

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

**TUESDAY, 27 NOVEMBER 2012  
ROOM 578, CITY HALL  
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

**PRESENT**

Dominique Hawkins, Chair  
John Cluver  
Nan Gutterman  
Dan McCoubrey  
Amy Stein

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

**ALSO PRESENT**

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Co.  
Brian Emmons, Toll Brothers  
Van Potteiger, VPA  
Tom Witt, Esq., Cozen O'Connor  
Kit Leary  
Adrienne Mendell  
Antoinette Levitt  
Russ Troyer  
Ori Feibush, OCF Realty  
Al Hanssen  
Anne Cook  
Antoinette Levitt, Spring Garden Civic Association  
Robert Levitt  
Carl Primavera, Esq. Klehr Harrison  
Matt Shanchan  
Ralph Perkins  
Justino Navarro, Spring Garden CDC and Civic Association  
Dan Vicencio, RA  
Michael Alhadad  
Adam Montalbano  
James Morrissey  
Tracy Chin  
Christopher Plant  
Barbara Wolf, Spring Garden CDC and Civic Association  
Sarit Kadakia  
Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker & Partners  
Cecil Baker, Cecil Baker & Partners

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 NOVEMBER 2012**

**PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

Barry Reinhart

**CALL TO ORDER**

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Ms. Gutterman and Messrs. Cluver and McCoubrey joined her. Ms. Stein joined the meeting while it was in progress.

**ADDRESS: 818-20 CHESTNUT ST**

Project: Create new entrance at storefront

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Posel Enterprises

Applicant: James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Company

History: 1880; Horn & Hardart; alts for Horn & Hardart, Ralph Bencker, architect, 1930, 1936

Individual Designation: 4/30/1986

District Designation: None

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes exterior alterations as part of the rehabilitation of the upper floors of this building into residential units. The alterations would include the replacement of front façade windows, the rehabilitation of the cornice, and the creation of a new entrance at the storefront. The upper floors of the building have been vacant for decades. The ground floor, which was also vacant for many years, is currently occupied. The original date of construction of the structure is 1880; however, it was significantly modified in the 1930s for Horn & Hardart with an elaborate Art Deco style storefront and sign.

The creation of a new entrance at ground floor is necessary in order to access the residential apartments on the upper stories. The applicant proposes two alternatives: Alternative A, which would place the entrance in a recess of the storefront, and Alternative B, which would place the door in the easternmost bay of the storefront. Alternative B would have the greatest impact visually and in terms of the removal of historic fabric.

The Historical Commission approved altering this storefront in 2002 for the creation of a second entrance, much in the same manner as is proposed in Alternative B. That work was never undertaken.

The current applicant submitted a similar application in October 2012. The Architectural Committee suggested that the applicant should study the details of the storefront further. The applicant withdrew the proposal from the Commission's agenda in order to develop the details of the alteration as suggested. The applicant submitted the current application with the requested details. The October 2012 application included the replacement of metal panels with glass in the signage niche; that aspect of the project is not proposed in the current application.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of restoration work and Alternative A of the storefront alteration, pursuant to Standard 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented to application to the Architectural Committee. Developer David Hess and architect James Campbell represented the application.

Mr. Hess addressed the Committee. He stated that the Committee had advised them last month to develop additional details of the storefront alteration and that they had taken the advice

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 NOVEMBER 2012**

**PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

seriously. He stated that he hoped the details would be acceptable to the Committee. Mr. Campbell noted that the details were developed for Alternative A, which was the preferred option of both the staff and the Committee. Mr. Campbell explained that they had originally proposed to center the door in the modified bay, but that, upon closer examination, they realized that such a placement would only yield a sliver of stone beneath the sidelight. He stated that it would be more successful to remove the stone base in the proposed work area and install a single door with sidelight instead. Mr. Hess stated that the stone would be saved, unaltered, and displayed in the new lobby of the residential entrance.

Mr. Cluver asked if the decorative mullion would be reused. Mr. Campbell answered that the mullion would be salvaged and utilized as a transom bar for the new entrance. He noted that the height of the bar would follow the horizontal mullion that already exists on the main entrance to the doctor's office.

Mr. Hawkins asked about the plans for the sign in the niche after the non-historic sign is removed. Mr. Campbell explained that the sign would be restored, but that in order to do so they would need to investigate the existing conditions further. He clarified that only the non-historic sign faces would be removed. He stated that no original element would be removed and that the intent is to restore the sign if possible. Mr. Hess stated that they may put up a temporary banner advertising the apartments, but only for a short time.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance noted that the stone base panel runs around the entire storefront. He asked whether a bronze kick plate could be installed to the door and sidelights in order to carry the visual continuity of the stone base. Mr. Campbell answered that, in his opinion, it would add a new element to the storefront that did not exist historically and is not present anywhere else on the storefront currently. He noted that the entrance doors to the doctor's office do not have kick plates and are fully glazed. He stated that the intent is to match the doctor's office doors, which will be adjacent to the new door. Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Mr. Campbell's decision. He stated that it would be best to allow the door to be read as a new entrance and not to try to mask it. Mr. Cluver and Ms. Gutterman agreed with Mr. McCoubrey and endorsed the proposal as presented.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of restoration work and Alternative A of the storefront alteration, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**ADDRESS: 410 S FRONT ST**

Project: Install plaza

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Toll PA XV, LP

Applicant: Shawn Frawley, Toll Brothers Inc.

History: vacant lot; New Market, 1973, Louis Sauer, architect; demolished 2000

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Non-contributing, 3/10/1999

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

**OVERVIEW:** The Historical Commission approved the construction of a residential building at this site in July 2012. At that time, the Commission determined that the design of the plaza facing

Headhouse Square required additional refinement. The applicant now proposes the final design for the plaza.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented to application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Brian Emmons represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked for a clarification of the proposed materials. Mr. Emmons explained that the proposed materials would be stone and brick. Ms. Hawkins asked whether the stone would be laid in a random pattern. Mr. Emmons answered that the stone paving would likely be random. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the ramp would also be finished in the same material and, if so, if it would satisfy the ADA regulations. Mr. Emmons explained that the ADA entrance to the complex would be located along Front Street and that the ramp along Headhouse Square is meant for older residents, but not for disabled residents.

Ms. Hawkins suggested that the stone paving should be a geometric pattern rather than random. Mr. Cluver agreed with that suggestion. Mr. McCoubrey stated that historically paving in the city was tight and more geometric. Mr. Emmons stated that changing to a more geometric, tight pattern would be acceptable. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the stone paving would stop at the ramp or extend beyond it. Mr. Emmons answered that they had designed the stone-paved area as a circumscribed square. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the stone paving should be continued to the rear of the plaza to visually unify it. Ms. Hawkins agreed with Ms. Gutterman, and stated that having a brick border around the stone-paved area linked it to the brick sidewalks, but that the stone should engage the wall of the complex to tie in the entire plaza into the residential complex. Mr. Cluver added that the stone capping over the knee walls and retaining walls should be consistent throughout, and should also extend to the walls of the complex in order to unify the design of the plaza with the complex itself. Mr. Emmons liked the suggestion and agreed to make the change. Ms. Gutterman asked if the application proposes any lighting. Mr. Emmons stated that they will design some ambient lighting, but would work with the staff on that detail at a later date. Mr. Danta stated that lighting is within the staff's authority to approve and that they will work with the applicant on that point at the staff level.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with natural stone paving and capping to extend the entire depth of the plaza in a regular pattern, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**ADDRESS: 1708 AND 1710 RITTENHOUSE SQ**

Project: Raise rear roofs, construct rear parapets, install elevator

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1708-1710 Rittenhouse Square Street LP

Applicant: Thomas P. Witt, Cozen O'Connor

History: 1850

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to alter the roofs on the rear ells of two adjacent rowhouses, which are internally connected, and to install an elevator. The floor levels and

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 NOVEMBER 2012**

**PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

ceiling heights of the rear portion of the buildings do not meet the building code for the commercial use of the property, which will be used as a medical office. The proposed alteration would raise the roofs over the rear ells and elevate the floors to align them with the floors in the main blocks of the buildings. The only visible exterior alteration would be the construction of parapets at the rear facades of the buildings. The rear facades of the buildings have different cladding materials: 1708 is clad in brick and 1710 is clad in stucco. The rears of the properties face Manning Street, which has the character of a service alley for most of the block. An elevator is proposed, the shaft of which would extend beyond the roof line, but would not be visible from the public right-of-way.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided each parapet matches the cladding material of the facade below, pursuant to Standard 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Thomas Witt and architect Van Potteiger represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked if the rear façades of the buildings are accessible to the public. Mr. Danta answered that Manning Street is a public street, although only a few buildings face the street. It has the character of a service alley for most of the block.

Mr. Witt remarked that the alterations would make both buildings fully accessible in the least intrusive manner. Mr. Cluver noted certain inconsistencies in the drawings. He suggested that the drawings should be reviewed for drafting mistakes before submitting for permits. Ms. Hawkins noted that doors provide access to the roofs over the rear ells, but the roofs do not have decks or railings. She asked whether the proposal included a roof deck or a railing on the parapet to make the roofs accessible. Mr. Potteiger answered that the roofs would not be accessible. Ms. Hawkins stated that, if the roofs will not to be accessible, then the doors should be removed. Ms. Gutterman agreed.

Ms. Gutterman asked how high the parapet would extend above the new roof. Mr. Potteiger answered that the extension would not be greater than eight inches, just enough to allow for the new roof membrane to be rolled up and capping to be installed on the parapet wall. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the retention of the cornices to delineate the height of the original roof was a good idea and would satisfy the Standards.

Ms. Hawkins reiterated the necessity to revise the drawings before submitting for permits and to rectify drafting mistakes. She stated, however, that the staff could work with the applicant on those final detail and revisions.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided each parapet matches the material of the wall below, the parapet wall above the new roof line is not greater than 12 inches, and the existing doors to the roofs are replaced with appropriate windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**ADDRESS: 2100 FAIRMOUNT AVE**

Project: Legalize exterior alterations

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 2100 Fairmount LLC

Applicant: Ori Feibush, OCF Cafe

History: 1922, Westing, Evans & Egmore Furniture Factory

Individual Designation: 12/6/1979

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to legalize alterations to the ground-floor facades of this commercial property that were recently undertaken without approvals or permits.

The building was constructed in 1922 for a furniture manufacturer, which retained ownership of the building until 1942. The Commission's files contain a real estate advertisement, which likely dates from the 1942 sale of the building. The advertisement includes a photograph of the building and shows its ground-floor openings and windows in their original configuration. The original ground-floor windows followed the patterns of the windows in the upper stories. The ground floor was subsequently altered in 1965. The masonry openings were changed and windows removed. The Commission reviewed an application to again modify the ground-floor openings in 2004. At that time, the Commission approved the reopening of two bays along 21st Street and the three eastern most bays along Fairmount Avenue. The approved design included cutting the windows down below the levels of the historic sills and the installation of aluminum windows that matched the pattern of the historic windows and the rhythm of the mullions found in the upper stories. For financial reasons, the 2004 project was not carried out to its fully approved extent; the as-built project differed slightly from the approved project.

The current tenant, OCF Café, received an approval July 2012 for the exploratory removal of stucco on the façade of the building in order to identify the original window openings. The approval did not include the removal of existing windows or the installation of new ones. The applicant discussed a window project with the staff prior to undertaking any exterior work, and was advised that such an application would require the full Commission's review. Despite the staff's clear instructions and the strict limitations of the exploratory approval, the applicant moved forward with the window project without any approvals or permits, cutting down the window openings and installing new windows, even after the building inspector ordered him to stop. The applicant eventually stopped working on the exterior after the Department of Licenses & Inspections shut down the entire project, inside and out.

The applicant now seeks to legalize the exterior alterations without modification. The application proposes to legalize the reopening of most of the masonry openings to their original widths, but to new sill heights at the floor level, below the original sill heights. The application also proposes legalizing the windows that were installed without an approval. The new windows do not match the original configuration or the configuration approved by the Commission in 2004. Two bays have roll-up garage-style doors. Railings not yet installed are proposed along the exterior face of the building at the garage doors. The application does not propose any signage, but some signage will likely be needed by the new business.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 NOVEMBER 2012**

**PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented to application to the Architectural Committee. Business owner Ori Feibush and attorney Carl Primavera represented the application.

Mr. Primavera stated that they were present mostly to listen to the Committee's comments. He described the events as "the unraveling of a thread on a sweater." He stated that they are not here to offer excuses for the illegal work, but instead to resolve the matter in the best way possible. He described the situation as difficult for everyone involved.

Ms. Hawkins stated that, when the Committee reviews legalization applications, it always looks at whether work performed would have been approved had it been presented to the Commission in advance and followed the normal review channel. She stated that the application clearly does not meet the Standards. She stated that the windows that were installed do not match the historic configuration, which is known from the historic photograph. She questioned the expansion of the openings and contended that the garage doors are certainly incompatible with the historic character of the building. Ms. Gutterman asked why the work had been carried out with an exploratory permit only. Mr. Feibush acknowledged that the permit stated that the windows were not to be removed or new windows installed, but that he had spoken to Mr. Danta and informed him that the work would likely exceed the approved scope. He explained that the exploratory work could not be completed without the removal of the windows and that the new windows had to be installed, owing to security issues. He noted that the walls around the old windows were filled with foam and an assortment of non-load bearing elements. Ms. Hawkins asked if there were lintels over the windows at the time the exploratory work took place. Mr. Feibush answered that the historic lintels were present and that they remain today. He clarified that he was referring to the infill below and around the windows, which consisted of chicken wire, foam, and pieces of old doors and windows. Ms. Hawkins asked if the integrity of the masonry opening was ever compromised. Mr. Feibush answered that the masonry openings were stable and were reopened to their original widths, which was known from the surviving metal lintels. He noted that the heights were changed, because the original sills were not present and the cavities were filled with the random materials. Mr. Feibush stated that the photograph from the 1970s shows the condition of the building after it was altered; among the alterations was a garage door, upon which the new garage doors were based.

Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Danta if the exploratory permit was limited to the removal of stucco at the face of the building to find the original dimensions of the windows. Mr. Danta answered that the exploratory approval was limited to the removal of stucco only. Mr. Feibush concurred with Mr. Danta. Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Feibush why the windows and infill materials were removed when the permit only allowed the removal of stucco to find the original dimensions of the openings. Ms. Feibush stated that they had only removed non-historic materials. Ms. Hawkins asked her question a second time. Mr. Feibush answered that he did not have a good answer. She stated that the removal of the infill and the existing windows had created the "security issue" that led to the installation of new windows and doors on the façade of the building. Mr. Feibush restated his comment that the removed materials were non-historic. He added that some of the openings were surrounded mostly by foam, which had no integrity or stability. Mr. Feibush stated that he had clearly exceeded the approval and building permit. Mr. Primavera stated that it had been a misinterpretation of the approval, and a layman's interpretation of what seemed reasonable, rather than a literal understanding of the Historical Commission's jurisdiction and process.

Mr. Primavera asked the Committee to discuss the issue of the ADA ramp. Mr. Feibush stated that he had brought this issue to the attention of the plans examiner, Curtis Daniel. Mr. Feibush

stated that the existing ramp was not up to code, and that Mr. Daniel asked him to remove it. Mr. Feibush explained that he went to the Department of Licenses & Inspections to secure a permit and was told that a permit was not necessary for sidewalk work. He also asked his attorney whether the removal of the ramp would invalidate the agreement with the City's Law Department and was told that it would not affect it. The agreement lifted a stop work order allowing Mr. Feibush to continue his interior renovations, provided he undertook no work to the exterior without the appropriate approvals and permits. Mr. Feibush stated that he removed the ADA ramp based on that guidance. Mr. Primavera asked the Committee to advise his client regarding the ramp. Ms. Hawkins stated that the applicants conceded removing a non-compliant ramp, but provided scant details for the new ramp. Mr. Primavera stated that the proposed plans include a new ramp, and that the Streets Department thinks that they have priority jurisdiction over this particular element, but, given the sensitivity of the situation, they do not want to proceed without guidance from the Historical Commission. Ms. Hawkins stated that, in her personal opinion, the entire proposed legalization is inappropriate. Mr. Primavera asked her to discuss the ramp. Ms. Hawkins clarified that the ramp cannot be discussed in the abstract without discussing the door it leads to and how it alters the façade of the building. She added that the ramp cannot be discussed alone, but must be considered in the larger context. Mr. Danta stated that the old ramp was removed in the last few days. Mr. Feibush stated that the ramp had been slowly removed over a period of three weeks. Mr. Danta noted that the ramp was an existing condition that was grandfathered. Mr. Feibush stated that the ramp was illegal and that he had received a violation for the ramp. Mr. Primavera asked whether a replacement in kind for the ramp was possible. Ms. Hawkins stated that a non-compliant element loses its grandfathered status when it is removed. Mr. Cluver stated that the building code gives latitude to grandfathered conditions that may not be up to the current code. Ms. Hawkins reiterated that the application presents larger issues than merely the removal of an illegal ramp. Mr. Danta stated that he could not speak for the Department of Licenses & Inspections, or whether a permit had been issued for the construction of the ramp that was present until very recently. He added that the Commission had reviewed and approved the ramp that existed on the building as part of the rehabilitation in 2004. Mr. Feibush clarified that the drawings from the 2004 review did not accurately represent the as-built condition. Mr. Danta agreed and reiterated that he had earlier stated that the 2004 project was scaled back and revised owing to financial reasons, but that the Commission had granted an approval for the installation of a ramp on the façade of this building. Mr. Feibush clarified that he was referring specifically to the dimensions of the as-built ramp and how those dimensions did not match the drawings submitted to the Department of Licenses & Inspections. Ms. Hawkins asked whether a copy of the 2004 approval was available. Mr. Danta answered that it was available and could be provided to the Committee members.

Mr. Cluver stated that he supported the reopening of the masonry bays to their historic widths. He suggested that cutting the openings down to the floor did not meet the Standards. He contended that, even if original fabric had not survived at the window openings, the original heights should be reestablished based on the historic photograph. Mr. Cluver objected to the illegal nature of the alterations. Mr. Feibush stated that the garage doors are a "modern interpretation" of the 1970s configuration of the ground floor, which clearly included a garage door. Mr. Cluver stated that the 1970s photograph should not have been used as an inspiration. Mr. Feibush stated that his aim with the garage doors was to place more "eyes on the street" and open up the façade, as well as exposing original elements that had survived, such as the steel lintels. Ms. Hawkins stated that the application before them proposed final approval of the legalization of the work. She contended that the Committee could not recommend approval as presented. Mr. Primavera stated that they have an agreement with the City to seek a solution to

the illegal situation and that they wish to proceed to the Commission to comply with the process and the agreement. He requested that the Committee consider the application as submitted.

Anne Cook, a resident at 2101 Wallace Street, stated that they had spoken to Mr. Feibush during the alterations when the new aluminum windows were installed and was told that the windows were being installed for security reasons. She noted, however, that one bay remains open to this day with plywood around it but no window. Ms. Cook stated that the Historical Commission had reviewed an application for a neighboring property, dating to the 1920s, and had steered the design away from a Victorian-inspired storefront to a design more appropriate to the age and style of the building. She stated that the process works best when everyone follows the letter of the law.

Al Hansson, a 40-year resident of Wallace Street, stated that he had seen the building go from an empty shell to a rehabbed apartment building. He stated that the owner had desecrated the ground floor with a stucco parging when he rehabilitated it. He added that, when work began a couple of months ago, he was excited to see the original lintels with their rosettes exposed, but dismayed by the nature of the windows. He urged the Committee not to accept an alteration merely because it is there, when the developer circumvented the normal process and ignored the letter of the law. He expressed his opposition to the existing conditions.

Antoinette Levitt, the president of the Spring Garden Civic Association, stated that she lives steps away from the subject building. She stated that the illegal alterations are a complete disregard of the historic district designation, which the neighborhood fought so hard to obtain. She stated that she had a fire in her own residence, and because of the historic designation, she was unable to install aluminum windows, which would have been cheaper than the historically appropriate wood windows. Ms. Levitt stated that the security issue expressed by Mr. Feibush does not seem to involve the openings that are still only covered by plywood and have been in that condition for months. She noted that the alterations involve two main facades, owing to the location of the building on a corner. She urged the Committee not to recommend approval of the white aluminum windows simply because they are there. Mr. Cluver asked her to clarify whether the white aluminum windows in question were in the upper stories or at ground level. Ms. Levitt clarified that she was referring to the illegal windows at ground floor. She also clarified that she was referring to the illegal garage doors.

Benjamin Leach of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Alliance supports the staff's recommendation and the community's position. He stated that this is not a case where the Committee or the Commission should grant forgiveness. He noted that not too many buildings of this era have historical records that show the original configuration of the building. He contended that the original configuration seems to suit the proposed use without the need for modifications.

Ralph Perkins, a neighbor, stated his solidarity and support for his neighbors and the community. He stated that there were about a dozen concerned neighbors present at the Committee meeting, who spoke for the community as a whole. Robert Levitt, a neighbor, expressed his desire to see the Committee follow the Commission's Rules & Regulations. Matt Shanchan, a 13-year resident, stated his support for his neighbors' comments and urged the Committee not to legalize the alterations.

Justino Navarro of the Spring Garden Civic Association stated his support for the neighbor's opposition to the illegal work. He stated that the neighborhood association takes great pride in

the cultivation and preservation of the historic district. He described the illegal work as an affront to the 40 years of preservation efforts by the community to protect the historic district.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10.

**ADDRESS: 1531 NORTH ST**

Project: Construct 3-story residential building

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Willis Berry

Applicant: Michael Patterson, Ashaur, Inc.

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Non-contributing, 10/11/2000

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a three-story, three-unit house with a roof deck on a vacant lot within the Spring Garden Historic District. The lot is considered to be “undeveloped” and the Commission’s jurisdiction is Review-and-Comment only. The first and second story of the front elevation would be clad in brick with a bay clad in aluminum siding on the second floor. The windows would be one-over-one. The third-story, parged in stucco, would be set back, allowing space for a wood deck. The side and rear elevations would be parged in stucco with one-over-one windows.

**STAFF COMMENT:** The staff comments that the arrangement of the windows and doors is awkward and not reflective of typical fenestration patterns found in the district; the bay window, set back, and roof deck would be more appropriate for the rear than the front.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Coté presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the Commission has Review-and-Comment jurisdiction only in this case. Therefore, the Committee can make suggestions, which the applicant can choose to implement or not, but the Commission cannot deny the application or condition an approval.

Mr. Cluver concurred with the comments of the staff. He stated that the front façade looks more like a rear façade. He stated that the rhythm found on the street is two bays wide on the narrower buildings and three bays wide on wider buildings. He thought that three bays with three windows on the upper floors and two windows and a door on the first floor would be a more appropriate treatment to the façade. He opined that a deck should not be on the front and would be inappropriate. Ms. Hawkins added that the basement window looks like it is much too close to the property line and such a configuration may not work structurally as drawn.

Ms. Gutterman stated that the bay material is inappropriate for a front façade. Ms. Hawkins asked about the proposed material. Ms. Gutterman responded that it appeared to be aluminum cladding. She stated that the drawings are lacking in details. Ms. Hawkins stated that the windows should look more like real punched windows in a masonry wall with a lintel at the top and a sill at the bottom of the opening. Ms. Gutterman stated that the lintel over the door is inappropriately expressed; it does not look like it could hold the masonry above it. Mr. Cluver

stated that the paired windows on the side elevations should have a mullion between them and suggested some consistency of the treatment of the side and rear elevations. Ms. Hawkins stated that there are many mistakes and inconsistencies in the architectural drawings. Elements seen in one view are not seen in others, even though they should be. Cornices that should wrap around do not. She stated that the architectural drawings were very poorly executed. She listed numerous problems with the drawings.

Justino Navarro of the Spring Garden Community Development Corporation and the Spring Garden Civic Association stated that his organization agrees with the Committee's comments and opposes the design of the new building. He stated that it is inconsistent with the historic character of the district. He stated that they would like to see the traditional fenestration pattern with lintel and sills that Mr. Cluver described as well as a water table. Mr. Navarro suggested brick types that would match the historic character of the neighborhood.

Ms. Stein joined the Committee.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia stated that he supports the comments made by the Committee and the Civic Association. He stated that this not the first time that an applicant has not appeared for a Review-and-Comment review. He stated that the distinction between vacant at the time of designation and vacant after designation is an arcane distinction. Mr. Gallery suggested that the Committee recommend that the Commission review its Review-and-Comment policy.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that he found the lack of details frustrating in a Review-and-Comment review. Ms. Gutterman recommended that the Commission review its Review-and-Comment policy. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the community has any role in the review of new construction. Mr. Navarro stated that the community has an opportunity in the zoning process when a variance is required. He stated that this project does not require a variance and the developer has not responded to overtures from the civic association. He stated that civic association supports Mr. Gallery's suggestion. Mr. Cluver contended that the Commission should have full jurisdiction over the development of vacant lots in historic districts. Ms. Hawkins stated that she knows of no other city in which its preservation agency has no jurisdiction over vacant lots in historic districts. Mr. Cluver stated that lots in historic districts are very desirable for development. Kit Leary stated that the lot in question once had a building on it; the Commission should have jurisdiction over the new construction. The Committee resolved to request that the Historical Commission review its policy regarding its jurisdiction over vacant lots in historic districts. Mr. Navarro asked how he and his constituents could work to change the Commission's policy. He asked whether the Commission or the City Council had the authority to change the Review-and-Comment policy. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the neighbors "show up in force" at the Commission meeting and ask the Commission to amend the policy. Mr. Cluver agreed. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the neighborhood generate a petition requesting the Commission "amend the designation" of the Spring Garden Historic District. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the civic association adopt a formal position on this matter. She stated that they should "voice your opinion in force." Ms. Gutterman suggested that they seek the support of the district councilman to lobby the Commission to change its policy. Mr. Navarro asked the Committee to confirm that the Commission, not City Council, has the authority to amend the law regarding Review-and-Comment jurisdiction. Ms. Hawkins stated that "the full Commission has the ability to amend the ordinance to approve the change to the way that it was stated. So full review authority over all properties is what you want."

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT:** The Architectural Committee commented that the arrangement of the windows and doors is awkward and not reflective of typical fenestration patterns found in the district; the bay window, set back, and roof deck would be more appropriate for the rear than the front.

**ADDRESS: 1516 GREEN STREET**

Project: Demolish rear ell, construct 3-story rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: AHA Development Company

Applicant: Danilo C. Vincencio

History: 1860

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued a building permit to undertake the proposed work without referring the application to the Historical Commission for its review. When the Department realized that the permit had been issued in error, it stopped the work and revoked the permit. Other than the removal of the front windows, no significant work had occurred when the project was stopped.

The building is an Italianate twin with the typical front block and rear ell configuration. The attached twin has been demolished. The building is separated from the rowhouse to the east by an open area.

The application proposes to demolish the rear ell and construct a three-story rear addition in its place that would be not only wider than the demolished ell, but also wider than the main block. The application proposes no justification for the demolition of the rear ell, which may potentially be considered a demolition in significant part, thereby necessitating a finding of financial hardship or necessity in the public interest before any approval. The application also proposes restoration work to the front façade including a new door, windows, paint removal, and masonry repair.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the restoration of the front façade, with the staff to review details; denial of the remainder of the application including the demolition of the rear ell, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code and Standards 2, 6, and 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Danilo Vincencio represented the application. Developer Michael Alhadad arrived late, at the end of the review.

Mr. Baron explained that, although the staff had affixed a demolition notice poster on the building, it had not yet concluded that the removal of the rear ell constituted a demolition in the legal sense. The staff requested that the Committee opine as to whether the removal of the ell constituted a demolition or an alteration. The ordinance prescribes different tests for approval of a demolition as opposed to an alteration. Mr. Vincencio explained that the rear ell is in very poor condition. Ms. Hawkins asked if he had an engineer's report regarding its condition. He said that he did not, but that he could provide one. He said that the demolition of the rear allows for the construction of an addition that will accommodate more units.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 NOVEMBER 2012**

**PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

The Committee members asked about the definition of demolition in the ordinance. Mr. Baron explained that the ordinance defines a demolition as the removal of a building in whole or significant part. The Committee must decide whether the removal of the ell should be considered a removal in significant part. In other words, is the rear ell a significant part of the building. If so, its removal is a demolition. Mr. Baron stated that rowhouses typically include rear ells like the one in question to allow light into rooms at the rear. He noted that the proposed removal includes a portion of the main block of the building as well. Mr. Cluver asked to see photographs to determine the visibility of the rear from the public right-of-way. The non-historic, blank stucco wall of the rear ell is visible from the street from the west because of the adjacent twin has been demolished. On the east side, one can glimpse a small section of the rear ell on an oblique angle through the passageway between buildings. Ms. Hawkins recounted that the Commission had determined that the removal of a rear section of a church on 21<sup>st</sup> Street, which could only be seen down a five-foot-wide side alley, constituted a demolition. Mr. Vincencio said that he could modify the design to avoid demolishing any of the main block of the building. All of the Committee members agreed that the removal of the rear ell alone constitutes a demolition. They concluded that the application does not claim of hardship or public interest to warrant approval of the demolition.

In addition, the Committee members opined that the addition would be incompatible with the building because it would be wider than the main block. They said that the proposed restoration of the front façade seemed acceptable with some modifications to the door and first-floor windows, provided the staff reviewed the details.

Antoinette Levitt, the president of the Spring Garden Civic Association, opposed the demolition of the rear ell. Justino Navarro also spoke against the demolition and noted that the ell is visible and a significant part of the historic design of the building. Benjamin Leech of the Preservation Alliance stated that his organization agrees that the removal of the rear ell constitutes a demolition, that the wide addition is inappropriate, and that the application should be denied.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the restoration of the front façade, with the staff to review details, but denial of the remainder of the application including the removal of the rear ell, which would constitute a demolition, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code and Standards 2, 6, and 9.

**ADDRESS: 1602 SPRUCE ST**

Project: Replace storefront

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1602 Spruce L.L.C.

Applicant: James Morrissey, Morrissey Design L.L.C.

History: 1870; altered 1925

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** The building at 1602 Spruce Street is a nineteenth-century rowhouse that was altered about 1925. At that time, a storefront was inserted, the window openings at the second floor were enlarged for French doors and Juliette balconies, and the brick façade was stuccoed.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 27 NOVEMBER 2012**

**PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

This application proposes to replace the existing storefront with a new storefront with operable café-type windows. The existing storefront retains remnants of the 1920s storefront including a tripartite prism glass transom and a glazed central bay, which is flanked by two symmetrical recessed entryways. The application offers several storefront options. None would recreate the symmetry or appearance of the 1920s storefront. As a first step in the review, the Committee and Commission must determine whether the remnants of the storefront have achieved historical significance in their own right. If they have, they should be incorporated into the new storefront. If they have not, they may be removed and a new, compatible storefront installed.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects James Morrissey and Tracy Chin and developer Chris Plant represented the project.

Mr. Baron read the staff recommendation and showed photographs he had taken during a site visit with the architect. The photographs show the symmetrical entrances flanking the storefront window, one for the upstairs apartments and a second for the store. The open-air vestibules have marble floors and wainscoting, coffered ceilings, one transom with decorative interior molding, and cast stops on the windows. He noted that the two front glazing posts appear to be replacements. He displayed a photograph provided by the applicant that shows the three-part, prism-glass transom in the storefront. It is covered over on the exterior with a board.

Mr. Morrissey stated that his client wishes to retain what he can of the existing façade. He offered to attempt to save the prism-glass transom. He stated that the building is not ADA accessible. His client would like to make it accessible. He showed options for the storefront windows and doors. He explained that they are seeking to gain interior space for the coffee shop. It is only about 450 square feet and needs to be expanded slightly to make it viable. He showed the table layout for the new floor plan. Ms. Hawkins said that the Committee is not concerned with the interior layout and asked the applicants to move to the exterior. Ms. Gutterman intervened, stating that the applicants were discussing the interior plan to explain the reasoning behind the changes proposed for the storefront. She stated that it was essential to understand the interior layout to assess to proposed changes to the exterior. Mr. Morrissey showed two designs for the storefront and stated that they would accept either fixed or operable windows, but would prefer operable. Ms. Hawkins observed that the vestibules are currently on the exterior of the building and in the public realm. She said that, if a door is installed on the outside of the vestibule, these architectural elements would become interior features and therefore outside of the Commission's jurisdiction. Mr. Morrissey stated that they would like to enclose the vestibule on the left, but would be willing to keep the right vestibule open as it is. Ms. Gutterman asked if the prism glass transom extends across the storefront, or returns along the vestibules. Mr. Plant explained that the transom runs across the storefront at the plane of the front façade. Mr. Morrissey clarified that they hope to retain the transom and install the signage in front of the glass. He explained that the current vestibules have a small step which makes them unsuitable for ADA access. He stated that the ceilings of the vestibules are in poor condition and the marble is coming loose. He said that the storefront window is extremely deteriorated. It sliding forward on its stone base, leaving a gap that he can insert his hand into.

Mr. Farnham advised the Committee that it should conduct its review systematically and first determine whether the existing storefront has the significance and integrity to merit preservation. He reported that the storefront appears to have been added in the late 1920s for a used bookstore. He asked the Committee to determine whether Standard 4 applies. Has the

storefront, which postdates the building, acquired historic significance in its own right so that it must be retained and preserved? Mr. Farnham conceded that he had not visited the site, but opined that, from his review of Mr. Baron's photographs, the existing remnants of the 1920s storefront do not merit preservation. He stated that there appears to be a disparate collection of remnants of the storefront in various states of repair. He remarked that the workmanship of the storefront appears shoddy; for example, the marble pieces in the alcoves seem poorly matched and assembled. He noted that he disagrees with Mr. Baron about the value of this storefront and perceives it as a later alteration that does not have historic value. He asked the Committee to reach its own conclusion about the value of the existing storefront. If the Committee finds that it has value, it should require its retention and incorporation into the new storefront. If it finds that it does not have value, then the Committee should allow for its removal and replacement with a new storefront that is compatible with the historic building. Mr. Farnham added that the more exploration may prove that the three-part, prism-glass transom is worthy of retention and could become the inspiration for a new storefront below. Mr. Morrissey agreed, stating that the components of the storefront below the prism-glass transom were not of a high quality and have lost significant integrity. Mr. Plant seconded his comments, contending that the existing storefront is in very poor condition.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the side bays as defined by the prism-glass transom are wide enough to provide entrances that will comply with the ADA requirements. She stated that the splaying of the existing storefront vestibules would create accessibility problems. She asserted that, if they are wide enough, then the surviving transom could provide the basis for a new storefront design. She opined that the proposed designs for the storefronts are not compatible with the geometry defined by this transom. Mr. Plant stated that their goal is to create a storefront that is in keeping with the historic building. Mr. Morrissey stated that they would redesign the storefront as Ms. Hawkins suggested, using the transom as the basis for the storefront below, provided the transom can be salvaged. He stated that the transom was discovered after they designed the storefront alternatives. Ms. Hawkins advised the applicants to redesign the storefront. She stated that the alternatives look random. She suggested a symmetrical design informed by the transom. She stated that historic storefronts either have one alcove with doors to the store and apartments above or two entrances, either in alcoves or at the plane of the storefront. She suggested that either configuration would be appropriate. She stated that the ADA requirements should drive the design. Mr. Morrissey asked about a central door flanked by glazing. Ms. Hawkins stated that she would prefer glazing in the middle with a door or doors on the side.

Mr. Cluver suggested that both storefront recesses or vestibules should remain. He stated that the vestibules may offer an advantage by creating a central projecting bay, which would offer "a nice little seating nook with a nice bay window right of the street, which could be a delightful feature for the café." Mr. Morrissey replied that the client has a café on Passyunk Avenue with operable windows, the configuration of which works very well. Ms. Hawkins reiterated that the new storefront should have vertical elements that correspond to the divisions in the transom. Ms. Hawkins noted that the Commission has approved café windows in the past. Mr. Morrissey asked if the staff could have approved his proposed café windows administratively, at the staff level. Ms. Hawkins said that this proposal exceeds the staff's authority. She observed, however, that café windows are typically approved. Ms. Gutterman asked if the plans propose maintaining the beveled vestibule on the right. Mr. Morrissey stated that they would maintain the vestibule, but would remove the bevel, allowing the vestibule to be the same width from front to back. Mr. Plant stated that there is a metal bulkhead doorway in the sidewalk at the storefront window. He stated that there is a box over an open area behind the storefront window where the stairs run down into the basement. They plan to remove the flat metal doors from the sidewalk, remove

the box, and reinstall the floor behind the storefront glass. Ms. Hawkins stated that removing the bevel or splay and straightening out the vestibules would be acceptable. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that café windows would be appropriate for this storefront, but he suggested that the vestibules should be retained and restored. He said that the café windows should not have a heavy wood design, but should be something lighter that matched the lightness of the remaining pieces of the storefront.

Ms. Hawkins asked if any in the audience wanted to offer public comment. No one offered any comments.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee recommended denial of the proposed storefronts, but approval of a storefront that retains the transom and vestibules and installs new doors and/or windows in the central glazed area, with the staff to review details.

**ADDRESS: 74 N 02ND ST**

Project: Install signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: PSNU Dhangela Properties

Applicant: Adam Montalbano, Moto Design Shop Inc.

History: 1920

Individual Designation: None

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

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to add signage to this corner property. A furniture store occupies several connected structures on the property. The project seeks to visually link the various structures with signage. The building currently has a large billboard and a backlit plastic face box sign. The application proposes to add several new signs and banners. Six banners lit by wall sconces would be added to the building. A metal channel with metal letters and indirect lighting would be installed across the facades of the building. The transoms above the windows would be restored with clear glass. A banner, painted signs, and a metal sign would be added at the side and rear. Large signs would span the parking areas on Arch Street and Little Boy's Way.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of the restoration of the transoms; denial of the lighting and signage, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Storefront Guidelines [Not Recommended: Using inappropriately scaled signs and logos or other types of signs that obscure, damage, or destroy ... character-defining features of the historic building].

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Adam Montalbano and business owner Sarit Kardakia represented the application.

The applicants clarified that they are not proposing to reface the billboard or box sign at this time. Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Baron to clarify the staff's concern about the lighting. Mr. Baron explained that there are concerns about the possible number of holes for electrical connections. He said that some of the proposed signage elements individually appear to meet the Standards, but that the total amount of proposed signage overwhelms the building. He pointed out that the channel sign on the corner building cuts across the projecting vertical piers of the building. The

staff had recommended that the architect explore breaking the signage into pieces that fit between the piers so as not to hide one of the main design elements of the building.

Mr. Kadakia explained that this store is actually a very large showroom of 13,000 square feet distributed among several connected structures. He is attempting to use the signage to let potential buyers understand that he has more than a first-floor boutique furniture store. Mr. Montalbano explained that the amount of signage is allowed under the zoning code. He said that the lights would be attached to the signage channel. He showed a new rendering with the back buildings painted black with a wide blue stripe across the walls.

Ms. Hawkins said that black would not be an appropriate color for the buildings and that the Commission favors painting walls the underlying material color, in this case brick red. Ms. Stein said that she has worked in Old City for many years and the paint scheme creates the effect of a gas station or auto repair store rather than the smaller scale of businesses in the neighborhood. She recommended using the windows for marketing, including potentially cutting additional show windows in the former party walls along the parking lot.

Ms. Gutterman and other Committee members said that, in spite of the amount of signage that is allowed by zoning, the proposed signage seems excessive for the building. Ms. Gutterman suggested that some banners would be appropriate perhaps with icon images rather than words. She also thought that awnings over the windows would be appropriate. Mr. Cluver suggested that, rather than a solid sign channel, perhaps a thin armature that would hold individual letters, allowing more of the building to show through, would be appropriate.

Mr. Kadakia asked if the removal of the billboard would allow for more signage on the rest of the building. Committee members said they would look favorably on such a proposal.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the restoration of the transoms, but denial of the lighting and signage, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Storefront Guidelines.

**ADDRESS: 102-10 N 03RD ST**

Project: Construct 6-story mixed-use building

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Keble Associates Real Estate LP

Applicant: Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker and Partners

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a six-story, mixed-use building on a vacant lot with frontages on both Arch and 3<sup>rd</sup> Streets. The lot wraps around the building at the northwest corner of 3<sup>rd</sup> and Arch and is located within the Old City Historic District. The lot is considered “undeveloped” and the Commission’s jurisdiction is therefore Review-and-Comment only. The front elevations of the proposed building would be clad with horizontal metal siding, green louvers for ventilation, and punched window openings on the second through sixth stories. The 3<sup>rd</sup> Street elevation would be visually divided with red vertical stripes. The first story of the 3<sup>rd</sup>

Street elevation would have butt-glazed storefronts separated by precast stone piers and surrounds. A garage entrance with curb cut is proposed for Arch Street.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** The staff comments that, although the proposed building is generally compatible with the historic district in materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing, it could better relate to its immediate neighbors, the roofline could be delineated with a terminating element, and the storefronts could be redesigned to better reflect the features, rhythms, and scales of the typical storefronts in the area.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Eric Leighton and Cecil Baker represented the application.

Mr. Leighton explained that the new construction would infill of a vacant lot with the majority frontage on N. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street and a narrower frontage on Arch Street. He explained that they propose a residential lobby and 2,000 square feet of retail space on N. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street and a parking entrance on the Arch Street side. He continued that they propose five floors of residential space above the ground floor retail. He explained that the façade design derived from the desire to replicate the scale and repetition of the traditional Old City streetscape with a contemporary storefront. He stated that, after meetings with the Old City Civic Association, they were urged to changed their previously tripartite divided storefront design to a more contemporary design at the base of the building. He added that the Association suggested they use brick on the party walls that rise above the heights of neighboring buildings. He stated that they tried to replicate the scale of the larger window openings in the district.

Mr. Cluver asked the staff why their comments stated that the metal material was compatible with the district. Ms. Sell responded that metal cladding has been used on other new buildings in this district. She opined that brick is certainly the predominant façade material in this district, but metal cladding is compatible with the district. She explained that the members of the staff differed in their opinions about the compatibility of the metal cladding proposed in this design. Some pointed to the many cast iron facades in the district.

Ms. Stein asked if the metal panels would be painted or exposed. Mr. Leighton responded that they would be painted and directed the Committee to a photograph of a building on which the metal was used. Mr. Cluver asked the applicant to describe the “PVC trim” at the ground floor. Mr. Leighton explained that the material is a composite wood material and the joints would be articulated. Mr. Baker explained that the material is durable. The articulation would occur in reveals where the columns rise with a three-piece division on the top. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the red vertical element was inset. Mr. Baker responded that it is inset. It is part of the overall architectural system.

Ms. Gutterman stated that, although metal is used within the district, it is used on a smaller scale. She stated that she has concerns about the amount of the material and that the design does not include a “lid” that finishes the building. She asserted that the proposed building is not compatible with the district or the adjacent buildings. Mr. Baker explained that there are many buildings that are five stories tall within the district and streetscape. He stated that the neighboring buildings have a very robust architecture that carries from base to top. He explained that, as an architect, he does not believe in lids and has never created a building with a lid. He explained that he uses other architectural devices that change at the top that tell the viewer that the building is coming to a stop. He stated that he tries to change the rhythms at the top of the building.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that it appears as though brick is the back material and metal is the front material. He stated that, at this scale, he would prefer to see masonry as the front material and the metal panel as the back material. He recalled examples of the buildings with brick-clad front facades and clapboard-clad side facades that demonstrate the traditional hierarchy of façades and materials. Mr. Baker explained that the interior of the building is a sophisticated pre-fabricated all-metal system that is about lightness. He explained that they would like to express that this is a metal building from inside to outside and the walls where the building meets the neighbors become the bookends. Mr. McCoubrey argued that conventional masonry openings in a metal building are not appropriate to a metal building. He agreed that the size and scale are compatible, but not the material. He acknowledged there are buildings with cast iron facades, but they also allow for larger windows.

Mr. Baron stated that, when the staff initially met with the applicant prior to submission, the storefront design had tripartite divisions. He explained that he understands the change was made after meeting with the OCCA, but opined that the applicant's first storefront idea was the better one. He stated that the building is most viewed by pedestrians and the divisions create a pedestrian experience. Mr. Baker responded that they could work with glass to appear as tripartite. He explained that the OCCA viewed the building as new construction that should have a contemporary storefront.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance commended the architects for coming to the Committee meeting for their Review-and-Comment review. He stated that he is concerned about the materials and disagrees with the staff's comment that the material is compatible. He stated that there are no corrugated metal facades in the district. He stated that there was a metal panel discussed for the National Products Building, but it was never used. He opined that the corrugated material conveys a cheapness of construction. He stated that where the metal is mixed with brick, the appearance is better. He stated that he has greater reservations about the Arch Street elevation than the N. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street elevation because it is a small slice within a continuous string of masonry facades. He opined that, if metal is used, it should be non-corrugated metal.

Mr. Cluver stated that, although he understands the need and purpose of the louvers, they are jarring on the façade. He stated that he finds the design very clever and well-thought out, but not necessarily appropriate to the district. He stated that he has concerns about the lack of a top because the vocabulary of the district is base-middle-top. He stated that he understands that the architect does not employ tops, but the district does. He added that the materials are also not compatible; there are metal elements in the district, but it is a masonry district. Mr. Baker argued that the contemporary architecture in the district is top-less.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to comment that, although the proposed building is generally compatible with the historic district in size, scale and proportion, and massing, it is not compatible in materials and features. It could better relate to its immediate neighbors, the roofline could be delineated with a terminating element, and the storefronts could be redesigned to better reflect the features, rhythms, and scales of the typical storefronts in the area.

**ADDRESS: 107 COTTON ST**

Project: Construct 5-story mixed-use building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 526 S 3rd St LLC

Applicant: Barry Reinhart, BLR Associates LTD

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Manayunk Historic District, Non-contributing, 12/14/1983

Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to construct a five-story, mixed-use building with a roof deck on vacant lots within the Main Street Manayunk Historic District. This district was designated by City Council prior to the passage of the current historic preservation ordinance. Although similar to the review criteria expressed in preservation ordinance, the review criteria set forth in the so-called Manayunk ordinance are unique. That ordinance dictates that:

Additions, alterations, and new construction shall be designed so as to be compatible in scale, building materials, and texture, with contributing buildings in the historic district.

The building would be faced with brick and include large double-hung windows and stone quoins. The fourth story would be terminated with a cornice. The fifth story would be recessed and clad with stucco. A roof deck railing is proposed to wrap the building at the cornice line. An awning is proposed over the Cotton Street entrance. No information has been provided regarding its materials.

In March 2008, a similar application was reviewed and approved by the Historical Commission. That application proposed a four-story building with roof deck, fixed windows with transoms, fully-glazed storefronts, a three-story projecting bay on the Station Street elevation, and a marquis awning that stretched over the entire façade.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Approval, provided the deck railing is a metal picket, pursuant to PM-704.2.7.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Barry Reinhart represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins observed that, since the 2008 application, the building has grown by one story, quoins have been introduced, and the pilasters have been removed. Mr. Cluver stated that there was discussion in 2008 about the height of the building and its compatibility with the neighborhood. He observed that the height of the building has not be reduced, but rather increased. He asked the applicant to comment on the size of the building relative to the neighborhood. Mr. Reinhart explained that the building to the south, fronting Main Street, is 55 feet tall and this building is proposed at 52 feet tall. He added that there other buildings throughout the area that have similar heights. He argued that it is compatible in height with neighboring properties. Ms. Hawkins stated that it would be helpful if the applicant provided photographs supporting his position. Mr. Cluver stated that it would be helpful to have an arial map or a site plan of the neighborhood to understand the context of the neighborhood. Ms. Hawkins asked why the extra story was added. Mr. Reinhart explained that they need to produce additional revenue because the lot was purchased at a peek market and has sat vacant for five years. He added that the City's new zoning rules allow for additional height. Ms. Hawkins

asked why the fifth story is recessed. Mr. Reinhart explained that he met with Mr. Baron of the staff and the representatives of the Manayunk Civic Association and they expressed concerns about the addition of a floor. He continued that, in response to their concerns, they decided to set it back to reduce its impact on observers. Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Reinhart why the 2008 design had brick pilasters and the new proposal has quoins instead of the pilasters. Mr. Reinhart responded that he does not know of a particular reason the change was made and the architect could alter the current proposal to reflect that original detail. Mr. Cluver stated that the architectural vocabulary of the previous proposal is more appropriate to Manayunk and that he does not know of any buildings in that area with quoins. Mr. McCoubrey asked the applicant how far the setbacks were in the previous proposal. Ms. Hawkins asked if the current application is situated on the property line. Mr. Reinhart responded that the building would extend to the lot lines. Mr. Cluver asked if the windows on the Cotton Street side are the same as on the Station Street elevation. Mr. Reinhart responded that he does not know the dimensions, but that the windows do appear to be similar in size. Mr. Cluver asked if the single bay of smaller windows are bathroom windows. Mr. Reinhart confirmed that it are. Mr. Cluver stated that the Cotton Street façade, with the exception of the quoins, has an industrial aesthetic that breaks down on the Station Street elevation. He explained that it loses the same sense of rhythm of industrial buildings and the rigidity of the bay repetition. He observed that the change from a three-window bay to a two-window bay with a random bathroom window is out of place. Ms. Hawkins cautioned the applicant in the use of historicising elements such as lintels over the windows that do not appear to bear on the masonry wall. She added that the cornice has a heavy bracket and suggested a cleaner and simpler cornice to align with the industrial aesthetic. She continued that she has concerns about the overall height and how it works within the overall context of the district. She suggested providing more photographs of the streetscape and a plan that indicates where this building is relative to the one that is five stories. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the 2008 setback of the rooftop addition was considerably larger the setback than in this proposal. He agreed with Ms. Hawkins that this is a large building in a three-story rowhouse context. He acknowledged that there are some larger mill buildings along Main Street. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the building materials should be noted on the drawings.

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to PM-704.2.7.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

#### **STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES**

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

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

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

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

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

Standard 7: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damages to historic materials will not be used.

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.

PM-704.2.7: Design: Additions, alterations, and new construction shall be designed so as to be compatible in scale, building materials, and texture, with contributing buildings in the historic district.

Storefront Guidelines: Not Recommended: Using inappropriately scaled signs and logos or other types of signs that obscure, damage, or destroy ... character-defining features of the historic building.