

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

**TUESDAY, 26 APRIL 2016
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dan McCoubrey, AIA, 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

Kerri Silsbe, Project Expeditors
Ryan Lohbauer, Stanev Potts
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Michael Phillips, Esq., Obermayer Resmann Maxwell & Hippel
Michael Skolnick, PZS Architects
Michal Silberman, PZS Architects
Lee Berman
Jason Winig, Winig Properties
Stephen Varenhorst, Varenhorst
Kira Fallon, Varenhorst
Stephen Maffei, Abitare Design
Joe Schiavo
Janet Kalter
Stuart Rosenberg, SGRA
Steven Savitz, SRS
Mark Travis
Hao Li, mimohaus
Justin Stevenson
Ashley Hahn
David Landskroner, Hightop Real Estate & Development

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 2027 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Remove non-historic storefront and ramp; install exterior ATM with platform and ramp

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: AMCD Walnut St Assoc.

Applicant: Kerri Silsbe, 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 remove a non-historic storefront and ADA ramp, and install an exterior automated teller machine (ATM) with platform, canopy, and ramp. In place of the glass storefront system, a cement plaster finished wall would be installed, with the ATM located in the center of the new wall. The canopy covering the ATM would extend five feet six and one half inches over the new platform. An ADA ramp would be installed in front of the ATM platform, bringing the new ramp out to a point flush with the front of the steps at the property next door.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Kerri Silsbee represented the application.

Ms. Silsbee explained that her client wishes to make the ATM more visible and accessible to more people without a keycard. Mr. Cluver said that the additional projection of the new platform and ramp would be too prominent on the façade and counter to the historic character of the building. Ms. Gutterman agreed and asked if the ATM could potentially be shifted to the right side of the storefront and placed low enough that no ramp would be necessary at all. Ms. Silsbee replied she and her colleagues determined it would look better in the middle of the storefront. Mr. Cluver stated that the Committee and Commission had consistently asked for ATMs to be installed inside and had approved this one inside in 2012. He opined that the proposed storefront material was completely inappropriate for the historic building. Mr. Baron added that, although it is noted that the storefront is not original, there are parts of the storefront such as the vestibule and the ornate transoms that have significance and the glazing, while probably a replacement, is the correct material for the storefront. Ms. Gutterman stated that the Committee should recommend denial of the application. Mr. Cluver suggested design alternatives he might consider; however, these were not adopted by others. Ms. Pentz encouraged the restoration of the storefront including the removal of the awning.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9 and the 2012 approval.

ADDRESS: 1606 CHESTNUT ST, UNIT 4

Proposal: Legalize roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Howard Winig Marital Trust, Winig Properties

Applicant: Jason Winig, Winig Properties

History: 1890; Isaac S. Miller Store; Albert W. Dilks, architect

Individual Designation: 9/12/1990

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize a deck constructed without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit. The existing deck sits just over seven feet back from the front façade, and the railing is highly visible at numerous locations along Chestnut Street and from both 16th and 17th Streets. The deck is accessed by a pilot house that appears to have been constructed between 2003 and 2004.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guidelines. The staff notes that the project would satisfy the inconspicuous standard if the deck and railing were pulled back to a point where they were no longer visible from Chestnut Street, with a location determined by a mock-up. The staff suggests that this may be roughly in line with the front edge of the pilot house.

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

Mr. Baron reported that he had visited the site and gone up to the roof. He explained that the placement of the deck is partially determined by the ownership of the roof. The owner of the condominium that includes this deck only owns a piece of the roof at the front of the building. Ms. Gutterman said that property owners do not have a guaranteed right to a deck. The Architectural Committee must review the application as if the deck had not already been constructed. After looking at photographs, the Committee members concluded that the deck should probably be set back three sections of the fence including the front dunnage beam, but the exact location should be determined by a mock up. They determined that the deck is conspicuous in its present location.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 2013 MOUNT VERNON ST

Proposal: Construct two stories on approved one-story, rear addition and roof deck on rear ell

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: High Top Real Estate & Development

Applicant: David Polatnick, PZS Architects

History: 1859

Individual Designation: 11/6/1975

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story rear addition with a bay on the twin at 2013 Mount Vernon Street. The property is located mid-block in the Spring Garden

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 APRIL 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Historic District, and the only public visibility to the rear is through a gate to a private alleyway on Wallace Street. The applicant previously obtained an approval at staff-level for a roof deck and pilot house, a one-story rear addition, and the reconstruction of a bay. This application proposes to demolish the rear masonry wall of the existing ell and to construct two stories above the approved single-story addition. The bay, originally proposed as a reconstruction of a previously existing structure adjacent to the rear masonry wall, would be constructed at the second story of the addition. All walls of the addition, including the second-story bay, would be clad in siding.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that the siding is a dark, neutral color and that a secondary material is incorporated into the design of the rear elevation, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Michael Skolnick and Michal Silberman represented the application.

The Committee members looked at photographs and discussed the public visibility of the rear of the building. Mr. McCoubrey expressed some concern with the amount of demolition of the brick wall that had occurred without a permit. Ms. Gutterman asked to see a site plan of the block to understand how far out this addition would project compared to other buildings on the block. They provided her with an aerial photograph to show the rears of nearby buildings. They concluded that one other building on the block had a similar projection. They discussed the question of materials. Several Committee members expressed a concern that Hardiboard was inappropriate because the original construction was masonry. Mr. Skolnick said that the community organization asserts that stucco looks cheap and cracks easily. Mr. Cluver found the Hardiboard acceptable while the other Committee members did not. The Committee members asked about the windows in the older portion of the building. The architects responded that the front windows are wood and the rear windows vinyl. Mr. Baron said that the window materials should be stipulated on the plans. Also, the staff will need to review shop drawings of the approved windows. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the plans indicate that the windows would match the originals, which would be wood.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, provided the addition is clad in a masonry material and the bay in wood based on the two-story side bay, and the rear windows are six-over-six in the historic section and one-over one in the new section, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADDRESS: 1226 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct three-story, rear addition, pilot house, and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Lee & Karly Berman

Applicant: Stephen Maffei, Abitare Design Studio, LLC

History: 1825

Individual Designation: 11/28/1961

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore the front façade and construct a three-story rear addition with roof deck and pilot house on this circa 1825 house in the Washington Square West

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 APRIL 2016

4

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

neighborhood. The rear of the property is visible from Waverly Street. The construction of the rear addition would result in the removal of the rear roof slope, rear dormer, and rear façade. Two options are presented for the design of the rear of the addition. The proposed roof deck would start at the ridge line of the existing roof and continue the length of the addition at the rear. There are several other examples nearby of large rear additions, most notably the property next door at 1228 Pine Street, which the Commission approved in 2004. In that instance, however, the historic building including the rear had been altered prior to the approval of the large rear addition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the restoration of the front façade, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6; denial of the rear addition as proposed, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Stephen Maffei and property owner Lee Berman and represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked about the degree of visibility of the rear addition at 1228 Pine Street versus this proposed rear addition. Ms. Broadbent responded that the visibility is comparable, but noted that the rear of 1228 Pine Street had been previously altered prior to the Commission approving the large, visible rear addition in 2004, and the rear roof slope had already been removed. Ms. Stein asked how far the addition would extend past the addition at 1228 Pine Street. Mr. Maffei responded that it would extend about six feet beyond the addition at 1228 Pine Street.

Ms. Gutterman asked if consideration had been given to building a large rear ell addition that did not touch the original house. Mr. Maffei responded that it was considered, and they settled on a design that incorporates an interior courtyard. Ms. Gutterman responded that the deck and fourth bedroom blow out the rear of the original house. Mr. Maffei confirmed this, but explained that the homeowner has a growing family and is looking to provide space for his family. Ms. Gutterman responded that she supports the courtyard and the rear widening out, but she does not support the demolition of the rear wall of the historic house. She suggested a rear ell that is designed like a rear ell was historically. Ms. Stein asked if Ms. Gutterman meant instead that the third floor of the addition should be removed. Ms. Gutterman responded that the existing roof should remain as is, and the deck would start at the end of the stair. Mr. Cluver commented that the proposed addition is bigger in footprint than the existing house, but it should not be larger than the house. Ms. Gutterman opined that a rear ell behind the house is a manageable proposal. She commented that the house has a small footprint to start with, so whatever is built will likely be larger than the square footage of the historic house. She opined that the addition could rise back up to a third story towards the rear, as long as the existing roof and rear dormer are retained. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the addition could be like a separate structure in the back, tied together to the existing house with a small connection. Mr. Maffei questioned Ms. Gutterman's suggestion to rise back up to a third story on the addition, if the intention is to keep the rear roof slope and dormer visible from Waverly Street. Ms. Gutterman responded that the proposal should be for a two-story addition with roof deck, so the roof slope would remain visible from Waverly Street. Mr. Baron suggested that the Committee should recommend a two story rear addition for this reason. Ms. Stein asked about the height. Mr. Maffei responded that the addition will not extend above the ridgeline of the historic building, although the pilot house would project higher, but will not be visible from Pine or Waverly Streets. Mr. McCoubrey asked if there is parking at the rear. Mr. Maffei responded that there is parking at the rear, along with a gate.

Ms. Stein opined that the addition is overwhelming, and the solid parapet at the deck adds visual height. Mr. Maffei commented that the addition will include about 24 feet of actual living space. He stated that the stair will likely not work if he has to retain the rear roof slope. Mr. Cluver agreed. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the stair remain, or maybe adding a stair that links the second to third floor. Mr. Maffei responded that the existing stair is a winder and is dangerous, so it needs to be removed. He commented that the rear of the historic building has been modified over time, and is not in pristine condition. Ms. Gutterman opined that the roofline should not be changed at all. Ms. Stein stated that the building is individually designated, and the designation is intended to preserve historic fabric. Mr. McCoubrey summarized that the house is special in that it retains its rear roof slope and dormer; the proposed addition is too large; one story should be removed from the addition; the entire roof slope and dormer should be preserved; and the addition should disengage from the rear of the house as much as possible.

Ms. Pentz asked about the dormer restoration on the front roof. Mr. Maffei responded that the dormer is currently in poor condition and is encased in roofing material. He referenced a barrel dormer located at 1230 Pine Street, where the staff had approved the restoration. Mr. Maffei stated that his client intends to restore the front façade of the house, which will include masonry cleaning, new windows to match the historic windows, and removal of non-historic brick planters. Ms. Pentz reiterated that she is leery of the change to the dormer roof unless there is more evidence presented to show the original condition. Ms. Broadbent responded that the staff has historic photographs and will work with the architect on the details of the dormer restoration. Mr. Maffei stated that the dormer restoration as presented is a suggestion, and it can remain a gable dormer. Ms. Pentz stated that the front and rear dormers presumably match. Mr. Berman responded that they do not match. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the staff has the necessary information that will inform the decision regarding the dormer restoration.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment. Patrick Grossi, representing the Preservation Alliance, voiced his support for the staff's recommendation. He stated that the building retains much of its historic integrity and should be treated as sensitively as possible, and that the Alliance would support a proposal like the two-story option suggested by Ms. Gutterman.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the restoration of the front façade, with staff to review details including details related to restoration of the dormer, pursuant to Standard 6; denial of the rear addition as proposed, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.

ADDRESS: 421 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Demolish penthouse; construct new penthouse

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Dan Wheeler

Applicant: Stephen Varenhorst, Varenhorst

History: 1857; Bank of Pennsylvania/Philadelphia National Bank; John M. Gries, architect; H.C. Oram & Co., iron work; additions, 1892, 1893; one story added, 1903, T.P. Chandler

Individual Designation: 6/24/1969

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

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a non-historic, sixth-floor penthouse and construct a new penthouse on top of the Bank of Pennsylvania building, a highly significant building on Bank Row in the Old City Historic District. The Historical Commission approved the existing penthouse, with a 10-foot setback from the Chestnut Street façade of the historic bank, in 2005. The existing penthouse was approved at a height of 13 feet 8 inches, with a small center pediment that reaches 19 feet 9 inches in height.

A similar application to the one now presented was reviewed by the Architectural Committee at the March 2016 meeting. The Committee voted to recommend denial, but with the following suggestions to improve the design:

- simplify the highly-articulated façade,
- reduce the overall height, with attention paid to the end walls,
- lower the front section of the penthouse, and add a set-back clerestory, and,
- change the color of the façade to gray or a color that will similarly fade to the background.

The revised drawings submitted for this review reflect the Architectural Committee's March 2016 comments, in addition to comments received from the Preservation Alliance's easement committee. The Chestnut Street façade of the proposed penthouse will be set back 13 feet from the front facade of the historic building, with vertical sun screens that will be set back 11 feet 5 inches from the façade. The flat-roof height was reduced to 14 feet 9 inches above the roof deck. The penthouse would open onto a deck at the front and sides of the building, and the existing glass railing would remain.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Stephen Varenhorst and Kira Fallon represented the application.

Mr. Varenhorst stated that the revised design incorporates comments from both the Architectural Committee and the Preservation Alliance's easement committee. Mr. Cluver asked about the west side screen wall, which appears to be more prominent in the proposed design than what is currently constructed. Mr. Varenhorst explained that the wall is intended to blend with the addition and also to hide mechanical and other equipment on the roof. Mr. Cluver suggested that the wall be reduced in height to lessen its visual impact. Mr. Varenhorst responded that the wall height is flexible and can be adjusted. Mr. Varenhorst stated that he will work with the staff on final color selections. Ms. Stein suggested a soft gray instead of a deep gray. She opined that the revised design is a big improvement over the earlier design and is much more appropriate for the historic building.

Ms. Gutterman asked about comments from the National Park Service on the proposed design. Ms. Broadbent responded that the National Park Service had commented on the prior design, to say that they had no comment unless the proposal was taller or closer to the Chestnut Street façade, at which time it would offer a comment.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment. Patrick Grossi, representing the Preservation Alliance, commented that the project was reviewed by the Alliance's easement committee. He stated that the committee's primary concern was about the relationship between the penthouse and the historic façade. The committee considers the design as now proposed successful, and supports the design.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the west side screen wall is reduced in height, with staff to review details including color selections, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 141-43 N 04TH ST AND 319 CHERRY ST

Proposal: Construct additions and five-story building

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: John G. Traver Co. Inc., c/o Steven Savitz

Applicant: Ryan Lohbauer, Stanev Potts Architects

History: 1780

Individual Designation: 4/26/1966

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application seeks in-concept approval for the development of a parcel that includes 141-43 N 4th St and 319 Cherry Street. The eighteenth-century property at 141-43 N. 4th Street, which was individually designated in 1966 and categorized as Significant in the Old City Historic District inventory in 2003, would be retained and would become a stand-alone building once again. The primary question for this in-concept review is in regards to the rear three-story building and the vacant lot. The application proposes to construct a one and a half-story addition on top of the eighteenth-century school building, and five-story additions on two sides of an eighteenth-century school building at the center of the site. A one-story addition surrounding the school building would be demolished. The application also proposes to construct an L-shaped, five-story building on the site, which would be combined with a vacant parcel at 319 Cherry Street.

The structures at the rear of the property are not explicitly called out in the Old City Historic District inventory; however, research has confirmed that the three-story brick building is an eighteenth-century school building that was associated with the German Reformed Church on Race Street, and which was converted to a warehouse in the nineteenth century. The structure appears to have had a story added, and the rear is stuccoed, but the north elevation retains its brick watertable and Flemish bond pattern, and the original window and door openings are easily discernible. The razing or partial razing of the structure would constitute a demolition, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9. The staff notes that, although somewhat altered, the existing eighteenth-century school building retains many of its character-defining features, and that any construction on top of the building is inappropriate.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Ryan Lohbauer and Stuart Rosenberg represented the application.

Mr. Lohbauer asked Ms. DiPasquale if the staff had any comments about the height of the proposed construction. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff asserts that the new construction should stay under approximately 45 feet, or approximately four stories.

Mr. Cluver asked whether the existing roof is flat and why the proposed roof is pitched. Mr. Lohbauer responded with a brief overview of the history of the property and the block. He noted that there were three distinct periods of influence on the development of the parcel. Originally, in the mid and late-eighteenth century, it was a mixed-use residential block with religious buildings and some commercial properties. In the mid-nineteenth century there was a rapid transition to heavy industry, and many buildings were converted into industrial uses. In the 1960s, the

Redevelopment Authority of Philadelphia (RDA) came in and systematically removed much of the neighborhood's industrial past, replacing it with an impression of the early style. Regarding the property, Mr. Lohbauer continued that, by the church's own estimation, the school building was a simple, utilitarian structure at the rear of their property on Race Street. The school, he noted, was built on the interior of the block and never really visible from the nearby streets. The relationship between the church and the school buildings changed over time when the existing church, constructed in 1837 was located farther back on the lot than its predecessor, making it closer to the school building. Furthermore, Mr. Lohbauer continued, when the congregation moved from the neighborhood in the 1880s and sold their properties to the John Lucas Paint Company, the John Lucas company, like many other Victorian industrialists of the time in a neighborhood that was rapidly becoming the workshop of the world, employed architectural strategies to cleverly get around the limitations of the neighborhood, which were strange lot sizes and existing infrastructure that did not accommodate industrial uses. Those strategies were employed at this property, he noted. At that time, the church had several additions built adjacent to it, and there were bridges connecting the school to the church. The 4th Street structure (number 1 on the plan) was converted to offices, and served in that capacity for over 100 years. Mr. Lohbauer noted that the reason he was discussing this history is that it is important to the Standards of Rehabilitation in defining what characterizes the building, is historically relevant, and should be preserved.

Ms. Pentz asked for clarification as to the location of the church. Mr. Lohbauer indicated the location of the church on the plan and in the renderings. He directed the Committee's attention to rendering D. He noted that the church is set back from Race Street, and that the building in question is immediately behind the church, and hidden from many angles by the church itself.

Mr. Lohbauer addressed the project's compatibility with Standards 2 and 9. Standard 2, he noted, is about preserving the important pieces of the property. He opined that the north façade that retains the original Federal style watertable and belt courses is very interesting, but is now on the property line. He stated that none of the exterior walls will be removed, and there will be limited openings cut into the walls.

Ms. Pentz responded that the application also proposes to construct a story on top of the building. She noted her appreciation of the structural report, but stated that it does not address the question of how the historic building would handle the additional loads. She commented that there is a note about underpinning the walls. Mr. Lohbauer responded that underpinning is probably necessary. Ms. Pentz stated that, realistically, it would only be necessary because of the additional load of an additional floor, although the report indicates that it would be necessary due to frost depth. Mr. Lohbauer responded that the foundations are not covered by enough soil to meet Code. Ms. Pentz responded that she, as an engineer herself, has never heard of a building getting underpinned because the foundation depth did not meet Code. She stated that there would have to be some evidence of difficulty because of that. Ms. Gutterman commented that the issue would be whether the design meets the Code for the load of what would be added. Ms. Pentz noted that it is common sense that the historic building would not be capable of carrying another floor without some additional work. She stated that she wanted to make it clear that the additional reinforcement would be necessary because of what the applicant is proposing to do to the property, not because of any inherent flaw with the current building construction. Mr. Lohbauer disagreed, opining that careful attention would need to be paid to the foundations in general. Mr. Lohbauer noted that there are many joints that need to be re-pointed and wood pieces that have rotted, which is to be expected of a building its age and that has not been used.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicant had studied reducing the mass of construction overall by eliminating construction on top of the historic building and reducing the new construction along Orianna Street to four stories to make it more complementary to the neighborhood. Mr. McCoubrey agreed, noting that the Committee's feeling has been that five stories is too tall for the new construction, and that no addition should be added on top of the historic building. Mr. Lohbauer responded that that makes the project more challenging, and that reusing the historic building is an added expense. He noted that they had reduced the height of the buildings from their previous review to try to bring it more in line with the Committee's previous suggestions. He opined that five stories is appropriate for the context, and that it would not be the tallest building on the block. Ms. Pentz replied that there were not five-story masonry, load-bearing buildings in the 1790s. Mr. Lohbauer responded that there were five-story masonry buildings for a significant portion of the existing building's life. He opined that the industrial history of the historic building and the neighborhood is also interesting. He noted that many of the eighteenth-century buildings in the neighborhood had had stories added to them, which were then removed to make the area look like an untouched Colonial neighborhood in the mid-twentieth century. He opined that it is inappropriate treatment of complex history and would not be the way preservation is viewed today. Mr. Lohbauer opined that the massing of the proposed construction would fit the context of the industrial neighborhood. Mr. McCoubrey responded that there are two-story buildings and gable-end buildings along Cherry Street, and that a five-story intrusion would not relate well to those buildings. Mr. Lohbauer directed the Committee's attention to Rendering F, noting that he could slope the roof along Orianna Street so that it gets lower at Cherry Street so that it is roughly in line with the gable-roofed building at Cherry and 4th Streets. Mr. Lohbauer noted that, if the construction was limited to 45 feet, it would be the shortest structure on the lot; Structure Number 1, the Significant 1780s historic building at 141-43 N. 4th Street, is 47 feet and climbs to 52 feet at its peak.

Ms. Stein stated that she had issues with the addition on top of the school building because the school and church were linked functionally throughout their history, and construction on top of the school building would cause it to overwhelm over the church. She noted that the space between the church and school buildings is narrow, and the altered relationship between them would be visible from multiple vantage points. She stated that she is opposed to the extra story on top of the school building. Mr. Lohbauer responded that his position is that, even with the additional story, much of the building is hidden from view. He questioned whether there was a way to reduce the height but retain the additional story. Ms. Gutterman responded that she did not feel that that would be possible.

Mr. Cluver questioned the description of the school building as four stories. Mr. Lohbauer responded that it is three stories with an elevated basement. On the church (north) side of the building, the ground is higher. Mr. Cluver questioned the placement of the original roofline of the school. Mr. Lohbauer responded that he assumes the single, top story was added because the brick bond of that floor is different from the floors below. He noted that it is conjecture to posit the original height of the building, but that his best guess is that it was two stories with a gable or gambrel roof. Mr. Cluver noted that the 1917 Sanborn indicates a three-story structure. Ms. Stein responded that that would post-date the additional floor constructed for the warehouse use.

Mr. Cluver questioned the proposed materials and construction techniques of the additional floor. Mr. Lohbauer responded that, pursuant to Standard 9, the addition should be distinguished from the original structure. He envisioned it as some kind of brick, but constructed in such a way to feel contemporary and modern. He noted that the massing should feel compatible, but that there would be some sort of hyphen to distinguish it from the historic

structure. Mr. Cluver opined that, if the applicant were to do an addition, the key would be to keep a certain degree of sameness so that it does not draw attention to itself. Mr. Lohbauer agreed, noting that it should feel like a campus of buildings that is an aggregation of buildings over time.

Mr. McCoubrey questioned the placement of the one-bedroom addition on the south side of the school building. Mr. Lohbauer responded that it was placed in such a way to create windows and allow circulation through the building while allowing the corners of the historic building to be expressed. He noted that the addition is aligned in such a way to allow many of the original window openings to be expressed, but still allow enough windows to create a workable residential layout.

Mr. Cluver questioned the demolition of the one-story, 1970s addition. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff did not have an issue with the removal of that addition.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment. Neighbor Joe Schiavo commented that he knows the Committee is not interested in zoning issues, but that the applicant makes reference in their proposal that it meets zoning standards for CMX-3 and requires no variances. He asked the applicants for confirmation of this statement, and whether they are meeting the zoning requirement for parking, open area, and FAR. Mr. Lohbauer responded affirmatively. Mr. Schiavo stated that he understood the reason the west wall of the proposed new construction along Orianna Street was blank, but opined that it was unfortunate. He also expressed dismay over the unfenestrated south-facing wall of the one-bedroom addition. He noted that they always hope in Old City to not get any more blank walls. Mr. Lohbauer that he was glad Mr. Schiavo brought up the question of zoning. He noted that, from zoning perspective, the lower the building gets, the more difficult it is to meet zoning requirements for parking.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that the fundamental issue for him is the recognition that the school building is important in its own right, and that that needs to be respected. He noted that he understood Mr. Lohbauer's argument that this was an area that evolved from residential to heavy-duty industrial, and that that heritage is also significant. He stated that his opinion is that there is enough of the eighteenth-century school building remaining that it needs to be respected and not added onto or obstructed by an addition on the south side. Mr. Cluver commented that when the building was a school, it was a story lower, and opined that the history is one of addition. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the existing structure conveys its history, but to add an additional story starts to erode its understanding as a school house.

Ms. Pentz stated that she is totally against adding a story to the school building, as it would threaten whatever fabric remains.

Ms. Gutterman also expressed her concern over the proposed addition on top of the school, as well as the addition on the south side of the building. She opined that it was important to retain the shape of the historic school building and to keep any adjacent new construction separate. She stated the importance of the school building retaining its existing height, particularly in relationship to the church building. She opined that there is also less risk to the fabric of the historic school by not adding on top of it.

Mr. Lohbauer asked if there was a way to modify the application to make it acceptable. Ms. Gutterman responded that the Committee's recommendation is only advisory, and that the applicant is welcome to modify the package before submitting to the Commission. Ms. Stein followed up that it would not be possible for the Committee to tell the applicant that, if he

removed a floor, the application would be approvable; the Committee would need to see a revised design.

Mr. McCoubrey opined that construction on the entire site should be limited to four stories, and encouraged the applicant to locate the southern one-bedroom addition at the corner of the L-shaped addition turning onto Orianna Street.

Mr. Lohbauer commented that the south and east elevations historically were secondary and tertiary, and it was only the demolition of Victorian structures and creation of surface parking lots by the RDA that make the structure visible from the rear. Ms. Gutterman responded that historically the building may have been visible from all sides. Mr. Lohbauer disagreed, noting that that the block was constructed with three-story structures around the perimeter. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the school would at least have had light and air on all sides; it would not have had protruding additions. Ms. DiPasquale directed the Committee's attention to an 1858 atlas showing the free-standing school house at the center of the block.

Ms. Gutterman suggested the applicant pursue a proposal that eliminates construction on top of the school building and reduces the height of the construction along Orianna to four stories.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9. Mr. Cluver dissented.

ADDRESS: 1604 PINE ST

Proposal: Legalize roof deck, pilot house, and glass railing

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Pine 1604 LLC

Applicant: Mark Travis, YCH Architect

History: 1850; base and shop window alterations

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 legalize a deck, pilot house, and mechanical equipment constructed without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit. While not visible directly across the street from the front elevation, the deck's glass railing and condensing unit are conspicuous from the northeast corner of 16th and Pine Streets.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline. The staff notes that the project would satisfy the inconspicuous standard if the railing and mechanical unit were pulled back to a point where they were no longer visible from the north or east, with a location to be determined by a mockup. The staff suggests that this placement may be roughly in line with the front edge of the pilot house; with such a setback, the deck would sit exclusively on the rear ell.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Marlon Travis and architect Taylor Stevenson represented the application.

Mr. Travis acknowledged his mistake in not applying for a building permit before constructing his roof deck and pilot house. He explained that the project took a long time to work its way through the Department of Licenses & Inspections, and that he forgot to discuss the project with staff.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 APRIL 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Ms. Gutterman stated the Committee would never have approved of the deck as proposed. Mr. Travis asked for an explanation. Ms. Gutterman explained that the deck is visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Travis disagreed. Ms. Gutterman responded that the railing and mechanical equipment are visible. Mr. Travis disagreed. Ms. DiPasquale stated that she saw the railing and mechanical equipment herself at the site. Mr. Travis stated that he does not see the railing or mechanical equipment. He presented photographs of the front elevation (Sheet A-6), stating that the deck was designed so that it would not be visible from the front façade. Mr. Cluver responded that the railing and mechanical unit are visible in Photograph #1 of Mr. Travis's submission. Mr. Stevenson opined that the railing is subtle behind the trees. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. McCoubrey both responded that the railing and unit are not subtle or inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

Ms. Stein directed the applicants' attention to the photograph taken by the staff, which showed the railing and mechanical unit in full view in the winter time when the trees were not yet in bloom. Mr. Travis argued that the railing would only be visible for four months of the year, when the trees were not in bloom. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that they cannot rely on the presence of trees to disguise the deck. Mr. Travis disagreed, stating that there are many trees in the city.

Ms. Stein asked if the existing railing is glass. Mr. Travis confirmed that it is, noting that it is the same railing that he had installed previously without approvals at 1800 Delancey Street and was forced to remove. Ms. Stein responded that the Commission does not typically approve glass railings because they are reflective, which makes them more conspicuous.

Mr. Travis conceded that the railing and mechanical unit are visible, but argued that they are visible from a limited view. Ms. Stein commented that 16th Street is a primary street, and that Mr. Travis's own photograph shows that the deck is highly visible. He opined that the deck is only visible from a small area and that one must stand on a neighbor's stairs to see the railing. The Committee members disagreed, noting that his own photograph showing the railing was taken from the curb.

Ms. Gutterman noted that the applicants should have, or retroactively should, work with the staff to determine a location for the deck and equipment that would render them inconspicuous. She suggested Mr. Travis work with the staff to develop a mock-up or move the railing back to the point that it is no longer visible from 16th Street. Ms. Gutterman noted that changing the railing from glass to a picket would help reduce visibility by reducing glare. Mr. Travis asked why the Commission always wants picket railings in the city. He expressed frustration and lack of understanding as to why, after spending time and money restoring the property, he should not be able to use a glass railing. Ms. Gutterman responded that it has to do with the visibility and glare of glass. She noted that the railing did not necessarily need to be pickets, but could be a different material, provided the visibility of the railing is reduced. Ms. Stein suggested that the glass railing would be acceptable if it was completely invisible from the public right-of-way. Ms. Gutterman noted that the top of the railing is also very bright and visible.

Ms. Pentz commented that the Architectural Committee and Commission regularly review proposals for decks, and that they try to be consistent in not allowing decks on the main roofs of buildings. Mr. Travis disagreed that the existing deck was constructed on the main block. He stated that the only part of the deck that is on the main roof is the section that the condensing unit sits on. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the section that the condensing unit sits on, plus seven and a half feet of additional decking, according to the drawings. Mr. Travis disagreed that that portion of the deck was on the main block.

Ms. Gutterman suggested that the applicant work with the staff to determine a location of the railing, deck, and mechanical equipment that would be less visible. Mr. Travis again asked from where the deck was visible. Ms. Gutterman responded that that question had already been addressed, and noted that it is visible in his own photograph. Mr. Travis asked again where the deck was visible. Mr. McCoubrey clarified that the primary concern is the guardrail of the deck and the mechanical equipment. Ms. Gutterman questioned whether the dunnage of the deck is also visible. Mr. Travis opined that it is not.

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

ADDRESS: 520 N 15TH ST

Proposal: Construct third-story, rear addition with roof deck and pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Andy Hui & Anthony Hui

Applicant: Hao Li, Mimohaus Architects LLC

History: 1859

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a third story with roof deck and pilot house at the existing rear ell of the building at 520 N. 15th Street. The property is located mid-block on the west side of N. 15th Street, within the Spring Garden Historic District; however, the property is abutted to the south by a one-story structure that would cause the party wall side of the proposed addition and pilot house to be visible from 15th Street. Though sloped toward 15th Street, the pilot house would span the addition's entire south wall, extending the wall above the roof of the main block.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that the pilot house is reduced in size and that the stucco of the addition's south wall is scored or somehow differentiated from the historical section of the party wall to provide visual information about the historical massing of the building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Li Hao represented the application.

Mr. Hao distributed a rendering of the addition and roof deck to the Committee members to show the south elevation, which he stated was the elevation of the most concern, owing to its visibility from N. 15th Street. There is no visibility, he added, from Spring Garden Street. Ms. Gutterman inquired about the color of the stucco as depicted in the rendering. Mr. Hao responded that the printed color is not accurate and that the color would match the existing stucco. Mr. McCoubrey asked Mr. Hao if the profile of the pilot house in the rendering has changed from the original submission. Mr. Hao answered that it is the same sloped profile and explained that, for the interior arrangement, a smaller pilot house would not be feasible. Mr. D'Alessandro referenced the roof deck plan in the application and indicated that the pilot house contained a sink. He suggested removing the sink to eliminate some of the interior space. Ms. Gutterman asked how much of the pilot house massing would be seen from a public right-of-way. Mr. Cluver indicated that the photograph taken just south of the property on N. 15th Street,

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 APRIL 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

included in the application, best depicted the potential visibility issues. Mr. Hao stated that the pilot house would start beyond the main block of the building and visibility would be limited. Ms. Gutterman inquired whether the pilot house could be moved toward the rear of the addition. Mr. Hao answered that the rear ell does not abut the adjacent property. The existing stair, he continued, is located on the south side of the structure, and his intention was to continue it to the roof, where the pilot house would also partially block the view of the proposed deck.

Mr. Cluver inquired about visibility at the rear of the property. Mr. Hao responded that the three-story structures on Spring Garden Street prevent the rear of the property from being visible, and he added that the same is true of the northern neighbor on N 15th Street. Mr. Cluver stated that the context is important for the discussion, but information is lacking in the application.

Mr. McCoubrey asked Mr. Hao to clarify where the slope of the pilot house terminates in the rendering. Mr. Hao indicated that the second rendering he provided more accurately reflects the slope and termination of the pilot house roof. He stated that he tried to minimize the impact of the roof while maintaining overhead clearance at the interior.

Ms. Gutterman inquired about the design of the roof's north elevation, opposite the pilot house. Mr. Hao noted that the north wall is a parapet for the deck. Ms. Gutterman then asked whether the massing of the entire deck and pilot house structure could be further reduced. She commented that the design does not show the cornice of the existing building aligned with the addition, and further observed that the north wall proposes solid masonry rather than continuing the metal railing shown for the three remaining elevations. Mr. Hao explained that the parapet echoes the slope of the pilot house. Ms. Gutterman recommended reducing the massing of the pilot house as well as the solidity of the overall roof design. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the parapet wall would not be visible from a public right-of-way, since it would be located on the north side of the roof.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that, if the stair could be moved toward the rear, it would reduce the visibility of the pilot house from N. 15th Street. Mr. D'Alessandro asked how the slope was determined. Mr. Hao cited the RM-1 zoning requirement that limits the building height to 38 feet and stated that the current proposed height reaches 36-1/2 feet. Mr. D'Alessandro asked for clarification on the proposed materials of the addition and whether the addition would be wrapped in a wood rain screen, as indicated in the application drawings. In the new rendering, Mr. Hao responded, several materials were being explored to differentiate the new addition from the historic structure. He added that stucco to match the existing building would be incorporated with the wood rain screen. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that many pilot houses were originally metal clad.

Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the Committee support the staff recommendation of approval, provided that the pilot house is reduced in size; however, he added that the third-story addition should be stucco and the pilot house should be clad in metal rather than a wood rain screen. Mr. Cluver warned against a visual banding between the second story, third story, and pilot house that would be created by the incorporation of three materials. Mr. Hao stated that he would tie in the new and existing materials and would rework the scale to minimize the projection at the roof. The Committee agreed that stucco should be incorporated into the new elements. Mr. D'Alessandro reiterated that the pilot house should be clad in metal, with stucco to be used at the third-story addition. Mr. Hao acknowledged that such a scheme would be possible, but offered a second option where the walls of the third-story addition and pilot house could be clad in metal. Mr. Cluver opined whether stucco could be used as the sole material, with some distinction made between old and new material. However, he felt the design would

need to be more fully conceptualized before the material type and placement could be definitively established. Mr. Hao stated that, in choosing the material for the addition and pilot house, he would be as sensitive as possible to the historic structure.

Mr. Cluver recommended that Mr. Hao include in his application an aerial photograph to show the building's context, as well as a rendering illustrating the massing of the addition and pilot house when viewed from N. 15th Street.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the pilot house is reduced in height and length, and that the stucco of the addition's south wall is differentiated from the historical two-story wall below to indicate the building's historical massing, with the staff to review details including colors, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guidelines.

ADDRESS: 1722 PINE ST

Proposal: Rehabilitate building per passive house standards

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Paul Thompson & Laura Blau

Applicant: Laura Blau, BluPath Design Inc.

History: 1845

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to execute a deep energy retrofit of a four-story, four-unit historic property within the Rittenhouse-Fitter Historic District. By retrofitting the property, the applicant ultimately seeks EnerPHit certification, a retrofit standard of the International Passive House Association. Work to the front façade would involve installing new Passive House Certified windows, removing non-original shutters, and repointing brick. Work to the rear would include removing the ground-level bay and installing new shingles on the remaining second- and third-story bays, over-insulating the brick walls using a rainscreen EIFS system, installing Passive House Certified UPVC casement windows, installing a new cornice, and restoring the existing fire escape. At the roof, the existing wire-glass skylight would be replaced with a Passive House Certified skylight, existing mechanical systems would be removed, and the roofing material would be replaced.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect and property owner Laura Blau represented the application.

Ms. Stein asked Ms. Keller if the building's rear is fully visible from a public right-of-way. Ms. Keller responded that it is visible from Waverly Street. Ms. Blau stated that Waverly Street is an alleyway used to access parking and for garbage pickup. Ms. Gutterman emphasized that, regardless of its use, Waverly Street is still a public right-of-way, albeit a lesser public right-of-way.

Several Committee members stated that they could not access the supplemental information provided through an online link.

Ms. Blau requested clarification on the standards used to guide the staff's recommendation for denial. Ms. Gutterman stated that the recommendation is based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, and specifically Standards 2 and 9. Mr. Cluver added that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards are ten standards that are adopted as the Historical Commission's guiding principles. In addition, he continued, there are guidelines issued to clarify and expand on those standards, which were developed by the National Park Service and are publicly available. Mr. Cluver noted that guidelines for sustainable rehabilitations have also been established, and the Committee would reference those guidelines as well. The sustainability guidelines, he stated, provide information about envelope insulation, windows, and other features, in addition to offering recommended courses of action.

Ms. Blau asked if one of the standards refers to windows. Mr. Baron commented that Standard 6 best reflects the approach for maintaining or replacing windows. He noted that the standard indicates that historic fabric should be retained whenever possible; however, in instances when replacement is necessary, new material should match the historic.

Ms. Gutterman read Standard 2, which states:

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.

Ms. Gutterman then read Standard 9, which states:

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.

Mr. McCoubrey remarked that the rear of the property facing Waverly Street is quite a substantial brick element and alteration to it poses a fundamental issue. Ms. Blau argued that the rear is a non-original addition. Historic maps provided by the staff show that the rear existed by 1922.

Ms. Stein commented that the project's goal of achieving a deep-energy retrofit is interesting, but questioned why the rear brick façade had to be wrapped in EIFS and asked whether the same goal could be attained through interior work. Ms. Blau answered that that approach will be taken on the first floor; however, she stated that the building is occupied and that performing the whole retrofit from the interior would be very costly and would require long-term residents to seek temporary housing. She further commented that the brick at the building's rear is low-quality, very absorbent, and that various sealants and other interventions to mitigate water infiltration have had little success. Mr. Cluver asked whether the rear had been repointed. Ms. Blau answered that repointing had been done to areas where moisture absorption was highest. Ms. Gutterman inquired whether thermography has been used to expose moisture patterns and to determine if moisture is traveling through the brick face. Ms. Blau responded that she intends to conduct a brick moisture test. Ms. Gutterman recommended that Ms. Blau rent a thermal imaging camera to understand problematic areas. Ms. Blau stated that she understands thermal imaging, and added that other rear facades along Waverly Street are stuccoed. Ms. Gutterman argued that those facades are stucco and do not incorporate EIFS, as Ms. Blau is proposing. Ms. Gutterman emphasized the difference between the two materials and expressed concern over the longevity of EIFS, potential mold and moisture issues, and its more plastic quality. She

added that a three-coat stucco could be a possibility for the rear of the property, but opposed covering the walls with EIFS, which she felt was not appropriate for the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District.

Ms. Gutterman discussed the proposed energy-efficient windows and commented that the Historical Commission encourages window restoration when possible. When replacement is not a viable option, windows should be replaced in kind, which in this case, Ms. Gutterman noted, would be wood. She added that other materials can be considered at non-visible facades. Ms. Blau responded that vinyl is only proposed for the rear. Ms. Gutterman stated that the application proposes to remove historic windows at the front façade. Ms. Blau contended that the front windows are no longer functional. Ms. Gutterman countered that functionality can be restored to wood windows and interior storms can be installed, which would increase energy efficiency, even though it may not meet Passive House standards. She added that the property is historic, and the Committee is tasked with protecting the building's historic fabric.

Ms. Blau cited several examples from New York City where Passive House windows have been accepted by the Landmarks Preservation Commission. She noted that the windows honor the intent and appearance of the historic properties, while meeting Passive House standards for energy efficiency. Mr. Cluver inquired whether a study has been done to determine the energy savings of a Passive House retrofit in comparison with the efficiency of the existing structure when smaller additions, such as internal storm windows, have been incorporated. Ms. Blau responded that a study has been done and elaborated on EnerPHit standards, a Btu per square foot standard. She claimed the retrofit would make the building ninety percent efficient in its heating and cooling with the potential to reach even greater efficiency.

The Committee raised the issue of compatibility between the historic structure and the proposal for a Passive House retrofit. Mr. Cluver explained that there are already energy benefits to the structure, since it is situated in the middle of a row with a party wall on two sides. He stated that interior storms could improve efficiency, although Ms. Blau felt that action would only achieve an Energy Star rating.

Ms. Pentz requested clarification on whether the rear brick walls would be demolished. Ms. Blau answered that she is proposing to retain the brick walls but would add a breathable vapor moisture barrier with rain screen EIFS, a drainage plane, and four inches of rigid insulation. She stated that, if necessary, she could use a three-coat stucco system, but noted that it would be considerably more expensive and would increase the depth of added materials. The Committee members discussed the dimensions of each layer to determine whether the three-coat stucco system or EIFS system would create a thicker application.

Ms. Blau contended that the brick wall remains in poor condition, even after attempts to mitigate the moisture issues. She argued in favor of applying EIFS and insulation to stabilize the wall and commented that new windows would be installed so that the exterior relationship between the window and façade is retained. She commented that numerous non-historic windows exist on buildings along Waverly Street.

Ms. Gutterman asked how the returns will be resolved, or if the EIFS system is proposed only for the rear wall. Ms. Blau responded that all three sides of the rear will receive the same intervention. Ms. Gutterman inquired about the proposal for the bay. Ms. Blau remarked that the bay is currently clad in vinyl siding, and that she is proposing to remove the first-story portion which she believes is not original, super-insulate the feature, and re-clad it with a more appropriate shingle siding.

Ms. Blau explained that the entire project is predicated on extending the service life of the building by another hundred years, as well as meeting the 2030 Challenge and 8050 Challenge. She described the condition of the building's mechanical systems and her desire to make the building carbon free. She provided the Committee members with a study conducted by an organization that supplies Passive House products and explained issues related to moisture barriers and insulation.

Ms. Pentz asked how the system is applied to the wall and whether it is reversible. Ms. Gutterman responded that the application of EIFS would not be reversible, since the historic brick underlying the system would be compromised. Ms. Blau countered that the EIFS application could be removed more easily than stucco. Ms. Gutterman stated that she believed what is being proposed for the rear exterior walls is not reversible. Other Committee members concurred.

Ms. Blau noted that the change proposed to the fire escape would allow it to be self-supported with new footings, which would eliminate thermal bridges from the attachments, reduce freeze-thaw cycling, and otherwise minimize issues at the wall.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the goal is laudable, but reiterated the fundamental disconnect between preservation and the proposed retrofit, which would involve covering the historic brick and relocating windows. Mr. Cluver concurred and recommended that Ms. Blau find a balance between preservation and energy efficiency. He indicated that the EnerPHit standards accommodate this balance by recognizing the validity of preservation issues, and he noted that the EnerPHit standards offer exemptions to the exterior envelope that allow such structures to meet the requirements. The first of the eight standards, he continued, is concerned with whether the intervention is required by the preservation authority. Mr. Cluver stated that in this proposal, the exterior cladding and replacement of windows drive the project beyond acceptable levels of preservation. Although different standards exist in other jurisdictions, he added, the guidelines in Philadelphia are based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and he encouraged Ms. Blau to review the document.

Ms. Blau articulated that she feels that there is a moral imperative to save the planet first, then preserve the cultural integrity of the building. She commented that she and the Committee differ on where the balance point is between preservation and energy efficiency.

Ms. Gutterman recommended that Ms. Blau work with the staff on window replacement at the rear and side elevations, as well as options for achieving some level of energy efficiency at the front windows.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:50 a.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.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.