

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

**TUESDAY, 28 JANUARY 2020
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-029
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. The following Committee members joined him:

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

The following staff members were present:

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

The following persons were present:

- David Ali, SEPTA
- Nancy Pontone, East Falls Historical Society
- K. Block
- Corey Hull, JMT
- Kevin Rockey, Sowinski Sullivan
- Steven Peitzman
- Bob Torres, Studio Torres
- John Oszowski, Studio Torres
- Chris Carickhoff, Studio C
- Ian Toner, Toner Architects
- Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association
- Ashley May, EBuilt
- Kevin Rasmussen, Rasmussen/Su
- John Hanson, Hanson Fine Building
- Adam Lampl, Toll Brothers
- Paul Albano, SLCE Architects

Lawrence Gilbert, Lawrence Gilbert Architect
David Berry, Lawrence Gilbert Architect
Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Julia Frayman
Liesl Geiger, Studio Geiger
Jane Golden, Mural Arts
Amy Johnston, Mural Arts
Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Christopher Stromberg, S2 Design
Francesca Crivelli, S2 Design
Nicholas Melisiotis
William Vessal
John Hanson, Hanson Fine Building & Preservation

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 1600S S BROAD ST

Proposal: Construct elevator and enclosure at Tasker-Morris subway entrance

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: SEPTA

Applicant: Bradford Hull, Johnson, Mirmiran, Thompson

History: 1938; Broad Street Subway Entrance, Tasker-Morris Station

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

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

This application proposes to reconfigure the subway entrance on the northeast corner of Broad and Morris Streets at the Tasker-Morris Station, located along the Broad Street Line. The entrance was created in 1938 as part of the Snyder Avenue Extension. Three of the station's entrances retain historic railings and curbs, and one entrance features modern replacement railings. This application proposes to move and reinstall the cast iron railings from the narrow historic entrance at the northeast corner of S. Broad and Morris Streets to allow for ADA accessibility and to increase station safety.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Reconfigure the subway entrance.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The application proposes to retain and reuse the cast iron railings from the northeast corner of S. Broad and Morris Streets. The historic cast iron guardrail will be reinstalled upon a granite-clad concrete curb that is part of the new stair headhouse.
 - The applicant has indicated that it is not feasible to salvage and reinstall the existing granite curb from the subject entrance. The staff recommends that any new granite to be used at the new stair and elevator match the historic granite as closely as possible.
 - The staff recommends that the applicant remove and safely store any historic fabric that cannot be used in the new entrance, including the posts shown in Figure 4.
- *Accessibility Guideline: Recommended: Providing barrier-free access that promotes independence for the disabled person to the highest degree practicable, while preserving significant historic features.*
 - Staff considers the retention and reuse of the historic cast-iron guardrails as proposed to be compliant with this guideline.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the newel-post element currently abutting the building will be retained and stored, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Accessibility Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:02:48

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Kevin Rockey represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler asked if there was a way to incorporate the newel-post into the design rather than simply retaining and storing it.
 - The applicant responded that there could be an opportunity to incorporate the newel-post at the mezzanine level.
- Ms. Gutterman asked about the distance between the new entry and the stoops of the houses.
 - The applicant responded that the distance is approximately seven feet.
- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant if any studies had been done to make the design more contextual as opposed to something so out of place with this neighborhood.
 - Mr. Rockey responded that their approach was to maintain the integrity of the railing.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that she could see that they had incorporated the historic railing because they had to, but they had made no effort to integrate it into new design with the historic railing.

- Ms. Stein wondered about the genesis of the design. She asked if the glass block and color scheme were part of a new SEPTA standard for subways.
 - The applicant responded that the materials pull from elements that are common in SEPTA's subway entrances.
- Ms. Stein responded that these materials were not common in this district.
 - Mr. Rockey remarked that the materials, such as stainless steel and glass block, are being used in designs for other subway entrances in other locations such as the Race-Vine station and close to 30th Street Station. He acknowledged that this project was the first time they were integrating historic fabric into a new design.
- Mr. Detwiler asked Mr. Rockey to confirm whether they had taken the design currently under review directly from an existing design.
 - Mr. Rockey responded that they had not.
- Ms. Stein commented that the other locations Mr. Rockey had mentioned were much more commercial than the residential Tasker-Morris station, and therefore she wondered if there was a more sensitive design they could use.
 - The applicant acknowledged that the use of stainless steel was a recommendation that came out of the Art Commission meeting.
- Ms. Gutterman remarked that, even if the stainless-steel components were a bronze color, the design would blend better.
- Mr. McCoubrey acknowledged that the applicant was working within several constraints and suggested that anything that could be done to minimize the visual impact of the design would be an improvement. He compared the width of the elements of the historic entrance to the new design and suggested that reducing some of the overall dimensions could improve the proposal.
 - Mr. Rockey said that they could certainly investigate the dimension of the base for the historic railing.
- Mr. Detwiler agreed with Mr. McCoubrey that not only was the existing granite curb beautiful, it was an integral part of the design of the historic entrance that needed to be replicated or reused in some way.
 - Mr. Rockey stated that he did not believe that it would be possible to remove the railing and salvage the granite for reuse in the new entrance.
- Mr. Detwiler reiterated that recreating the dimensions of the historic curb could be important to this new design.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if the pylon was original to the historic entrance or if it was added later.
 - Mr. Rockey responded that the pylon was original but that it had been clad in metal and it is currently unknown whether the original fabric is extant beneath the cladding.
 - Mr. Rockey directed the members of the Architectural Committee to the historic plans that he had included in their meeting materials packets.
- Mr. D'Alessandro remarked that it would be nice to reproduce some of the details that were documented on the drawings. He added that the applicant could likely find examples of these elements existing elsewhere in the city.
- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant about the agreement surrounding the illuminated sign proposed in the new design. She asked whether SEPTA was limited to a certain number of illuminated signs at bus shelters.
 - The applicant responded that he did not know the answer to Ms. Gutterman's question but that he could look into it.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Patrick Grossi spoke on behalf of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposal does not integrate the historic elements of the designated subway entrance sensitively enough into the new design.
- The elegance of the more minimal elements of the historic subway entrance is not sufficiently recreated in the new design.
- The pylon should be further investigated to see if original or historic fabric exists underneath the cladding.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed design is not compatible with the designated historic subway entrance and therefore does not comply with Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 1600 S Broad Street MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 3625 MCMICHAEL ST

Proposal: Construct new main entrance; install casement windows and patio doors

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: RTR Realty Associates LLC

Applicant: A. Robert Torres, Studio Torres LTD

History: Manor Sunday School Association Chapel

Individual Designation: Under consideration

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This modest building designed in the Arts & Crafts style was originally constructed in 1916, with contributing additions built in 1938 and 1946. There are other sections of the building that are not visible from the right-of-way that are considered to be non-contributing.

In order to convert the building to two independent residences, the applicant is proposing to create two separate entrances. A new entrance is proposed for Midvale Avenue that would replace three existing windows with a new porch and pair of double doors. The existing double-door entrance would be replaced with two new casement windows. On the McMichael Street façade, the existing main entrance would remain.

New door openings are proposed for the secondary facades (see drawings ELE-3 and ELE-4). New casement windows are proposed throughout.

This building is currently under consideration for designation. The Committee on Historic Designation recommended that the property be listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places at its meeting on 15 January 2020. The nomination will be reviewed by the Philadelphia Historical Commission at its 14 February 2020 meeting.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construction of a new main entrance and porch for the new address at 3130 Midvale Avenue.
- Installation of new patio doors facing the side yard for property on 3625 Midvale Avenue.
- Installation of new casement windows throughout.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposal retains the significant existing main entrance on the McMichael Street facade.
 - The introduction of the new entrance and porch on the Midvale Avenue façade does not require the removal of any significant or decorative architectural features.
 - Archival images document the use of casement windows at the subject property.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - The new entrance and porch on the Midvale Avenue façade appear to be designed in a way that their future removal would not compromise the essential form or integrity of the historic property.
- *Historical Commission Rules & Regulations Section 6.9.a.10: The Commission, its committees, and staff may consider development plans in place at the time of the issuance of the notice announcing the consideration of a designation including but not limited to executed contracts, substantial design development, or other evidence of a material commitment to development in the review of applications.*

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and Section 6.9.a.10 of the Rules & Regulations, in light of the extensive plans for the development of the property already

in place at the time the Historical Commission notified the property owner of its intent to consider a designation.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:22:13

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect A. Robert Torres represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Torres commented that his charge was to create two separate residences from the one building. He stated that their proposed design was in keeping with the original Arts & Crafts style.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if the proposal involved removing existing double-hung windows.
 - Mr. Torres responded that they proposed to remove the existing double-hung aluminum windows.
- Mr. Detwiler asked what the original window configuration had been.
 - The applicant responded that based on some remaining historic fabric, he believed that originally there had been casement windows with leaded glass.
- Ms. Pentz remarked that it was stated that there was documentary evidence of the historic windows and asked whether photographs exist.
 - Ms. Schmitt responded that there were images of the building that showed there had been casement windows at some point in the past.
- Mr. Detwiler clarified that he was reacting to the solid panes of glass that were proposed in the plans because he found them too plain.
 - Ms. Schmitt circulated a copy of the archival image that showed casement windows at the subject property.
 - Mr. Torres responded that they felt that the size and scale of the windows they were proposing were appropriate to the building.
- Mr. Detwiler asked the applicant if they were maintaining the existing window openings.
 - Mr. Torres replied that much of the original window trim appeared intact and they intended to keep it. He further explained that they planned to order custom wood windows to replace the existing double-hung windows.
- Mr. Detwiler commented that there were some larger windows that they were proposing to alter.
 - Mr. Torres responded that there were a few windows that they were proposing to make taller, but they were not proposing to change their widths.
- Ms. Gutterman commented that there were some windows under the gable at the rear that appeared larger than the others, both in height and width.
 - Mr. McCoubrey remarked that these windows did not appear to be visible from the street.
 - Mr. Torres directed the Architectural Committee members to sheet PH-4 where they could see photographs of the existing conditions.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicant about the stone base that was visible in some of the existing conditions photographs. He noted that in some of the proposed drawings, this stone was shown to extend whereas in the photographs and existing conditions drawings it simply stopped.
 - Mr. Torres explained that they intended to see how much of the stone foundation they could expose by removing the existing stucco once they were

on site. He stated that they also planned to wrap stone around the porch to continue it along.

- Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicant what materials they planned to use for the porch steps and landing.
 - Mr. Torres responded that they intended to use flagstone for the porch floor and steps.
- Mr. Detwiler directed the applicant to ELE-3 and asked whether it would be possible to better tie together the new door and window opening they proposed in place of the existing bay of three windows. He stated that the existing window opening appeared much cleaner than what was proposed.
 - Mr. Torres confirmed that they could raise both the new door and window openings to the height of the existing window bay opening.
- Mr. D'Alessandro referred to drawing PH-3 and asked the applicant whether he believed there was any value to the existing doors that they planned to replace.
 - Mr. Torres responded that they were steel doors with no historic value.
- There was an overall agreement by the members of the Architectural Committee and the applicant that the landscaping for this property would be an important component of the project.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented that it appeared that the roof needed to be repaired or possibly even replaced entirely.
- Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the applicant consider punching through a bay of windows that was further back from the street in order to create their proposed patio doors.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Nancy Pontone opposed the plan to create new patio doors at the side of the original chapel space.
- Steven Peitzman opposed the plan to create new patio doors at the side of the original chapel space.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- This property is currently under consideration for listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.
- This Arts & Crafts-style building was constructed in 1916 and includes contributing additions that were built in 1938 and 1946.
- There are other sections of the building that are not visible from the right-of-way that may be considered non-contributing.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The installation of the proposed patio doors could be done in such a way that it would not destroy significant architectural details and could remain inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, satisfying Standards 9 and 10.
- The new entrance and porch proposed for the Midvale Avenue façade appear to be designed in a way that their future removal would not compromise the essential form or integrity of the historic property, satisfying Standard 10.

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

- the height of the door and window proposed on drawing ELE-3 is raised to match the height of the existing window opening;
- the round window at the Midvale Street entrance is retained;
- the option of relocating the patio doors from the second bay to the third bay is studied; and,
- no mechanical equipment is visible from the public right-of-way;
- pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and Section 6.9.a.10 of the Rules & Regulations, in light of the extensive plans for the development of the property already in place at the time the Historical Commission notified the property owner of its intent to consider a designation.

ITEM: 3625 McMichael Street MOTION: Approval with conditions MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: D'Alessa					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 25 S VAN PELT ST

Proposal: Alter facades; construct fourth-floor addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 25 Van Pelt Real Estate Advisors, LLC

Applicant: Christopher Stromberg, S2 Design

History: 1894; Evening Home and Library Association; Westray Ladd, architect (1894);

Magaziner & Eberhard, architects (1939 addition); 1939 addition, Big Brothers Association

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

Located between Ludlow and Chestnut Streets in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, the property at 25 S. Van Pelt Street features two notable building campaigns: a Renaissance Revival portion to the south, designed by Westray Ladd and constructed in 1894 as the headquarters of the Evening Home & Library Association, a charity for "wayward" boys; and a Modern section, designed by Magaziner & Eberhard and constructed in 1939 for the Big Brothers Association of Philadelphia (the local precursor to Big Brothers Big Sisters). The 1939 project entailed the rehabilitation of the entire complex, including exterior modifications to and partial demolition of the 1894 building, which was originally twice as wide, and the incorporation of the interiors of the old and new buildings. The 1939 addition included a large gymnasium, lecture rooms, basement workshops, and a caged-in roof court. The applicants include in their submission conceptual drawings by Magaziner & Eberhard from 1938 that would have

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JANUARY 2020

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

demolished the 1894 building entirely and constructed a larger building; this concept was never realized, and the Athenaeum of Philadelphia also holds the original as-built drawings for the structure as it exists.

The application proposes to make substantial alterations to the 1939 portion of the property to separate it from the 1894 portion of the building and convert it into three residential units. At the first floor of the primary (west) facade, the application proposes to cut new window, door, and garage openings. The application proposes to construct a fourth-floor addition clad in light-colored paneling of an unspecified material. The roof of the addition would feature decks and pilot houses. On the rear (east) elevation, which currently faces a parking lot not associated with the building, the application proposes to cut new sets of windows at the second floor, and to install new windows in the original openings at the first and third-floor levels.

This application for final approval follows a previous in-concept application reviewed by the Architectural Committee in September 2019 and the Historical Commission in October 2019. Substantial changes were made between the in-concept reviews, but the Historical Commission recommended denial of the in-concept application at its October 2019 meeting. No changes have been made to the proposed façade alterations between the October 2019 application and the current application. The fourth-floor addition, however, which was previously set in five feet from the front and rear parapet walls of the existing building, has been pulled out so that it is flush with the existing facades. The proposed addition “floats” above the existing building with the use of small gap between the existing parapet and the addition.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Cut down/enlarge existing window openings to create garage and pedestrian entrances
- Remove existing brick to create new second-floor windows at front and rear
- Install brick in place of glazing between second and third floors
- Construct fourth-floor addition with roof decks and pilot houses

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - The application proposes to remove substantial portions of existing brick and significantly alter the materials and features that characterize the property.
 - The application does not comply with this standard.
- *Windows Guideline | Not Recommended: Changing the number, location, size, or glazing pattern of windows on primary or highly-visible elevations which will alter the historic character of the building; Cutting new openings on character-defining elevations or cutting new openings that damage or destroy significant features; Adding balconies at existing window openings or new window openings on primary or other highly-visible elevations where balconies never existed and, therefore, would be incompatible with the historic character of the building.*
 - This application proposes to alter the number, location, and size of windows on the primary elevation of the building, to cut new window openings on the primary façade.

- The staff suggests that it may be possible to cut minimal new openings to provide code-required egress, but does not recommend approval of the installation of garage entrances on the primary elevation.
- The application does not comply with this guideline.
- *Roofs Guideline | Recommended: Designing rooftop additions, elevator or stair towers, decks or terraces, dormers, or skylights when required by a new or continuing use so that they are inconspicuous and minimally visible on the site and from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining historic features.*
 - The proposed rooftop addition would be visible from the public right-of-way.
 - The application does not comply with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 2 and the Windows and Roofs Guidelines.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:44:23

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Christopher Stromberg and Francesca Crivelli and developers Nicholas Melisiotis and William Vessal represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Stromberg directed the Committee's attention to the 1938 concept drawing by Magaziner & Eberhard that called for the complete demolition of the 1894 building and construction of a taller building occupying the full site. He argued that this conceptual drawing supports his argument for a larger structure on the site and that the existing building was a pragmatic design that served a utilitarian purpose. He disputed the Committee's belief discussed at the previous in-concept review that the Magaziner design that was built is significant in and of itself. Mr. Stromberg opined that the rooftop addition is not an overbuild for the scale of the block, noting that there are numerous taller existing and proposed structures in the vicinity. He stated that they also need to make penetrations in the facades in order to make the building usable. Mr. Stromberg argued that the existing building's ribbon windows are its only character-defining feature. He noted that they are proposing to replace the windows in-kind with the same sort of configuration, while adding new windows to make the building more usable.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro responded that the Committee and Commission are bound by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and opined that the current proposal does not meet those standards.
 - Mr. Stromberg questioned what other significant features there are to the building.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro responded that it is not just that individual features are being replicated or removed, but that the insertion of entrances and garages to create three rowhouses changes the overall character of the building.
 - Mr. McCoubrey noted that, while he appreciates that there may have been a grander scheme for the property at some point, that was not the design that was ultimately built. He disputed the assertion that the earlier conceptual design justifies adding an addition now. He noted that there is a scale and

- relationship between the 1939 and 1894 portions of the building in terms of the materials and alignment of the base, second-floor, and fenestration.
- Mr. McCoubrey clarified that there have not been any modifications to the proposal from the Historical Commission's in-concept review other than to align the addition with the facades of the existing building. He noted that he does not see that any of the Commission's recommendations have been incorporated.
 - Mr. Stromberg responded that they made changes between the previous in-concept reviews by the Architectural Committee and Historical Commission.
 - Mr. Stromberg explained that following the Historical Commission's meeting, they looked into the Commission's suggestions but still need to create access to the building. He reiterated that there are no entrances on the 1939 building currently, and that the addition of entrances is essential.
 - The Committee members agreed that it would be acceptable to create some new openings, but that the number and size of openings, particularly the cutting of garage doors, is inappropriate and alters the overall design of the building and changes the relationship to the street.
 - Ms. Gutterman opined that the rooftop addition is too large and disrespectful to the scale of the historic building and that she suspects that the pilot houses and roof decks, although shown in lighter line weight on the drawings, would make the addition even more conspicuous.
 - Ms. Gutterman noted that at the previous Architectural Committee review, they discussed the possibility of maintaining the connection between the 1894 and 1939 portions of the building and using the existing entrance on the 1894 portion to access the 1939 portion. She questioned whether the applicants studied this suggestion.
 - Mr. Vessal opined that it would be crazy to sacrifice the 1894 building programmatically in that way. He reiterated that the 1939 portion of the building has no means of egress and no second-floor windows.
 - Mr. Vessal opined that the Magaziner & Eberhard design has no value and no character beyond the windows.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro commented that it is difficult to understand the layout of the building because no floor plans were included in the submission.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that the applicants have not made substantial changes to their proposal and have chosen to focus only on the windows. She noted that they have not compromised on the insertion of the garage doors, which the Committee objected to at the previous review. She reiterated that the punching of some windows would be acceptable.
 - Mr. Detwiler explained that the application changes the character of the existing building by essentially taking the solid mass of the 1939 addition and making three individual rowhouses out of it. He noted that many former industrial buildings have been converted into condominiums with a shared entrance. He agreed that three entrances and three garages is too many for this building.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro agreed that the rowhouse approach is not appropriate for this building.
 - Mr. McCoubrey noted that the proposed garages occupy what could be livable space.
 - Mr. McCoubrey noted that he could picture a loft arrangement in the building.
 - Mr. Vessal objected to the Committee attempting to design the project for him. He stated that he needs windows at the second floor.
 - Mr. McCoubrey responded that no one said they could not add any windows at the second floor.

- Mr. Stromberg noted that they took the suggestion from the Committee to carry the design of punched openings from the first floor and carry them up to the second floor. He reiterated the importance of installing entrances at the first floor and windows at the second floor.
- Ms. Gutterman reiterated that some new openings would be acceptable to make the building functional, but that the current proposal does not strike the right balance. She explained that there is too much removal and replacement of masonry at the ground floor, and that the project changes the character of the building.
- Mr. D'Alessandro agreed that the rowhome approach to this building fails.
- Mr. McCoubrey questioned why one of the garages is narrower than the other two.
 - Mr. Stromberg responded that they are proposing to cut the windows down and that that bay of windows is narrower than the other two.
 - Ms. Stein noted that the headers of the existing first-floor windows are also being lowered.
- Ms. Stein noted that very few changes have been made from the in-concept review and that she does not know how the Committee's perception should have changed regarding the garage doors and alterations to the masonry.
 - Mr. Stromberg agreed that they have not made substantial changes since the previous Historical Commission review, but that they feel they need to make these modifications. He explained that they do not want to combine the two portions of the building programmatically. He opined that the scale of the addition is appropriate.
- Mr. Vessal reiterated that the conceptual design by Magaziner & Eberhard was much larger and opined that the architects would not have cared about this building.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that they cannot compare the proposal to a conceptual design that was never built. The Architectural Committee and Commission are looking at the building as it was constructed and how the proposed modifications impact the integrity of that building. She reiterated that that does not mean that no changes can be made, but that the changes must be balanced to preserve the integrity of the building as it was built.
 - Mr. Vessal stated that the Committee's position that this insignificant, unadorned building cannot be altered is "asinine." Ms. Gutterman objected to Mr. Vessal's use of foul language. Others observed that the word "asinine" is not vulgar word, but is an accepted term that means stupid or foolish.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The 1939 portion of the property is historically significant in its own right as the work of an important architectural firm, Magaziner & Eberhard, and should be treated along with the 1894 portion of the property as contributing to the historic district.
- The cutting of some doors and windows would be acceptable, but the current proposal would remove too much of the brick façade and would permanently alter the character of the building.
- The number and size of the garage openings, and amount of material proposed to be removed for their installation, is inappropriate.
- The addition is an overbuild and would be conspicuous from the public right-of-way.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed project would remove substantial portions of existing brick and significantly alter the materials and features that characterize the property, failing to satisfy Standard 2.
- The application proposes to change the number, location, and size of windows and add garage doors on the primary elevation in ways that alter the historic character of the building, failing to satisfy the Windows Guideline.
- The proposed rooftop addition would be conspicuous from the public right-of-way, failing to satisfy the Roofs Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 2 and the Windows and Roofs Guidelines.

ITEM: 25 S Van Pelt Street					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 6605 AND 6607 RIDGE AVE

Proposal: Rehabilitate dwelling; construct multi-family buildings on subdivided lots

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 6605 Ridge Realty LLC

Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects

History: 1868

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Ridge Ave Roxborough Historic District, Contributing, 10/12/2018

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

BACKGROUND:

The buildings at 6605 and 6607 Ridge Avenue are three-story stone twin houses with historic two-story rear ells and non-historic one-story rear additions. Historically, the twin occupied the same parcel, which featured a frame stable at the rear. The land to the southeast of 6605 Ridge Avenue, at the corner of Gorgas Lane and Ridge Avenue, has never been developed.

This application for final approval proposes to remove the one-story additions on the historic houses, constructed in 1940 (6605) and in the 1980s (6607), and to subdivide the properties and construct three multi-family buildings on the subdivided parcels. The new "Building 1," which would be constructed to follow the angle of the corner of Ridge and Gorgas, would be set

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JANUARY 2020

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

approximately 13 feet from the existing building at 6605 Ridge. The application does not specify a color palette for the masonry to be used on the building, but the staff suggests that a light, natural color would be appropriate for the district.

This application for final approval follows an in-concept application reviewed by the Architectural Committee in May 2019 and the Historical Commission in June 2019. At that time, the Commission recommended approval in-concept, but requested that the corner new construction Building 1 be simplified, and that the vinyl siding proposed for the new construction along Gorgas Lane be replaced with a more appropriate material. This application responds to those requests.

The application also calls for the renovation of the existing buildings, but lacks details on door and window replacement, which could be reviewed and approved at the staff level.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish rear additions
- Renovate existing buildings
- Subdivide properties
- Construct three, three-story multi-family buildings

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

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

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:08:40

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Ian Toner and designer Sam Katovich represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Stein questioned the density and trapezoidal shape of the proposed buildings, noting that they are not contextual with regard to the surrounding rectangular buildings. She suggested that a drawing showing the proposed building footprints as they relate to the surrounding context would be helpful.
 - Mr. Katovich responded that the facades of Buildings 2 and 3 align with those of the neighboring properties on Gorgas Lane.
 - Mr. Toner noted that the shape of the buildings is dictated by the oddly shaped lots.
- Ms. DiPasquale questioned whether the footprint of Building 1 was reduced since the in-concept review.

- Mr. Katovich responded negatively, noting that the side yard was previously mislabeled as five feet, when it should have been eight feet as currently shown.
- Ms. Gutterman questioned what materials are proposed for which portions of the buildings.
 - Mr. Katovich responded that they are proposing to use brick on street-facing elevations and fiber cement panels with joints to mimic stucco on secondary elevations.
 - The applicants presented a whitewashed brick sample for Building 1 and a red brick sample for Buildings 2 and 3.
 - Mr. Toner noted that they are open to color suggestions and to working with the staff to find an appropriate material.
 - The Committee members opined that the brick used on Building 1 should be a true buff brick as opposed to a whitewashed red brick.
- Mr. Detwiler confirmed that the mansard proposed for Building 1 in the in-concept application has been eliminated.
 - The applicants responded affirmatively.
- The Committee members questioned the fenestration of the proposed construction.
 - Mr. Katovich responded that they felt the fenestration on the proposed buildings should be differentiated from the historic buildings.
 - Mr. Detwiler opined that double-hung windows would be more appropriate for Building 1.
 - Ms. Gutterman agreed, and opined that the sidelite next to the door on Building 1 should be eliminated.
- Mr. Detwiler expressed trouble with the shapes of the buildings, noting that he would like to see them step more than conform to the shape of the lot.
 - Mr. McCoubrey disagreed, noting that the ways builders treat construction on oddly shaped lots can be interesting.
 - Mr. Toner explained that the buildings along Gorgas Lane are set back from the street and up behind a retaining wall.
- The Committee members suggested that the brick of the main facades turn onto the sides of the new buildings and onto the rear of Building 1 as well so as not to appear as a veneer.
 - Mr. Toner agreed, noting that the cornice could also return.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The overall height and massing of the proposed buildings is acceptable, but modifications should be made to the fenestration and masonry added to the side elevations to make the designs more compatible with the historic property.
- The details of the rehabilitation of the existing dwellings can be reviewed and approved by the staff.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed construction does not destroy historic materials that characterize the properties. The new work is differentiated from the old, and the materials are consistent with the historic district, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9, with the following provisions: solid buff brick is used; the brick returns past the front facades of all buildings and onto the rear façade of Building 1; the window configuration of Building 1 is simplified to double-hung windows and the sidelite by the front door eliminated.

ITEM: 6605 and 6607 Ridge Avenue MOTION: Approval, with conditions MOVED BY: Detwiler SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz	X				
Amy Stein		X			
Total	5	1			1

ADDRESS: 7620-22 RIDGE AVE

Proposal: Rehabilitate building; construct addition at rear

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Baker Street Partners LLC

Applicant: Drew Hohenwarter, Studio C Architecture LLC

History: 1850; Deeper/larger footprint by 1940s

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Ridge Ave Roxborough Historic District, Contributing, 10/12/2018

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a three-story addition to an existing three-story historic building at 7620-22 Ridge Avenue. The property at 7620-22 Ridge Avenue has been consolidated with the property at 485 Minerva Street, which is not designated as historic. As part of the proposal, the rear additions of the main three-story masonry structure will be removed and the Minerva Street buildings will be demolished.

Historically, the three-story masonry building at 7620-22 Ridge Avenue appears to have been constructed in sections. The first part was constructed circa 1850 and the second half was added on during the early twentieth century. The extension of the rear additions was added during the second half of the twentieth century.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Rehabilitate the three-story historic masonry building.
- Demolish the rear additions of 7620-22 Ridge Avenue.
- Demolish 485 Minerva Street buildings.

- Construct new building to the rear of 4620-22 Ridge Avenue; new construction will be connected by a “hyphen” structure at the rear of the historic building.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - The exterior of the historic building must be rehabilitated in a manner that respects and preserves the historic character of the property.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The new construction should not be taller than the historic building. The proposal shows that exterior cladding materials intend to differentiate the new construction from the historic building.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent construction or related new construction will be undertaken in a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - The “hyphen” structure connecting the historic building to the new construction ensures that the buildings could be separated in the future if required. This allows for the essential form and integrity of the historic building to be preserved. The connection will be done at the rear of the historic building and will not be visible from the public-right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that “hyphen” structure is lower than cornice of historic building, the height of new construction is not taller than historic building, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:32:45

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Chris Carickhoff and developers Steve Olszewski and Andrew Mulson represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant to provide more detail about the changes proposed to the historic building.
 - Mr. Carickhoff responded that they are trying to be as minimal as possible with the changes to the historic building, for example patching and repairing where needed.
 - Ms. Gutterman inquired if they are proposing new siding.
 - Mr. Carickhoff noted the only new siding on the historic building would be on the small addition on the north elevation and it would be matching the Dutch lap siding on the new building.
- Ms. Gutterman asked for the applicant to talk about the link between the historic building and new building.

- Mr. Carickhoff said that the link would also have the Dutch lap siding and noted that it houses the stair for the building. He explained that by placing the stair there they were able to lower the height of the new building so that it is subordinate to the historic structure. Mr. Carickhoff stated they are proposing a glass entrance and dormer component with a standing seam roof along Minerva Street.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if there was more information the dormer versus the ridge of the roof.
 - Mr. Carickhoff pointed out to a specific drawing in the application.
 - Mr. Gutterman responded that it does not show the dormer relationship to the ridge of the historic roof.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro and Ms. Gutterman asked that page numbers be added to the presentation and drawings.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that she agrees that the new building needs to be respectful of the existing historic building; it should be shorter. She added that she is concerned about the changes proposed to the existing building, how the new and the old meet, and how the connection is designed.
 - Mr. Mulson clarified that there will be not changes whatsoever to the front façade. He continued that that as you are traveling south on Ridge Avenue, the only change visible to the north facade of historic main building will be to an egress stair that will be removed and turned into a smaller entryway.
 - Ms. Gutterman restated her concern about the connector structure between the historic building and the new construction, specifically how they meet.
 - Mr. Mulson pointed out that the connector will be recessed behind the historic building.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that it will still be visible from Ridge Avenue. She noted that she wants to understand how the new construction and historic building meet and intersect. She asked what the vocabulary of that elevation is and how it is or is not respectful of the historic building in the proposed choice of massing, windows, materials, etc. Ms. Gutterman asked about the meeting of the roof, the meeting of the wall, modifications to the historic building, and whether it is all reversible.
 - Mr. Mulson responded that the addition, the new construction, comes off the rear of the historic building, so the existing additions would be removed and the connector would be recessed in there.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that she understood that. She asked if the new building is touching the existing building in the area where the current additions will be demolished and whether the new connector will align to these openings. She noted that the new building will be taller than the existing additions. She asked if the new connection would go into the same location.
 - Mr. Carickhoff interjected that the connector will be set back away from Ridge Avenue and Minerva Street from where the current addition connects.
 - Ms. Stein and Ms. Gutterman asked if the stucco will need to be repaired.
 - Mr. Mulson confirmed there may need to be stucco repairs but he does not know the exact measurements at this time.
 - Ms. Mehley commented that there are no photographs in the application that show the rear of the historic building and what currently exists there such as windows.

- Ms. Gutterman said that she does not dispute that this area of the building cannot be seen from Ridge Avenue but she is wondering about the sensitivity of the connection of the new addition to the historic building.
 - Mr. Mulson said that there are not any windows along the upper portion of the historic building but there is a doorway that was cut in at one point to provide access to the rooftop of the existing rear addition. This existing door cannot be seen from street level and they would need to go on to the roof to photograph it.
- Ms. Gutterman and Mr. Detwiler stated that the proposed site plan should be updated with a red dashed line to show where the new construction will be in relation to what currently exists. They stressed that this should be done for the Historical Commission meeting so the Commissioners completely understand where the connection is between the existing, historic building and the new construction.
- Mr. Detwiler recommended dimensioning the floor plans all along the side of the historic building. He continued that, in looking at the floor plans, the juncture between the historic building and the connector is important and may need to be set back further from the historic building's southwest corner. Mr. Detwiler pointed out that the detail showing how the cornice of the historic building and roofline of the connector building come together is a crucial detail for the Historical Commission.
- Mr. Detwiler pointed out the proposed windows in the new building are significantly larger in scale than the windows in the historic building. The existing and proposed buildings are two different scales. Mr. Detwiler stated that the windows in the front house with the Dutch Lap siding could be reduced in size 75%. He pointed out that in older buildings windows get smaller on the higher floors, especially the window on the third floor.
 - Ms. Gutterman added that the third-floor window was too close to the roofline.
- Mr. McCoubrey offered a suggestion. He noted that the staff was concerned about new building being taller than the existing building and he suggested that it might be easier if a mansard roof was added to the new building. Mr. McCoubrey explained that this would bring the cornice down and would allow for more volume at the top of the building. He added this would allow the historic building to appear very different from the new building and then the windows would become large openings/windows the mansard.
 - Mr. Detwiler asked about the location of the mansard.
 - Mr. McCoubrey responded that it would be on the entire addition. He said that the addition as currently designed looks like a tacked on gable roof with a lot of mass behind it. Mr. McCoubrey noted that there is so much dormer and so little roof and that if the whole thing read as a standing seam mansard roof it might simplify things, give a little more volume and bring the scale down.
- Mr. Detwiler countered Mr. McCoubrey's roof suggestion with another option to address the scale of the proposed front gable roof with dormers. He suggested losing the center mass and maintaining more of a consistent roofline that is not broken up with two shed dormers instead of a massive one. Mr. Detwiler noted that he does not believe it is currently working as shown and if the developer needs that entire floor uninterrupted then they should select the mansard roof suggestion. He added that if such a mass is selected, it needs to be one or the other.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that he had a comment about the Dutch Lap siding. He pointed out that everything else around this building is stucco and although there are some wood frame buildings in this area; it is pretty rare in the city to have this Dutch

Lap material. Mr. McCoubrey said that having the new construction as stucco would have it fit in better.

- Mr. Carickhoff said that part of the reason for differentiating the siding on the new construction was to make it subordinate to the stucco of the historic building.
- Mr. McCoubrey and Mr. D'Alessandro noted that stucco would be better on the new construction and the hyphen or connector could be all glazed to make it simpler.
- Mr. Detwiler pointed out that he appreciates the water table and stone base proposed for the new addition. Mr. McCoubrey noted the stucco would look good with the stone base.
- Ms. Gutterman added that the stucco could be differentiated with color.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented again on the height of the addition. Mr. Detwiler pointed out that the floor heights were acceptable.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented that, if the link structure between the historic building and addition had a flat roof, it would make it lower in height than the historic cornice.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that in general the applicant has created an appropriate composition. Ms. Gutterman added that it is respectful of the historic building.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposal was respectful to the historic building and the overall plan was well composed.
- Specific aspects of the proposal did not meet the Standards, therefore the Committee believed they had to recommend denial of the application.
- If several issues are addressed and the design is revised in advance of the Historical Commission meeting, the application could meet the Standards.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The exterior of the historic building must be rehabilitated in a manner that respects and preserves the historic character of the property.
- The documentation provided does not define the full extent of the proposed changes to the rear wall of the historic building; therefore, the application did not satisfy Standards 2 and 10.
- The application drawings do not show the connection points between the historic building and the new construction. The height of the "hyphen" or "connector" should fall below the cornice of the historic building.
- The scale and massing of the windows and roof should be reduced to be more compatible with the historic building. For these reasons, the application currently does not satisfy Standard 9.
- The application would meet the Standards if revised as follows:
 - The documentation shows the rear elevation of the historic building, the full extent of demolition, and where the new construction connects to the historic building.
 - Stucco is proposed instead of Dutch Lap siding. The stucco could be different colors to differentiate the old and new.

- The height of the “hyphen” or “connector” structure falls below historic cornice and the cladding material of this structure is reconsidered.
- The window sizes on the new construction are reduced to relate better and complement the historic building.
- The gable roof with the dormer facing Minerva Avenue is large in relation to the new construction and historic building. It should be reconsidered.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as submitted, but approval with the suggested revisions, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

ITEM: 7620-22 Ridge Avenue MOTION: Denial as submitted, but approval with revisions MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz	X				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 147 SUMAC ST

Proposal: Rehabilitate building; construct 7 single-family dwellings

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Deborah Gribbin

Applicant: Judy Robinson, Continuum Architecture

History: 1884; Maurice Wilhere House

Individual Designation: 1/1/3000

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to rehabilitate the existing historic building (one half of a twin) at 147 Sumac Street and develop the remainder of the large site with new single-family homes. The new construction would include four new homes on Kalos Street and three new homes along Righter Street. The existing driveway will be used to access a parking area located at the rear of the buildings. An additional driveway to the parking area will be created and accessed from Righter Street.

The property at 147 Sumac Street is currently going through the designation process. At the 15 January meeting of the Committee on Historic Designation, the Committee recommended designating the historic building and a buffer around it, but not the entire lot. The Committee

recommended creating a buffer area around the historic building that includes the existing curb cut. As a result, the lot area outside the buffer would not be part of the historic designation.

Although the application lists the rehabilitation of the historic building as part of the scope of work, no information about the rehabilitation is provided. That work should be reviewed under a separate permit application.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Rehabilitate the existing building.
- Construct seven new single-family homes.
- Create parking area with two access driveways.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - The exterior of the historic building must be rehabilitated in a manner that respects and preserves the historic character of the property.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The land buffer created around the historic building as part of its designation to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places should allow for new construction on the existing lot that will not affect its historic character.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent construction or related new construction will be undertaken in a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*
 - The land buffer around the historic building should be sufficient enough to allow for adjacent construction that will not alter the essential form and character of the property if the new construction is removed or altered in the future.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided a land buffer is created around the historic building as part of the designation process; and a separate building permit application is submitted for rehabilitation of the historic building.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:55:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Judy Robinson, James Maransky, attorney Rachael Pritzker, and Ashley May represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. McCoubrey and Ms. Gutterman asked about the extent of the Historical Commission's jurisdiction if the proposed buffer is created around the building when it is designated as historic.

- Mr. Farnham responded that the Historical Commission would not have jurisdiction if limited the extent of the designation as proposed.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked if the Historical Commission would have review-and-comment jurisdiction or no jurisdiction at all.
 - Mr. Farnham responded it would have no jurisdiction outside of the boundary if the boundary is revised as proposed. He added that review-and-comment jurisdiction is only possible under certain circumstances in a historic district; this site is not in a historic district.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked if there was any discussion about the size of the buffer.
- Mr. Farnham responded that the recommendation was that the buffer would extend to the far side of the existing curb cut along Sumac along the side and to the rear property line of 145 Sumac Street at the rear. Ms. Mehley pointed out a photograph in the application showing the curb cut area.
 - Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the width on the other side of the twin and the amount of space between 145 Sumac Street and it neighboring property.
 - Mr. Maransky replied that it is smaller than the one proposed for 147 Sumac Street.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that the applicant did not need to review every aspect of the plans but could respond to the staff recommendation or highlight the project materials.
- Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the landscaped promontory that is at the corner of Sumac Street and Righter Street, near the curb cut. He asked if this was a retaining wall and if the plan is to build up the land. He noted that this area currently slopes down.
 - Mr. Maransky replied that he thinks that it will be a field condition issue. He stated that once they start working they will need to determine if it can slope down or would require a retaining wall.
 - Mr. McCoubrey commented that there is currently a hedge there that forms a nice boundary. He added that having a significant retaining wall in this location is not in keeping with the way other nearby properties relate to the sidewalk.
 - Ms. Robinson noted that the retaining wall would be low. She added that it would be approximately 2 feet tall.
- Ms. Stein commented that the drawings provided are very nice and they gave the Committee a sense of the whole picture of the neighborhood and the scale of the development. She noted that the scale of the proposed buildings is very appropriate to the site. Ms. Stein stated that she recognized the challenge of an “L-shaped” property and how one can develop that in a way that can take advantage of that underutilized site. She added that the massing of the site is appropriate in respect to the corner.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented on the retaining wall again. He pointed out that, based on the scale provided on the drawing, the retaining wall reads as over three feet tall. Mr. McCoubrey and Ms. Gutterman agreed that it could be shorter.
- Mr. McCoubrey pointed out a rendering showing the rear façade of the proposed buildings along Kalos Street as viewed from Sumac Street. He noted that the rear cladding is proposed as a dark charcoal gray color and that the tonality of that façade could be more in keeping more with the surrounding buildings. He pointed out that the color jumps forward and could be distracting.
 - Ms. Robinson asked if the Committee was proposing a lighter color.

- The Committee members responded that the color should be of a more medium tone like a medium gray or medium beige.
 - Mr. McCoubrey asked about the proposed rear material.
 - Ms. Robinson replied that the plan was for a material like fiber cement board siding.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented on the proposed buffer. He noted that the proposed houses along Righter Street step back significantly enough from the corner of Sumac and Righter Streets and allow for the historic building to be clearly read.
 - Mr. Maransky said that their team had met with Historical Commission's staff for an informal review before they submitted their application. The staff recommended reducing the density and pulling back from that corner. He noted this change was reflected in the current application.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that the proposed buffer and development as shown on the site plan is respectful.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the division of the newly created properties.
 - Mr. Maransky replied that they will be fee simple ownership through a planned community, essentially being single-family parcels.
- Mr. D'Alessandro noted the retaining wall and asked if any earth would be placed against the existing historic building.
 - The applicants stated this would not be done.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro asked if drainage would be away from existing building.
 - The applicants confirmed it would be.
- Mr. D'Alessandro inquired about the proposed work to the historic building and noted that this should be done as soon as possible.
 - Mr. Maransky responded that once they receive zoning approval, they will be submitting their building permit applications soon after.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro expressed concern about the historic building's condition while they are doing construction work on the other properties.
 - Mr. Maransky replied that the historic building is currently in livable condition, although it does need a lot of work.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the historic building's fabric will be protected while the applicant is doing the new work.
 - Mr. Maransky confirmed that the historic building would be protected.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The boundary around the designated portion of the property may be revised. As a result, the lot area outside the boundary would not be part of the historic designation. If the revised boundary is approved by the Historical Commission, the Commission will have no jurisdiction over the development outside of the boundary.
- The application successfully provided a sense of the neighborhood and the scale of the development.
- The scale and massing of the proposed buildings is appropriate to the site.
- A three-foot retaining wall is proposed and may be constructed at the corner of Sumac Street and Righter Street. The retaining wall will be located between the historic building and the new construction. The Committee noted that, if a retaining wall is necessary, it should be shorter than the heights shown.

- The rear façades of the Kalos Street buildings should be clad in a lighter color.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The exterior of the historic building will be rehabilitated in a manner that respects and preserves the historic character of the property, satisfying Standard 2.
- The land buffer created around the historic building as part of its designation to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places should allow for new construction on the existing lot that will not affect its historic character, satisfying Standard 9.
- The land buffer around the historic building should be sufficient enough to allow for adjacent construction that will not alter the essential form and character of the property if the new construction is removed or altered in the future, satisfying Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a minimum 15-foot wide land buffer is established around the historic building on the two exposed sides; the retaining wall at the corner of Sumac and Righter Streets is no taller than 24 to 30 inches; the rear elevations on Kalos Street have a medium gray or beige color, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10.

ITEM: 147 Sumac Street MOTION: Approval with conditions MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 338 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Demolish rear and side additions; construct rear and side additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 338 Spruce LLC

Applicant: Kevin Rasmussen, Rasmussen/Su

History: 1790; Williams-Hopkinson House; façade restored 1960

Individual Designation: 6/26/1956, 4/30/1957

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to demolish two non-historic one-story side and rear additions, and construct a one-story addition at the side and a three-story addition at the rear. The existing one-story rear addition proposed for demolition was approved by the staff in 2017 and replaced a twentieth-century kitchen addition. The existing one-story side addition likely dates to c.1960,

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JANUARY 2020

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

when approval was granted to demolish and rebuild all or part of extensions at the rear. The first-floor rear of this building is not visible from the public right-of-way owing to a one-story garage. The visible second and third floors of the proposed rear addition would be clad in painted lap siding and the roofline of the rear addition would hit the existing rear ell slightly below the roofline. No work is proposed to the front façade.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Demolish non-original side and rear additions.
- Construct side and rear additions.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The removal of non-original additions and construction of new additions at the rear ell of 338 Spruce Street does not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The proposed rear addition is differentiated from the red brick of the rear ell and is compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:09:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Kevin Rasmussen represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Detwiler asked about the location of the condensing units.
 - Mr. Rasmussen described their location and noted that the units are not visible from the public right-of-way.
- Mr. Detwiler asked about the doors in the stair to the courtyard.
 - Mr. Rasmussen responded that it is a new consolidated masonry opening at that location, that follows roughly the jambs of two existing masonry openings, one of which is a door and one of which is a window. The doorway that faces south is an existing masonry opening that leads into the front of the house.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about any changes to the existing rear ell.
 - Mr. Rasmussen responded that there will be a new masonry opening at the first floor, where a new dining room is called out in the plans.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked about visibility from the public right-of-way.
 - Mr. Rasmussen responded that the rear it is only visible from a small area on Cypress Street, and first floor is not visible. He noted that the building is one of the shallowest structures on the block. He acknowledged that Three Bears

Park is across the street on Cypress Street, and directed the Committee's attention to photographs in the application showing limited visibility from the rear owing to the location of the addition on the lot.

- Ms. Gutterman asked about the cladding of the rear addition.
 - Mr. Rasmussen responded that it will be a painted lap siding on the second and third stories, and the lower portion will be brick. The roof will be metal to match the existing rear ell.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Boni, Chair of the Zoning and Historic Preservation Committee for the Society Hill Civic Association, commented that he does not have much to say because his committee has not reviewed the application. He invited Mr. Rasmussen to attend the next Committee meeting. He commented that his personal concern is visibility from the rear and if the rear carport door and surrounding brick wall will be changed.
 - Mr. Rasmussen responded that there are no proposed changes to the carport door and associated brick wall as part of this application.
 - Ms. Gutterman gave her copy of the application materials to Mr. Boni.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The additions proposed for demolition are non-historic.
- The visibility of the new rear addition will be limited to the second and third floors on Cypress Street.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The removal of non-original additions and construction of new additions at the rear ell of 338 Spruce Street does not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The proposed rear addition is differentiated from the red brick of the rear ell and is compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment, satisfying Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 338 Spruce Street MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Detwiler SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 613 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct addition above carport

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Igor Frayman

Applicant: Lawrence Gilbert, Lawrence Gilbert Architect

History: 1990; Stephen Varenhorst, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a two-story addition above an existing one-story carport at the rear of this property along Panama Street. The building at 613 Pine Street is identified as a c. 1980 structure and is classified as Contributing in the inventory of the Society Hill Historic District, owing to the involvement of the Redevelopment Authority in its construction. However, the 1980 structure was demolished and the building currently on the site was constructed in 1990 without the involvement of the RDA. The current building should not be classified as Contributing in the inventory because it was constructed after the Period of Significance of the district.

The proposed addition would include brick cladding and wood windows to match the existing house facing Pine Street. The existing overhead door at the carport would remain.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Construct two-story addition above existing carport at rear.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - There are no historic materials, features, and spatial relationships to protect at this property. The height of the addition will be taller than most structures along this block, many of which are garages; however, the proposed structure would be located directly across the street from a large four-story school building. Therefore, the proposed structure would not adversely impact its environment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:25:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Lawrence Gilbert and David Berry, and property owner Julia Frayman represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JANUARY 2020

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- Mr. D'Alessandro asked why the windows do not vertically align.
 - Mr. Gilbert responded that there is a toilet room.
- Mr. Detwiler asked if the stair window on the third floor needs to be as tall as proposed.
 - Mr. Gilbert responded that it matches the window below it on the second floor, but the sill height could be raised to make it align with the other third floor windows.
- The Committee acknowledged that the south elevation is facing a courtyard and is not visible from the public right-of-way.
- Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the drawings show a rubber roof, but that it should be a standing seam metal roof.
 - Mr. Gilbert responded that the slope is very slight.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro responded that he suggested metal rather than shingles for that reason.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Boni, Chair of the Zoning and Historic Preservation Committee for the Society Hill Civic Association, commented that the committee has not had a chance to review this application. He invited Mr. Gilbert to attend the next committee meeting. He commented that there is an approved, but not built, project immediately adjacent to this site.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The south elevation faces an interior courtyard and is not visible from the public right-of-way.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- There are no historic materials, features, and spatial relationships to protect at this property. The height of the addition will be taller than most structures along this block, many of which are garages; however, the proposed structure would be located directly across the street from a large four-story school building. Therefore, the proposed structure would not adversely impact its environment, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the sill heights of the third-floor windows align on the Panama Street facade, and the roofing material is changed to standing seam metal, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Gutterman abstained, owing to her absence during part of the review.

ITEM: 613 Pine Street MOTION: Approval with conditions MOVED BY: D'Alessandro SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman			X		
Suzanne Pentz	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	5		1		1

ADDRESS: 242 DELANCEY ST

Proposal: Demolish rear addition; construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Paul and Annamaria Jaskot

Applicant: Kevin Davey, Hanson Fine Building

History: 1780; Roof 1875; Restored 1960

Individual Designation: 6/30/1959

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This three-story building, constructed in 1780 and located midblock on Delancey Street, is considered significant in the Society Hill Historic District. The building was completely rehabilitated in the Second Empire style about 1880; the front façade was clad in scored stucco, the window openings were altered, and a mansard was added. The front façade was reconstructed to its eighteenth-century appearance in the early 1960s. The front slope of the roof on the main block was restored with a dormer, but the rear slope was not; the rear roof on the main block is a flat roof at the four-floor level, a remnant of the former mansard. A small portion of the rear of the building is minimally visible through the shared alley between it and 244 Delancey Street. The existing rear ell is three stories in height and clad in brick with areas of stucco. Several small modern additions have been constructed at the rear ell and the first floor has been stuccoed. The brick of the rear ell includes many scars and several types of brick, likely resulting from infill and addition. The front section of the rear ell, nearest the main block, appears to be original. Historic maps show that a large, rear addition was constructed between 1874 and 1885, during which time the building acquired its current footprint. The rear addition likely coincides with the new front façade and mansard. It is likely that a third story was added to the original rear ell at that time. While no work is proposed to the front façade, this application seeks to demolish most of the rear ell and construct a three-story brick addition with pilot house.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish rear ell, with the retention of party wall and portions of rear wall of main block;
- Construct three-story rear addition with pilot house.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - This application proposes to demolish the historic rear ell and construct a new addition in its place. The historic ell was constructed in two phases, with the most recent phase dating to c. 1880. While the new ell would largely replicate the old in materials, scale, massing, and size, it would destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The proposed work does not comply with this standard.
- *Standard 10: New additions or 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 impaired.*
 - The demolition of the existing rear ell and construction of a new addition would result in the loss of a significant amount of historic fabric. If the new construction were removed in the future, the building would not retain its essential form or integrity. The work does not comply with this standard.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:36:52

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney Carl Primavera, architect Liesl Geiger, and contractor John Hanson represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Geiger distributed an engineer's report, explaining that it provides a synopsis of the house's condition and recommends the rebuilding of the rear ell.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that, according to the report, the reasons for rebuilding the ell would not be due to structural issues but instead to provide a modern exterior wall assembly, improve energy efficiency, and level the floors. She noted that the report does not state that the rear ell is structurally unsound and needs to be reconstructed.
 - Mr. Hanson replied that the report suggests that the moment the ell is altered, the structure would not support those efforts.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that Mr. Hanson is reading into the report in a way she is not.
- Mr. Primavera noted that the floors are uneven and that there are accessibility and program issues. He asked Ms. Geiger to explain why they believe they are preserving the character-defining features.
- Ms. Geiger contended that the issues with the rear of the building include the lack of light, narrow stairs, and floor alignment difficulties. She noted that the floors at the back portion of the house do not align with the middle portion. She contended that the ell's original fabric has already been removed, with numerous windows replaced

- with glass block, and that the rear was built in several phases. She added that the engineer's opinion is that if the rear were changed, the structure would not be able to withstand the alterations.
- Ms. Gutterman reiterated that the applicants' argument is that the house needs to be modernized to provide a twenty-first century living space. She acknowledged that fact but stated that the house may not be for them. She argued that there are numerous windows facing the terrace that must be providing light to the interior. She concluded that she does not understand the rationale of destroying a significant amount of historic fabric at the owners' desire for a wider floor plate.
 - Mr. Primavera disagreed that the rear ell is comprised of significant historic fabric. He countered that rear ells are often viewed as secondary, though he noted a recent renewed interest in looking at them. He opined that the main portion would be restored in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and that the rear is not visible from a public way. He observed that the preservation ordinance authorizes the Historical Commission to protect historic fabric for the public's visual benefit. The public cannot see this ell. He stated that the owners are making a serious investment and called these types of homes wonderful but contended that they do not serve the purpose they did when they were built. He added that they are sacrificing the rear ell but that he feels they have a right to do so, given recent practice. He added that what they are saving and what they are building are far more important. He stated that a neighbor works for the National Park Service and is excited about the project. Mr. Primavera stated that this application is not unusual, given the years and years of approvals of these types of applications.
 - Mr. Detwiler observed that the fireplace is being removed and asked whether there are any proposed changes to the chimney.
 - Ms. Geiger responded that they have not reached that point yet.
 - Mr. Detwiler commented that a house, especially one deemed significant in its listing in the Society Hill Historic District, has key characteristics that make it significant. He agreed that the rear ell has some irregularities, but he suggested that there are ways to work with the existing ell. He asserted that he is of the mind that parts of the ell are original fabric. He stated that the proposal is for a very nice floor plan but at the cost of an eighteenth-century wing of a significant house. He expressed his opposition to the project.
 - Mr. McCoubrey explained the building's chronology, stating that it included an eighteenth-century wing and a later nineteenth-century wing from the 1870s.
 - Mr. Hanson responded that the original structure dates to the 1780s and the earlier part of the ell shows up on maps starting in the 1860s.
 - Mr. McCoubrey disagreed, contending that only the portion at the rear of the ell was added in the 1870s.
 - Ms. Geiger commented that the stairs have been altered and that currently there is no main stairway. She noted that an elevator would be installed to make the house more sustainable.
 - Ms. Gutterman replied that the interior could be modified to address some of the applicants' concerns, but it does not mean that the whole rear ell needs to be demolished.
 - Mr. McCoubrey observed that the work proposed would replace the ell with less square footage. He stated that the existing ell is quite intact, despite its relatively

- minor condition issues. He added that the ell is considered a character-defining feature.
- Ms. Geiger asked whether there are parts of the ell that are more character-defining than others.
 - Mr. Detwiler answered that the earlier portions of the ell have more significance than the nineteenth-century portion at the rear. He added that the Committee has allowed modifications to ells and suggested that there would be more flexibility in that part of the ell as opposed to the earlier components.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Boni, chair of the Society Hill Civic Association's zoning and historic preservation committee, stated that the applicant would present to the committee on 10 February 2020, at which time he hopes to understand the plan better and provide more feedback to the Historical Commission. He asked that the Commission offer the factors it considers in these types of cases and how it analyzes those factors. He requested more guidance in understanding character-defining features and the significance of rear ells as it applies to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.
 - Mr. McCoubrey responded that ells are generally considered secondary components of a house. He elaborated that in terms of a house's history and use, ells are significant features and can provide more information about the history and culture of the occupants than the front of the house can offer. He added that the publicly viewed façade is important but the rear ells are equally important as character-defining features.
 - Mr. Detwiler agreed, adding that in today's society, history and interpretation focus on what was happening at the rear of the house as much as what happened at the front.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The main house dates to c. 1780, and the narrow portion of the rear ell likely dates to that period. There was an addition at the rear of the ell that was constructed between 1874 and 1885.
- The proposed work would include the demolition of the entire rear ell.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The rear ell is a character-defining feature of the building, and the proposed work would cause the loss of a significant amount of historic fabric. The application does not satisfy Standard 9.
- The demolition of the rear ell would cause a loss of the building's form and integrity. The application does not satisfy Standard 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ITEM: 242 Delancey Street MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz	X				
Amy Stein					X
Total	5				2

ADDRESS: 1432 DIAMOND ST

Proposal: Rebuild demolished rear ell with addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Lopsonzski 1432 W Diamond

Applicant: Shae Morong, Plato Studio Architect, LLC

History: 1886; John M. Sharp, builder

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

The building at 1432 Diamond Street comprises one half of a twin and is part of three identical twins on the south side of Diamond Street. The side and rear elevations are highly visible from N. 15th Street, owing to an adjacent vacant lot to the west where another twin historically stood. In June 2019, the staff of the Historical Commission approved a building permit for interior alterations. Work to the building began once the permit was issued in early July. During the interior work, part of the side façade of the rear ell collapsed. In August 2019, the Department of Licenses & Inspections (L&I) declared the building imminently dangerous and abated the dangerous condition by demolishing the rear ell. According to L&I, the building plans submitted in July 2019 were inaccurate and did not reflect the extent of the work actually being undertaken at the site. Specifically, the height of the basement was misrepresented in the plans, and the basement was then excavated to achieve the height shown. Excavation was not part of the permitted work. Additionally, one emergency egress was indicated in the plans, but two window wells were installed. L&I concluded that the collapse of the historic ell was caused by poor construction methods and work that exceeded the July 2019 permit. At this time, only a one-story portion of the ell's rear wall remains standing.

In December 2019, the Historical Commission denied an application to construct a rear ell with a 20-foot extension beyond the original rear ell. The Commission noted that an engineer should inspect the building for structural stability and that an engineer's report should be submitted to the Historical Commission. It further recommended that the extant portion of the building be stabilized, sealed, and weatherized within 30 days. On 15 January 2020, the staff approved a building permit application to temporarily seal the building.

This application proposes to construct a three-story rear ell with a 12-foot addition beyond the original rear ell.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct three-story brick addition in place of demolished rear ell.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - Although the proposed three-story rear ell would be clad in brick to match the now-demolished structure, the new ell would include a 12-foot addition at the rear that would extend the building beyond its neighbors. The rear wall of the proposed ell would include a second-story bay, an extant feature of all other buildings in the row. However, the proposed bay does not replicate the detailing of the original bay. The application does not comply with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the application as proposed, but approval of the reconstruction of a rear ell that more accurately replicates the appearance and dimensions of the historic ell, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:56:45

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Plato Marinakos represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. D'Alessandro asked why the architectural drawings reference two building permit applications.
 - Mr. Marinakos explained that an application was submitted to winterize the building and a separate application is being submitted to construct an addition, though he clarified that the ell and addition would be constructed at the same time.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked if the building would be renovated when the ell is constructed.
 - Mr. Marinakos affirmed that the building would also be renovated.
- Ms. Gutterman asked the applicant why he is proposing an addition as opposed to reconstructing the ell to its original dimensions.
 - Mr. Marinakos replied that the owner contends that a small 12-foot rear addition would maintain a good deal of open space, while allowing for an extra bedroom.
 - Ms. Gutterman concluded that the owner would benefit financially by the Committee allowing him to grow the ell by 12-feet.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired about the proposed materials for the rear ell.

- Mr. Marinakos answered that the ell was originally constructed of brick and some of it was salvaged during the demolition process. He added that he would use those bricks as samples to match the new brick.
 - Ms. Gutterman questioned whether the brick would be a veneer.
 - Mr. Marinakos stated that it would be real brick
- Ms. Gutterman inquired about the materials of the rear bay.
 - Mr. Marinakos responded that the bay would be painted wood to match the historic bay.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked the staff if enough photographic evidence exists to recreate the bay.
 - Ms. Keller replied that there are several other existing bays in the row that are identical to this one.
- Mr. McCoubrey commented that, in addition to the length, there is a question about the height of the proposed ell.
 - Mr. Marinakos countered that he responded to the Committee's comments and lowered the height of the rear ell.
 - Mr. Detwiler observed that the main block has a tall parapet, and Mr. Marinakos noted that the parapet makes the heights deceiving.
 - Mr. McCoubrey noted that the original floor levels of the rear ell were offset from the main block.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated that the drawings appear to show the roofline of the main block being lowered. He asked that the drawings be revised to show that no change is proposed to the roofline of the main block. He added that in looking at the side elevation, the drawing does not match the photograph.
- Ms. Gutterman observed that some drawings show the bay at the rear of the ell and some do not. She asked that they be revised to be consistent and asked whether the intention is to include the rear bay.
 - Mr. Marinakos replied that the previous plans did not include the reconstruction of the bay but that the Committee and Commission requested that it be included. He stated that the new plans respond to that request and include the rear second-story bay.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Department of Licenses and Inspections demolished the rear ell to abate a dangerous condition owing to unsafe building practices that exceeded the permitted work.
- The application proposes to construct a new ell with a 12-foot addition; the historic bay would be recreated at the rear wall of the addition.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The application does not propose to reconstruct the historic ell to its original dimensions and appearance; therefore, the work does not satisfy Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as proposed, but approval of the reconstruction of a rear ell that more accurately replicates the appearance and dimensions of the historic ell, including the second-

story bay, and that the roofline of the rear ell be differentiated from that of the main block, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 1432 Diamond Street MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 125 S 18TH ST

Proposal: Legalize mural

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owners: Allan Domb Realty/18th and Sansom LLC

Applicant: Jane Golden, Mural Arts Program

History: 1937; Louis Magaziner, architect

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to legalize a mural installed without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit on the Sansom Street façade of this Moderne structure in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Residential Historic District.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Legalize mural

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed mural does not comply with this Standard because it changes the appearance of the historic street façade.
- *Historical Commission Rules & Regulations, 6.8.a.2: Murals shall not be placed directly upon historic fabric.*
- *Historical Commission Rules & Regulations, 6.8.a.3 Murals shall not be placed in a manner that obscures historic fabric.*

- The proposed mural is placed directly on historic fabric and obscures historic fabric.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations 6.8.a.2 and 6.8.a.3.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:08:34

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Jane Golden and Amy Johnston of the Mural Arts Program represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Golden acknowledged that the mural was installed without the Historical Commission's review. She noted that the mural was placed on two buildings on the 1700-block of Sansom Street. The buildings stand on the boundary of the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District and only one of the buildings, 125 S. 18th Street, is within the district. She stated that they wrongly assumed that none of the buildings was under the Historical Commission's jurisdiction. She stated that she respects the Historical Commission and its process and observed that she made a mistake in this instance. She explained that the mural artist Steve Powers is an acclaimed artist. Ms. Golden reported that her constituents have been asking for more murals in Center City. She explained that this mural was intended to be temporary, in place for only one to two years.
- Mr. McCoubrey asked whether the mural was painted directly on the masonry.
 - Mr. Baron claimed that this is the second mural that Mural Arts installed on this façade. He claimed that Mural Arts applied some sort of wheat paste on the façade and then applied a beige paint over it. He postulated that this mural was painted then painted on top of the beige paint.
 - Ms. Golden responded that Mr. Baron is incorrect. The mural in question is painted directly on the limestone or cast stone façade of the building.
- Ms. Golden stated that this mural was installed in 2018 and was intended to be in place for one or two years. She explained that the mural will last for much longer than two years, but they intended to replace it with another mural after about two years.
- Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Farnham if the Architectural Committee could legalize the mural.
 - Mr. Farnham reminded the Committee that it is advisory only. It offers non-binding recommendations. It cannot approve or deny applications. However, the Architectural Committee could recommend that the Historical Commission legalize the mural.
- Ms. Golden stated that removing this mural would impose a financial hardship on Mural Arts. Removing the mural would be very expensive.
- The Committee members suggested that the mural should be removed during the warmer months. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the mural could remain in place for a while, since it was only intended to be in place for two years or so. She stated that she would not be comfortable legalizing it permanently, but it could stay in place for a while. She also recommended that a conservator or masonry consultant should be

consulted on the removal to avoid damaging the masonry. Ms. Gutterman added that removing it may do more damage than leaving it in place.

- Ms. Golden stated that Mural Arts has a conservator on staff.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David S. Traub read and submitted a letter opposing the legalization of the mural.
- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance supported the staff recommendation of denial of the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The proposed mural covers historic fabric on a visible street façade.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed mural does not satisfy Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations 6.8.a.2 and 6.8.a.3.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and Sections 6.8.a.2 and 6.8.a.3 of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations.

ITEM: 125 S 18th Street					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 2038 WOLF ST

Proposal: Install 18 composite windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joseph E. Czarnecki

Applicant: Maggie McDevitt, Renewal by Andersen of Greater Philadelphia

History: 1911; James H. and John T. Windrim, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to install Andersen Fibrex windows on the front, side, and rear façade of this twin house in Girard Estate. The Architectural Committee reviewed a version of this

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 JANUARY 2020

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

proposal at its last meeting and recommended denial. Since that time the applicant has removed a piece of metal panning to reveal the original wood frames. The application now includes drawings that show how the subframe of the Fibrex window would be installed in a new wood frame. Because of the design of the Fibrex window, about one inch of subframe would be exposed and visible. The drawings do not show the correct detail on the sill or brickmold to match the existing frame; however, the applicant has indicated that he is willing to adjust the brickmold detail.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install windows

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*
 - The proposed windows do not match the historic windows in design or materials, but the deviation in design will be minimal and the change in materials should be imperceptible from the street. The windows currently have very wide non-historic panning on the frames, so any change will be a vast improvement.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:25:06

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Nuzio Terra of Anderson Windows represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee members asked about the material of the existing windows.
 - Mr. Terra explained that the extant windows are vinyl sash in original wood frames with aluminum capping.
- Mr. D'Alessandro recommended that the applicant mock up a new wood frame in an existing opening. He noted that the proposed drawing is highly inaccurate.
 - Mr. Terra responded that he will work with the staff to revise the drawing.
- Mr. Detwiler said that he researched the original pane configurations in Girard Estate. He noted that all the building types seem to have had six-over-six windows. He recommended that the Committee recommend six-over-six windows, not one-over-ones, for this building.
 - Mr. Terra agreed and stated that Anderson offers a simulated-divided-light window with an exterior muntin.
 - The Committee members determined that the proposed Fibrex material, which simulates wood, was acceptable but noted that the subframes would not be acceptable if they were visible behind the existing wood frames.
 - The applicant responded that he can hide all but one-quarter inch of the subframe behind the wood frame. The Committee members responded that a slight reveal would be acceptable.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The existing frames are in very poor condition, the historic window pattern is not documented, and the openings have been altered with infill.
- The non-historic vinyl windows and aluminum panning will be removed.
- The architectural drawings of the proposed window installation are incorrect in terms of the sill, brickmold, and bead and need to be corrected.
- The windows should be six-over-six with simulated muntins that include interior and exterior grills as well as spacer bars.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed windows will meet Standard 6 if the window frames are reconstructed to match original frames and the subframes are hidden or mostly hidden by the frames.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the windows are six-over-six with simulated muntins that include interior and exterior grills as well as spacer bars and the frames match the existing with the subframes mostly hidden behind the wood frames, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

ITEM: 2038 Wolf Street					
MOTION: Approval with conditions					
MOVED BY: Rudy D'Alessandro					
SECONDED BY: Nan Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	x				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 708 SANSOM ST

Proposal: Construct 24-story mixed-use tower

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Toll Washington Square, LP

Applicant: Brian McGillin, Hunter Roberts Construction

History: Vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Jewelers Row Historic District, 1/1/3000

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

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to construct a 24-story mixed-use retail and residential tower at 708 Sansom Street. The property known as 708 Sansom Street is an assemblage of the lots at 702, 704, 706, and 710 Sansom Street and 128 S. 7th Street.

The assemblage at 708 Sansom Street is located in the proposed Jewelers' Row Historic District. The district nomination is pending before the Historical Commission and is scheduled to be reviewed by the Committee on Historic Designation in February and by the Historical Commission in March. Also, two individual nominations are pending before the Historical Commission for part of the assemblage, what was known as 704 and 706 Sansom Street. The Historical Commission tabled the individual nominations because the developer vested rights in demolition permits before the notices for the individual or district nominations were issued. The demolition permits were not subject to the Historical Commission's review and, after some litigation regarding the validity of the permits, the developer legally demolished the buildings. The assemblage known as 708 Sansom Street is now vacant. In the cover letter accompanying this application, the developer requests that the Historical Commission consider and reject the individual nominations because the buildings have been demolished at its February meeting.

The Historical Commission is reviewing this application because the assemblage is within the boundary of the proposed Jewelers' Row Historic District and because part of the site has been individually nominated for designation. Pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(f) of the preservation ordinance, the Department of Licenses & Inspections is prohibited from issuing building permits for properties during the review of nominations proposing designation after the requisite property owner notice has been mailed, unless the Historical Commission has approved the building permit application or no final action has been taken on the nomination and 90 days has elapsed since the submission of the application.

14-1005(6)(f) Jurisdiction During Consideration of Designation.

L&I shall not issue any building permit for the demolition, alteration, or construction of any building, structure, site, or object that is being considered by the Historical Commission for designation as historic or that is located within a district being considered by the Historical Commission for designation as historic where the building permit application is filed on or after the date that notices of proposed designation have been mailed, except that L&I may issue a building permit if the Historical Commission has approved the application or has not taken final action on designation and more than 90 days have elapsed from the date the permit application was filed with the Historical Commission. Where the Historical Commission takes final action on designation within the time allotted herein, any building permit application on file with L&I shall be deemed to have been filed after the date of the Historical Commission's action for purposes of this Chapter 14-1000.

The applicant has requested that the individual nominations should be considered and “formally denied” by the Historical Commission. The individual nominations for 704 and 706 Sansom Street claim that the historical and architectural values associated with the properties that qualify them for designation derive strictly from the buildings that stood on the properties. The nominations do not claim that “the location itself maintains historical, cultural, or archaeological value regardless of the value of any existing structure” (Definition of Site in 14-203(298)). Likewise, the nominations do not claim that 704 and 706 Sansom Street contain archaeological resources that would have survived the demolition below grade. Therefore, it appears that, in light of the complete demolition, the Historical Commission must reject the individual nominations because they suggest no basis for individually designating the properties without the buildings.

With regard to the pending historic district nomination, it appears that the Historical Commission’s jurisdiction over the building permit application will be limited to non-binding comment. Section 14-1005(4) of the preservation ordinance states that “the Historical Commission’s scope of review of applications for building permits for construction, as defined herein, shall be limited to a 45-day period of comment.” Section 14-203(76) of the ordinance defines “construction” as “the erection of a new building, structure, or object upon an undeveloped site.” Section 2.23 of the Historical Commission’s Rules & Regulations defines an “undeveloped site” as:

a property within an historic district which is not individually designated, to which the inventory in the historic district nomination attributes no historical, cultural, or archaeological value, and upon which no building or structure stood at the time of the designation of the historic district. Non-historic foundations and other below-grade constructions; surface parking lots; non-historic parking kiosks and other kiosks, storage sheds, and other impermanent constructions without foundations; and non-historic walls, fences, and gates shall not be construed as buildings or structures for the purposes of this definition.

The site at 708 Sansom Street can be considered an “undeveloped site” and, therefore, the Historical Commission’s jurisdiction over the current application can be considered “limited to a 45-day period of comment.” The Historical Commission cannot approve or deny so-called review-and-comment applications but can offer non-binding comments on the application at its public meeting and that of its Architectural Committee. Once the Committee and Commission have commented on the application, the applicant’s obligations to the Historical Commission under the pending historic district nomination have been met and the Department of Licenses & Inspections may issue the building permit.

The proposed building would be 24 stories in height with setbacks at the 5th, 16th, 22nd, and 24th-floor levels. The building would have frontage on Sansom Street as well as S. 7th Street. The main entrances to the residential lobby and retail space would be located on Sansom; the loading dock on 7th Street. The building would be primarily clad in an aluminum and glass curtain-wall system with some grey brick at the lower levels.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct 24-story tower.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

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

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - Most buildings in the proposed historic district are between three and six stories in height and are clad in masonry with punched window openings. The proposed building is differentiated from those around it but is not compatible with the buildings in the proposed district in massing, size, or scale.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the proposed tower does not satisfy Standard 9.

The staff recommends that the Architectural Committee formulate a recommendation on the building permit application to the Historical Commission that serves both scenarios, comment and plenary jurisdiction, because the matter of the individual nominations will not be settled at the time of the Committee meeting.

The staff recommends that the Historical Commission consider the individual nominations for 704 and 706 Sansom Street before considering the building permit application. The staff recommends that the Historical Commission reject the nominations because the properties no longer satisfy any of the Criteria for Designation cited in the nominations, owing to the legally undertaken, complete demolitions of the buildings.

The staff recommends that the Historical Commission find that 708 Sansom Street qualifies as an “undeveloped site” and that its jurisdiction over the building permit application is “limited to a 45-day period of comment.”

The staff recommends that the Historical Commission comment that the proposed tower does not satisfy Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:43:17

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Paul Albano, attorney Carl Primavera, and developer Adam Lamp represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Albano stated that the building was designed as a podium with tower to provide an appropriate scale at the ground level. He stated that the tower steps back so that the storefront section has the scale of the buildings around it. He also noted that he designed the storefront section to have the rhythm of the nearby buildings.
- Ms. Gutterman asked the architect why he decided to clad the storefront section primarily in glass, not masonry. She stated that she accepted the height of the overall building, which is much shorter than the St. James, but asked why the base could not be more solid.
 - Mr. Albano responded that he decided to use more glass because he wanted the building to have a contemporary feel. He reported that he studied designs with more masonry at the base and found them unsatisfying. He stated that he did not want to replicate the surrounding historic buildings.

- Ms. Gutterman stated that she was not asking for replication. She observed that the rendering indicates that the block will look like a mouth with a missing tooth.
- Mr. McCoubrey objected to the setback at the eastern edge of the base for the lobby entrance. He asserted that the setback awkwardly exposed the party wall of the building at 700 Sansom Street, the historic building to the east. He noted that that party wall has not been exposed in the 200 years that the building at 700 has stood. He observed that the block face is one solid plane without setbacks. Mr. Detwiler agreed and stated that the façade at the setback entrance should be pulled forward to the block face.
- Mr. McCoubrey stated that he appreciated the slight variations in height in the storefront section but asserted that the storefront section should be further differentiated from the tower. He observed that most of the storefront section is clad with the same curtainwall system as the tower. He suggested that the cladding could be changed at the storefront section to differentiate it from the tower. Ms. Gutterman stated that the base of the building should look more like a base. Mr. Detwiler agreed and stated that the glass tower should not extend all the way down to grade. The glass tower at grade is inappropriate for Sansom Street.
 - Mr. Albano stated that he studied the design with more masonry and less glass but determined that such designs were not successful.
- Mr. Detwiler suggested that the tower should be set back more above the storefront section.
 - Mr. Albano stated that the setback at that point is 5.5 feet.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated that the setback should be at least 10 feet.
- The Committee members asked about the 7th Street façade.
 - Mr. Albano explained that there is a one-story façade with a garage entrance on 7th Street. The tower is set back 18 feet from the garage entrance.
 - Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the garage façade should be taller, like the buildings around it. Mr. Detwiler disagreed.
 - Mr. Albano explained that the small, historic storefront buildings to the north of the garage on 7th Street are one story in height.
- Ms. Stein noted that signage is one character-defining feature of the proposed Jewelers' Row Historic District. She stated that signage on the retail sections of this building on Sansom Street will help integrate it into the neighborhood. Mr. McCoubrey added that the two storefronts could be revised to be less like one another.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that she accepts the fact that the tower will be constructed but will request revisions to the design of the storefront section along Sansom Street.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Paul Steinke of the Preservation Alliance stated that the storefront section should have less glass. He also stated that the party wall of the building at 700 Sansom Street should not be exposed by the setback entrance to the tower.
- David S. Traub suggested revisions to the storefront section of the tower.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The design of the tower and garage façade on 7th Street are acceptable.
- The proposed storefront section along Sansom Street is not compatible with the surrounding buildings and should be revised as suggested.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The storefront section along Sansom Street does not satisfy Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the tower, but denial of the storefront section along Sansom Street, which should

- better meet the sidewalk;
- be respectful of the building at 700 Sansom Street; and,
- maintain continuity across the façade with no setbacks.

ITEM: 708 Sansom Street					
MOTION: Approval of all but the storefront section on Sansom Street					
MOVED BY: Ms. Gutterman					
SECONDED BY: Mr. Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey	X				
John Cluver					X
Rudy D'Alessandro	X				
Justin Detwiler	X				
Nan Gutterman	X				
Suzanne Pentz	X				
Amy Stein	X				
Total	6				1

ADJOURNMENT

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 04:07:00

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 1:07 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

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