

**THE MINUTES OF THE 625TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 2014
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman Jr., chair
Richardson Dilworth, Ph.D.
Ralph DiPietro, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Anuj Gupta, Esq.
Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP
Rosalie Leonard, Esq., Office of City Council President
Melissa Long, Office of Housing & Community Development
John Mattioni, Esq.
Thomas McDade, Department of Public Property
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
R. David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Robert Thomas, AIA
Betty Turner, M.A.

Jonathan E. Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Kim Broadbent, Historic Preservation Planner I
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

Torey Howarth, The Howarth Co.
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Jeffrey Hayes, Jeffrey Hayes Architect
Jim McGillin, McGillin Architecture
Jason Birl, Ambit Architecture
Lynn Alpert, Richard Grubb & Associates
Frank Graff
Jamie Unkefer, Digsau
Nick Musser, Digsau
Kathy Dowdell
Julia Griffith, University of Pennsylvania
Madeleine Helmer, University of Pennsylvania
Sang Bae, University of Pennsylvania
Amy Lambert, University of Pennsylvania
Brooke Wiczorek, University of Pennsylvania
Yoo Choi, University of Pennsylvania
Sarah Blitzer, University of Pennsylvania
R. Lindsey Uhl, University of Pennsylvania
Eryn Boyce, University of Pennsylvania
Rich Smith, University of Pennsylvania
David Hollenberg, University of Pennsylvania

Andrew Cushing, University of Pennsylvania
Jess Neubelt, University of Pennsylvania
Audrey von Ahrens, University of Pennsylvania
Sanjana Muthe, University of Pennsylvania

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman, the chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Dilworth, DiPietro, Gupta, Hawkins, Leonard, Long, Mattioni, McDade, Merriman, Schaaf, Thomas, and Turner joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 624TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Leonard moved to adopt the minutes of the 624th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 8 August 2014. Mr. Gupta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 AUGUST 2014

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included applications for the following addresses: 1606 Chestnut Street, 2200-04 E. Norris Street, 2214 Locust Street, 2033 Wallace Street, and 2100 N. 49th Street. Mr. Sherman asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments. Mr. Sherman asked if the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for the applications for 1606 Chestnut Street, 2200-04 E. Norris Street, 2214 Locust Street, 2033 Wallace Street, and 2100 N. 49th Street. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 1606 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Alter storefront

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Estate of Howard Winig & Susan Lewin

Applicant: Jason Winig, HW & Associates Realty Corp

History: 1890; Thackara Manufacturing, Isaac S. Miller Store, Claflin Shoe Store; Albert W. Dilks, architect

Individual Designation: 9/12/1990

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, especially the placement of the door within the storefront, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

OVERVIEW: The application proposes to alter the facade of the mixed-use building at 1606 Chestnut Street.

At the ground floor, the front façade is comprised of a storefront window at the right and a recessed, open vestibule with doors to the ground-floor retail space and upper-floor residential space at the left. The application proposes to insert a door in the center of the storefront to provide a direct entrance to the retail space. Although the retail space was originally accessed through the side door in the vestibule, it did have a doorway in this location in the 1990s at the time of designation. The application also seeks to lower the internal floor to make the entrance accessible. The application also proposes the glazing of the open vestibule. The owner explains that people often use this recessed, open vestibule for illicit activities, making it unsafe and unsanitary for the residents. The application proposes restoring finials at the roofline, based on the historic photographs.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 2200-04 E NORRIS ST

Project: Construct pilot house and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: TVG 2200 Norris Street LLC

Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Architects

History: 1860; Friendship Fire Company

Individual Designation: 5/26/1964

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the penthouse is clad in grey metal panels, with the staff to review a mock-up to ensure that the deck with railing is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, pursuant to Standard 9 and Roofs Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to enlarge a rooftop penthouse to allow an elevator and stair to run to the roof, construct a roof deck, and install rooftop mechanical equipment. The staff has already approved a permit application to restore the facades of this historic firehouse. To

ensure that the deck is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, the staff should review a mock-up of the deck; the location of the deck railing should be adjusted if necessary to reduce visibility.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 2214 LOCUST ST

Project: Construct third-story addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Liza Herzog & Paul Curci

Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Architects

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, contingent upon one of the following, with the staff to review details:

1. the cornice of the addition aligns with or is below the cornice of the existing building; or,
2. the new roof drops and engages with the existing cornice.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a third-story addition over the existing two-story rear ell of a mid-block row house. The addition would be set back nearly 23 feet from the rear façade of the existing ell and nearly 50 feet from Latimer Street, the rear service alley. Owing to limited headroom, the proposed addition would extend above the rear cornice of the three-story main block and onto the rear slope of the main roof. The ell of the neighboring house to the west, with which the subject property shares a party wall, is three stories in height throughout and is longer than the ell of the subject property. The addition would be minimally visible from the east along Latimer Street, a service alley. It would not be visible from Locust Street.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 304 CHERRY ST

Project: Construct multi-family dwelling

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Kenneth Lesko

Applicant: Torey Howarth, The Howarth Company LLC

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/12/2003

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee voted to concur with the staff's comments supplemented with the comments offered during the review and the assertion that the design of the building should be refined so that it is compatible with the streetscape and the historic district.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a five-story multi-family building on a parking lot in the Old City Historic District. The lot was vacant at the time of the district designation, is

therefore an “undeveloped site,” and the Historical Commission’s jurisdiction is limited to “review and comment.” The narrow lot fronts on Cherry Street; a narrow, private alley runs along its eastern boundary to an open courtyard at the rear. The proposed building would have a lobby and parking on the ground floor and residential units above. The lobby and parking would be accessed from the private alley. A pilot house on the roof would provide access to a roof deck. The architectural plans lack annotations regarding exterior materials, but they appear to depict brick facades.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Historical Commission. Developer Torey Howarth represented the application.

Mr. Howarth explained that he has changed architects for this project since submitting the initial application. Stephen Maffei of Abitare Design Studio will now be the architect for the project. He noted that the design presented to the Architectural Committee has not changed, but that he hopes to have a redesigned project within a week, which he will present to the Old City District. He asked if this review by the Historical Commission could be used to discuss bays over the alley and to obtain additional feedback on an overall design.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the drawings are nothing more than massing drawings, lacking the level of detail that is typical of these types of applications. She suggested that the applicant submit a new application with the revised plans rather than discussing it at this time.

Mr. Sherman asked for clarification on the meeting date with the Old City District. Mr. Howarth responded that the meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, 17 September, and the new design will be completed by that time. Ms. Hawkins confirmed that the Architectural Committee provided comments on the initial design, but observed that there will be a new design. She commented that there is a lack of clarity in regards to review and comment applications and the jurisdiction that the Commission holds. She stated that it is her understanding that the Architectural Committee will review an application again if a design substantially changes from the first time it is reviewed.

Mr. Howarth asked for direction regarding the building envelope and bays, and stated that he will seek to incorporate that direction into the design that will be presented to the Old City District. He added that the new design will be four stories instead of the five as is currently shown.

Mr. Sherman asked the Commission to provide basic guidance as to how a building like this is reviewed within the context of the historic district. He suggested that Mr. Howarth then incorporate that guidance into the new design, so that the next review by the Architectural Committee is predictable. Mr. Howarth asked for the date of the next Architectural Committee meeting. Ms. Hawkins responded that the meetings are held on one of the last Tuesdays of every month. Mr. Farnham commented that the submission deadline for the next meeting has already passed, but that the deadline could be waived up until Monday, 15 September, when the Historical Commission staff needs the revised drawings in hand to allow time for public review and time to distribute materials to the Architectural Committee.

Mr. Farnham stated that this application raises an interesting and complicated question, in that the Historical Commission only has review and comment authority over this application because it is an undeveloped site within a historic district. He elaborated that the question is: What obligation does a developer or property owner have to present a finalized design to the

Commission, if the Commission in fact has no real authority to approve or deny the design, but only the authority to require an opportunity to comment on those? For this specific project, this gray area becomes even more complicated if the building is extended out over Loxley Court, the private alley. The Commission in the past has considered alleyways and streets, even if private, to be developed in the legal sense, meaning that the Commission's jurisdiction may jump from review and comment to full jurisdiction if this building were to extend out over the alley. He concluded that the Commission needs to make some decisions about the extent of its authority.

Mr. Sherman asked if this project triggers a review by the Civic Design Review Committee. Mr. Howarth responded that it does not trigger that particular review.

Mr. Dilworth asked if the new building will be considered a contributing resource to the district upon its completion. Mr. Farnham responded that there is no rule in the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations that dictates how the Commission treats new construction once it is constructed, but the assumption is that it is treated as non-contributing to the district. Oddly then, the Commission has no real jurisdiction over the construction of building on an undeveloped site, but, arguably, full jurisdiction over the new building after it is erected.

Ms. Hawkins offered the following suggestion: Presuming it is too late to get on the agenda of the next Architectural Committee meeting, and presuming the drawings will change next week based on the meeting with the Old City District, then the Commission could provide comments today and require that the application be reviewed by the Architectural Committee one additional time for final review at the October 2014 meeting. It would not be sent back to the full Commission, resulting in less of a delay to the applicant. Mr. Howarth responded that he is currently seeking a zoning variance, and that Ms. Hawkins' suggestion will not work with his schedule. He added that the parcel is currently under contract to purchase, with a closing date of 10 October, and he needs a final zoning answer by that date. He noted that, if the Historical Commission review process does not hold up the zoning process, then Ms. Hawkins' suggestion can work. Mr. Sherman responded that the Historical Commission review process should not hold up the zoning process.

Ms. Hawkins suggested that the Architectural Committee review the revised elevations, but noted that that the addition of projecting bays may complicate matters. Mr. Howarth responded that he will likely propose two bays that project three feet out from the building and are ten feet wide. He noted that he initially presented a design to Mr. Baron that included a four-foot cantilever over the alley, but the revised design will likely have two bays instead of that cantilever. He added that the current drawings are "one hundred percent not reflective of where the project will be."

Several Commission members offered opinions on the review and comment process. Mr. Thomas opined that the developer has "no obligation to listen to anything" the Commission says. He elaborated that, in terms of the process, there is nothing the Commission can say or do that will prevent the developer from erecting whatever can be approved by those entities that do have full review authority. He added that the review and comment process, despite the lack of authority, typically results in better buildings when architects and developers respect the process and take the feedback from the Commission into account when designing a building. It may not increase the cost of the project but may increase its value. He concluded that the overall design of the building can be improved by bringing the project back to the Commission for a review of the revised design. Mr. Schaaf added that the Planning Commission's Civic Design Review is advisory, similar to the review and comment process, and they find that most

developers and owners do want to cooperate with the process and are anxious to hear from experts in order to improve a project.

Mr. Farnham clarified that the only way the Historical Commission could adversely impact the developer's schedule and impact the zoning review process would be to decide at some point that it has full jurisdiction over this project. That would give the Commission the authority to deny the application. Alternatively, if the Commission were to decide today that it has review and comment jurisdiction only, even if bays are added onto the building that project over the alley, then any subsequent review would be advisory only and cannot impact the developer's schedule. He concluded that the real question for the Commission to answer is whether it has review and comment authority or full authority at this site. If it only has review and comment authority, then this developer is free to move forward and is also free to come back and obtain the advice of the Commission in the future.

Mr. Baron voiced concern about the potential of building on the alley. He suggested that the Commission should retain control if the bays were to evolve into actually building on the historic alley.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to find that the Historical Commission's jurisdiction is limited to review and comment provided there are no bays on the east facade below the second-floor level, and to encourage the applicant to submit a new application for comment when the design is fully developed. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 4 BOATHOUSE ROW

Project: Install lift and ramp

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Pennsylvania Barge Club

Applicant: Jeff McGinnis, Pennsylvania Center for Adapted Sports

History: 1892; Pennsylvania Barge Club; Louis Hickman, architect; second floor added by C.E. Schermerhorn, 1912

Individual Designation: 1/5/1984

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application, with the staff to review details, provided the following suggestions are considered:

1. moving the chair lift back from the front edge of the porch;
2. turning the ramp on the porch 90 degrees to point towards the chair lift; and,
3. selecting a dark, neutral tone for the chair lift so that it blends with the building.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a porch chair lift and ramp for the Pennsylvania Center for Adapted Sports, located at 4 Boathouse Row. The project is intended to make the building accessible. The chair lift will be located on the side of the porch and will require the removal of a small section of non-historic wrought-iron fence. The ramp will be located at the front entrance on the porch and will have wood benches at its sides that will serve as railings.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect James McGillin represented the application.

Mr. McGillin stated that he had considered all of the suggestions provided by the Architectural Committee, but that each suggestion was not feasible. Regarding the suggestion to move the chair lift back from the front edge of the porch, Mr. McGillin stated that there are several reasons why this suggestion cannot be accommodated. First, there is a change in grade sloping towards the river, which means that a taller tower would need to be installed because of this change, which would result in the unit being more visible owing to the increase in height. Second, there are long boats on boat racks in the spot to which the chair lift would be moved that cannot be relocated. Third, there is an existing window in the side of the porch that the chairlift would block if it were moved closer to the rear of the porch. Regarding the suggestion to turn the ramp on the porch 90 degrees, Mr. McGillin stated that there is one step projecting from the doorway that is less than six inches in height. Reorienting the ramp would actually create a step that is not allowed by the International Building Code. Regarding the suggestion to select a dark, neutral tone for the chair lift, Mr. McGillin stated that the proposed beige color is the standard color of the chair lift. Selecting a custom color would result in a \$1,000 increase in cost to this non-profit organization and a delay of 11 weeks to the delivery schedule. He noted that the standard beige is very similar to the porch concrete color as well as the mortar.

Mr. Thomas questioned whether the Commission should still push for the chairlift to be dark gray. Mr. McGillin passed around a photograph showing the proposed beige color of the chairlift, which allowed the Commission to see that the proposed unit is not enclosed. Mr. Thomas responded that the unit is smaller than he originally believed it to be because it is not enclosed on all sides. He suggested that the staff review color samples of the chairlift. Mr. Sherman asked about reversibility of the project. Mr. McGillin responded that the only attachments are to the concrete of the porch.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to approve the application, with the staff to review details including a color sample of the chair lift in field, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2119 SPRUCE ST

Project: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Leslie Puchowitz and Susan Puchowitz

Applicant: Leslie Puchowitz

History: 1860; metal bays added, 1900

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Erin Coté, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a brick pier is placed between the person door and the garage door, the PVC trim is painted a light color, and the brick veneer matches the existing brick, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a three-story rear stair-tower addition, which was constructed around 1916 and is not original to the building, and construct a four-story addition. The addition would have a person door and a garage at the first floor, a bay window at the second floor. On the third floor, the addition would step back and have a roof deck. The proposed materials are brick veneer, PVC trim, and cement board. This application also

proposes to cut a window for a new door on Van Pelt Street in the original portion of the building. The staff contends that the addition should be clad in real brick, not a veneer, and should be trimmed with a more appropriate material for a street façade, not PVC.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Jason Birl represented the application.

Ms. Coté stated that the design was updated and copies of the revised architectural drawings distributed to the Commissioners. Ms. Hawkins stated that she reviewed the revised drawings and concluded that Architectural Committee's comments have been incorporated into the proposal.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application presented at the Historical Commission meeting of 12 September 2014, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 21 SUMMIT ST

Project: Construct two-story front entrance porch

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Bill & Jane Farran

Applicant: Jeffery Hayes, Jeffery Hayes Architect

History: 1857; Samuel Austin, original owner; alterations and additions in 1896, 1900, 1901, 1922, 1958

Individual Designation: 8/2/1973

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Erin Coté, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposed porch, but approval of a reconstructed Queen Anne porch, a porch based on the design of the historic porch at 25 Summit Street, or a compatible, two-story porch as discussed during the review, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove a non-historic metal hood and stone steps at the front façade of this Italianate house and replace them with a two-story porch. The appearance of the original entrance is unknown; the staff was unable to locate a photograph or rendering of this building as originally constructed. However, scars in the masonry indicate that there was likely a two-story porch on the house at one time. A photograph of the now demolished 25 Summit Street was located. There are several similarities between the two buildings. Given the scars found on 21 Summit Street and the size and placement of the second-floor central window, the staff believes that the entrance to 21 Summit Street looked very much like the two-story portico entrance that stood at 25 Summit Street. An undated but early photograph of 21 Summit shows that a one-story Queen Anne Style porch was added to the front façade and a Queen Anne Style window was installed in the second-floor center window. The Queen Anne porch likely replaced the original two-story Italianate porch. According to a zoning permit, the Queen Anne porch was removed in 1958. The rebuilding of the one-story Queen Anne porch would satisfy the Standards.

As originally proposed, the new porch would have paired columns at the first floor, single columns at the second floor, a balcony at the second floor, and a standing-seam metal gable roof. The Queen Anne style window at the second floor would be removed and the opening

enlarged for French doors to access the balcony of the new porch. The new porch roof would align with the scars in the masonry, which is assumed to be the roofline of the original porch.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Côté presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Jeffrey Hayes represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins thanked Mr. Hayes for considering and incorporating the Architectural Committee's suggestions. She stated that the revised drawings do indeed reflect the comments of the Committee. Mr. Hayes stated that the process, although a little rocky, was very successful. He stated that appreciated the feedback and support he received from the Architectural Committee and is happy with the outcome.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the revised application presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting on 12 September 2014, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2033 WALLACE ST

Project: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Francis Graff

Applicant: Francis Graff

History: 1862

Individual Designation: 7/6/1972

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

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reconstruct the rear and side walls of the rear ell at the second and third floors, as previously approved by the staff, but to expand the first floor by approximately six feet and install new bi-fold doors with sidelites. The new doors would open onto a new brick patio, elevated approximately two and a half feet above grade. The proposed addition would not be visible from the public right of way along North Street, as there is an existing solid garage door and fence along the rear of the property.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADDRESS: 201 S 18TH ST

Project: Alter window openings, install green roof

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rittenhouse Clardige LP

Applicant: Robert Gilberg, Kaiserman Company

History: 1955; Rittenhouse Claridge; Samuel O'Shiver, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the removal of existing ribbon windows, the cutting down of the masonry below the windows, and the installation of a new glazing system at the second floor of the building above the main entrance to the apartment lobby on 18th Street. The entrance canopy below the windows to be altered obscures views of the windows; the staff conducted a site visit and determined that the alteration would not be visible when close to the building, but that the upper sections of the windows in question including the meeting rails and mullions are visible on the opposite side of 18th Street, west on Walnut Street, and within Rittenhouse Square. The new glazing system would include the vertical but not horizontal mullions of the original windows. The application also proposes the installation of a green roof in place of the gravel ballast on the flat roof of the entrance canopy to the apartment lobby. The new green roof system would require additional structural reinforcement along one beam within the below-grade garage.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architects Jamie Unkefer and Nick Musser represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins summarized the Architectural Committee discussion. She reported that the Committee reviewed the level of visibility of the proposed alterations, as well as the architectural vocabulary of the building, which is notable for its ribbon windows. The Architectural Committee, she explained, had a split opinion, with some members feeling that any intervention involving the dropping of the sills was inappropriate, others who thought only a portion of windows should be dropped, and others who approved of the dropping but felt that keeping the horizontal meeting rail/mullion was the important. She also observed that dropping the sills poses problems at the corners of the building where the windows and sill on two facades meet.

Mr. Sherman questioned whether the driving purpose of this alteration was to create additional outdoor space on the roof of the lobby. Mr. Unkefer responded that, no, the loads associated with an accessible roof would be too great to be structurally supported easily. The purpose instead, he noted, was to provide attractive views of a new green roof and of Rittenhouse Square from the interior of the building. The roof would not be accessible. The building, he continued, has not been updated significantly since 1955, and, in order to be competitive to residents, his client, the Rittenhouse Claridge, wants to enhance the second-floor amenity space to be comparable to the competition. Part of this enhancement involves improving the aesthetics of the ballast lobby roof with the installation of a green roof, which also improve views of Rittenhouse Square.

Mr. Unkefer noted that, as architects, they appreciate the strength of the ribbon windows, and would not propose to alter them if it were not for the fact that the benefit to their client outweighs the costs, particularly given the lack of visibility of the sills from the public right-of-way.

Ms. Hawkins commented that the Architectural Committee did not voice any objections to the idea of a green roof on top of the lobby. The two contested items, she noted, were the dropping of the sill, and the removal of the horizontal meeting rail/mullion element from the length of the façade. There was talk, she said, of maintaining the horizontal element while dropping the sills. One of the concerns raised by the applicant, she continued, was that the horizontal is located at eye level for the average person inside of the building. Ms. Hawkins commented that she did not consider the obstruction of views by the horizontal member to be a sufficient justification for altering the building. Mr. Unkefer commented that it was an unfortunate aspect of all floors of the building; the horizontal is right at eye level for the average person.

Mr. Sherman commented that the horizontal band is visible from the far side of the street and from Rittenhouse Square, but asked if the sills were visible from anywhere. Ms. Hawkins replied that one has to be far away to see the sills, but that the meeting rail/mullion system tying the windows together is visible from a lesser distance. Mr. Sherman opined that he was less concerned about the dropping of the sills than the retention of the cadence of the window grid pattern that is used throughout the building.

Mr. Unkefer commented that, as a compromise, his clients might be willing to retain the horizontal element of the windows, if they can drop the sills. Mr. Unkefer noted that the ground floor has been heavily altered throughout the years to accommodate the commercial needs of the tenants; the apartment complex has been unaltered, but must be updated to remain competitive. Mr. Thomas responded that the Commission understands that the financial health of the building is part of its preservation, and that, although he did not know the exact dates of the alterations to the ground floor, he was certain that some of the modifications occurred prior to designation. Now that the property is designated, he continued, it is important to ensure that changes meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He agreed that lowering the sills may make a significant difference to way in which occupants experience the building, if the alterations are done correctly. He noted that the three items in question here are the lowering of the sill, the junctions of the altered and unaltered windows and sills at the corners, and retention or removal of the horizontal meeting rail/mullion elements. He continued to note that the meeting rails/mullions for this building are not particularly wide, but the retention of that band is important to the character of the building. He opined that lowering the sill is not adverse in his mind, but that he contended that several windows at each end of the façade should retain their current sill heights, so that the transition at the corners is more elegant.

Mr. Sherman opened the floor to public comment, but none was offered.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the application, provided that the horizontal mullion level and vertical mullion alignment are maintained, and that the sills are retained for four windows in from the corners at both ends, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2100 N 49TH ST

Project: Construct two-story addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Kearsley Equities LP

Applicant: Bobby H. Fike, Noelker & Hull Associates

History: 1856; Kearsley House/Christ Church Hospital; John M. Gries, architect; alterations by George Appleton Robbins, 1933

Individual Designation: 1/7/1982

District Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a new structure on the campus of the historic Christ Church Hospital, now the Kearsley Rehabilitation Center. The new building would be constructed on a site where a non-historic structure stood, but was demolished in 2010 with the approval of the Historical Commission. The site is off to the side of the historic building and the new structure would not obstruct views of the historic building. The new building would feature an approximately 24,000 square foot primary level with a 10,000 square foot “walk out” lower level opening to the rear of the site. The new structure would not attach to the historic Christ Church building, but would connect to existing additions constructed in 1981 and 1995. The structure would have a gable roof, and would feature several gable fronts, reminiscent of the shape of the historic Christ Church building. Additional information about exterior materials should be provided.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 9:57 a.m., Mr. Sherman moved to adjourn. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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