

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

**TUESDAY, 25 JULY 2017
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-029
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

PRESENT

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

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

ALSO PRESENT

Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Shannon Barg, Preservation Alliance
Netanel Portier, Mural Arts
Maude Haak-Frendscho, Mural Arts
Michelle Tremont, Barneys New York
Drew Kmetz, Varenhorst
Stephen Varenhorst, Varenhorst
Julie Scott, Reku Design
Kelly Zhey
Carl Primavera, Klehr Harrison
Kelly Ennis, Kelly Ennis Design

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 130 S 18TH ST, UNITS RC1 AND RC2

Proposal: Install signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: ADR 1811 Walnut St LP

Applicant: Natalya Atroshyna, EZ Signs LLC

History: 1900, Rittenhouse Club, Newman, Woodman & Harris, architect; rear demolished, 2009

Individual Designation: 4/8/1970

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install two banner signs at the second story of the former Rittenhouse Club, which is now occupied by Barney's New York. The building, located mid-block on Walnut Street, faces Rittenhouse Square and currently has a series of awnings at the first- and second-story windows, and a small projecting sign and plaques at the first story. The application proposes to introduce two new banner signs next to the curved bays. These signs would project four feet from the façade and would extend eight feet in height. Each banner would consist of Sunbrella fabric with no illumination. The staff suggests that the small, existing first-story sign could be replaced with one of the proposed banners rather than installing two new signs at the second story.

The application also shows awnings at the two center second-story windows. These awnings are not currently installed and are not part of the application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application at first, but Michelle Tremont of Barneys New York, the tenant, joined the discussion later in the review.

Ms. Gutterman asked Ms. Keller if the applicant offered a reason for the proposed re-signing of the building. Ms. Keller answered that she was not offered a reason, adding that she has been in contact with the sign company contracted by Barneys New York. She speculated that the store is trying to increase visibility, since it currently has minimal signage.

Mr. McCoubrey inquired whether Barneys occupied only the second floor of the building. Ms. Keller responded that it is on both the first and second floors. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the two small, rectangular signs flanking the door exist. Ms. Keller replied that they do exist and clarified that the western sign identifies Barneys New York, while the eastern sign is for a different tenant. Mr. McCoubrey observed that the photographs of the façade show that the signs are both vertically oriented but one is drawn in a horizontal configuration in the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether the staff's suggestion to replace an existing sign is meant to change the placement of the proposed signage from the second to first story. Ms. Keller responded that it is, but that she did not know if the applicant would be amenable to that request.

Mr. Cluver noted that Anthropologie, located on the corner of the block, has larger banner signs and asked whether they had been approved. Ms. Keller replied that she did not know.

Mr. Cluver expressed concern over the quantity of signage on the small façade and suggested that the applicant replace the existing blade sign with a banner sign. Mr. McCoubrey recommended that the new sign be placed at the western side of the building, in the same location as the existing blade sign.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether the other Committee members would recommend that the sign be placed at the first or second floor. Mr. Cluver replied that he would be open to either location, but opined that the first floor would be a more effective location. He added that the proposed banner sign may be too large for the first-story location and suggested that, if the applicant were to replace the blade sign, they maintain the same projection that the current sign has and extend the banner approximately three quoins in height. Since no one is present to represent the application, he continued, the Committee can only provide speculative comments.

Mr. D'Alessandro agreed that the sign should be placed near the western edge of the first floor, as long as it does not interrupt the front entrance, light fixtures, or doors. Ms. Gutterman also agreed with Mr. Cluver, commenting that there is likely a visibility issue resulting in people walking past the building, owing to the store's lack of a significant street presence. Mr. D'Alessandro replied that he has walked past the building many times and taken note, owing to the nature of the architecture. The building, he added, is not a generic box and does not need lots of attention brought to it.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if the Committee is in agreement that the applicant can replace the blade sign, as long as it remains below the cornice line and fits within the quoins of the first floor.

Michelle Tremont of Barneys New York joined the meeting and introduced herself as the tenant of the first and second floors of the building. She indicated that her company has been interested in the building's signage for the past few years and that the store has had problems with pedestrians being able to recognize the building and store entry. There is a lot of signage along that retail corridor, she added, and the building is very discreet. She commented that the store has approval from the landlord and condominium board to install the banners. She explained that she would like to avoid any permanent damage to the existing stone and that the shop drawings show the attachments will connect into the reveals of the limestone blocks. The banners, she continued, are intended to be positioned within the same "zone" as the existing awnings to be more subtle and tasteful. She described the flags at the adjacent Barnes & Noble property as being very large and oversized. She noted that both adjacent buildings have flags and, at the end of the block, the Anthropologie store contains banners that wrap the corner of the street. Ms. Tremont stated that she is open to making adjustments if the Committee has recommendations pertaining to detailing or sizing and reiterated that the proposal is intended to bring more exposure to the façade. The building, she continued, currently has such a residential appearance, which is problematic for attracting customers and being able to identify the store along the retail corridor.

Mr. McCoubrey asked that Ms. Tremont listen to the staff's recommendation and noted that the Committee has already had some discussion about the banners. Ms. Keller read Ms. Tremont the staff recommendation, reiterating that the staff suggested replacing the first-story blade sign with one proposed banner. Ms. Keller explained that the staff found the locations and size of the banners proposed for the second floor to be problematic, because they could potentially obstruct the bays, owing to the proposed four-foot projection of the signage and their proximity to the bays. Mr. Cluver added that the volume of signage is also problematic and that the

Committee has been trying to reduce the amount of signage on buildings. He noted that replacing the smaller existing sign with a more visible sign would provide some benefits. To retain that existing blade sign, he continued, and add two more banners at the second story, in addition to the ground-floor plaque, would create a lot of signage on a relatively small façade.

Ms. Tremont replied that she is certainly open to suggestions and described the Barneys aesthetic as being very subtle. She indicated that the store does not incorporate much signage at any of its locations in order to avoid having garish, oversized signs. She commented that she would consider a larger banner in place of the existing blade sign. In terms of pedestrian access, she asked whether the Committee would allow a second matching sign at the opposite side of the building. She clarified that she is asking whether she can move the proposed second-story banners to the ground floor. Mr. Cluver replied that if the proposed banners were installed at street level they would need to be scaled back. The signs shown for the second story, he continued, are scaled for the second story. Ms. Tremont agreed and stated that the banners could be scaled down if installed at the ground level. She then explained that the original proposal for banners at the second story was meant to provide subtle signage rather than adding more signage to the ground floor. She added that the second-story banners tied into the awnings and were consistent with banners on adjacent properties.

Ms. Stein inquired whether Barneys New York occupies both the left and right side of the building or if there is a second tenant in the space. Ms. Tremont responded that there is a residential entry identified by the purple awning at the right side. She elaborated that the entry consists of a small thru-space and that Barneys occupies the rest of the first and the entire second floor. Ms. Stein noted her concern that, if the Commission permits signage on both sides of the building, another tenant may want signage in the future. Ms. Tremont clarified that the entry is operated by the building owner and that she sought approval from the owner for the current proposal. The main entry for the building, she continued, is around the corner and the entry on Walnut Street is a secondary entrance. She added that the property owner has more signage at the building's main entrance and noted that it would be unlikely for the property owner to add signage to the Walnut Street entrance.

Mr. McCoubrey observed that the other buildings have flagpoles that support the banners and asked whether there is evidence of flagpoles on this building. Ms. Tremont responded that Anthropologie has vertical banners similar to her own proposal. She added that she thought they were more subtle and tasteful, because they are closer to the façade and more discreet. She commented that the flagpole attachment would cause more damage to the limestone and she wanted to avoid that. She also noted that the size of the flags is too large.

Ms. Pentz turned to Drawing S-1, noting that the load calculation is provided for the attachment system and added that the drawings states that Hilti rods are to be installed into solid masonry. She commented that Ms. Tremont described the attachment as penetrating only the mortar joints. She asked Ms. Tremont to have the engineers check the note on the drawing and confirm that the anchors will be installed into the mortar joints and not into solid masonry. Ms. Tremont confirmed that the anchors would only be installed at joints and noted that the attachment drawings show a metal plate extending over a limestone block. In elevation, she elaborated, the bolts are shown at the top and bottom of the plate and they attach at the stone reveals.

Originally, she continued, the plans called for black metal attachments, but they have since been changed to a color that matches the limestone.

Mr. McCoubrey summarized the Committee's discussion as centering on two main points: 1) that the signage should be located at the ground floor, and 2) whether there should be one or two banners. At the ground floor, he opined, the signage would be more visible and would not be blocked by the projecting bays.

Regarding whether one or two signs would be preferred, Mr. Cluver noted that with two tenants at the ground floor, an argument could be made for allowing the second tenant to install signage on their side of the building as well. He then observed that the building contains a very symmetrical facade and that he would accept symmetrical banners, but suggested that the banners stay tastefully minimalist and be smaller than those proposed for the second story, though they could be larger than the existing blade sign. He indicated that the engineer's drawings show the banners extending seven quoins, which are roughly 16 inches each, for a total of approximately nine feet.

The Committee discussed how many quoins in height would be allowable, and Mr. Cluver suggested three or four. He inquired about the projection of the current blade sign. Ms. Tremont responded that the current blade sign projects approximately 2-½ feet at most. She added that the Barneys signage is typically rotated, similar to what is shown in the application. With a longer banner, she continued, the projection of the existing blade sign would remain and the lettering would be made vertical. She further explained that she could use the same proportions as those proposed for the larger banners, but scale them to fit within four quoins. Mr. Cluver responded that on Sheet 2 of 4, the projection for the existing blade sign looks correct and to create the banners, only the length would need to be extended.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the design as submitted with the following suggestions:

- two vertical projecting signs are installed at the first story, with one of those signs replacing the existing blade sign;
- two new projecting signs are smaller than the proposed design, extending approximately three or four quoins in length and projecting roughly the same distance from the building as the existing first-story blade sign; and,
- all attachments penetrate the mortar joints and not the stone blocks.

ADDRESS: 1512-14 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Paint mural

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Forest City

Applicant: E. Maude Haak-Frendscho, Philadelphia Mural Arts Advocates

History: 1927; Drake Hotel; Ritter & Shay, architect; rear addition, 1954, Aaron Colish, architect

Individual Designation: 10/6/1977

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

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to paint a mural on the former Drake Hotel's 1954 rear addition along South Hicks Street. This wall previously had a mural on it, as seen in a

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 JULY 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

photograph from 1986. The proposed mural would depict outlines of rowhouses similar to those found on this block of South Hicks Street, in addition to the shadows of trees and a muted city skyline. Per Section 6.15.a.4 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations, "The Philadelphia Historical Commission, its committees, and staff shall not consider a mural's content as a part of its review of any application for a building permit, but may consider size, scale, and relationship to the historic context." The staff suggests that the proposed mural is appropriate in terms of size, scale, and relationship to the historic context, but notes that the buff brick addition was respectful to the Drake in terms of the chosen brick color, and that the primary color of the mural could be reconsidered to be more in keeping with that of the exterior cladding of the Drake.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and Section 6.15 of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Philadelphia Mural Arts project managers Netanel Portier and Emily Maude Haak-Frendscho represented the application.

Ms. Haak-Frendscho explained that Mural Arts came into this project through the InterAct Theatre Company, which is a new tenant housed in the Drake's annex building. The Hicks Street neighbors and InterAct Theatre have worked together on the project, and there have been several rounds of design review. The proposed design was selected by the neighbors. The colors were chosen to evoke a warm and glowing summer evening. There are 42 lines of play text embedded in the mural. It will be primarily directly painted, with some sections in mural cloth, which is an established mural application method.

Ms. Stein asked who commissioned the mural, who owns it, and who pays for its future maintenance. Ms. Haak-Frendscho responded that Mural Arts and InterAct Theatre are the primary partners. Mural Arts maintains its work throughout its life. Its life is not considered endless. Murals have a lifespan. A healthy lifespan is considered to be around 10 years. Mural Arts has a dedicated restoration crew. Ms. Stein asked if the mural will be removed at the end of its life. Ms. Haak-Frendscho responded that it that depends on its condition. Some murals have been painted out, and some have been restored. Ms. Stein commented that the Committee considers reversibility. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if there is any written information from the owners. Ms. Haak-Frendscho responded that Forest City is the owner of the building, and they have agreed and have been a part of the project throughout its development.

Ms. Gutterman commented that the photographs show what appear to be structural cracks on the wall of the building, in addition to light fixtures. She asked if those will be addressed. Ms. Haak-Frendscho responded that the light fixtures will remain. In terms of cracks, it was part of the decision to use direct paint as the method, so that it does not risk obscuring any of those issues. An assessment shows that it is not currently an issue, but something that Mural Arts should be aware of, and should avoid obscuring. Ms. Gutterman asked if the cracks will be addressed and repaired, or painted over. Ms. Haak-Frendscho responded that they will be painted over. It is considered to be a suitable condition for direct paint. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the parapet does not appear to be in good condition, and that it should be ensured that water is not getting into the wall.

Mr. Cluver commented that the red is coming across as a strong color, and that using more of an orange hue would pick up on the orange of the Drake. Ms. Haak-Frendscho responded that

there is a section of orange hue in the mural, and the Drake along with the rest of the block was considered for context. Mr. McCoubrey commented that it is more intense than a summer evening. Ms. Gutterman asked if there are physical samples of the colors that are proposed. Ms. Haak-Frendscho responded that she does not have those with her, but directed the Committee's attention to the large rendering that Ms. Portier was displaying. She informed the Committee that the neighbors directly across the street from the mural were among the most active in the project, and have been most supportive of this mural design and color choice. Ms. Stein expressed the same concerns for the color choices. She commented that the deep plum hues will divorce the annex from the Drake. She noted that although it was an annex, the architect at the time chose a buff brick, which does not match the Drake, but blends more closely with the palette of the Drake. She suggested inverting the colors so that the darkest colors are not at the edges in order to help it blend.

Mr. Cluver commented that mural content is not within the Committee's jurisdiction, but offered that a couple of the buildings look to be drawn as blueprints, but there are many details that are not historically accurate or appropriately scaled. If the intent of the artist is to have these be historically accurate depictions, there is some revising of that design that should be done. Ms. Haak-Frendscho commented that the intent was that it reads more closely as an inspiration of the architecture in the neighborhood. Pieces of architecture were pulled in, and the concept is to be a stage set, so that it bridges the idea of the theater and the street.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment. Patrick Grossi, representing the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, commented that the Alliance holds a preservation easement on the Drake, but it does not include the annex and therefore the Alliance has no authority to review this project. He commented that the Alliance has no objection to the mural.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the suggestions that the color is reconsidered to be more in keeping with the Drake, and a structural and water infiltration assessment is performed prior to work commencing.

ADDRESS: 1807 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Expand penthouse and roof deck; raise historic chimneys

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Richard Vague

Applicant: Drew Kmetz, Varenhorst

History: 1864; façade replaced

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace a roof deck and penthouse, which the Historical Commission approved in 2012. The proposed changes include the demolition of the existing penthouse, construction of a new penthouse and sunroom, and the raising of two chimneys. A raised rear chimney and small portion of the sunroom will be visible from Cypress Street at the rear, which is considered to be a service alley on this block.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, provided a mockup demonstrates that there is no visibility of the proposed work from Delancey Place, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Stephen Varenhorst and Drew Kmetz represented the application.

Ms. Broadbent distributed photographs showing visibility of a mockup that she reviewed the week prior for the addition, railing, and raising of the front chimney. She noted that the raised front chimney was quite visible from Delancey Place. Owing to that visibility, the architects reviewed the building code and determined that the front chimney did not need to be raised. Mr. Kmetz distributed a revised drawing that showed no changes to the front chimney. Mr. Varenhorst confirmed that the front chimney will not be raised.

Ms. Stein asked about the purpose of the work, since the existing deck is only five years old. Mr. Varenhorst responded that the entire house is being renovated, a new stair will be constructed to access the roof, and the stair does not work with the existing penthouse. The owner also wanted to add a small sunroom.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the setback of the existing deck from the front of the building. Mr. Varenhorst responded that it is set back approximately eight feet. The new deck will be set back five feet. He commented that there is some flexibility with the setback. Mr. Cluver asked about visibility of the railing. Ms. Chantry directed the Committee's attention to a photograph she provided that shows that the top of the railing may be minimally visible with a setback of five feet. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the railing should not be visible from Delancey Place. Mr. Varenhorst suggested setting the deck back to six feet in order to eliminate potential visibility of the railing. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the setback of the deck remain as it is currently. She asked about the difference in size between the existing and proposed deck. Mr. Varenhorst responded that the decks are similar in size. Mr. Kmetz referenced the mechanical units at the rear of the deck. Ms. Gutterman responded that she is not concerned about the Cypress Street side. Ms. Stein agreed that the deck should remain at the current setback.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised application, provided the setback of the deck remains at eight feet, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9, 10, and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 263 S 22ND ST

Proposal: Construct rooftop addition and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Balijepalli Srinivas and Daiya Kavita

Applicant: Julie Scott, reku design

History: 1920; addition constructed and façade replaced, 2006

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rooftop addition and deck on this building. The building underwent substantial renovations in 2006 including an entirely new façade and a change in height from two stories to three stories. The earlier building was a circa 1920s garage for the building next door. The proposed addition is set back over 25 feet from the front and 15 feet from the rear. The deck in front of the addition is set back 10 feet from the front of the building.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Julie Scott represented the application.

Ms. Chantry distributed photographs showing visibility of a mockup. She explained that there was no vantage point where she was able to see the railing, and she was only able to see the front corner of the addition when viewing from a distance to the north. She explained that what the public sees of this building is a 2006 façade, and nothing of the former garage building that was considered to be contributing to the district. Ms. Scott provided additional photographs of the new façade. Ms. Gutterman asked if there is a way to slope or lower the visible corner of the addition. Ms. Scott explained that they have proposed approximately a nine-foot ceiling height. Mr. Cluver asked about the windows on the property line. Ms. Scott responded that the windows will be fire-rated. Mr. Cluver asked about the wood-finished metal siding. Ms. Scott provided samples, and noted that they initially wanted to use wood, but reconsidered owing to maintenance. Mr. Cluver suggested that the roof of the addition be lowered to decrease visibility. He noted that the glassy addition will be more visible at night. Ms. Scott responded that she is matching the other ceiling heights in the building, which are 9'-6". Mr. Cluver suggested that she think of the addition as more intimate. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the building has been so altered, and the addition is the same height at the building next door at its highest point. Mr. Cluver responded that he did not realize it was the same height, and that new information changes his previous suggestion. Ms. Gutterman commented that a glass railing is proposed. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that the public will not see it. Ms. Gutterman responded that she does not like glass railings, and asked if a metal railing was considered. Ms. Scott responded that they considered a cable railing. Mr. McCoubrey responded that a cable railing would be acceptable. Mr. Cluver suggested clarifying the drawings to show that the roof drainage stays on the property and will not drain onto the neighbor's roof.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the railing is not glass, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9, 10, and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 6901 CASTOR AVE

Proposal: Legalize and install signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Kelly Zheng

Applicant: Kelly Zheng, A Plus Realtors

History: 1955; Ott Camera; Allan A. Berkowitz, architect

Individual Designation: 7/8/2016

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize one flat wall sign that was installed without Historical Commission approval or a building permit, and to install a second matching sign on the side elevation of the building. The existing sign is, and proposed sign would be, adhered to the delicate, character-defining glass tiles of the building's façade.

The staff notes that the proposed signage is inappropriate for the building, but recommends that a channel letter neon sign would be more in keeping with the style of the building. Alternatively, the staff notes that the existing/proposed sign could be installed behind the glass in the front window.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Kelly Zheng represented the application.

Ms. Pentz asked if the hood over the door is part of the application as well. Ms. DiPasquale responded that it is not.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicant would be willing to relocate the sign to the interior of the window. Ms. Zheng responded that she would prefer the sign be on the exterior wall. She noted that she purchased the building in March 2016, and it became historical in May 2016, but opined that she was not notified. She stated that she was already renovating the property when she was told she had a violation because she did not apply for the Historical Commission's approval. Ms. Gutterman asked if that was true. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the Historical Commission staff notified the property owner in the same way it notifies all property owners regarding designation matters. Ms. DiPasquale noted that she did not know whether the previous property owners conveyed that information to Ms. Zheng or not. Ms. Zheng reiterated that she started doing work and then received a violation.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that it is a beautiful gem of a building, and it is difficult to approve a sign being stuck on the front of it. Ms. Stein noted that several modifications have been made, including the replacement of the second-story window and the little neon signs, and the addition of a canopy that is not complementary to the original design of the building. Ms. Zheng responded that she is stuck now because she did not know it was historic. Ms. Stein replied that

the Committee is not opposed to adding signage to the building, but it concerned with the means and methods for how the signage looks and is installed, and that it needs to be complementary to the historic building, which is now individually designated as historic. Ms. Stein reiterated that signage can be added, but the signage that has been installed is not complementary to the historic building. Ms. Stein noted that the applicant could use the sign that was fabricated and place it behind the glass of the first or second floor windows, but that it should not be mounted to the exterior of the building. Ms. Stein asked if Ms. Zheng would be willing to create a sign that is more in keeping with the original red neon channel letter signs in the same location, mounted to the steel canopy over the windows. Ms. Gutterman agreed, noting that one neon sign might read "A PLUS" and another might read "REALTORS," while the sign with the phone number and address might be installed behind the window. Ms. Gutterman noted that the whole text of the existing sign would not be appropriate for channel letters. Ms. Zheng clarified that she would not be able to put the whole sign into the neon on one wall. Ms. Gutterman agreed, noting that the phone number and address with the name into a sign would be too big for the building. Ms. Zheng asked if she could just use her logo, A Plus Realtors, and the Chinese lettering on the sign. Ms. Gutterman responded that that might work, and the rest of the information could be included on a sign in the window. Mr. Cluver suggested that Ms. Zheng could also apply vinyl lettering and numbers to the interior of the window. Mr. Cluver explained that what does or does not work will depend on how it looks. He noted that, for example, channel letters that are eight feet tall would not work. Ms. DiPasquale explained that the original signage was composed of individual letters as opposed to a neon box sign. Ms. Zheng asked whether she would have to make individual letters. Ms. Gutterman responded that the Committee is looking for individual letters.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the material of the canopy. Ms. Zheng responded that it is clear plastic. Ms. DiPasquale explained that there were other modifications made to the building, but that the staff is not sure exactly when they occurred relative to the submission of the nomination and the date that the Commission staff notified the property owner of the nomination. She noted that the staff of the Historical Commission did ask for a violation for the canopy and second-floor window replacement, in addition to the signage, but that the Department of Licenses & Inspections only issued a violation for the signage. Ms. Zheng reiterated that she bought the building in March and started the renovation then, but that the building was nominated in May. Mr. Cluver asked if the owner applied for a permit before May. Ms. Zheng responded that she called the City and was told that, if it was an interior renovation and change of the window, she did not need a permit. Mr. Cluver clarified that the signage was not permitted.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment. Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia noted that the Preservation Alliance nominated the building and is sympathetic to the timing and that there may have been a sale potentially in place, but corrected that they submitted the nomination in February 2016. He commented that he is not sure when notice was sent to the owner of record, and that it may have been sent to the former owner. He noted that the Alliance would second the staff's recommendation and encourage signage that mirrors or pays homage to the original neon signage. He also commented that there have been other changes, including the canopy and replacement of the second-floor windows. He noted that he is not sure what plans, if any, there are for the Ott sign, which projects up through the cornice and which is the building's most distinguishing characteristic. He opined that it is a lovely building and was appropriately designated, but that the Alliance also wants it to be a functional building and successful business for the owner. He offered the Alliance's assistance to the property owner.

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

ADDRESS: 6433 DREXEL RD

Proposal: Construct two-story, single-family house

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Simon & Cindy Hauger

Applicant: Simon Hauger

History: vacant

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Overbrook Farms Historic District, Contributing, under consideration

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story single-family home on a currently vacant lot. The Historical Commission's jurisdiction is limited to Review and Comment because the lot is an undeveloped site in a historic district. The proposed house is a simple Colonial, clad in horizontal vinyl siding, and featuring a gabled roof. The house is oriented sideways on the lot, with the primary entrance centered on the long west elevation. A porch with a standing-seam metal roof and French doors would face Drexel Road. The proposed windows are primarily four-over-one and six-over-one, but the material of the windows is unspecified.

STAFF COMMENT: The staff comments that the proposed construction is generally compatible with the Overbrook Farms Historic District in terms of massing, size, scale, and fenestration, but not materials. The staff notes that, pursuant to Standard 9, vinyl siding is inappropriate for a district in which the majority of houses are clad in stone or a combination of stone and stucco or stone and wood siding.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owners Simon and Cindy Hauger represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether the staff was concerned about the installation of solar panels on the roof. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff was not concerned about the solar panels, as this will be a new house. She explained that placing solar panels on a historic house might have an adverse effect on the perception of the historic house, but placing solar panels on a new house would not generally have an adverse effect on the historic district. She elaborated, stating that the issue is not that the public will see solar panels, but that the placement of solar panels or other mechanical equipment on a historic building might change the massing or spatial relationships of a historic building. This, however, will not be a historic building. The proposed solar panels will not change the public's perception of a historic resource.

Ms. Pentz noted that the drawings call for vinyl siding, but the cover letter talks about aluminum siding, and that the owners were supposed to be investigating other alternatives.

Ms. Stein expressed concern about the orientation of the house, though she acknowledged that she has not spent much time in Overbrook Farms. She conceded that it is a narrow lot, but noted that the photographs provided of neighboring properties all face the street. She opined that it is counterintuitive to the historic district not to have an obvious entrance on the front of the

house. Mr. Cluver replied that, while it is not the predominant typology, it is not unheard of in that area. He noted that he was the architect for a restoration on a side-facing Overbrook Farms houses. Ms. Stein suggested that the street-facing elevation should create a greater identity or focus for the house. Mr. Farnham explained that he lives in the sister development to Overbrook Farms, Pelham, and there are numerous Colonial Revival houses in Pelham with the main entrance facing the side, not the front. He noted that when he first moved there, he thought it was strange, but he has become accustomed to it because it is so prevalent. Mr. Cluver noted that that is common in Drexel Hill as well. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that, in order to avoid having people come up and knock on the porch door, the applicants may want to have some sort of method of indicating the front versus the side entrances.

Ms. Pentz asked the owners what their intention is regarding the exterior materials. Mr. Hauger responded that they have exchanged ideas with the builder and are getting quotes on additional material choices, but that the aluminum siding was just a default in the architectural drawings, and they are still trying to work through those details. He noted that they are planning to get a quote to do half stone on the street-facing and entrance sides of the house, and then finish the top portion of the building with a high-quality siding like a HardiePlank. He noted that they are also exploring the cost of stucco. Ms. Gutterman asked where the stone would end. Ms. Hauger responded that the intention is to explore having the first floor clad in stone. She noted that it is a matter of balancing what they can afford. Mr. Cluver commented that when one looks at partially cladding a building in stone, it is critical to look at the transitions and where they are occurring. He explained that one thing to watch out for is what happens frequently in new developments where builders will apply stone to the front façade, but the second it turns the corner, it switches to vinyl siding, and the stone looks paper-thin. He noted that he would love to see the applicants use a stone and stucco combination, but that they should pay attention to where those transitions are occurring so it does not have the thinness to it. Ms. Hauger replied that they would discuss those comments with their architect.

Mr. Cluver also suggested looking at the design of the porch. He noted that a porch is a wonderful addition to the street, but that the porch elements of the current design are all very thin; they appear to be 4x4 or 6x6 posts with no brackets. He explained that porches in Overbrook Farms tend to be more robust, with bigger decorative posts and they tend to be deeper. He noted that the proposed porch only appears to be around five feet deep, which the owners may find is not sufficiently deep to be functional.

Ms. Pentz questioned whether the solar panels would be the same slope as the roof. Mr. Hauger responded affirmatively. Ms. Pentz asked what that slope would be. Mr. Cluver responded that the drawings note a slope of 5.5 to 12. Ms. Pentz remarked that there is a note on the drawing saying to “consult on optimal slope.”

Mr. D'Alessandro opined that the roof slope in general is too shallow, and that the fascia piece does not appear large enough. He noted that the fascia is dimensioned at 6.75 inches, but a standard 1x8 inch board would be 7.5 inches. He opined that the roof slope really should be more like 7 than 5.5 to 12. He noted that the roof also needs more of an overhang to fit in with the area. He noted that a greater slope would also be better for drainage.

Mr. Cluver asked the applicants whether they had discussed their goals with their architect, and whether those goals were to be compatible with the neighborhood or differentiated from it. He suggested that they look to the forms of other houses in the neighborhood to see how their

proposed design fits. Mr. D'Alessandro reiterated that the soffits of the houses in the district are much heavier and the slopes of the roofs much greater. Mr. Cluver noted that Overbrook Farms has some incredible homes that are tough to compete with, and that a building that looks like it was designed for a new development will not look as strong in this neighborhood. He expressed his hope that the owners expectations would be met in terms of how their house would fit into the neighborhood.

Mr. Cluver opined that the placement of the square bathroom window over the entrance was odd in that its head did not align with the other windows. Ms. Hauger responded that that was the architect's preference, though she had wanted all of the windows aligned. She noted that there was no other specific reason for the positioning. Mr. Cluver suggested that she ask about the height of the top of the window. He noted that he has also undertaken designs where the full-height window is installed, but the bottom pane of glass is frosted or treated as a solid panel so it looks like the other windows but there is still privacy.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the material of the windows and whether they were vinyl or vinyl-clad. Mr. Hauger responded that they got a quote for triple-pane, high-efficiency vinyl windows. Ms. DiPasquale asked whether the muntins would be sandwiched between the glass panes or applied to the exterior. Ms. Hauger responded that they would be between the glass panes. Mr. Cluver replied that, when one looks at Overbrook Farms, the muntins are exposed on the outside, and the windows with the grilles between the glass panes have a much different look to them. Ms. Gutterman agreed, noting that there are no shadow lines. Mr. Cluver noted that it is possible to get fiberglass windows from Marvin and other manufacturers that have the muntins on the exterior to keep the historic look, if that is important to the owners. Mr. D'Alessandro opined that the owners will want to be careful with their windows, especially since this will be their home. He noted that some windows that are vinyl and have snap-on grilles are not high-quality. He suggested that, in order to be cost effective in the long run, the windows are a good place to focus money and attention. After searching through his email, Mr. Hauger noted that the company they had enlisted to provide windows is WASCO. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that that is a good window company.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether the Committee should make a motion in addition to the comments made throughout the review. Ms. DiPasquale responded that they could make a motion like that of the staff comment if they would like to.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented recommend that the proposed construction is generally compatible with the Overbrook Farms Historic District in terms of massing, size, scale, fenestration, but not materials for the exterior of the building and/or the windows. The Architectural Committee made the following suggestions:

- no vinyl siding is used;
- the detailing of the the exterior with stone and stucco or stone and HardiePlank is explored, and, regardless of the cladding, a minimum 30-inch stone base is used;
- the slope of the roof, the depth of the soffit/eaves, and the height of the fascia board are all increased; and,
- the depth of the porch and the thickness of its supporting members are increased.

ADDRESS: 1914-16 RITTENHOUSE SQ

Proposal: Widen historic chimney; legalize installation of mechanical equipment

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Barton & Jil Blatstein

Applicant: Evan Litvin, Atrium Design Group

History: 1859; Alfred M. Collins House; alterations and additions, 1957

Individual Designation: 4/28/1970

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of mechanical equipment on the roof of this building at the southwest corner of Rittenhouse Square. The building has a mansard roof. The equipment, air conditioning condensers and a dehumidifier, are visible when viewing the front façade of the building. The applicant also seeks to legalize the removal of a historic chimney and proposes its rebuilding in a wider format to partially screen the mechanical equipment.

The staff suggests that, rather than reconstructing a missing chimney in a wider format to block views of the equipment, the mechanical equipment should be relocated to reduce its visibility from the public right-of-way or, if relocation is impossible, should be screened.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Carl Primavera and architects Evan Litvin and Shimi Zakin represented the application.

Mr. Baron provided a photograph showing the visibility of the mechanical equipment and exhaust vents from the north, on 19th Street. Mr. Primavera distributed additional photographs. He agreed that it is visible from a distance up 19th Street, even though it is set back very far from the front of the building. He stated that the dehumidifier cannot be relocated. Mr. Litvin stated that the plan is to reconstruct the chimney, but widen it to screen the equipment. Ms. Gutterman doubted that it would screen the mechanical equipment. Mr. Litvin stated that the smaller air conditioning units will be moved. Mr. Baron asked where the small units will be relocated. Mr. Litvin responded that they will be moved to the south of the dehumidifier. Mr. Zakin commented that they could also screen the dehumidifier with frosted glass or a mirror or light sheet metal. Ms. Pentz asked if the chimney had been demolished. Mr. Litvin confirmed that it had been demolished during the renovation of the building. Mr. Baron asked if the vents now seen at the roofline would be encapsulated in the rebuilt chimney. Mr. Litvin responded that they would be. Mr. Cluver asked if the caps will protrude from the top of the chimney. Mr. Baron commented that the historically-appropriate manner would be to build up the corners of the chimney and place a cap on it. Mr. Cluver asked why the chimney was demolished. Mr. Zakin responded that it was removed because it was no longer supported internally. Mr. Baron noted that the approved plans called for retaining the chimney. Ms. Gutterman asked if the new chimney would be reoriented east/west to cover the vents. Mr. Zakin responded that it would be oriented north/south.

Ms. Stein commented that the elephant in the room is that, in this large building of approximately 20,000 square feet, the dehumidifier ended up in a place that is visible from Rittenhouse Square, one of the City's jewels. She asked about relocating it to the south. Mr.

Primavera stated that it is not visible from Rittenhouse Square, but rather it is visible from 19th Street. He assured her that none of the mechanical equipment is or will be visible from Rittenhouse Square. He stated that they would discuss why it cannot be relocated. Ms. Stein opined that, if the applicant had submitted a design to the Committee with a visible deck or mechanical equipment when the larger project was reviewed, the Committee would have recommended denial. Mr. Primavera stated that the dehumidifier is approximately 20 feet back on the roof from the front facade. He commented that typically they would have built a mock-up to determine a good location for the mechanical equipment, but the contractor believed that it was so far back that it would not be visible. Ms. Gutterman commented that the Committee often stipulates that mechanical equipment should not be visible from the public right-of-way. She opined that the chimney should not be widened and a glass screen should not be installed. Mr. Zakin recommended a square perforated metal screen. Ms. Gutterman asked about painting the equipment grey. Mr. McCoubrey suggested a flat screen rather than a louvered screen. Mr. Zakin proposed to rebuild the chimney as a foreground element. He suggested they could submit details to the staff and construct a mockup for the staff to review. Ms. Stein commented that the dehumidifier looks further forward in the photograph than it is drawn on the roof plan. She commented that it looks to be approximately 10 feet behind the chimney in the plan, but in the photograph it looks to be only a few feet. Ms. Gutterman commented that it looks like the chimney has moved backward, and that perhaps the chimney is located incorrectly rather than the dehumidifier. The Committee members agreed that the chimney must go back to where it was historically. Mr. Litvin stated that the chimney and vents have not moved. The chimney stack was used as a chase for the vents and could not possibly have been relocated. It would be physically impossible to relocate it. He stated that the Committee members were mistaken if they believe that the chimney has been moved. The drawing may be incorrect. Mr. Primavera looked at the photograph and suggested that they resurvey and revise the drawings to make it right. Mr. Baron asked if the vents will be reoriented into the chimney. Ms. Gutterman stated that the chimney should be rebuilt according to the approved plans, in its original size and location. She commented that visibility will not be able to be determined until the historic chimney is rebuilt.

Mr. Primavera withdrew the application and stated that he would submit a revised proposal.

ADDRESS: 2122 WALLACE ST

Proposal: Construct addition, pilot house, and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Wallace Street Land Trust

Applicant: Bei Ou

History: 1855

Individual Designation: 2/7/1974

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to add a cantilevered rear addition and deck, both of which would not be visible from the public right-of-way. A pilot house would be constructed on the main block of the house and would be visible from Wallace Street.

The staff suggests that the pilot house should be redesigned or relocated to minimize its visibility from the public right-of-way.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 JULY 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the pilot house, but approval of all other aspects of the application, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Kelly Ennis and Bei Ou represented the application.

Ms. Stein asked about the cantilevered addition and the Commission's jurisdiction. She opined that the addition will prevent light and air from reaching the shared side yard. Mr. Baron responded that the Commission has jurisdiction over the exterior of the building and has commented on the widening of rear ells in previous cases. He commented that this application proposes widening the ell at top of the building rather than at the lower stories, which is more typical. Mr. Cluver asked about the photograph of the mock-up with the pole. Mr. Baron explained that the pole is the southernmost point of the stairhouse. The remainder is closer and slopes down toward the street. The structure is five feet deep at its highest point. He opined that, unfortunately it is on the visible side of the building. Ms. Ennis responded that they would be open to moving it, but it stacks on top of other stairs, and she is trying to be efficient with her use of interior space. Ms. Gutterman asked if the pilot house could have a greater slope to minimize visibility. Ms. Ennis responded that it is currently designed with 6'-8" of headroom, which is the smallest possible for the landing. Mr. Baron asked about reaching the deck via a rear porch and spiral stair to avoid intruding on floor space. Ms. Gutterman commented that the cantilever really reduces the light and air to all of the rooms below. Ms. Ennis commented that it is fairly dark in that area now, even without a cantilever. Ms. Gutterman agreed, but noted that it will be even darker after the cantilever is built. She also commented on the small windows. Mr. Cluver asked how far back from the front façade the pilot house would start. Ms. Ennis responded approximately 18 feet. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the height of the addition. Ms. Ennis responded that it will be kept below the existing roof. The addition steps down from the main block. The ceiling will be about nine feet in height. Mr. D'Alessandro recommended a spiral stair and redesigned access to the deck. Mr. Cluver commented that it is not the Committee's job to redesign the deficient application. Ms. Stein returned to the overbuilding of the third-floor addition. She stated that she is opposed to the cantilever. Mr. McCoubrey agreed, but suggested a bay to regain space. He commented that a rear ell is a character-defining feature, and noted that the house next door also has a rear ell, which creates a shared light court. Mr. Baron commented that the eight-foot light court space would become a four-foot space.

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

Ms. Ennis withdrew her application and stated that she would submit a revised application at a later date. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that she should include building sections in her revised application.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 JULY 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

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

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

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

6.15.a.2-3: Murals shall not be placed directly upon historic fabric.

6.15.a.3: Murals shall not be placed in a manner that obscures historic fabric.