

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

**TUESDAY, 27 AUGUST 2013
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP, chair
Nan Gutterman
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP
Rudy D'Alessandro
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Suzanne Pentz
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III

ALSO PRESENT

Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance
Robert Powers, Powers & Co.
Kevin McMahon, Powers & Co.
Leo Addimando, Alterra Properties
Sergio Coscia, Coscia Moos Architecture
Adam Jeckel, Coscia Moos Architecture
Joe Schiavo
Jerald Goodman, Esq., Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP
Brendon Ardietta, Esq., Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP
Joseph Van Bernum, Overbrook School for the Blind
Dan Jalboot, Daley & Jalboot Architects
Jeff Hawver, Studio Agoos Lovera
Michael Koep, Greythorne Development
Michael Pentz, Seiler & Drury Architects
Doug Seiler, Seiler & Drury Architects
John McDevitt, Please Touch Museum
Theresa Shephard, Shephard Restoration Engineering, Inc.
Phillip Scott, KSK Architects
Teresa Isabella
Lawrence Meehan, Hopkinson House Owners' Association
Judith Forte, Hopkinson House Owners' Association
V. Paul Coyne, Hopkinson House Owners' Association
Joel Frisch

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 247, 249, 251, 253, 255, 257, 259 MARKET ST, 3-05 N 03RD ST

Project: Renovate, reconstruct, demolish, and construct buildings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Marvin D. Ginsberg; David L. Pransky; Faye Carol Lingerie, Inc.; 247MGATE LLC

Applicant: Adam Jeckel, Coscia Moos Architecture, LLC

History: see staff overview

Individual Designation: see staff overview

District Designation: see staff overview

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate, construct, reconstruct, and consolidate a series of buildings at the northeast corner of 3rd and Markets Streets for a mixed-use commercial and residential development. These buildings, commonly known as the Shirt Corner, have been vacant for several years and are in poor condition, but are very important elements of the streetscape in this area.

The construction dates and designation histories of the various buildings included in this site are summarized below:

- 247 Market Street: mid twentieth century at front and c. 1830 at rear; Non-Contributing in Old City Historic District, 2003
- 249 Market Street: mid twentieth century; Non-Contributing in Old City Historic District, 2003
- 251 Market Street: c. 1830; individually designated, 1976, Contributing to Old City Historic District, 2003
- 253 Market Street: c. 1830; individually designated, 1976, Contributing to Old City Historic District, 2003
- 255 Market Street: c. 1830; individually designated, 1976, Contributing to Old City Historic District, 2003
- 257 Market Street: c. 1830; individually designated, 1976, Contributing to Old City Historic District, 2003
- 259 Market Street: c. 1830, Contributing to Old City Historic District, 2003
- 3-05 N. 3rd Street: c. 1915; Non-Contributing in Old City Historic District, 2003

The two-story building at 259 Market Street, at the corner, would be reconstructed in its historic four-story form using evidence from an historic photograph and a commercial panorama of N. 3rd Street. Historic fabric from the existing building such as lintels would be salvaged wherever possible. The buildings at 251, 253, 255, and 257 Market Street would be restored. The three Non-contributing buildings would be demolished and new buildings constructed in their places. All buildings would be connected internally. A single large commercial space would occupy the entire first floor of the complex and would be entered at the corner of 3rd and Market. The upper floors would house residential units. The lobby for the residential units would be located on 3rd Street. The new buildings at 247 and 249 Market Street would be four stories in height, faced in red brick on Market Street and stucco on Church Street, and fenestrated with punched vertical

openings. Above the first floor, the facade of the new building on Church Street would be set back from the sidewalk and include projecting balconies. In general, the elimination of the blighted condition and the restoration of the historic buildings would bring great benefits to Market Street, Old City, and Philadelphia generally.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided

1. existing storefront elements are preserved and reused where possible;
 2. the design of the first-floor, N. 3rd Street façade of the building at 259 Market is revised to more closely replicate the historic façade as seen in the commercial panorama;
 3. the paint is removed from the brick front facades of 251, 253, 255, and 257 Market and the facades are not repainted; and,
 4. the façade of the new building facing Church Street is not set back from the sidewalk line, but is shifted to the plane of the first floor;
- with the staff to review details, pursuant to Rehabilitation Standards 6, 9, and 10 and the Reconstruction Standards.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Leo Addimando, architects Sergio Coscia and Adam Jeckel, and preservation consultant Bob Powers represented the application.

Mr. Addimando explained that the plans presented to the Architectural Committee have been revised extensively from those originally presented to the staff. He reported that he and the staff have met several times to discuss the plans and refine the proposal. He added that they are still implementing some of the staff's suggestions. He corrected Mr. Baron's description, stating that the residential entrance would be located on Church Street, not N. 3rd Street. He said that the buildings are very expensive to rehabilitate and difficult to reuse. He reported that securing CVS as tenant makes the project possible, but noted that the pharmacy chain has many specific requirements for the retail space. He explained that they must undertake complex, structural work in the interior to support the old buildings and create the 10,000 sf open floor plate with one floor level required by CVS. He stated that they have agreed to install the more expensive storefronts that will retain some original and replicate other missing storefront elements as the staff has recommended. He noted that they originally proposed less expensive, standard storefronts. He stated that they cannot modify the storefront at the N. 3rd Street façade of the 259 Market building to better replicate image of the building in the commercial panorama because of the retailer's requirements for the storefronts windows. He said that, without CVS as the anchor tenant, the project cannot be financed. He noted that they originally proposed raising several of the roofs, but withdrew that part of the proposal at the staff's request. Also at the staff's request, they have worked hard to improve the cornice design. He assured the Committee that they will make every attempt to clean and restore the brick facades on Market Street, even though it may be difficult. Regarding the suggestion for Church Street, he said that they can shift the upper front façade forward, toward the street, to align with the first-floor façade at the sidewalk line. He concluded that the design has progressed significantly and they have made many concessions while working with the staff, before the application was submitted for the Architectural Committee's review. He stated that they are willing to save the buildings, even though they would make a very cogent hardship and demolition case.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there is any precedent for balconies on Market Street. Mr. Baron responded that the application does not propose balconies on Market, but does on Church Street. He observed that the application proposes rooftop terraces near the Market Street

façade, but no projecting balconies on Market. Mr. Baron stated that there are some to the east. Mr. Addimando said that there are several terraces on buildings to the east including one at 237 Market. Mr. Farnham stated that the Commission approved a similar terrace on a new building at 112 Market Street. Ms. Gutterman objected to the amount of the proposed signage for CVS. Mr. Addimando offered a revised plan to the Committee showing significantly less signage. The Committee members agreed that it was a great improvement.

Ms. Hawkins objected to the design of the façade of 3-05 N. 3rd Street, particularly the large central windows. She stated that it is “visually jarring.” She stated that the scale of the central windows and their horizontal orientations are problematic. Mr. Addimando explained that the design for the façade of that part of the building is based on the design of the building currently standing on the site. He noted that the existing building is much modified, but once had a large, horizontal center window like to one that they are now proposing. Mr. Coscia pointed to a historic photograph of the building in question and noted that Mr. Baron had asked him to base the design of the new building on the old building seen in the photograph. He contended that the wide horizontal windows in the new design were taken directly from the historic building; they must be compatible with the historic area because they are the historic windows. Ms. Hawkins stated that she can “appreciate the inspiration,” but nonetheless rejected the window design. The applicants stated that they would revise the window design in the N. 3rd Street building. Ms. Hawkins objected to the use of the fiber cement cladding in the inner courtyard. The applicants noted that the courtyard is not visible from the street, but offered to amend the material as suggested.

Mr. Cluver asked about the glass in the storefronts. Mr. Addimando stated that it would be clear glass. Mr. Cluver asked about the treatment of the storefront windows. Mr. Addimando said that CVS will install a film on the inside of the glass up to six feet in height to allow for racks for merchandise against the windows on the inside. Ms. Hawkins objected to “supergraphics.” Mr. Addimando replied that the CVS would not install “supergraphics”; it may be obscured glass with images of historic Philadelphia. Mr. Baron said that the Commission had approved a similar concept for the Walgreen’s pharmacy at the Suburban Station building. Mr. Addimando explained that they will need to seek a zoning variance for the signage.

Mr. Cluver asked about the rhythm of storefronts on Market Street. Mr. Coscia explained that the tripartite design is based on the original Greek Revival storefronts. He stated that they are removing the non-historic storefront elements and restoring to the historic storefront spacing. Mr. Baron pointed out that the marble capitals survive on 247 Market Street and the storefront will be adjusted to match the placement of the capitals. Mr. Cluver said that the new stucco facades should be clad with a real three-coat stucco, not EIFS. The applicants agreed. Mr. Cluver asked about the metal roof and dormer on 257 Market and noted that the building would have had a wood-shingle roof. Mr. Baron responded that this building had a metal roof early in its history and the Commission has routinely approved metal roofs for such buildings because they are historically appropriate, safer, and easier to maintain. Mr. Coscia stated that the metal is a better alternative than asphalt shingles. Mr. Cluver asked about the rationale for the two-over-two windows in the new buildings. Mr. Coscia replied that they wanted a divided window, but did not want to falsely replicate the historic six-over-six windows in the historic buildings. Mr. Cluver suggested that the new brick should be compatible with the old buildings. Mr. Coscia stated that he would use a compatible, full-sized brick.

Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the cornice over the storefronts should match the historic entablatures so that, when the signs are removed someday, the cornice looks appropriate. Mr. Baron suggested that the signage can be shaped on the back to wrap the cornice and not project from it, allowing the cornice shape to be maintained. Mr. McCoubrey agreed with his colleagues that the wide windows on the new building at 3 N. 3rd were not appropriate.

Ms. Hawkins asked for public comment. The representative of the Preservation Alliance offered no comments.

Joe Schiavo, formerly of the Old City Civic Association, contended that the street facades should not be stuccoed. It is not a “quality material.” He also objected to the sameness of the storefronts on Market Street, which would lend to a “strip-mall effect.” He asserted that the N. 3rd Street façade is “odd.” He praised the project for its appropriate scale, preservation, and mixed use. He concluded that the storefront windows on Market Street should be animated.

Ms. Gutterman suggested that the Committee adopt the staff recommendation with a few additions. She would add to the staff recommendation an endorsement of the revised signage package, a requirement that only real stucco and not EIFS or fiber-cement board is used, and a requirement that the 3-05 N. 3rd Street façade is revised with input from the staff. Mr. McCoubrey agreed.

Mr. Baron asked if the Committee accepted the applicant’s proposal for the storefront of 259 Market along N. 3rd Street, where he had suggested revisions to make it more like the design seen in the commercial panorama. The Committee members responded that the proposed storefront is acceptable; it does not need to be revised to replicate the building in the panorama.

Mr. Cluver asked if the roof decks could be removed from the front of the new buildings on Market Street. He then suggested adding a one-story parapet to hide the decks, making the buildings look like five-story buildings on Market Street. The other Committee members strongly rejected this suggestion.

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

1. existing storefront elements are preserved and reused where possible;
 2. the paint is removed from the brick front facades of 251, 253, 255, and 257 Market and the facades are restored in consultation with the staff;
 3. the façade of the new building facing Church Street is not set back from the sidewalk line, but is shifted to the plane of the first floor;
 4. the revised signage presented at the meeting is coordinated with the restoration and reconstruction of the entablature and/or storefront cornice;
 5. the facades of the new buildings are clad in brick or a three-part true stucco system rather than EFIS, fiberboard, or other alternative; and,
 6. the design of the façade of the new building at 3-05 N. 3rd Street, especially the fenestration, is revised to be more compatible with the historic district.
- with the staff to review details, pursuant to Rehabilitation Standards 6, 9, and 10 and the Reconstruction Standards.

ADDRESS: 6333 MALVERN AVE

Project: Remove/demolish pool wing

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Overbrook School for the Blind

Applicant: Joseph Van Bernum, Overbrook School for the Blind

History: 1900; PA Institute for the Instruction of the Blind; Cope & Stewardson, architects

Individual Designation: 5/26/1970

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove or demolish a wing of a building that houses a swimming pool at the Overbrook School for the Blind. The application “seeks the issuance of the permit based upon the financial hardship imposed upon the School by the prohibitive cost of maintaining this unsafe and obsolete structure for which the School has no viable use.”

The architectural firm of Cope & Stewardson designed and constructed the original campus for the school between 1897 and 1900. The pool wing was not part of the original design, but was added by Cope & Stewardson in 1906 and 1907. The pool wing extends off a rear wing of the original school complex. The pool wing faces a service alley at the rear of the campus, away from Malvern Street, Wynnewood Road, and N. 64th Street, which bound the campus. The pool wing is not visible from the public right-of-way.

The designation date of the Overbrook School for the Blind is unknown, but it was entered on the Philadelphia Register on 26 May 1970. At that time, the Historical Commission confirmed the designations of several “major 19th century buildings certified by the Philadelphia Historical Commission several years ago but not put on its list at that time.” Among those “major 19th century buildings” was the “Pennsylvania Institute for Instruction of the Blind, 64th and Malvern.” The designation predates the Commission’s use of nomination forms. Therefore, the various buildings on the school’s campus were not inventoried or graded as to significance at that time. Nothing in the Commission’s record indicates the Commission’s appraisal of the architectural or historical significance of this wing.

In May 2007, the Historical Commission approved a new aquatic center on the campus, which replaced the pool in question. The older pool is no longer used. The plan to demolish the pool wing was noted at the time of the review of the new aquatic center, but not officially proposed as part of the application. In September 2012, the Historical Commission considered and denied an application proposing to remove the pool wing, determining that it was incomplete. The current application expands on the application deemed incomplete in 2012. It argues that the retention and reuse of the pool wing would impose “a significant financial burden” on the school. It claims that the pool wing suffers from “numerous structural deficiencies” that would be “prohibitively expensive and exceptionally difficult to remediate.” It concludes that “the cost of repairing and maintaining the former pool building” would “financially burden the School by diverting funds required to advance the educational mission of the School to the maintenance of an obsolete, unsafe, and unused facility.”

To support its claims, the application includes the documents required of a financial hardship application for a non-profit institution as well as an engineer’s report on the condition of the pool wing and a proposal to repair the wall of the adjacent building where the pool wing would be

removed. Additional information submitted with the first application supplements the current application.

Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance authorizes the Commission to approve demolitions only in two instances, when the issuance of the permit is necessary in the public interest and when the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted (hardship). When reviewing this application, the Commission must first determine whether the removal of the pool wing constitutes a demolition. Not all removals are demolitions in the legal sense. Some removals may be reviewed as alterations, precluding the need for a public interest or hardship analysis. Section 14-205(88) defines demolition as:

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

In this case, the “building” in question is the Overbrook School for the Blind. Therefore, the proposed removal is not a complete demolition. In this case, the Commission must determine whether the razing of the pool wing constitutes a demolition “in significant part” of the designated resource, the school. Rehabilitation Standard 2 can provide guidance in determining whether the loss of the pool wing would constitute a demolition “in significant part.” It reads:

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

A demolition in significant part can be defined as a partial demolition that results in the loss of the “historic character” of the property, i.e. the removal or inappropriate alteration of those attributes that engender the property with historical importance. Does the pool wing “characterize” the property? Is the retention of the pool wing essential to the preservation of the “historic character” of the resource? Are the materials that make up the pool wing “distinct”? The materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize the property as a whole would include the Spanish Colonial architectural style, stucco, red tile, cloister plan, dome, towers, arched openings, perimeter wall, and lawns. In that the Commission is charged with protecting historic resources for the public, public accessibility must factor into any identification of “significant part” and distinct, character-defining features. Visibility from the public right-of-way is not the sole determining factor, but it is a factor.

If the Commission determines that the razing of the pool wing is a “demolition” in the legal sense, then it may only approve the application after finding that the issuance of the permit is necessary in the public interest or that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may reasonably be adapted. The application does not explicitly contend that the demolition of the pool wing is necessary in the public interest. The application does contend that the pool wing cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted or, in other words, the required retention of the pool wing would result in a hardship to the school.

Upon receipt of financial hardship applications proposing complete demolition, the staff typically forwards them to the Architectural Committee and Committee on Financial Hardship before presenting them and the resulting recommendations to the Commission for action. However, in this case of partial demolition, owing to the open demolition vs. alteration question, the staff is forwarding this application to the Architectural Committee and Commission as though it proposes an alteration. If the Commission disagrees and finds that the removal of the pool is a

demolition, not an alteration, it can remand the application to the Architectural Committee and Committee on Financial Hardship for review under the hardship provisions. If the Commission agrees that the removal of the pool is an alteration yet denies the application, it should then remand the application to the Architectural Committee and Committee on Financial Hardship for review under the hardship provisions.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Commission conclude that the removal of the pool wing is an alteration as defined in Section 14-203(15) of the Philadelphia Code, not a demolition as defined in Section 14-203(88), and approve the removal, pursuant to Standard 2, provided the following documents are submitted as mitigation to the Historical Commission within one year of the Commission's action:

1. a recordation report with photographs and/or measured drawings documenting the history and features of the pool wing, and
2. an inventory of all buildings on the campus, keyed to a map, with photographs and information including dates of construction and alteration, architect, original and current uses, and a physical description to assist with the review of future applications for the historic resource.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Joseph Van Bernum of the Overbrook School for the Blind, architect Dan Jalboot, and attorney Jerald Goodman represented the application.

Mr. Goodman stated that he agreed with the staff's conclusion that the removal of the pool wing would not constitute a demolition in the legal sense. He asserted that the pool wing was an ancillary addition and not a stand-alone building. He stated that his client would gladly provide the documentation proposed as mitigation in the staff recommendation.

Ms. Pentz stated that the answer to the question seemed obvious; the removal of the pool wing would constitute a demolition in the legal sense. Mr. Cluver stated that he disagreed and explained that he conceives of the pool wing as a small, later addition on a much larger whole rather than a free-standing building. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the Commission had approved the demolition of the rear wing of the Dilworth House as an alteration, but the appeal board disagreed, reversing the Commission and finding that it was a demolition. Mr. Farnham noted that the Dilworth decision is still being litigated. Ms. Hawkins remembered a recent application proposing to demolish the rear third of a church on N. 21st Street, south of Fairmount. She noted that the Commission had denied that application, finding that it was a demolition, not an alteration, because one-third of the building would have been removed. She stated that the amount of demolition in that case tipped the scale from alteration to demolition. Mr. Van Bernum reported that the pool wing accounts for only about 3% of the total square footage of the main building. Ms. Hawkins stated that this application presented a difficult case. She observed that the poor condition of the building would factor into the conclusion. Mr. Farnham agreed that the pool wing is in poor condition. He explained that the staff had considered this proposal as akin to a proposal to demolish a rear ell that is in poor condition. He noted that the Commission has approved numerous applications to demolish rear ells as alterations, without referring them to the hardship process. Ms. Hawkins asked if the pool wing is suffering from demolition by neglect. She conceded that the building is obsolete, but suggested that the Commission should not award neglect with an approval to demolish. The applicants responded that the building has not been neglected. Mr. Van Bernum stated that the school has invested significant funds in the building in attempts to preserve it, but the building has deteriorated nonetheless. Mr. Jalboot

noted that the building has suffered from 100 years of high humidity, not owing to neglect, but to the conditions inherent in an old pool. He reported that the humidity cannot be controlled in the pool wing. He stated that they tried to ventilate it with the existing window system, but that was not very effective. He asserted that it is impossible to control humidity with “a big dish of water” inside an uninsulated masonry building. He concluded that the deterioration is not the result of neglect, but is inherent to the design and was certain to occur, regardless of the maintenance regimen.

Mr. Goodman stated that the school has considered adaptive reuses for the wing. After considering its needs, including its need for a greenhouse, the school undertook a study to determine the costs of reusing the wing as greenhouse and demolishing the wing and building a new greenhouse. The cost for adapting the wing as a greenhouse was considerably greater than demolishing and building anew. Therefore, the school determined that, owing to the cost differential as well the limited functionality of an adapted greenhouse, reuse was infeasible. Mr. Cluver noted that, even if the pool wing were adaptively reused, any adaptation would remove those aspects of the wing that identified it as a pool facility and represented its historic significance. He contended that its significance is its use; the architecture does not have any real significance. Any reuse other than a pool reuse would result in the loss of its significance. He concluded that removing the pool wing should be considered an alteration, not a demolition, because the pool wing has no significance without the pool use, which cannot be feasibly retained. Ms. Gutterman agreed with Mr. Cluver that the pool wing does not read as a pool facility on the exterior and would therefore lose its connection to its historical use as a pool if the pool were removed. However, she stated that she would be “troubled by losing that part of the fabric of the campus.” She contended that the wing should be saved “even if it has dollars attached to it.” She suggested that a greenhouse use would be inappropriate because, like the pool, it would subject the structure to high humidity.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that, even though the wing is small relative to the overall campus, it is a part of the campus. He stated that he is worried about precedent. He suggested that, if this were approved as an alteration, not a demolition, then the University of Pennsylvania could seek to demolish a small building on its campus as an alteration. He contended that the size of the wing should not be the only factor when determining whether a razing is a demolition. Mr. Cluver countered that the Commission is now called upon to evaluate the contribution that the pool wing makes to the historical significance of the school because that evaluation was not done at the time of designation. The entire School for the Blind campus was individually designated as a single resource. On the other hand, individual buildings at the University of Pennsylvania, but not the campus as a whole, have been individually designated. We know what the Commission considers significant at the University because it has been individually designated and, therefore, the hypothetical situation at the University could not occur.

Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicants how the pool wing attaches to the back of the original rear wing of the school building. Mr. Jalboot explained that the pool wing was constructed against the rear wall of the original complex. He stated that a single door connects the pool to the complex. He noted that a section of the pool wing roof slopes into the main complex, trapping rainwater and leading to deterioration. He added that there are significant access problems between the complex and the pool wing, with awkward stairs, landings, and levels. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the other structures at the rear are original or early additions to the complex. He asked if there was a power plant associated with the school. Mr. Jalboot responded that there is a boiler plant at the rear of the complex. It has a flat roof and is not

original. A maintenance building stands between the pool wing and the boiler plant. A non-historic building stands on what was a lawn adjacent to the pool wing. Mr. Farnham showed a photograph of the original power plant with smokestack, which has since been demolished, to the Committee.

Mr. Cluver asked about the treatment of the connection between the complex and the pool if the pool wing is demolished. Mr. Jalboot stated that the wing would be demolished and the site would be graded and planted with grass. In the future, the school would like to construct a greenhouse on the site or elsewhere on the campus. Mr. Van Bernum reported that the school may need to build a structure at the rear of the complex to overcome significant accessibility problems within the main complex. He stated that this site may be appropriate for that structure. However, the school must first evaluate all of its accessibility needs before it can commit to a plan for the new facilities. Mr. Jalboot remarked that a large percentage of the student body has multiple disabilities. He noted that these handicaps drove the need for a new pool facility and will compel the school to upgrade its other buildings as well. Answering Mr. Cluver's earlier question, Mr. Farnham stated that the application includes information regarding the proposal to install matching stucco at the rear of the main complex, where the pool wing would be removed, and to grade and seed the site of the pool wing. Mr. Jalboot added that they will retain the door at the rear of the main building, which now opens into the pool wing, and will reuse it as an exit from the main complex.

Mr. Cluver observed that the engineer's report on the condition of the building recommended that, if retained, the structure of the pool wing should be upgraded to meet or exceed seismic building codes, owing to the large number of disabled children at the site. Mr. Cluver contended that the existing wing would not need to be upgraded to meet or exceed current seismic building codes. He stated that the cost for such upgrades should not be considered in any hardship analysis. Mr. Jalboot responded that the entire roof would need to be removed and rebuilt if the building were reused. Ms. Pentz stated that that assertion is subject to debate. She stated that it may not need to be reinforced as the engineer has recommended.

Ms. Hawkins asked for public comment from the audience. No one in the audience offered comments.

Ms. Gutterman advocated for the denial of the application. She stated that she believes that the removal of the pool wing is a demolition, not an alteration. She suggested that the application should be forwarded to the Committee on Financial Hardship. Ms. Hawkins and Pentz and Mr. McCoubrey agreed. Mr. Cluver disagreed and asserted that the removal of the pool wing is not a demolition in significant part.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend that the Commission find that the removal of the pool wing is a demolition and remand the application to the Committee on Financial Hardship.

ADDRESS: 1903 SPRING GARDEN ST

Project: Legalize removal of eight stained-glass windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Greythorne Development

Applicant: Louis D'Addezio, Archdiocese of Philadelphia

History: 1873, Hogg Residence; converted to La Milagrosa Chapel, 1912

Individual Designation: 11/6/1975

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

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

ADDRESS: 1903 SPRING GARDEN ST

Project: Renovate building, remove and construct rear additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Greythorne Development

Applicant: Mike Koep, Greythorne Development

History: 1873, Hogg Residence; converted to La Milagrosa Chapel, 1912

Individual Designation: 11/6/1975

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

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

OVERVIEW: These applications propose the conversion of a rowhouse used as a church to a multi-family dwelling. The building was constructed as part of a row of three grand houses at the northwest corner of 19th and Spring Garden Streets about 1873. The Hogg family, wealthy proprietors of carpet mills in Philadelphia and elsewhere, owned the property from the 1870s until 1912, when they sold it to a Spanish Vincentian order. The religious order converted the house to Capilla Catolica Hispana de la Medalla Milagrosa or Our Lady of the Miraculous Medal and held Spanish-language Catholic services at the chapel until recently. The Spanish order closed the chapel in June 2013 and has sold it to developer, who is proposing to convert the building back to residential use.

The Commission individually designated the property at 1903 Spring Garden Street at its November 1975 meeting. The Commission did not single out 1903 Spring Garden for designation at that meeting, but individually designated all properties on the 1900-blocks of Wallace, Mt. Vernon, and Brandywine Streets and the north side of the 1900-block of Spring Garden Street as part of an ongoing project to create a de facto historic district in the Spring Garden neighborhood. The property was later included in the Spring Garden Historic District, which the Commission designated in October 2000, and was classified as Significant. The related rowhouses to the east and west are also classified as Significant. The inventory notes its original construction date (c. 1875), but makes no mention of the conversion of the house to a chapel.

The first of the two applications proposes to legalize the removal of eight stained-glass windows. The Archdiocese of Philadelphia submitted the application, but does not own the property, and is acting on behalf of the Spanish order, the property owner. Five of the stained-glass windows were located in first-floor openings in the Spring Garden façade; three others were located at the rear. The windows bear the signature of the artist Ellwood Potts and the date 1934. The Spring Garden Historic District inventory entry for the property does not mention La Milagrosa Chapel or any of the alterations undertaken to convert the house to a chapel in 1912. It describes the first-floor, front, stained-glass windows as “replacement steel sash 3-light

windows” without mentioning the stained glass. The rear façade is not described in the inventory. The period of significance for the district is 1850 to 1930, which includes the conversion to the chapel in 1912, but not the stained-glass windows, which date to 1934.

The second of the two applications, from the developer, proposes converting the building for multi-family residential use. The front or Spring Garden Street façade would be restored to its 1870s appearance. At the front façade, the windows would be replaced with wood windows appropriate for the original building. The masonry would be pointed and cleaned. The slate mansard roof would be repaired. The cornice and other trim would be repaired and painted. A non-historic canopy would be removed. A basement window that was converted to a door would be converted back to a window. At the rear, part of a 1952 rear chapel addition would be removed and two additions would be constructed and clad in stucco. Two decks would be added. Parking spaces would be added. The rear of the building faces a service alley.

Rehabilitation Standard 4 mandates that “Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.” The Commission must decide whether the stained-glass windows and the chapel addition at the rear “have acquired historic significance in their own right.” The preponderance of the evidence seems to indicate that they have not acquired their own significance. The rowhouse was individually designated, apparently for its streetscape value as part of a de facto district, seemingly not because it was a chapel. When the rowhouse was included in the Spring Garden Historic District in 2000, neither the use as a chapel nor the exterior manifestations of the chapel was mentioned in the inventory. The conversion to a chapel in 1912, the stained-glass windows, the religious sculpture in the second-floor niche, and the rear chapel addition were not mentioned in the inventory. The rowhouse was converted to a chapel in 1912, during the period of significance of the historic district. However, the surviving exterior elements of the conversion date to 1934 and 1952, after the period of significance of the district. Nothing in the Commission’s record for this property indicates that it was designated to preserve its appearance as a chapel. The record appears to indicate that the Commission identified it for preservation as an Italianate rowhouse.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR STAINED-GLASS WINDOW APPLICATION: Approval, provided the historically-appropriate windows are installed within one year, pursuant to Standards 4, 6, and 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR REHABILITATION APPLICATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 4, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the applications to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jeff Hawver, developer Michael Koep, and preservation consultant Bob Powers represented the rehabilitation application.

Mr. Koep reported that he had closed on the property. The Spanish religious organization no longer owns the property.

Ms. Hawkins asked the Committee to first consider whether the removal of the stained-glass windows and their replacement with replicas of the original historic windows complied with the Standards. Ms. Gutterman and Mr. McCoubrey stated that they agreed with the staff analysis that showed that the stained-glass windows postdate the period of significance of the Spring Garden Historic District and are not noted in the district’s inventory and are therefore not historically significant within the context of the district designation. Ms. Hawkins asked if anyone

in the audience wished to speak on the stained-glass window replacement. No one responded. The Committee concluded that it would recommend approval of the legalization of the removal of the stained-glass windows, provided the historically-appropriate windows are installed within one year.

The Committee turned its attention to the restoration of the front façade and the alterations at the rear. Mr. Cluver questioned the choice of stucco for the cladding of the small rear additions. He objected to the introduction of a third cladding material in addition to the stone at the front and the brick at the rear. He contended that the stucco is “incongruous.” Mr. Hawver explained that they chose stucco for several reasons. First, they wanted the additions to be compatible with but differentiated from the historic building, which is brick at the rear. Also, they are proposing a lighter, frame-construction structural system rather than a masonry load-bearing system and the stucco was the most appropriate cladding material for that system. He stated that the second-story addition would be constructed on top of an existing one-story rear addition; the framing for it must be relatively light. He noted that other so-called addition is really only an infill wall, that would be constructed in the opening left from the removal of the 1952 rear addition. Others observed that the Commission routinely approves stucco rear additions, especially in Spring Garden. Mr. Cluver questioned Mr. Hawver about the detailing of the connection between the old brick and the new stucco at the rear addition. Mr. Hawver explained how the stucco would meet the existing brick wall, but added that he would detail the connection to the Committee’s specifications. Mr. Cluver asked if the side wall of the rear addition would align with or be offset from the existing brick wall. Mr. Hawver asked if Mr. Cluver meant the rear party wall with 1901 Spring Garden Street. Mr. Cluver indicated that he meant the side rear party wall. Mr. Hawver responded that the new stucco wall would align with the side party wall. Mr. Powers confirmed that it would align for structural reasons. Mr. Powers reiterated that many rear ells and rear additions in the Spring Garden neighborhood are stuccoed. It is a very common material for rear additions in the area. He added that they could color the stucco. Mr. Hawver noted that the railings on the decks would be set back from the cornice lines. He also noted that they are proposing to continue the existing cornice line at the first-floor rear across the new infill wall. Mr. Hawver stated that they would retain and repair the original Italianate corner at the third-floor rear. Mr. Koep stated that he had originally asked his consultants to design a two-story rear addition, where they are now proposing one story, but they dissuaded him from the idea because it would have interrupted the original Italianate cornice at the rear.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the application includes fewer details than a typical application. She stated that she approves of the concepts of removing and adding the additions as well as the other aspects such as the decks and parking, but does not believe that the application includes enough detail to warrant a final approval. She observed that the application requests final approval, but asked the applicants if they would consider reducing that request to a review in concept. Mr. Koep stated that he was seeking final approval. He stated that he is facing a tight schedule and does not want to delay the project for a subsequent review. He suggested that the details sought, such as the detailing of the joint between the old brick and new stucco at the rear party wall, could be reviewed by the staff for approval. He stated that “there is really not a lot to this. I mean you’re talking about cornice details, stucco, and the detail of the railings” at the rear of the building along a service alley. Mr. Cluver replied that, “technically, we are supposed to be reviewing permit level drawings.” Ms. Hawkins added that the drawings are not as “refined” as those they usually review. Ms. Gutterman agreed and stated that she had trouble determining what parts of the rear of the building can be seen from the public right-of-way. She added, however, that she approved of removing the 1950s addition and adding the new addition, decks,

and parking. Ms. Pentz stated that she is “sympathetic to the need to move forward expeditiously.” She stated that the applicants could resolve the open issues related to minor details with the staff. Mr. Cluver replied that he “is not convinced by the stucco addition.” Mr. McCoubrey suggested that they “express the edge of the brick wall where they cut it off” when removing the rear addition and “make an exception” in the first-floor rear cornice rather than extending it all the way across the rear to indicate that the section at the stucco is not original. He concluded that “those are the only small things that I would like to see.”

Mr. Powers asked if the Committee would have preferred “hard-line elevation drawings” rather than the hand-drawn elevations. Mr. McCoubrey replied in the affirmative. Mr. Powers offered to provide updated elevation drawings at the Commission meeting. Mr. Cluver suggested that the applicants provide the drawings to the Commission for approval. He noted that the Commission might approve them, or the applicants might need to submit for another round of reviews before the Committee and Commission to confirm such details as the joint where the brick and stucco meet. Mr. Farnham noted that the Rules & Regulations allow applicants to supplement applications after the Committee meeting. Mr. Farnham noted that the staff recommended approval of the application. He agreed that some minor details were not thoroughly documented in the plans, but contended that they related to work at the rear, which faces a service alley. He noted that most of the work proposed in this application could be reviewed at the staff level.

Ms. Hawkins observed that the application proposes restoration only to the front façade. Ms. Pentz asked if the air conditioners in the front windows would be removed. Mr. Koep stated that they would all be removed. He stated that he would work with the staff to identify new locations for the mechanical equipment. He assured the Committee that the new mechanical equipment would be invisible from the street.

Ms. Gutterman suggested recommending denial of the application, owing to incompleteness. Ms. Pentz disagreed, stating that she agreed with the staff recommendation and contending that the staff could review the details of the rear alterations as noted by the Committee. Mr. Powers asked why Ms. Gutterman would propose recommending denial of the entire project when the Committee conceded that they are only lacking a few details at the rear, which could be provided before the Commission meeting. Ms. Hawkins noted that the staff could review and approve the work at the front without the Committee’s review.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR STAINED-GLASS WINDOW APPLICATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend legalization of the removal of the stained-glass windows, provided the historically-appropriate windows are installed within one year, with the staff to review details.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR REHABILITATION APPLICATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the restoration at the front façade, with the staff to review details; and denial of the alterations at the rear, owing to incompleteness.

ADDRESS: 6002 AND 6008 WAYNE AVE

Project: Renovate former church complex for school

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 6008 Development Associates, LLC

Applicant: Leslie Greene, McCoubrey/Overholser, Inc.

History: 1873; St. Peter's Episcopal Church and Rectory; G.W. Hewitt of Furness & Hewitt, architect

Individual Designation: 11/30/1965

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate the former Saint Peter's Episcopal Church complex into a campus for the Waldorf School of Philadelphia. The church complex has been vacant for several years. The school purchased the property in June 2013. The complex is made of four buildings, a church, parish house, chapel and rectory. The current application proposes minor alterations to the exterior of all four buildings, most of which is restoration work and can be approved at the staff level. Most of the exterior work would involve reroofing, repairs, and provisions for accessibility. The restoration work includes masonry cleaning and repointing, window replacement, carpentry restoration, roofing restoration and repairs. Other minor alterations include the installation of a steel basement hatch. All of this work can be reviewed by the staff during the final administrative review for building permits. The Commission, however, must consider the following alterations, which exceed the staff's authority to approve:

CHURCH

- Remove existing stairs on west elevation and replace with new stairs and ADA ramp.
- Remove slate roof and replace with Ludovici tiles to match the color, texture, and pattern of the original slate roof. The installation of the Ludovici tiles would extend to the port cochere that connects the church building to the chapel.

PARISH HOUSE

- Remove non-original wood ramp and stairs and replace with concrete ramp, stairs, and landing with metal handrails on north elevation.
- Install fire-escape stair on south elevation. This would require converting an existing third-floor window into a door. This location would minimize the impact on the historic building and would not be visible from the primary public areas of the campus.

CHAPEL

- Install stairs on west elevation.
- Remove stairs on east elevation and replace with concrete ADA ramp.
- Remove stairs in covered walkway and replace with concrete stairs.
- Remove slate roof and replace with GAF slate-line asphalt shingles.

RECTORY

- Install wood ADA ramp and stair on north elevation.
- Install wood platform on south side and replace stairs on north side of building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details including Ludovici tile, masonry restoration, and slate replacement samples, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 AUGUST 2013

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

DISCUSSION: Mr. McCoubrey recused owing to a conflict. Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Doug Seiler and Michael Pentz represented the application.

Mr. Danta stated that most of the proposed work is either restoration or minor alterations that can be reviewed for approval at the staff level. He suggested that the Committee focus on those elements that fall outside the staff's authority to approve. Ms. Hawkins agreed and asked the Committee members to use the staff's bulleted list as a guide for the discussion.

The Committee began with the church building. Ms. Hawkins asked about the location of the stairs that would be removed from the church building. Mr. Pentz answered that they are located on the back of the church, away from Wayne Avenue. Mr. Pentz explained that the replacement stairs would include an ADA ramp. Ms. Hawkins asked about the proposed material for the railing. Mr. Pentz answered that they propose to use a painted steel railing and poured concrete for the stairs and ramp. Mr. Pentz noted that they would not be touching the wall of the church and directed the Committee members to a detail documenting the pouring of the concrete stair and ramp. He specified that the railings would not be attached to the building, but to the concrete of the ramp and stairs. Ms. Hawkins asked about color of the railings. Mr. Pentz answered that the railings would be painted black. Mr. Cluver pointed out that the notes on the drawings indicate that the railings would be stainless steel. Mr. Pentz clarified that the note is incorrect and that that railings would be painted steel. Mr. Cluver suggested properly flashing the seam between the ramp and wall of the building to minimize the infiltration of water.

Mr. Cluver asked why the slate roof of the church would be replaced with Ludovici tiles. Mr. Pentz answered that the slate roof is badly deteriorated and must be replaced; water leaks profusely into the interior of the church. He noted that the school has a limited budget and that the proposed tiles would offer a significant cost savings over replacement with real slate, yet would give the look of real slate. Ms. Gutterman asked about the dimensional differences and exposures between the original slate and proposed tile materials. Mr. Pentz explained that the existing slate is 10 inches wide and has a nine-inch exposure, while the tiles are 10 inches wide and have a 13-inch exposure. Ms. Hawkins asked if the roof had a decorative slate pattern. Mr. Pentz answered that there was no decorative patterning. Ms. Hawkins asked about the color variations on the proposed tile. Mr. Pentz explained that the colors of the tiles do not vary significantly. He pointed to the color photographs from the tile manufacturer. Mr. Cluver asked if the color was integral or surface applied. Mr. Pentz answered that the color is integral, but fired and vitrified on the surface of the tile, not in the mix of the clay. Ms. Gutterman asked how the ridges and hips would be treated. Mr. Pentz answered that that ridges and hips are copper and would be replaced in kind. He noted that any valleys would be covered in tiles custom made by the manufacturer and that no tile would be cut in the field. Ms. Hawkins asked if the tower would also be covered with tiles. Mr. Pentz answered that the tower is in good condition and that the current slate would remain. Mr. Cluver suggested installing a small mock-up of the tile on the roof for the staff to review as part of the final review and sign off. Mr. Cluver stated that the color match would be important in this case. Ms. Gutterman stated that color consistency is very important to the integrity of the campus. Ms. Hawkins asked if the tiles can be made smaller to minimize the difference in the exposure between the current slate and the proposed tile. Mr. Pentz answered that the tile can be custom made to match the nine-inch exposure, but that the cost savings they seek would be completely eliminated with custom tiles. Mr. Seiler stated that the budget for this project is limited and that the viability of the entire project relies cost savings, such as that derived from the tile instead of slate. Mr. Seiler noted that the buildings are in dire

condition and that this project would save them. Mr. Cluver acknowledged the need to consider alternatives that meet the budgetary constraints of the owner. Ms. Gutterman noted that the proposed tiles are a far better alternative than composite slate or asphalt shingles.

The discussion moved to the parish house. Mr. Pentz explained that they propose to eliminate a non-original pressure-treated ramp with concrete steps and a ramp. Mr. Seiler explained that the new landing would be larger to accommodate heavy foot traffic and the ramp. Mr. Cluver expressed his concern over the gap created between the ramp and the wall of the building. Mr. Seiler explained that the area would be maintained appropriately and not allowed to collect trash as Mr. Cluver feared.

Ms. Hawkins asked for an explanation of the proposed fire stair. Mr. Pentz explained that the stair is proposed as an exterior stair because an interior stair would occupy a large percentage of the floor plate and preclude creating the requisite classroom space. Ms. Hawkins asked if the stair would be visible from Harvey Street. Mr. Seiler answered that the stair would not be visible because that side of the campus, facing Harvey Street, is heavily wooded. Mr. Pentz added that the terrain slopes away from the site and there is a tall retaining wall along the street. He explained that the proposed design and location presents the least impact on the historic building, both interior and exterior. Mr. Danta stated that the staff had discussed this element at length during the staff meeting. He noted that the proposed design is reversible and inconspicuous, thereby satisfying the Standards. Mr. Cluver asked how many windows would be altered for access to the fire stair. Mr. Pentz answered that only the third-floor window would be altered. Ms. Hawkins asked if the fire stair would be painted black. Mr. Pentz answered that it would be painted black.

Mr. Pentz described the proposed work at the chapel. He stated that a stair would be added to the side of the building that would accommodate a change in elevation. The stair would include a landing and ADA ramp. Mr. Pentz noted that the location for the proposed ramp is the most logical in terms of the traffic flow of the campus and the access points to the building. He noted that although it may seem like an inappropriate location, it is the most logical spot. Mr. Seiler explained that the covered walkway is a main point of communication between the chapel and parish hall. He stated that concrete stairs within the walkway would be replaced. Ms. Hawkins asked if the proposed railings within the arches of the covered walkway could be less intrusive. Mr. Seiler stated that the railings are needed for protection from the eight-foot drop between the covered walkway and the ground. Ms. Gutterman described the railings as too intrusive. Mr. Cluver agreed and advised that the railings could be made smaller and less intrusive. Mr. Seiler acknowledged that the railings could be made lighter and agreed to redesign them.

Mr. Cluver asked why they proposed to install Slateline asphalt shingles on the chapel roof, and not the tile or slate. Mr. Pentz answered that financial considerations are driving the decision to use asphalt shingles on this building. He stated that their use will result in a significant savings. Mr. Cluver suggested that the school should fundraise for a slate roof. Ms. Gutterman stated that the differences in materials may have a detrimental effect on the overall perception of the campus. Mr. Seiler suggested that, since the Ludovici tile is acceptable on the church, it should also be acceptable on this roof. Ms. Hawkins stated that it is acceptable, but noted that this roof is very complex and that it may require many custom tiles that may eliminate the cost savings of the tile.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the proposed ramp at the rectory building; it is wood, but all the other proposed ramps are concrete. Mr. Seiler stated that the ramp is designed to match the rectory's wood porch. He stated that concrete was inappropriate for the building. Mr. Cluver objected to the proposed railing. Ms. Hawkins asked how the ramp would meet the wood porch. Mr. Seiler explained that the ramp would have an extension within the porch to accommodate the eight-inch step of the entrance door. Mr. Seiler stated that, to meet code, they must extend the ramp five feet from the door. Mr. Cluver suggested pushing the ramp away from the edge of the porch to respect the original level of the porch floor. Mr. Pentz stated that the ramp may not be wide enough to accommodate that approach. Ms. Hawkins suggested that, if the ramp cannot be made smaller, then the railing should be simplified to minimize the visual impact.

Mr. Cluver asked if the stained-glass windows would be removed. Mr. Pentz answered that the Commission had already approved removing stained-glass windows in the church building. He noted that those windows had already been removed.

Mr. Baron asked if the transformer location had been finalized. Mr. Pentz answered that the transformer location had been finalized and it would be located away from Wayne Avenue. He noted that it would have a minimal visual impact at that location.

Ms. Hawkins asked if audience members had any comments. No one offered comments.

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

1. a mock up of the installed Ludovici tile is reviewed for approval by the staff;
2. the handrail within the loggia is held back from the arched openings;
3. the color of the asphalt shingle roof on the chapel matches the color of the tile on the church;
4. the ramp at the rectory is a composite material to match the color of the wood porch and has a simplified metal railing; and,
5. the proposed stair and ramp combination at the south entrance of the rectory is changed to a ramp alone with a simplified railing.

with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

ADDRESS: 4231 AVENUE OF THE REPUBLIC, MEMORIAL HALL

Project: Install waterproofing to dome

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia/Please Touch Museum

Applicant: Philip Scott, KSK Architects Planners

History: 1876; Memorial Hall; Herman Schwartzmann, architect

Individual Designation: 7/6/1978

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: The Historical Commission reviewed and approved an application in-concept to install a non-reversible coating on the outer dome of Memorial Hall in Fairmount Park in December 2012. The outer dome has been experiencing water infiltration for years. The inner dome was temporarily wrapped during the rehabilitation of the building for Please Touch Museum in 2004. That intervention was a temporary solution, which protected the interior

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 AUGUST 2013

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

plaster finishes from further water-related damage. The current proposal is a long-term solution. The proposed material would be applied to the exterior of the outer dome. The material, known in the trade as Decothane, is a translucent mesh-reinforced epoxy. It can be tinted to match any substrate. The applicant has installed sampled on the building using one of the company's standard colors. The sample was reviewed by the Historical Commission and Parks & Recreation staff, who determined that the sample appeared slightly too yellow for a convincing copper patina color. The applicant will work with the manufacturer to amend the color to better replicate a copper patina before installing the custom blend on the dome. Aside from the color question, however, the sample did not present any adverse effects on the perception of the dome from the ground.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the color is amended to better replicate a copper patina, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Phillip Scott and John McDevitt of the Please Touch Museum represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the application of the coating reduces the size of the lights in between the ribs of the dome. Mr. Danta answered that there is a small overlap over the glass, but that it is not noticeable from the ground. He explained that the photograph in the package is taken with a zoom lens and that, in reality, the eye can not perceive the small detail from the ground. Mr. Scott added that the color contrast is not as stark in reality as it appears in the photograph. Ms. Gutterman asked if the bases of the corner sculptures would be coated as well. Mr. Scott answered that they are currently working with a consultant to coat the bases and create a water-tight seal. Mr. McDevitt stated that the pedestals of the sculptures were coated in the last major restoration of the exterior of the building in 1976. Mr. Cluver asked if the glass is smooth. Mr. Scott answered that it is on the exterior; it has a textured finish in the interior. Mr. Cluver stated that the proposal is drastic, but is acceptable, given the unique and severe problems of this dome. He acknowledged that several less intrusive attempts to seal the dome have been unsuccessful. He concluded that keeping the building watertight far outweighs any of the drawbacks of this proposal.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the color is amended to better replicate a copper patina, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 604-36 S WASHINGTON SQ

Project: Replace and reconfigure sidewalks

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Hopkinson House Owners' Association

Applicant: Theresa Shephard, Shephard Restoration Engineers, Inc.

History: 1961; Hopkinson House; Oscar Stonorov, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes as Phase 1 of a larger project to remove the existing block pavers in the sidewalk area in the entrance way under the canopy and repair the structural

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 AUGUST 2013

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

concrete deck and garage beams below grade. This application proposes to replace the brick pavers with stamped concrete panels with a bluestone texture and gull gray color. In addition, a concrete ramp is proposed to span across the Belgian block drive way from the curblin to the sidewalk along S. Washington Square. The color of the ramp will be red to match the Belgian block. The width of the ramp will not exceed the width of the canopy and will allow level access to the entrance area. There is also an alternate proposal in which the sidewalk and ramp would be stamped concrete with a bluestone texture, gull gray color, and have a herringbone pattern. Stonorov's original plans for the sidewalk and drive show smooth concrete panels, a concrete curb, and fan shaped Belgian block paving in the driveway.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the smooth red concrete access ramp in the driveway, but denial of the sidewalk replacement, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Engineer Theresa Shephard and Lawrence Meehan, Judith Forte, and V. Paul Coyne of the Hopkinson House Owners' Association represented the application.

Mr. Baron noted that the concrete pattern in the Stonorov drawing of the sidewalk is very much like the window pattern of the building. He stated that the staff recommends that, if the sidewalks are replaced, the Stonorov design for them should be replicated. Mr. Cluver asked Ms. Shephard if she was proposing Phase 1 only at this time, or if she was requesting approval of all phases of the project. She asked the Committee to consider the entire scope, even though the later work would not be undertaken until next year. Ms. Shephard displayed renderings that included images of alternate stamped concrete designs. Ms. Shephard agreed with Mr. Baron that the original Stonorov concrete design of 4' by 8' panels aligns with the window mullions. She added that she and the owner are willing to replicate the original panel design. She stated that she has concerns about selecting the correct color because the building has been coated and is no longer the original color. It is now parchment, an off white, beige, or cream color. She stated that the new sidewalk should complement, not compete, with the building color. Mr. Baron stated that he is as concerned about the texture of the proposed concrete as well as the color. It is intended to look like a slate paver. Ms. Shephard stated that the texture would make the walks slip resistant. She also noted that concrete walks quickly become stained. She stated that the proposal is intended to embellish the property and make the entry more "intimate." She added that a change in the sidewalk design from standard concrete would indicate that the embellished sidewalk was private property and not part of the public right-of-way. Ms. Hawkins stated that the proposal seems to be trying to make this Modernist building look like Colonial Society Hill. Ms. Shephard stated that, ultimately, the owner does not want a light concrete because it is difficult and expensive to keep clean. Ms. Hawkins stated that the new sidewalk should maintain the Modernist aesthetic of the building. The Committee members indicated that they would be in favor of restoring the concrete sidewalk with a broom-finish buff color with patterning to match the Stonorov drawing. Mr. McCoubrey and Ms. Gutterman stated that a range of colors for the concrete would be acceptable, but they should harmonize with the color of the building and replicate the original patterning. The Committee members agreed that the stamped faux slate sidewalk was incompatible with the Modernist building. They also agreed that the concrete ramp was acceptable. Mr. Cluver asked Ms. Shephard to verify that the slope of the proposed ramp satisfied the code and would not require railings. She responded that it meets code and would not require railings.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the smooth red concrete access ramp in the driveway, but denial of the proposed sidewalk replacement, pursuant to Standard 6.

ADDRESS: 1027-31 ARCH ST, UNIT 102

Project: Legalize storefront windows, install awnings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Spring Easton, LLC

Applicant: Scott Hartner, Hartner Architecture & Construction

History: 1901; Pitcairn Building; Hewitt Brothers, architects

Individual Designation: 9/14/1988

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of storefront windows, which were recently installed without the Historical Commission's approval or a building permit. It also proposes to install four shed awnings, which would be mounted into the brick.

The property in question is a commercial condominium on the first floor of a building at the northeast corner of 11th and Arch Streets. The unit is located at the rear of the building and includes four large storefront bays that open onto N. 11th Street. The storefront bays have ornate window surrounds with original transoms over non-historic storefront systems. Paired casement windows above a fixed single-light horizontal window were installed in the non-historic storefront systems in two of the four storefront bays. The pane configurations as well as the heavy, thick window frames are inappropriate for the storefronts.

This application also proposes to install shed awnings at the four storefront bays. The drawings and renderings provide conflicting details regarding the awning attachment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

Mr. Cluver stated that he is opposed to the awnings as proposed because they would obscure the transoms. He noted, however, that he might be amenable to awnings that were set below the transoms, but withheld final judgment until such a design is proposed. The Committee members agreed that the installed windows are incompatible with the storefront.

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

ADDRESS: 415 S CROSKEY ST

Project: Construct third-floor addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joel Frisch

Applicant: Rebecca Vieyra

History: 1860

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to add a third story on top of a two-story rowhouse in a row of nearly identical two-story rowhouses. Although the addition would be set back and several cladding options have been provided, the new addition will be highly conspicuous from the street. The Commission has approved some third-story additions on carriage houses on streets with buildings of mixed heights, but has not approved additions in instances such as this. On this side of this block, the building wall is uniformly two stories in height.

The application also proposes replacing the illegal vinyl windows. The staff has already approved an application for the appropriate wood windows. The application implicitly proposes legalizing alterations to the front door.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Joel Frisch represented the application.

Mr. Baron reported that he visited the site to inspect a mock-up of the addition and found it to be visible. He contended that any addition on this roof will be conspicuous because the building is located near the end of the row of buildings. He also asserted that the Commission has not approved additions on the main roofs of rowhouses. An approval of this application would be precedent setting.

Mr. Frisch stated that he is seeking to build an inconspicuous addition. He said that the addition would not be visible from the north or directly in front of the building. He said that automobile traffic comes from the north. He claimed that there is only one point in the street where one corner of the addition would be visible. He asserted that it would be inconspicuous. Mr. Frisch concluded that he is seeking to restore the front of the building and add an inconspicuous rear addition. He stated that he is flexible regarding the materials of the façade of the addition. Ms. Hawkins asked whether the alley behind the building is a service alley. Mr. Frisch stated that the alley is a three-foot gated pedestrian alley used for trash removal only.

Mr. Cluver stated that he is concerned that, if this application is approved, in 15 years the whole block will have a jumble of third-story additions on what is today a uniform two-story row. Mr. Frisch said that the buildings at ends of the block are taller. He also noted that the row of three- and four-story buildings on 22nd Street, which are to the east of this row, can be seen looming over the row. He contended that this row does not appear to have a consistent roofline because of the much taller buildings just behind them. Ms. Gutterman replied that those buildings face a much wider street. Mr. Frisch countered that those buildings are seen when one stands on Croskey Street and looks at the row in which his building stands. He claimed that any rear

addition on his building would be seen against the rears of the buildings on 22nd Street. Mr. Frisch asked if the direction of traffic flow on his one-way street would factor into the decision. Ms. Hawkins stated that it would play no role. She stated that they would look at the proposal through the eyes of a pedestrian.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if the existing building has a rear ell. Mr. Frisch stated that it does not; it is a single block. He also noted that the property has a very small rear patio, which cannot be built on owing to the rear open space requirement. The roof is the only place for the addition.

Mr. Frisch remarked that several houses in the immediate area have rooftop additions that were approved by the Historical Commission. He said that some of the additions are not set back from the front façades. He noted that his proposed addition is set back from the front facade to make it less visible. He claimed that it would be inconspicuous. Ms. Hawkins acknowledged that Mr. Frisch has set the addition back significantly from the front façade and has shown sensitivity with the design. She noted, however, that the row of houses is consistently two stories and an addition on one would disrupt that consistency. She commended that applicant for his efforts, but concluded that she could not recommend approval. Ms. Gutterman stated that they might be able to recommend approval if he was proposing raising a rear gable, but his is a flat roof. Mr. Frisch asked, hypothetically, if the addition could be approved if it were set back to a point where it was entirely invisible from the street. He noted that the addition is already very small, 150 sf, so setting it back farther may not be possible. Mr. Cluver said that rooftop additions seem to work better on large buildings that are four or five stories tall. He stated that he is “torn” about this application. He acknowledged that the existing house is very small and would benefit greatly from an addition, but contended that the block is intact. Ms. Pentz said that an approval of this addition would set a significant precedent that might lead to other such approvals.

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

ADDRESS: 325 S 18TH ST

Project: rear addition, windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Teresa Isabella

Applicant: Teresa Isabella

History: constructed c. 1860

Individual Designation: 11/4/1976

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

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

OVERVIEW: The applicant seeks to make a three-story addition to the rear façade of this building at the corner of 18th and Delancey Streets. In 1995 and 1996 the Commission approved the removal and reconstruction of bays at the side and the rear of the property based on their reproduction. Some progress has been made on the reconstruction of the side bays although their cornices and trim are missing. The rear bay is also still missing. The owner now seeks to add a large addition rather than to rebuild the rear bay. The addition will be much larger than the previous bay. It will sit on posts like the previous bay to provide a parking area, but will extend out nearly twice the width to provide more bedrooms. It will also be higher and have a glazed

solarium. The building will now have an internal elevator that will exit directly to the side yard through a door to be cut in the side front bay. The plans show a new metal fence.

The plans for the project are incomplete because they are missing east and west elevations. The north elevation which is provided is inaccurate, and lacking in mention of materials. Pieces that have been removed from the old building which are to be restored are shown missing.

The staff recommends denial of the proposal because the addition is completely out of scale with the building. The rear ell should be narrower and smaller in size than the existing portions of the building. The applicant made a commitment to restore the rear ell in 1996. That plan should be carried out.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10 and owing to incompleteness.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Teresa Isabella represented the application.

Ms. Isabella showed several images of the building in the period before the mansard was added at the end of the nineteenth century and discussed her proposal to add a fence along the side of the rear ell. She said that she has owned the property since 1973. She reported that she installed a new roof. Ms. Hawkins asked her to focus on the application. She stated that she wishes to add a rear addition that would be wider than the rear ell and larger than the former rear addition, which was demolished. She said that she needs the larger addition because the side bay will be occupied by an elevator. Ms. Hawkins stated that the application should include an elevation drawing of the side of the bay showing the new door for the elevator. Mr. Baron asked for details about the door including its appearance and operation. Ms. Isabella said that her architect abandoned her and that she is not familiar with the ADA requirements for the elevator. Ms. Hawkins said that she needs to have an architect design and draw the proposed elevator. The Committee members said that the elevator might require infilling windows in the bay, which would impact the exterior. They noted that the elevator has not been fully designed or drawn, leaving many questions unanswered. Ms. Isabella said that she would like to construct a rear addition that will have four units including a first-floor owner's unit. She said that adding the elevator reduces the available interior space at the front, necessitating the larger rear addition. Ms. Hawkins stated that the larger rear addition is out of scale with the rest of the building. She explained that any addition should be smaller in scale than the remainder of the building; the building should be "like a telescope," with the smallest section at the rear, not the largest. She also found the materials and design of the greenhouse section of the addition to be incompatible with the historic house. She said that the drawing is very unclear and incomplete. Ms. Isabella asked about other additions that have been approved by the Commission. Ms. Hawkins stated that they need to review this proposal on its merits. She suggested that the Committee recommend denial because of incompatibility and incompleteness.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10 and owing to incompleteness.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 AUGUST 2013

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

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

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

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

Reconstruction Standard 4: Reconstruction will be based on an accurate duplication of historic features and elements substantiated by documentary or physical evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different features from other historic properties. A reconstructed property will re-create the appearance of the non-surviving historic property in materials, design, color, and texture.