered. Mr. McCoubrey commented that it should look more like a storefront, rather than a masonry wall.

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

ADDRESS: 135 S 17TH ST

Proposal: Install signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 135 WA Partners LP

Applicant: Dorann Matthews, Forman Sign Company

History: 1915; Latham Hotel

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install signage at the first-floor commercial space of this corner building at 17th and Walnut Streets, which has two commercial entrances. The proposed signage includes two sets of illuminated letters, two non-illuminated aluminum plaques, two non-illuminated wall signs, one non-illuminated window sign, and various vinyl window decals.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the illuminated letters are reduced in size to be contained within the masonry openings, and the aluminum plaques allow for visible masonry on all sides, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

Mr. McCoubrey asked if the flags shown in the rendering are part of the application. Ms. Broadbent responded that the flags are not included in the written scope of work. Mr. Cluver stated that the flags are not part of the application or approval. Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicant had explained why they needed so much signage. Ms. Broadbent responded that presumably they are approaching this project as having two facades, with two commercial entrances. Ms. Gutterman responded that she understands, but it seems like too much signage. She stated that she understands a sign above each entrance, and window decals to ensure no one walks into the glass and also to show hours, but then it should stop. Ms. Stein commented that the plaques on each side of the pilasters are unnecessary and obscure decorative elements. Ms. Gutterman commented that Capital One is moving from across the street, so they are not at a disadvantage in terms of branding and identity. Mr. McCoubrey questioned the neon signs at night. Mr. Cluver commented that they do not have the corner plaques across the

street. Ms. Gutterman commented that the Capital One sign across the street is not as large as the proposed new signs. Ms. Gutterman commented that it would have been helpful to have the applicant present to explain why so much signage is desired. Ms. Gutterman asked about the staff's recommendation for the illuminated signs. Ms. Broadbent responded that the staff recommends that the signs are reduced in size to fit within the masonry openings. Ms. Stein commented that only one of the illuminated signs seems to overlap the masonry. Mr. McCoubrey commented that one bay is likely wider, but the signs are the same size.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the illuminated signs, provided they are reduced in size to fit within the masonry openings; approval of the wall signs, window sign and window decals, with the staff to review details; and denial of the aluminum plaques; pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 2322 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct three-story addition and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Kyle Wharton

Applicant: Scott Woodruff, DesignBlendz

History: 1960

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an addition at the rear and on top of a two-story contributing building. The addition would be set back approximately 17 feet from the front façade and a deck set back 5 feet 7 inches from the front façade. Because the building faces Fittler Square and sits in a row of two-story rowhouses, the addition will be highly visible and conspicuous. There may be room to construct a rear addition that would not be conspicuous. The applicant also proposes inappropriate vinyl windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Architect Scott Woodruff represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman contended that the addition as proposed will be highly visible. Mr. Cluver thought that it would probably not be possible to construct a third-floor addition that meets the Standards. He said it would be too conspicuous. He suggested that the additions should be kept to the rear and at a maximum of two stories, even if this means applying for a zoning variance. Given the rearward pitch of the roof, Mr. Cluver also thought it would be difficult to drain stormwater if a third floor were added. Other Committee members suggested eliminating the deck and about half of the mass of the addition. They observed that the stair hall was occupying an inordinate area. They said that the applicant could work with the staff on a mock up to see if the addition could be redesigned to be inconspicuous. They doubted whether it would be possible to make an addition inconspicuous, given the site of the building on the park. Mr. Woodruff said that from View Position One on his plans, he thought that any third-floor addition would be visible owing to the flat terrain and long viewing distance.

Mr. McCoubrey called for public comment of which there was none.

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

ADDRESS: 111 S INDEPENDENCE E MALL, UNIT A

Proposal: Apply clear coating to masonry

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Glenn Hugo / MRP Realty

Applicant: Thomas Collins, Phoenix Contractors, Inc.

History: 1893; Philadelphia Bourse Building; Hewitt Brothers, architects

Individual Designation: 1/26/1971

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to coat all masonry at the significant Bourse Building including brown sandstone, brick and terra-cotta with coatings and sealants. Although the applicant claims that the coatings would be protective, coatings often have the opposite effect, trapping moisture within masonry and encouraging spalling and other damage.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 7.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Contractor Thomas Collins represented the application.

Mr. Collins indicated that building has a new owner, who wishes to “button up” the building and consolidate it until he can afford to make a later application to restore the masonry. Mr. Collins stated that they are removing loose stone and pointing areas where water was getting in. Ms Gutterman responded that coatings are irreversible and often do not penetrate deeply enough to truly consolidate anything. With freeze and thaw, she continued, this often results in even larger pieces of stone delaminating from the building. Ms. Gutterman added that coatings often change the color of the masonry. She further argued that this is an incomplete package because there is no demonstration of the need for the coating or test data to show that it will be beneficial for the masonry. Mr. Collins responded that he could provide a letter from a masonry consultant.

The Committee members suggested that it would be useful to have the consultant undertake some testing and then appear again before the Committee to discuss the necessity of this work.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 7.

ADDRESS: 117 LEAGUE ST

Proposal: Legalize as-built new construction

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Einstein Investments LLC

Applicant: Janelle Snyder, SnyderLAW

History: 1815

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize as-built construction. On 8 January 2016, the Historical Commission approved an application for the removal of the rear ell and rear wall of the main block and the construction of a three-story rear addition with pilot house and deck where the older rear ell had stood. The owner subsequently went beyond the approved scope of work and, without a permit or approval, demolished not only the rear ell and wall but also the structure and roof of the main block. The Department of Licenses & Inspections building declared the remaining sections of the building Imminently Dangerous and they were demolished. Since that time, the staff has worked with the owner on what was intended to be an accurate reconstruction of the main block, with a rear ell and pilot house as approved by the Commission. The drawings that the Historical Commission approved on 8 January 2016 specified, "Existing Roof at Main Block to Remain; Patch and Repair as Required," and showed the height of the original roof as 37 feet 9 inches. However, it does not appear that this height accurately reflected the actual height of the original building. The reconstruction drawings approved by the staff showed the roof of the main block at plus or minus 34 feet 8½ inches and specified that the "Height/slope of roof to be checked against ghost of roof on party walls. Elevation not to exceed historic height." However, an inconsistent measurement on the rear elevation drawing shows the roof of the main block at plus or minus 37 feet 9 inches. The height of the parapet is shown at 34 feet 2 inches, and the roof deck at 30 feet 8 inches. In all drawings, the rear deck and parapet are shown as lower than and hidden by the main block roof. As built, however, the new construction parapet rises above the main block, making it highly conspicuous from the public right-of-way. The staff does not consider the as-built condition to be consistent with either set of approved drawings. The drawings may have included inaccurate dimensions, but they always clearly depicted the rear addition and deck with parapet as being lower than the ridgeline of the historic main-block roof. The staff considers that relationship, the relationship of the height of the ridgeline to that of the new construction to be paramount.

The application is accompanied by a summary of events composed by the developer's attorney. The staff resolutely disputes the accuracy of the summary.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's approval of 8 January 2016.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner/developer Michael Salamone and his partner Natalie Walker, and attorney Janelle Snyder represented the application.

Mr. Baron displayed a photograph showing the visibility of the deck parapet, which now projects higher than the ridgeline of the historic roof height. He noted that the actual height of the roof of the rear addition is approximately the same height as the peak of the main-block roof.

Ms. Stein asked if the photograph represents the status of construction as of today. Mr. Baron responded that, when he saw the building yesterday, the brick façade had been laid to approximately the second-floor windows. He noted that the windows and door look appropriate at this time. Ms. Stein clarified that the real issue is the parapet. Mr. Baron agreed, and noted that the visible portion of the rear has also been covered in siding that was not approved in the drawings. Ms. Stein asked if the owner has been asked to reduce the height of the parapet and is unwilling to do so. Mr. Baron responded that he recommended to the owner that one of the ways to reduce the conspicuousness of the rear addition without lowering the actual room height would be to move the parapet wall back to be in line with the door position of the pilot house. Mr. Baron noted that that solution would allow the height of the interior to continue to be the height as shown on the drawings, and would allow the ridge height to be consistent also with the drawings. The Committee members expressed confusion over the location of roof of the rear addition in relation to the roof of the main block. Mr. Baron used the photograph to explain the location of the roof and parapet. Ms. Gutterman noted that the relocation of the parapet would prevent a portion of the roof from being occupied. Mr. Baron responded that the existing roof deck is very long.

Mr. D'Alessandro recommended changing the entire pilot house. Mr. Baron responded that the pilot house was always shown as taller than the peak of the main-block roof. Mr. Baron noted that the drawings included in the Committee members' packets depict the design with the Commission's approval stamp, in which the pilot house extends above the peak of the sloped main-block roof. Mr. Baron noted that the Committee members have the drawings reviewed by the Commission, as well as the drawings that the staff stamped approved. Ms. Gutterman asked if there are as-built drawings. Mr. Baron responded that no as-built drawings were submitted, only the drawings that the staff approved.

Ms. Stein asked if the owners had anything to contribute to the conversation. Ms. Snyder responded that when her clients purchased the building, it was in poor condition. Ms. Snyder claimed that she was unaware of any improper demolition without permits, but that at some point in the renovation, the front facade became unstable and had to be taken down. She opined that it is not a historic neighborhood, and she does not believe that it is a historic building anymore. She noted that when the developers rebuilt the building, the parapet wall was not visible because the roof of the main block was higher. She explained that the staff asked that the parapet wall be reduced and that the slope of the roof of the main block be reduced to what it was originally. She asserted that her clients lowered the roof of the main block and lowered the height of the parapet that they built. She opined that the staff wanted a certain ratio. Ms. Gutterman responded that the staff was looking at a drawing that was presented that shows a parapet wall lower than the ridge of the main block roof. Ms. Snyder responded that that is what was built. Ms. Gutterman responded that that is not what is visible today. Ms. Snyder responded that the staff forced her clients to lower the roof. Mr. Baron explained that when the owner presented the initial proposal to the Historical Commission, they provided a drawing showing a roof pitch that differed from the actual roof pitch, but with a note that stated that they were keeping the existing roof. If they were retaining the original roof, the pitch of the roof was not in question. He noted that the drawing was inaccurate. Ms. Gutterman explained that the drawings presented to the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission previously, and to the staff subsequently, showed a certain relationship between the roof peak and the rear addition. Ms. Snyder opined that that was not made clear to her clients when they redid the work, and now they are being asked to do it a second time. Mr. Baron responded that it was, in fact, made clear, because the approved drawings stated that the "height and slope of the roof to be checked against the ghost of the roof on the party walls. Elevation not to exceed historic height." When the building was rebuilt, Mr. Baron noted, that requirement was not followed, so he made

suggestions to ameliorate the conditions. Ms. Snyder argued that her clients made the suggested changes but they were not what Mr. Baron wanted them to be. Mr. Baron responded that that is not true, and noted that the rear elevation on Sheet A200 indicates a plus or minus height for the rear elevation. Mr. Baron explained that the top of the roof, even at the back, should have been adjusted plus or minus to be in concert with the relationship to the front of the building. Ms. Snyder again asserted that her clients followed Mr. Baron's recommendations that resulted in the building that is visible today. Mr. Baron responded again that that is not true. He noted that, when he talked to Mr. Salamone on site about lowering the roof, they also talked about lowering the parapet height. Mr. Salamone responded that he did lower the height of the parapet by one foot from height as originally built.

Mr. Salamone opined that, if he was to bring the parapet below the height of peak of the roof, he would not have a roof deck anymore. Ms. Gutterman responded that they are suggesting that the parapet be pulled back. Mr. Salamone was resistant, and opined that the parapet would be below the ceiling on the third floor. Ms. Gutterman questioned how that would be possible. Mr. Cluver questioned how the parapet is higher than the peak of the main roof. Ms. Snyder responded that Mr. Baron made her client lower the main roof. Mr. Cluver clarified that the peak of the roof was not actually 34 feet 2 inches. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the drawings showed a steeper slope than what actually existed. Mr. Salamone claimed that it was never addressed to change the parapet wall on the plans, but that there was just a note to follow the ghost line of the roof. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the dilemma is that the note effectively dropped the ridgeline, which would have then impacted all elevations. Ms. Stein stated that the Historical Commission expects accurate drawings. She noted that the Commission does not have the staff to go out and survey every property; that is the responsibility of the applicant. She argued that the geometry in the application that the owner provided to the Commission in the first place was inaccurate, so that creates a dilemma because the as-built conditions are not something the Historical Commission would have approved. She asserted that the addition looks terrible and is highly visible. Mr. Salamone retorted that it is only visible from certain angles. Ms. Stein responded that the photograph was taken from the public right-of-way, and that the Commission considers the visibility from any point along the public way, even from the intersections. She noted that she understands that there was a complicated history to this project.

Ms. Snyder asserted that her client does not want to make more changes to the building without knowing that they will be approved, and stated that they want to know what to do. Ms. Gutterman responded that, at the same time, the owners are saying that they cannot lower the parapet because they would lose part of the roof deck. Mr. Salamone observed that he would lose the roof deck. Ms. Gutterman stated that the parapet can be jogged to reduce its visibility. Ms. Snyder responded that they have to think about access. Ms. Gutterman stated that the pilot house was always approved to be taller than the roof ridge; that is not in question. She explained that if the front parapet was pulled back, it would free the ridge to be the ridge. Mr. Salamone responded that then the roof would continue to slope up another 10 feet. Ms. Gutterman responded that no, she assumes that the roof of the deck is flat and would continue to the rear as a flat roof if the parapet was pulled back. Ms. Stein noted that the chimney is also drawn inaccurately.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that it is difficult to evaluate the proposal without any drawings that show the as-built conditions. Ms. Gutterman tried again to explain that, although she does not know the magic dimension, there is likely to be a point where, if pulled back and perhaps on an angle, the parapet is no longer visible. She noted that that would leave a void of flat roof with no deck between the peak of the main roof and the pulled back parapet around what would still be a very adequate deck.

Mr. Cluver opined that the pitch of the roof as built looks very shallow, but that is what was there historically. Mr. Baron responded that the side wall survived, and he directed the Committee members' attention to the photograph in their packets of the roof before the building was demolished. He noted that it is clear where the roof hits the chimney. Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Salamone how much he lowered the roof. Mr. Salamone responded that Mr. Baron recommended that he lower it by one foot. Mr. Baron replied that he had not recommended a certain number of feet, but had recommended reducing the roof to follow the outline of the original roof. Mr. Cluver verified the height of the roof with the Google Streetview image. Mr. McCoubrey asked where the roof started sloping back down. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the roof did not have a rear slope, it was front-sloping only. Mr. Salamone confirmed this, noting that the rear wall of the main block came straight down from the peak of the roof.

Ms. Stein suggested that there seems to be a consensus that the parapet should be pulled back to the point that it is no longer visible. She also recommended that the staff conduct a site visit to determine the visibility of the pilot house, which may still be visible. Ms. Gutterman responded that the pilot house was constructed as approved. Mr. Cluver asked if the slope of the pilot house was an extension of the main roof, or if it was a stand-alone piece. Mr. Salamone responded that it is separate from the main roof, and claimed that it is not visible at all because there is a three-story building to the other side.

Mr. Baron addressed the placement of air-conditioning units, noting that they were originally proposed to be placed on the deck but concealed by the peak of the roof. Now that the roof deck is higher than the main block, Mr. Baron noted that he did not approve the placement of the units in that location, but rather required that they be located in the rear yard.

Mr. Cluver stated that it is difficult to assess the proposal because the drawings were inaccurate to begin with, and no as-built drawings were provided. Mr. Cluver echoed Ms. Gutterman's suggestion that a way to correct the situation would be to keep the roofs as they are, but to eliminate the parapet entirely, and replace it with a metal railing set back to align with the north face of the pilot house, leaving an open flat roof between the railing and the sloped roof peak, with a large deck at the rear. He noted that there could be essentially a corridor between the pilot house door and the deck. Mr. Cluver suggested that there may be a nook for the mechanical units. Mr. Salamone responded that the mechanical units do not need to be on the roof. Mr. Cluver reiterated that the elimination of the parapet and the installation of a simple metal railing would be more in keeping with previous approvals for decks on rear ell. Mr. Cluver suggested that the pilot house could remain as-is.

Ms. Snyder opined that no visual aspects of the original building remain, except for the chimney and side wall, and asked if it would be better to apply for the building to be rescinded from the Philadelphia Register. Ms. Gutterman responded that there is a separate process for rescission. Ms. Snyder opined that it seems unnecessary to work with the Historical Commission on a non-historic building in an area that is not historic when the historic building has been lost. Ms. Gutterman responded that the building was demolished through no fault of the Historical Commission.

Mr. Cluver suggested that it would be helpful if the architect could draw the building accurately, and show the proposed addition accurately, rather than doing essentially a live mock-up. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the applicants work with the staff with the basic concept of pulling back the deck and eliminating the parapet. Ms. Snyder responded that her client has tried to work with the staff. Mr. Cluver responded that the staff had inaccurate information to work with,

which makes it very difficult. He asserted that the staff was given bad information to begin with, and they cannot be expected to read minds and develop solutions that anticipate mistakes on the drawings. Ms. Gutterman agreed, as did Mr. D'Alessandro, who echoed Mr. Cluver's recommendation that accurate drawings be provided.

Mr. McCoubrey clarified that the Committee is recommending that the parapet be replaced with a railing, and pulled back from the front. Mr. Salamone asked if it will be a problem if a small corner of the railing would be visible.

Mr. Salamone asked where the flat roof is supposed to drain. Ms. Gutterman responded that the Committee is not recommending a change to the roof, so the drainage should remain the same. Mr. Salamone responded that the flat roof will be visible. Ms. Gutterman responded that, yes, the Committee understands that the flat roof will be visible. Mr. Salamone asked what happens if they cut the parapet down and pull the railing back, and that creates a visual of the pilot house. Ms. Stein responded that the consensus from the Committee is that the pilot house is part of the previous approval, and that everyone is in agreement that the as-built conditions of the deck are inappropriate. She reiterated that the inaccurate drawings left everyone in a predicament. Mr. Salamone expressed confusion, noting that the parapet was built to the dimensions shown on the drawings. Ms. Gutterman responded that the drawings inaccurately represented the height and slope of the original main block's roof, which then created an inaccurate relationship to the rear addition. Ms. Snyder opined that the drawings are accurate, but it is the note about following the slope of the original roof makes them inaccurate. The Committee members unanimously disagreed, Mr. McCoubrey responding that the note is what assured the Historical Commission that the new building would not exceed the height of the original historic building.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment. Neighbor Angela Trusco, the owner of 119 League Street, spoke in opposition to the legalization of the as-built conditions. She asserted that it is, in fact, a historic area, with many properties on the block, including her own, having been built in the eighteenth century. She stated that the rooftop structures as built are highly visible from Front Street and League Street. She asserted that the builder had asked to demolish this building from the beginning, and has damaged her house, removed her fence and trespassed on her roof and yard against her wishes.

Mr. Baron suggested that the Committee members address the material of the side elevation, because the installed siding was not approved or even proposed to the Historical Commission. Mr. Salamone responded that no material was specified or approved. Ms. Gutterman responded that the wall is rendered in the drawings as stucco. Mr. Salamone responded that stucco creates lawsuits. Ms. Gutterman responded that, if he wanted a different material, he needed to have had that material approved before he installed it. Mr. Salamone asked where the drawings show that the proposed material is stucco. Ms. Gutterman responded that the architect rendered it as stucco. Ms. Stein noted that the north elevation calls for stucco, and the side elevation is rendered exactly the same way with exactly the same color and texture. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that party walls are generally intended as a fire break, and siding is not an appropriate cladding material for a fire break.

Ms. Snyder noted that Page A405 of the drawings calls for a detailed brick cornice, but noted that her client is not able to get the bricks for a few months because they are on backorder. She asked whether it would be acceptable to copy a detail from a different neighbor using square bricks. Mr. Cluver responded that that could be handled by the staff. Mr. Baron responded that

the staff feels the approved cornice should be constructed. Mr. Cluver and Ms. Gutterman agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application to legalize the existing as built condition as well as the request to legalize the siding on the party walls and to approve revising the design of the cornice, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's approval of 8 January 2016.

ADDRESS: 2127 ST JAMES ST

Proposal: Enclose front porch with glass and aluminum structure

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Merion Ruth Rogel

Applicant: Steven Cohen, Steven S. Cohen, Architect P.C.

History: 1923; English Village; Spencer Roberts, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application follows a previous application to construct an addition, called a plant porch, in place of a non-historic trellis at the front façade. The building, listed as significant in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historic District, is one of the 20 distinctive cottages that comprise English Village. While the previous application proposed to construct a masonry and glass enclosure at the front façade, this application proposes to construct an aluminum and glass greenhouse structure in the same location. The existing front façade window would be converted to a set of bi-fold doors located at the interior of the addition. The area under consideration totals approximately 61 square feet.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9 and the Historical Commission's recommendation of denial at its 10 November 2016 meeting.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Steven Cohen represented the application.

Mr. McCoubrey observed that the application changed from a masonry enclosure with windows in the previous proposal to a metal and glass enclosure in the current proposal. Mr. Cohen responded that the current proposal was developed based on a suggestion by the Committee at the last meeting. Ms. Gutterman acknowledged that she had suggested a glass enclosure and believed it could be appropriate. The problem, she continued, is that the glass in Mr. Cohen's proposal has not been detailed to reflect the character of the house. She opined on the question of differentiating the addition from the historic structure, but added that it can look too dissimilar. She then stated that she takes exception to removing the windows and suggested that access be provided through the existing kitchen door.

Mr. Cohen defended the design, stating that it is a very simple glass object and that simplicity is the focus. He asserted that should someone choose to remove the structure and recreate the court in subsequent years, they could easily do so. He further contended that the glass enclosure would not have a major impact on the historic building and that it would attach where the trellis currently attaches. He agreed that the existing windows could be retained and that the structure could be accessed through an existing door at the kitchen. The concept, he continued, is to create a garden room. Mr. Cohen added that he considered eliminating the vents at the top

and placing them on a hopper-style window at the bottom. He argued that the structure would not be visible from a public way, as shown in photographs, because of mature landscaping.

Ms. Gutterman inquired about the age of the wooden structure. Ms. Keller asked if Ms. Gutterman is referring to the pergola. Ms. Gutterman affirmed. Ms. Keller noted that the owner installed the pergola illegally, and in 2003 the Commission had received an application to legalize the structure, including the adjacent latticework. The Commission, she continued, voted to recommend the legalization of the lattice on the south wall, except the easternmost piece, and the pergola on the condition that the rafters are shortened so that the curved ends do not project beyond the entrance vestibule. That latter condition, she asserted, has not been met. The Commission denied legalization of other parts of the latticework, she added.

Mr. Cohen responded that the trellis would be eliminated with the installation of the glass enclosure. Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Cohen to clarify whether the structure would be anchored where the trellis currently connects to the building. Mr. Cohen claimed that the glass structure would not do any further damage to the masonry. Ms. Gutterman asked if the trellis is anchored to the masonry wall above the kitchen door. Mr. Cohen answered that he believed so and that it logically should be.

Ms. Pentz stated that, if the existing windows at the living room are retained, she would accept the proposal.

Mr. Cluver inquired about the base material. Mr. Cohen answered that he planned to use brick, but he could use stone to be more in keeping with the base of the historic structure. Mr. Cluver inquired about the use of mullions and whether one would be located at the break between the wall. Mr. Cohen confirmed that a mullion would exist at the break. Mr. Cluver then asked if a mullion would be placed at counter height, or whether the design would incorporate a sheer plane of glass. Mr. Cohen replied that he planned to keep the mullions at one level, adding that he could insert a mullion at the window line of the vestibule.

Mr. Baron expressed concern over placing a structure at the front façade of a significant building. The structure, he continued, would be visible not only from the adjacent courtyard which the public can access but also from the street. Mr. Baron noted that he had visited the site the previous day and viewed the property from 22nd Street. He explained that the building is visible because it is perpendicular to the street. He then opined that someone could suggest constructing a similar greenhouse structure on the front of the Powell House or another significant building and argued that such a structure would set a tremendous precedent. Mr. Baron asserted that many people would like to alter the front yards of English Village, but once the green planted area is removed, it suddenly would no longer be an English Village. It would instead, he added, become a series of hardscaped spaces.

Elsbeth Brown interrupted Mr. Baron to ask the Committee if the floor was open for public comment. Mr. Baron explained that he is a member of the Historical Commission's staff. Ms. Brown asked if any member of the staff could speak about any project. Mr. Cluver responded that the entire staff reviews each application and Mr. Baron has been involved in that process. Ms. Brown retorted that Mr. Baron has personal issues and an ongoing misunderstanding with the property owner, Marion Rogel. Ms. Keller justified Mr. Baron's remarks by stating that the staff unanimously agreed on the recommendation for denial, adding that the recommendation does not reflect one staff member's opinion.

Mr. Cohen stated that, at the 10 November 2016 Historical Commission meeting, he discussed the concept of constructing a greenhouse and claimed that Mr. McCoubrey agreed to the concept at the time. He added that Mr. McCoubrey advised Mr. Cohen to submit a new application for review by the Architectural Committee, and Mr. Cohen asserted that this application reflects that recommendation.

Mr. McCoubrey countered that he indicated at the meeting that the property is highly visible from the courtyard and is the building anchoring the end of St. James Place. The building, he continued, is seen as one progresses through St. James Street. Mr. Cohen reiterated that the glass enclosure was discussed at the previous Historical Commission meeting and again claimed that at the time, when asked specifically, Mr. McCoubrey stated that he thought it would be acceptable but that another application would be necessary.

Mr. McCoubrey requested comment from other Committee members. Mr. D'Alessandro expressed concern over the precedent of such a structure. Ms. Pentz commented that the proposed structure would be reversible. Ms. Gutterman stated that she understands the precedent being set, but argued that it is a conservatory without high walls, and no fabric of the building is being changed. She asserted that she is more easily convinced of its reversible nature in light of the fact that the existing pergola is illegal. Her concern, she continued, relates to the structure's details and how it meets the historic masonry, how the glass is divided, and how air enters the addition. She added that the proposal is acceptable in concept, but that many details need to be considered before she could approve the structure in this particular setting. Ms. Gutterman asserted that complete applications showing the entire project need to be reviewed. She reiterated that she would accept the proposal in concept but would request that the applicant return once more with a full set of details before being granted final approval.

Ms. Stein stated that she thought she recalled that the walkway was private rather than public and that the public way was limited to 22nd Street. If this property were the first or second from the entrance, she continued, it would be highly visible from a public way. Because the property is ten or so lots from the entrance, the circumstances are different, she added. Ms. Stein opined that English Village residents could erect a wrought iron gate along 22nd Street at any time, and the street into the community would no longer be public.

Mr. Cluver asked Ms. Keller if the pergola, except for the curved, projecting element, is legal. Ms. Keller noted that according to the 2003 Commission decision, the Commission voted to legalize the pergola "with the shortening of the rafters so that the curved ends do not project beyond the entrance vestibule." Mr. Cluver stated that the existence of the legalized pergola helps justify its existence, which mitigates some of the issue of setting precedent. He added that, even with a greenhouse projecting past the plane of the entry vestibule, he could accept the concept of such a structure owing to the building's location deep within English Village where it has minimal visibility, rather than along 22nd Street. He also noted that it would be a reversible element. Mr. Cluver described the English Village as having an undulating, informal architecture rather than containing formal Georgian or Federal buildings. Mr. Cluver agreed with Ms. Gutterman that the details remain vague and that they are needed to determine whether the structure is a sensitive addition or whether it contains heavy-handed post-modern detailing that would be out of place.

Ms. Brown, a neighbor of Ms. Rogel, commented that she has run errands with the property owner, and when she parks her car at 22nd Street, Ms. Rogel cannot see her in the car. She claimed the building has no visibility from 22nd Street.

The applicant submitted the proposal for final approval; however, the Committee decided to recommend converting from an application for final approval to an application in-concept.

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

- the existing windows are retained and not replaced with bi-fold or tri-fold doors;
- the detailing of the greenhouse is submitted to determine its acceptability; and
- the detailing includes dimensions and materials, profiles, and the planes of the front wall relative to the entry vestibule and house.

ADDRESS: 313-15 S CHADWICK ST

Proposal: Construct addition and roof decks

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Josephine and Robert Volpe

Applicant: Susan Uhl, Landmark Architectural

History: 1860; Women's SPCA of Pennsylvania

Individual Designation: 10/5/1978

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a third-story addition with two roof decks, create a second-story open space at the rear, and install new windows and doors. The building is located midblock on Chadwick Street. While the rear is not visible from a public right-of-way, the property is located directly across from a parking lot, making the front façade and rooftop highly visible to the public. The proposed third-story addition would be set back eight feet from the Chadwick Street façade and would contain a green roof in the set back area. Lower and upper roof decks with glass railings are proposed just south of the addition. A portion of the roof would be demolished at the rear to create an open second-story space, and a rear window would be enlarged to provide light and air to a new deck. The front façade of the former carriage house was previously altered when it was converted to an SPCA office. This application is seeking to reinstall windows and doors according to a historic survey that predates the SPCA conversion.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9, with the following comments:

- The Chadwick Street elevation of the addition should be contained to a single plane;
- The setback of the addition should be equal to the setback of the neighboring third-story addition at 309-11 S. Chadwick Street; and
- The deck should have black metal vertical picket railings rather than glass railings.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Robert Palladino and owner Robert Volpe represented the application.

Mr. Palladino stated that he sought to respect the building's cornice line, so he proposed an eight-foot setback for the addition. He indicated that the adjacent one-story addition at 309-11 S. Chadwick Street contains a setback of approximately 19' or 20'. The main dilemma at 313-15 Chadwick Street, he continued, is a zoning requirement to maintain a 9' setback at the rear. Mr. Palladino noted that the addition would be visible from the parking lot across the street but that he was trying to minimize its visibility from Chadwick Street, which is approximately 25' wide. He commented that he was not opposed to changing the glass railing, adding that he chose glass

in an effort to make the railing as minimally obtrusive as possible. Mr. Palladino also expressed his willingness to change the undulating design of the front façade to a single plane. He proposed to keep the 8' setback and to continue the façade along a single plane at that distance.

Mr. Cluver suggested that the setback be maintained at 13'-6" and the bathroom be eliminated. Mr. Volpe responded that eliminating the bathroom would make the room virtually useless, unless the bathroom is moved inside the plane of the wall. Mr. Cluver asked if the addition contains a bedroom. Mr. Volpe answered that it would be a flex room, but that it would most likely function as a third bedroom. He asserted that the property stands at only 38' deep, with a 9' loss at the rear for the zoning requirement and an 8' loss at the front for the setback. Mr. Palladino agreed that the setbacks limit the addition to 14.5' on the exterior. He asserted that the dimension works if no additional rooms need to be incorporated at the interior, but if they lose the benefit of having the bathroom project, the interior space would be less desirable.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for clarification on the zoning restriction as it pertains to the rear setback. Mr. Palladino answered that there is a rear yard setback requirement that applies even to the third floor. He explained that no requirement exists at the front façade, though he reiterated that he is not attempting to bring the addition in line with the front exterior wall. Mr. McCoubrey asked for further clarification on whether the 9' shown as the rear setback represents the rear yard setback required by zoning; he then asked whether the requirement applies if the existing structure occupies the full site. Mr. Palladino replied that the setback is still required for the addition.

Ms. Stein asked Mr. Cluver if he recommended that the bathroom be eliminated from the addition. Mr. Cluver answered that it was his initial suggestion. Ms. Stein observed that the bedroom is 14'-7" by 18'-6". Mr. Cluver suggested several options for moving around interior space that would allow the addition to maintain a single plane at the front façade but would incorporate the bathroom. Mr. Palladino asked if the Committee would compromise slightly on the dimension of the setback.

Ms. Pentz referenced the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, noting that additions should be inconspicuous. Mr. Palladino provided a rendering that showed the addition within its larger context and commented that the addition will always be visible, no matter the setback, owing to the parking lot located across Chadwick Street. When standing on Chadwick Street, he argued, the addition is virtually invisible with the proposed 8' setback. Mr. Palladino contended that he did not want the addition to be as intrusive as some of the neighboring properties. He argued that the precedent on the block has been set and the character would not be disturbed with an 8' setback.

Ms. Gutterman observed that there are currently two proposed setbacks within the design: one at 8' and, from that plane, an additional setback of 5'6". She offered that a compromise could be to incorporate a 13' continuous setback, so the bathroom of the addition could be pushed inside the plane of the wall, since there would be a gain of some space, even with the loss of other space. Mr. Volpe asked for clarification on the request. Ms. Gutterman stated that the staff recommendation is to make the front façade a single plane, and she reiterated her suggestion of creating a single setback that would be positioned at approximately the midpoint of the two setbacks in the proposed design. Ms. Stein supported the suggestion, adding that simplifying the design would help the addition be less conspicuous, since its location across from a parking lot creates visibility regardless of design. Mr. Palladino responded that he had questions for the Committee about material. The current design, he continued, incorporates a horizontal

alternating lap. He stated that the idea was to make the addition as inconspicuous as possible and asked if using a fiber-cement panel that decreases shadow lines and blends into the background would be preferable. Mr. Cluver noted that the seams would need to be battened. Ms. Gutterman stated that the issue relates to color rather than to shadow lines.

Mr. Baron remarked that the elements contributing to the addition's visibility include the multiple planes, steeply sloped roof, muntins, and overhanging eaves. He asserted that the addition possesses a presence of its own and has the semblance of a small house atop the historic carriage house. He also argued for simplicity. Mr. Baron noted that the neighboring addition has the benefit of being hidden by buildings across Chadwick Street, though he added that the Commission and owner compromised on a setback to make the addition inconspicuous. He reiterated that this building is exposed owing to the lack of buildings on the west side of Chadwick Street and asserted that the architecture emphasizes the presence of the addition. Mr. Baron encouraged the applicants to seek a zoning variance in order to utilize the space at the rear of the property. Mr. D'Alessandro added that the Standards advise that new additions should preserve the historic character of the existing structure, and the proposed addition, he asserted, is conspicuous.

Mr. Volpe responded that he preferred not to seek a variance, because the property is going to be used as his home. Seeking a variance, he argued, would delay the project for several months.

Mr. Palladino addressed Mr. Baron's concerns and stated that the muntins at the third-floor windows could be eliminated. The sloped roof, he continued, was conceptualized to offer a less intrusive appearance from the street by introducing a lower profile. Mr. McCoubrey asserted that the building is a large solid block, and placing a highly articulated addition on top attracts attention. Mr. Cluver recognized that the applicants consented to simplifying the design, adding that they agreed to the change in material at the railings and simplifying the plane of the front façade. He commented that only the distance of the setback from Chadwick Street and materials remained unresolved.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he did not support the proposed changes to the size of the masonry openings at the front façade. Ms. Gutterman responded that the applicant is seeking to restore the openings to their historic appearance. Mr. Palladino clarified that the southernmost second-story double-door would be enlarged to mimic the existing opening on the opposite side. Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether Mr. Palladino is proposing to change the masonry opening. Mr. Palladino affirmed. Ms. Keller showed a photograph of the front façade and noted an area of infill below the current window sill, and stated that the staff believes the opening historically matched the northernmost opening. Mr. Volpe indicated that the adjacent property at the north also contains arched openings at both ends of the front façade. Mr. Palladino stated that the first-story openings are existing, but will receive new windows and brick molds. Mr. Baron clarified that the change to the second-floor opening would be a restoration. Mr. Palladino agreed, stating that all other openings are existing. Mr. D'Alessandro observed that the plans propose new six-over-six double-hung windows. Mr. Palladino explained that new windows will be installed in the existing openings. Mr. Baron added that the window configuration is drawn from an insurance survey.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as submitted, but approval with the following revisions, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9:

- the addition's S. Chadwick Street façade is limited to a single plane, though a slight articulation in plane could be considered;
- the setback from S. Chadwick Street is about 10';
- the deck has a metal vertical-picket railing rather than a glass railing;
- the addition's windows are simplified with the removal of the muntins;
- the materials of the addition are simplified; and
- the redesign of the roof overhangs is considered.

ADDRESS: 1736 GREEN ST, AKA 1735 BRANDYWINE ST

Proposal: Construct three-story building on subdivided lot

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Loonstyn Development L.P.

Applicant: John Loonstyn, Wallace St. Construction LLC

History: 1891; Willis Hale, architect; subdivided lot at 1735 Brandywine Street

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story building with a roof deck and pilot house on a newly created lot facing Brandywine Street. The property was historically associated with 1736 Green Street, but has been subdivided from it. A one-story garage constructed around 1960 stands on the subdivided lot. Although it was all one property known as 1736 Green Street at the time of the district designation, the rear portion of the lot was listed separately as 1735 Brandywine Street in the Spring Garden Historic District inventory and classified as non-contributing. The front façade of the proposed structure includes a brick veneer, one-over-one windows, a six-panel door at a recessed entryway, an Italianate-style cornice, cast stone base, and cast stone lintels and sills. The east side of the property, which would be visible from Brandywine Street, would be clad in composite siding.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application. Owners John and Joe Loonstyn represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked Ms. Keller if a typical window pattern exists for the area. Ms. Keller answered that a typical window configuration in the Spring Garden Historic District would include two-over-two double-hung sash, but that one-over-one double-hung sash windows have been accepted for new construction in the district. Mr. Cluver stated that with the Italianate cornice, two-over-two sash might be more cohesive. John Loonstyn stated that the building at 1736 Green Street, which is the rear adjacent property from which the lot was subdivided, has one-over-one sash windows. Mr. Cluver asked if the windows are original to the building, and Mr. Loonstyn asserted that they were.

Mr. Cluver noted that shutters are shown only on the first floor and are too narrow for the opening. He recommended either including the proper design on all front façade windows or eliminating them from the proposal. Mr. Loonstyn responded that his architect included them but

that they could be removed. Mr. Cluver observed that the stone lintel over the front door did not fully span the door opening and did not align with the lintels over the windows. He then made note of the panel above the door frame, suggesting that it be eliminated. He recommended that the door include a transom or that it extend the full height of the opening to allow all the lintels at the first story to align. Ms. Gutterman asked that the lintel also be widened.

Ms. Keller requested that the Committee review the recessed doorway. Though difficult to see in elevation drawing, she noted that it is more clearly presented in plan. She added that the staff would like the door to be brought to the plane of the front façade. Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Loonstyn if Ms. Keller's suggestion would be problematic. Mr. Loonstyn responded that he dislikes the recessed door and prefers that it be flush with the brick façade. He stated that he would incorporate a glass transom into the door system.

Mr. McCoubrey inquired whether there would be joint details at the cast stone base that the staff could review. Mr. Loonstyn affirmed. Ms. Stein asked whether the front step would also be cast stone, and again Mr. Loonstyn affirmed.

Mr. D'Alessandro inquired whether the brick is a full 4". Mr. Loonstyn replied that it is the full dimension and noted that the brick is Glen-Gery 52-DD. Mr. McCoubrey asked whether the party wall is exposed on one side. Mr. Loonstyn answered that both sides are exposed. Mr. McCoubrey recommended that the applicants work with the staff to resolve the details of how the cornice terminates or turns the corner. Mr. Loonstyn stated that he typically incorporates a brick and a half at the return. Mr. Cluver asked if the railings located toward the rear match those shown on the roof plan. Mr. Loonstyn affirmed. Ms. Gutterman inquired where the mechanical equipment would be placed. Mr. Loonstyn answered that a condensing unit would be located on the rear of the roof where it would be inconspicuous from the street.

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

Mr. Cluver questioned the cornice's termination. He clarified the components of the cornice, which include decorative banding and the projecting molding. He opined that the lower banding could terminate at the ends of the front façade, while the projecting molding could turn the corner. Joe Loonstyn stated that extending the cornice around the corner on an infill property is problematic, because the cornice can project over the property line. A neighbor, he continued, could also build an adjacent structure on either side in the future. Mr. Cluver explained that the brick could be corbelled out to receive the cornice, so it has the appearance of a terminating element.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee moved to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9, with the following provisions:

- the front door is in the plane of the main façade;
- the lintel at the entryway is directly over the door with the panel eliminated, or the doorway includes a transom or other historically consistent element;
- the shutters are either eliminated or revised to be historically appropriate in size and detailing;
- the brick façade incorporates a return of one and a half or more courses;
- the rooftop equipment is located with a large setback from the front façade, with the location to be confirmed with the staff; and

- a terminating feature is added to the cornice, such as a turn, corbel, or other historically appropriate element.

ADDRESS: 100 S BROAD ST

Proposal: Install signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: LBT Limited Partnership, LP

Applicant: Ed Eimer, Eimer Design

History: 1898; Land Title Building; Daniel H. Burnham & Co., architect

Individual Designation: 8/2/1973

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install signage in each window opening and over the entrance to the proposed retail space at the corner of Broad and Chestnut Streets. The logo signage in the arched window openings would be internally-illuminated acrylic suspended from a steel frame. The application also proposes to install three powder-coated aluminum box signs with illuminated acrylic lettering at the corner window bays, and over the Chestnut Street entrance. The application does not address how electricity will be provided to the illuminated signage.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that the conduit for the internally-illuminated signage is run through the frame of the windows and is painted to match the underlying masonry, rather than drilled through the masonry, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Luca Segato represented the application.

Mr. Segato distributed a revised Sheet #5, a detail depicting how electricity would be provided to the illuminated signage.

Mr. McCoubrey asked whether the existing doors on Broad Street would be used as an entrance. Mr. Segato responded that, while it is part of the same retail space, the only entrance would be on Chestnut Street, which is why they do not propose to emphasize that opening. He noted that all of the Broad Street openings, with the exception of the corner, would receive the same treatment. Ms. Stein questioned the means of accessibility at the Chestnut Street entrance if the doors are revolving. Mr. Segato responded that the Chestnut Street doors are swing doors.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the amount of signage proposed, opining that it is just too much. She suggested that where there is the A.C. MOORE sign, there should not also be a pinwheel logo sticking up from it. Ms. Stein agreed. Ms. Gutterman opined that there are two issues in her mind: one is the pinwheel on top of the A.C. MOORE sign, and the other is that not every window needs an illuminated pinwheel.

Ms. Stein noted that, if the panel signs are important, the Committee generally permits one at the entrance. She opined that the additional panel sign a few feet away at the corner on Chestnut Street does not seem necessary, because there is one right around the corner on Broad Street. She opined that all of the illuminated pinwheel signs seem highly inappropriate

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 JANUARY 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

owing to the obvious poles that hang down and put permanent holes in the masonry. She suggested that if the pinwheels were located on the interior of the building or were applied window graphics, that would be preferable, and would be outside of the Historical Commission's purview. Ms. Gutterman agreed, noting her preference for a decal as opposed to an illuminated sign. Mr. Segato responded that the idea was to center the signs in the windows. Ms. Gutterman responded that he still could, but that she does not know if there need to be 15 illuminated objects to alert shoppers that they have arrived at A.C. Moore.

Ms. Pentz and Mr. D'Alessandro opined that the sign over the entrance should not be so large. Mr. Segato asked if it was smaller if it would be acceptable. Ms. Gutterman responded that it is all just too much. Mr. Segato responded that the branding of the pinwheel logo is important. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the pinwheel presented on top of the entrance sign could be incorporated into the panel sign band itself. Ms. Stein agreed, noting that each of the A.C. Moore letters must be at least 30 inches tall.

Ms. Gutterman questioned how the panel signs would be anchored to the masonry, and stated that a detail would need to be provided for the attachment method. Mr. D'Alessandro asked why the sign needs to say "Entrance." Mr. Cluver quipped that the fact that it needs to say entrance means that there are too many signs. Ms. Gutterman asked why it does not just say "Arts and Crafts." Mr. McCoubrey noted that the panel signs are also quite high off of the sidewalk.

Ms. Gutterman recommended eliminating the secondary panel sign on Chestnut Street and having only a single panel sign on the Broad Street elevation and one on the Chestnut Street elevation. She noted that a passerby at Broad and Chestnut Street, or even across the street, would be able to see one or both signs at any given time. Mr. Segato responded that the purpose was to have a presence at the corner. Ms. Gutterman replied that it is not that large of a corner, and the proposed signage is high, so it will be more visible. She opined that it is also confusing to have the two signs on Chestnut Street because it indicates the entrance. She suggested that one panel sign would be another option, and that the rest of the signage could just become logo signage. She noted that, even with a more streamlined signage package, there will still be a presence at the corner. She also noted that the visible products in the interior will draw people in.

Mr. Segato asked if any of the suspended pinwheel signage would be acceptable. Ms. Gutterman responded that she personally does not feel any of it is appropriate. Ms. Stein and Mr. D'Alessandro agreed. Mr. Cluver opined that he would accept the pinwheel logo over the entrance sign. Ms. Gutterman noted that the former tenant, FYE, had limited exterior signage, but had window displays and graphics that informed passersby of the store.

Mr. Segato asked if there could be fewer of the suspended pinwheel signs. Ms. Gutterman responded that she would recommend that the pinwheel become a decal in the window as opposed to the suspended sign. Ms. Stein noted that she is very uncomfortable with the proposal as presented because it involves permanently drilling into every single window keystone. She noted that FYE never had an identity problem, and that the Committee has never recommended approval of this much signage on a historic property. She opined that the signage overwhelms the building and is not common anywhere along Broad Street.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that he would be in favor of the pinwheel on top of the panel signs as proposed, but not any of the suspended sign. He noted, however, that the panel sign and pinwheel should be reduced in size.

Ms. Gutterman noted that the property is also lit at night as part of the Avenue of the Arts, and wondered how that lighting may impact the signage on this building.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, with the following suggestions for a subsequent application:

- all illuminated pinwheels are removed from the window openings, with no anchoring into any keystones;
- the illuminated pinwheel proposed on top of the panel signs can remain, but the size of the panel signs should be reduced and limited to one panel sign on each street frontage; and,
- the details related the anchorages into the masonry and the electrical conduits are provided and appropriate.

ADDRESS: 1726 SPRUCE ST, AKA 1727 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Construct townhouse

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1727 Delancey LP

Applicant: Shimi Zakin, Atrium Design Group

History: 1870; subdivided lot at 1727 Delancey Place

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to subdivide a parcel that runs from Spruce Street back to Delancey Street and to construct a single-family four-story residence on Delancey Street. Currently, the Delancey end of the site is open and used for surface parking. To accomplish the subdivision, a non-historic, one-story rear addition would be removed from the Spruce Street building.

The Commission previously reviewed and approved a proposal for this property that featured a four-story house on Delancey with pilot house, a front-loaded garage, and no setback from the sidewalk. The new proposal is similar in design to the previous project, with brick and zinc panel cladding, and vertical aluminum-clad fenestration; however, the current proposal sets the building back from the sidewalk 20 feet, creating a “front yard” with an asphalt parking pad and brick wingwalls.

The staff contends that, while the front-loaded garage of the previous proposal was not ideal, the 20-foot setback from the street further disrupts the rhythm of the historic district. If the “front yard” parking is determined acceptable, the staff recommends the use of pervious paving and the installation of a decorative gate across the driveway opening.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Snežana Litvinović, developer Yoav Shiffman, and attorney Michael Phillips represented the application.

Ms. Litvinović noted that they favored their earlier application approved by the Historical Commission and felt it was more appropriate, but owing to a zoning appeal delay, the owner has decided to pursue a project that would be by-right through zoning. She noted that a 20 foot setback is required because the property is zoned RM-4. She explained that the design of the building, aside from the setback, is essentially the same as what was approved previously, but with the replacement of the garage door with a fenestration system.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if this would be considered a rear yard. Ms. Litvinović responded that it is not. She explained that the zoning of RM-4 would require a variance if there is no setback, even if it is the right thing to do by all urbanistic principles. Mr. Cluver responded that the zoning code analysis seems to indicate that there is not enough lot area. Ms. Litvinović responded that the proposal does have enough lot area since it is an existing lot. She noted that this proposal does not subdivide the lot, but keeps it as a six-family multi-unit lot. She explained that the lot would have two fronts by zoning. Mr. Cluver asked if parking is allowed in a front yard, and Ms. Gutterman asked if parking is allowed next to a bedroom. Mr. Cluver responded that the ground-floor bedroom is a study.

Ms. Litvinović noted that there is existing parking on the lot now. Ms. Pentz asked whether pervious paving could be used for the parking, if parking is necessary. Mr. Shiffman responded that he would be willing to do that. Ms. Gutterman asked if there could be a gate. Mr. Shiffman responded that that probably would not be possible, because it will be the entrance to the house and the gates would not be allowed to swing into the right-of-way. He noted that if they could do it from a design standpoint, it would be something they would consider. Ms. Gutterman questioned what would keep the cars out of the right-of-way. Ms. Litvinović responded that there really is not enough room for two parking spaces.

Ms. Stein asked what would happen if the Commission deems it inappropriate to set a building back and park cars in front of it in a historic district. She opined that the project impacts the character of the district. Ms. Litvinović responded that they would have to apply for a variance to eliminate the setback. She noted that there is already parking on this lot and that the same side of the block has 28 off-street parking spaces, including garages and open parking. Ms. Gutterman responded that that may be true, but that those cars are parked at the rear of a property, not at the front entrance. Ms. Litvinović responded that that is correct. Ms. Gutterman opined that parking at the front of a property is not in keeping with the historic character of the neighborhood. Ms. Litvinović replied that pushing the building back 20 feet is not in keeping with the historic character of the block, but it is what was requested by zoning. Mr. Cluver asked if they have sought a zoning variance. Mr. Phillips responded that they obtained a zoning variance, but that that variance is being appealed by the Center City Residents' Association and by two neighbors. Ms. Gutterman questioned the reasoning for the neighbors' opposition. Mr. Phillips responded that the neighbors do not want the garage and want the setback. Ms. Gutterman asked why the neighbors would rather have the setback than a building at the street.

Mr. Shiffman noted that some of the neighbors are present. Neighbor Thomas Crumlish, owner of 1723 Delancey, observed that he does not recall ever having said that he would prefer that the building be set back or that he did not want a garage. Rather, he objected to the overall size and massing of the structure, noting that the ends of the block at 17th and 18th Streets have four-story homes, but the center of the block traditionally featured two- and three-story carriage houses for the properties on Spruce and Pine Streets. He opined that the approval a four-story building with a roofdeck sets a precedent that any height goes on the block and that it does not matter that it is a quite little residential block.

Attorney Stanley Krakower, representative of the Center City Residents' Association (CCRA), stated that the CCRA is supportive of the neighbors in this endeavor, primarily in ensuring that the proper legal steps are taken. Mr. Krakower opined that there were several aspects of the plan that the neighbors objected to; as far as the set back is concerned, the neighbors felt it mitigated some of the problems of the massiveness of the building at the street. He noted that the first preference would be to reduce the height of the building, but zoning allows for the proposed height, so the setback was the second option. He noted that the fourth floor on this plan appears to be set back farther than the previously proposal, which is also better. Ms. Stein pointed out that one thing that significantly changes by moving it back, that neighbors may not have considered, is that it blocks the central open space of the rears of all of the properties on the bordering blocks. She noted that one of the elements that is interesting about cities like Philadelphia and London is the courtyards of space at the rears of rowhomes that allow air and light into the buildings. By shifting the proposed building back on the lot, it puts a hard wall for all of the properties that look out onto the shared open space. She noted that the setback also interrupts the pattern of the street. Mr. Krakower responded that the new building will remain on the same lot as 1726 Spruce Street by zoning standards. He opined that there should still be some space between the two buildings on the lot. Mr. Shiffman responded that the distance between the buildings is approximately 20 feet. Mr. Krakower opined that it is not really a "courtyard" behind the buildings. Mr. McCoubrey explained that the rears of the properties all have windows that look out over the open space, with maximum six foot high fences. Mr. Krakower noted that there does not seem to be an ideal solution, but the immediate neighbors seem to prefer this proposal, and the association feels it should support whatever position the majority of the neighbors take. Ms. Stein reiterated that the proposed project would block the light and air to many properties, and that is the reason why there are generally building codes that prevent this type of proposal. Mr. Krumlish responded that there are a variety of depths of buildings along the block.

Mr. Cluver opined that the proposal seems counter to good urban design, and questioned the fact that zoning allows for parking in a front yard. Ms. Litvinović responded that it generally would not be approved, but the parking is existing parking that remains where it is. Mr. Krakower responded that the zoning code does not allow parking in the front yard, but it is a question for the Department of Licenses & Inspections. Ms. Gutterman responded that that is outside of the Historical Commission's jurisdiction. Mr. Krakower opined that the proposal will require some kind of clarification, but that will be left to the Department.

Ms. Gutterman asked why the staff recommended denial. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff does not feel that the setback is in keeping with the historic character of the district.

Mr. Cluver noted that a recommendation of denial puts the Historical Commission in opposition with the zoning code. Mr. McCoubrey and Ms. Gutterman responded that the Historical Commission is charged with protecting the historic fabric and character of the district and abiding by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Ms. Gutterman stated that she does not feel the setback is in keeping with historic preservation standards.

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

ADDRESS: 900-38 E WASHINGTON LN

Proposal: Demolish shed; construct two sheds

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City Parks Association

Applicant: Chris Van de Velde, Awbury Arboretum Association

History: 1862; Francis Cope House

Individual Designation: 5/7/1981

District Designation: Awbury Arboretum Historic District, Significant, 5/14/2010

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the construction of the three-bay storage shed, but denial of the demolition of the existing Significant shed, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10, and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the prohibition against demolition.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish an existing shed and to construct two sheds around a slightly reconfigured parking area at the rear of the Francis Cope House in Awbury Arboretum. The proposed sheds would be clad in board and batten wood siding with carriage-style overhead doors and wood columns designed to resemble those of the Cope house.

The existing shed proposed for demolition is listed as Significant in the district inventory and is attributed to Yarnall & Cooper, architects of the Francis Cope House. However, no date of construction is listed for this structure, and its appearance, even if altered, does not suggest contemporaneous construction with the 1862 Cope house. The 1895 and 1910 Bromley atlases indicate a carriage house structure associated with the neighboring John S. Haines estate. No auxiliary wooden structures are identified on the Francis Cope property.

The staff contends that the carriage house shed is inaccurately identified as Significant in the district, when at most, it should be contributing; however, given its classification, the shed should be rehabilitated or reconstructed to its original appearance, rather than demolished.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Christopher van de Velde, general manager of the Awbury Arboretum, represented the application.

Mr. van de Velde explained the location of the existing shed and the proposed sheds, and the fact that the parking lot would be expanded as part of the proposal over the location of the existing shed.

Mr. van de Velde commented that it is the condition, functionality, and additions to the existing shed that are problematic to its retention. He noted that in the last few years, the organization has made a considerable effort to overhaul the operations of the Arboretum because it cannot financially sustain itself, so they have started to rent the Cope House regularly for weddings and social events. As part of that functionality, they are looking for various sheds that serve to provide space for the storage of the tables and chairs that are essential to those activities. He noted that they have also significantly upgraded the maintenance of the property, and now have volunteers doing various tasks in the existing shed.

Ms. Pentz suggested that if there is evidence that a certain portion of the shed is a later addition, perhaps those areas could be removed. Mr. van de Velde noted that the original shed is situated under the red roof, but that the doors on the original shed are not original. The

original doors, he stated, slid on tracks. Mr. van de Velde explained that much of the existing wood siding of the shed has been replaced, and other portions are in poor condition.

Ms. Pentz asked if there is any arched structure on the interior. Mr. Van de Velde responded that no, the rafters are straight, and run east to west.

Ms. DiPasquale clarified that the staff does not object to the Arboretum removing any non-historic additions to the shed, but given the classification of the structure itself as Significant, it would either need to be reclassified or go through the financial hardship process to be demolished. Ms. Pentz noted that, if the shed is associated with the architect of the Cope House, she would agree. Ms. DiPasquale and Mr. Van de Velde responded that they had not found any documentation to that effect. Mr. Van de Velde noted that they proceeded on the theory that many of the sheds were built in and around the private houses of the Cope family's property over different generations. Mr. Cluver questioned how the classification of the shed came about. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the shed is identified in the historic district's inventory, but no supporting evidence regarding the date of construction or architect. Mr. Van de Velde responded that he searched the Arboretum's archives and could not find any documentation on the shed.

Ms. Stein asked if it would be possible for the Arboretum to build one new shed and restore the existing shed for the same function. Mr. Van de Velde responded that it may be possible, but it would make it difficult to increase parking. Ms. Gutterman replied that it does not look like they would gain that many parking spaces. Mr. Van de Velde responded that they would gain approximately 12 to 13 parking spaces with the demolition of the shed. Ms. DiPasquale asked whether it would be possible to extend the parking to either side of the existing shed. Mr. Van de Velde responded that it might be possible, but he does not want to commit to being able to do that until he has spoken with other people.

Ms. Pentz noted that she does not see any evidence that the existing shed could not be rehabilitated. Mr. van de Velde responded that he assumes one could rehabilitate anything, but that he does not know what the costs associated with that would be. He noted that they do not have any idea what the original doors would have looked like. Ms. Gutterman asked if a structural engineer has evaluated the shed, noting that supporting documentation indicating that the rehabilitation of the structure is infeasible and an application to reclassify the structure would provide the Commission more latitude in approving its demolition. She noted that she would feel more comfortable if there was a report indicating that, by the time the structure was completely rehabilitated, nearly none of the historic fabric would remain. Mr. van de Velde responded that he feels that it would not be cost-effective to rehabilitate the shed, noting that the organization has to spend its money wisely. He noted that it functionally does not satisfy the organization's needs. Ms. Gutterman asked how large this shed is as opposed to the existing shed, noting that they appear to be roughly the same size.

Mr. Cluver summarized that the Committee does not have the authority to recommend approval of the demolition of the existing shed given its classification and the documentation provided, but that the Commission, with its greater latitude may be able to. He suggested that the applicants provide more information explaining why the retention of the existing shed may not be feasible. He opined that moving the shed off to one side might be an option. He noted that the design of the smaller shed is also not shown in the application. Mr. van de Velde responded that they are proposing the same design as the three-bay shed but in two bays.

Ms. Pentz reiterated that she could not recommend approval of the demolition of the existing shed without additional information on its history. Mr. van de Velde responded that he cannot manufacture information that does not exist. Ms. Pentz asked if there are any older photographs.

Mr. Cluver noted that the long-term viability of the house is of primary concern, and if there can be an argument made that the shed is impeding its long term survival, that may be a persuasive argument, but not one that can be made before the Architectural Committee. He reiterated the need for the Committee to stay within the guidelines of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and the classification of the building. The Committee must recommend against the demolition of the shed.

Regarding the design of the other proposed shed, Mr. Cluver commented that the curved doors have an odd relationship to the window in the door, and that he would expect a historic door to be a more squared-off carriage style door.

Ms. Stein questioned the vertical orientation of the proposed siding, and asked if there is precedent for that at the Cope House. Mr. van de Velde responded that the photographs they have of other sheds in the district indicate a vertical board and batten system, which is what they are proposing here as well. Mr. McCoubrey questioned the columns on the proposed shed, noting that he recognizes that there is an overhanging eave, but suggesting that, historically, the eave would have been supported by brackets rather than columns. Mr. van de Velde responded that he suspects that the column design was intended to echo the Cope House porch. Mr. McCoubrey replied that it would be inappropriate for the shed, as a utilitarian building, to have the same level of high-style features as the porch of the main house. He suggested that the shed stand alone as its own utilitarian structure.

Mr. Cluver opined that the design problems with the proposed three-bay shed are insignificant enough that the Committee could recommend approval, with the staff to review details of the doors and to resolve the column versus bracket question.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the three-bay storage shed, with the staff to review details including the doors and the brackets in place of columns, but denial of the demolition of the Significant shed, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10, and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the prohibition against demolition.

ADDRESS: 2500 S CLEVELAND ST

Proposal: Install gate and parking pad

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Giuliano Apadula & Amanda Apadula

Applicant: John Christinzio

History: 1910; John Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Girard Estate Historic District, Contributing, 11/10/1999

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a parking pad at the rear of this corner property located in the Girard Estate Historic District. A section of non-historic fence and raised patio would be removed to accommodate the one-car parking pad. The section of existing historic

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 JANUARY 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

hairpin fence would be retained, and a new section to mimic the historic would be erected, which would include a foldable gate along the proposed driveway. Greenery is proposed along the driveway and along the side of the property. The Historical Commission approved a very similar application for a property in Girard Estate in January 2017, provided the parking area was paved with a pervious material.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the parking area is paved with a pervious material, pursuant to Standards 2 and 5.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. John Christinzio and property owner Giuliano Apadula represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there is clearance for a car to park at this site. Mr. Christinzio responded that he drew the width of a sport utility vehicle on the site plan and determined that the driver can exit the vehicle. Mr. Cluver asked about the grade. Mr. Christinzio responded that they are removing the one-foot rise and the entire pad. Mr. Cluver asked about steps. Mr. Christinzio responded that steps will be added on the inside of the fence, which was the original configuration. He explained that the patio was a later addition, and the fence is not historic. He stated that they will remove the non-historic fence and replace it with a reproduction of the historic hairpin fence, bringing it closer to the original historic character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Cluver stated that he needed to make a standard comment about his disapproval of privatizing parking. Mr. McCoubrey commented that he tried to make that argument at the Commission's January meeting. Ms. Broadbent clarified that the previous similar application received a recommendation of denial from the Committee, but an approval from the Commission. Mr. Apadula commented that the previous approved application was for a two-car parking pad, rather than his one-car proposal. Mr. McCoubrey commented that this application is far less of an imposition in the Girard Estate landscape compared to the last one that the Commission approved. Mr. Cluver stated that his concern is more related to urban planning rather than historic preservation, but he still wanted to state it.

Ms. Gutterman voted to recommend denial, owing to a potential precedent that is being set, and the Committee's previous recommendation of denial for a similar application. Others noted that any precedent for parking in Girard Estate was set by the Commission long ago. Mr. Apadula asked Ms. Gutterman to elaborate on her recommendation of denial. She responded that she does not believe in creating private parking in Girard Estate, and despite that the Commission will likely overrule it, she believes that the rear yards should remain green spaces. Mr. Apadula responded that he understands, and that he will have greenery along the site. Ms. Gutterman responded that having greenery along a perimeter is not the same as having an outdoor yard. Mr. Apadula asked if there are any design improvements, since the opposition is solely based on parking. Mr. Cluver responded that the design that is proposed is acceptable if one accepts the premise of the parking. The Committee unanimously agreed. Ms. Gutterman commented that the Commission will likely approve the application. Mr. Christinzio commented that there are only four potential properties remaining which have not created private parking at the rear. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the Committee's responsibility to the Commission is to advise it as to whether or not a proposal is in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and the Committee needs to be consistent in its recommendations.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to its recent recommendation of denial for a similar application.

ADDRESS: 2311-13 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Reopen window openings and construct new brick façade over existing façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2311 Spruce Street Partners

Applicant: Keith Braccia, PMC Property Group

History: front wall rebuilt, 1945; front wall stuccoed, 1974

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate the front façade of this former stable, which was heavily altered in 1945 and again in 1974. This application proposes to reopen former window openings on the second and third floors, which are evident in the attached photograph taken in 1968, and install new doors on the first floor. The application also proposes to build a new brick wall in front of the existing brick and stucco wall. The applicant executed a similar scheme with a new brick veneer in front of an existing facade at a non-designated property at 11th and Pine Streets; a photograph of the result is included for your reference. The staff suggests that the front wall should be rebuilt in a manner that allows it to remain flush with the neighboring property, rather than sit proud of the row out in the right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the new brick veneer is constructed in the plane of the historic brick façade, not forward of the existing stucco wall, pursuant to Standards 5 and 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Keith Braccia and Jonathan Stavin of PMC Property Group represented the application.

Mr. Stavin explained that PMC Property Group recognizes that this building does not fit with the rest of the historic neighborhood, and that they used this approach on a non-designated building and the neighbors were generally very receptive to how it improved what was a white stucco front façade. Ms. Pentz stated that she objects to the details, quoins, balconies and steel beam. Mr. Stavin explained that six apartments would need to be vacated in order to remove the stucco and then what is presumed to be a deteriorated brick wall behind it. He stated that the compromise is building a brick wall in front of the existing façade as proposed. He stated that the details of the overall appearance can be changed, but that the goal of the application is to get approval for building the brick wall over the existing façade. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the proposed design is a big improvement for the building.

Mr. Cluver stated that it can be assumed that the brick façade shown in a 1968 photograph is what is behind the existing stucco. Mr. Stavin commented that, often when you remove stucco, you find the reason it was applied in the first place is because the underlying brick was so badly deteriorated. Ms. Gutterman questioned if they would have to remove sections of stucco to tie anchors into the brick wall. Mr. Stavin confirmed this, but noted that it would not involve removing the existing wall. Ms. Gutterman asked if the condition of the underlying brick has been determined, and if the stucco was applied directly to the brick face, or if a lath was used. She opined that if it was applied to the brick face, it will fall off if anchored through. Mr. Stavin stated that he believes the stucco was applied to the brick face, but that the contractor has determined that the application method used previously on S. 11th Street will work on this building. Ms. Gutterman opined that the stucco will fail if anchored through. Mr. Stavin responded that a new wall will be constructed in front of it, and the goal is not preservation of the stucco. Ms. Gutterman stated that breathability may be impacted by a new brick wall. Mr.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 JANUARY 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Stavin responded that typically they use a waterproof membrane. Ms. Gutterman stated that the tenants will be impacted by the reopening of window openings. Mr. Stavin agreed, but noted that it would not be to the extent that it would be if the front wall had to be removed and rebuilt to be flush with the adjacent property, per the staff recommendation. He stated that the façade will project one brick width past the neighbor's façade, if they receive approval for this project. Mr. Cluver commented that other buildings have had stucco removed and the brick façade restored and cleaned successfully.

Mr. Stavin stated that the other option is to leave the building in its current state, which is what they will do if they do not receive approval for the new brick wall component of the application, but that they would rather improve the building per this proposal. He stated that the façade design can be changed to remove the quoins, steel beam and balconies. Mr. Cluver agreed that the steel beam, balconies, quoins, brick corbels, and nine-over-one windows are out of place. He suggested a wood cornice. He acknowledged the desire to improve the appearance of the building, but stated that the means of improvement are of concern. Ms. Stein asked for additional information regarding the return of the façade on the side of the building.

Ms. Gutterman again suggested the removal of the existing stucco to expose the underlying brick wall. She stated that there is no basis for the proposed design. Mr. Stavin responded that they looked at the character of the street and used that to determine the proposed design. Ms. Broadbent clarified that zoning documents state that the front wall was rebuilt in 1945, which is presumably behind the stucco, and the stucco was applied in 1974. Presumably, if the stucco is removed, what will remain is a 1945 brick façade.

Mr. Cluver stated that he is not comfortable with the proposed approach, unless a mason does the exploration, and determines that the stucco is remarkably well-adhered to the brick, and removing it would damage the brick that is there. He stated that the exploration needs to be done before the Committee can commit to a brick veneer in front of the existing façade.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

14-203(88) Demolition or Demolish.

The razing or destruction, whether entirely or in significant part, of a building, structure, site, or object. Demolition includes the removal of a building, structure, site, or object from its site or the removal or destruction of the façade or surface.