

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

**TUESDAY, 27 SEPTEMBER 2011
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, Chair
John Cluver
Rudy D'Alessandro
Shawn Evans
Dan McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

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

Rick Sudall, Nolen Properties
Cindy Hamilton, Heritage Consulting
Jim Nolen, Nolen Properties
Deidre DeArcanis, JKR Partners
David Urffen, JKR Partners
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Sam Olshin, Atkin Olshin Schade Architects
Paul Avazier, AOS Architects
Betsy McCoubrey
Jonathan Weiss, Equinox Management & Construction
Paul Sehnert, University of Pennsylvania
Mathew Grubel
Peter Manoogian
Richard Tyler
Emanuel Kelly
Marianna Thomas
Esaul Sanchez, University of Pennsylvania
JoAnn Greco, Plan Philly
Hyman Myers, National
Hele Heintz, Wilson Eyre Condominium Association
Homer Robinson, Kaiserman Company
Diana Bonesteel, Kaiserman Company
Martin Rosenblum, MJR Architect
Jerry Roller, JKR Partners
Marissa McMurtrie, JKR Partners
Boyden Erik Gabell, Gabell Law
Tony Forte, Saul Ewing

Daryl Carrington, J. Davis Architects
Farek Farid, J. Davis Architects
Paul Horning, Clemens Construction
Gabe Canuso
Antonio Fiol-Silva, WRT Architects & Planners
Richard Thom, Thomitecture
Jessica Malarik
Jaclyn Mason
Bobbi Mason, TKFOP, LP
Adam Laver, Blank Rome
P.G. Laver
Michael Laver
Janet Milkman
Neal Fisher, Hankin Group
Bill Westhofer, Environetics
Kevin Rasmussen, Rasmussen/Su Architects
Joe Ferry, Crescent Boat Club
Stephan Potts, Stanev Potts Architects
K. Ragg, Korman Communities
Jeff Frask, Templetown Reality
Crystal Lacey, Bowman Partners, LLP
Rafael Lissack

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 101, 121, 201, 221 W JOHNSON ST

Project: Rehabilitate building, construct rear addition, construct site features, identify location and footprint for later construction of new building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Philadelphia Preservation Group, LP

Applicant: Deidre DeAsanis, JKR Partners, LLC

History: 1895; Nugent Home for Baptists; J. Franklin Stuckert, architect

Individual Designation: 10/8/2004

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate and construct a rear addition on the former Nugent Home for Retired Baptists at 221 W. Johnson Street, on the boundary of W. Mt. Airy and Germantown in northwest Philadelphia. The historic building would be returned to its original use, housing for seniors. It also proposes site work including driveways, sidewalks, parking lots, and fencing for 101, 121, 201, and 221 W. Johnson Street. Finally, it proposes an approval of the location and footprint, but not the design of a new building to be constructed during a later phase. Except the addition to the Nugent building and revisions to the site plan to accommodate the addition, the Commission approved the project in concept in 2007.

The Commission has a long and complicated history with these properties on the 100 and 200-blocks of W. Johnson Street. The Presser Home for Retired Musicians, a grand Classical

Revival style retirement home with carriage house, stands at 101 W. Johnson. The Nugent Home for Baptists, a grand Chateausque style retirement home, stands at 221 W. Johnson. A large open area, once gardens for the homes, separates the two buildings; it is now known by the addresses 121 and 201 W. Johnson Street. Thomas Presser and George Nugent gave their fortunes and estates for the establishments of the retirement homes at the turn-of-the-century. Although separately established, the Presser and Nugent properties have had common ownership since the late twentieth century, when a company unrelated to the current owner operated nursing homes at the two buildings. The nursing homes were closed after they were cited for numerous health and safety violations. The buildings sat vacant for a few years until 2004, when a religious organization signed an agreement to purchase the properties in order to demolish the buildings and construct a mega-church. Fearing that they would lose the historic buildings, a coalition of neighbors, neighborhood groups, and the Preservation Alliance nominated the two properties for designation. After a series of heated, emotional hearings, the Commission designated the properties in late 2004. The religious organization abandoned its plans and the properties, which were in poor condition, sat on the market awaiting a buyer. Eventually, the current applicant, Jim Nolen of Nolen Properties and the Philadelphia Preservation Group, purchased the buildings with the intention of redeveloping them with some new construction as market-rate housing. Since the purchase, Mr. Nolen has worked tirelessly to find a feasible means to adaptively reuse these buildings.

Mr. Nolen has worked for the last six years or so with the Commission to redevelop the properties. The Commission granted conceptual approval for his projects for the combined site in January 2006 and July 2007. In January 2006, the Commission approved a plan to rehabilitate the historic buildings and construct three new residential buildings. In July 2007, the Commission approved a similar scheme in which the three new buildings had been replaced by one larger new building. Before the project commenced, the housing market collapsed, making the approved project financially infeasible. Mr. Nolen struggled to find alternate plans that were feasible. Eventually, he was able to develop a scheme to rehabilitate the Presser building as elderly housing that took advantage of historic preservation tax credits, elderly housing subsidies, and other incentives and grants. The Presser building was recently restored to its former grandeur.

Mr. Nolen has not been so lucky with the Nugent building. He attempted to redevelop it with a scheme similar to the Presser scheme, with tax credits, grants, and other incentives for elderly house, but was unsuccessful owing to the complexity and configuration of the Nugent building, which does not lend itself to easy rehabilitation in the way that the Presser building did. Despite his best efforts, Mr. Nolen was unable to find a financially feasible way to rehabilitate the Nugent building as elderly apartments without constructing an addition. The subsidizing agencies all concluded that the unit cost at Nugent without an addition was too high. Therefore, Mr. Nolen has been compelled to propose a rehabilitation that includes an addition in order to reduce the unit cost.

The current application proposes a similar site plan to that approved in July 2007. However, to accommodate the addition to the Nugent building, the footprint of the new building has been reduced in length. It is important to note that the current application does not propose approval of the new building, but only of its footprint, so that the site work can be undertaken now. The design of new building, which is not slated for construction for many years, would be subject to the Commission's review at a later date.

The addition to the Nugent building would be constructed at the rear of the historic building, away from the public right-of-way. To accommodate the addition, a very small one-story rear

addition as well as a rear porch, which were damaged by a fire several years ago, would be removed. A thin glass connector as prescribed by the National Park Service would link the addition to the historic building. The link would connect to the historic building at a register of windows that has already been significantly compromised by the insertion of a fire escape. The addition would be a brick and true stucco masonry building with punched openings of the scale, proportion, and rhythm of those in the historic building. The cladding of the addition would alternate in color and finish to reduce its overall mass. It would have stringcourses that would correspond to the divisions on the historic building. The addition would provide the elevators, egress stairs, and other utilities for the historic building, thereby minimizing changes to the historic interior.

The historic Nugent building has suffered at the hands of the previous owner and also vandals. The previous owner deferred maintenance, leading to significant degradation of the building. Despite the best efforts of Mr. Nolen to secure the site after he took ownership, vandals have repeatedly damaged the building, stealing all copper in and on the building, including the monumental cornice and all plumbing. Vandals also removed two columns from the front porches, causing a section of the roof to collapse. Also, fires and short dumping damaged the building and site. As experience at the Presser building has shown, the best way to secure and protect the building is to occupy it.

The application proposes a significant rehabilitation of the historic building. The windows would be replaced with aluminum windows to match the pane configurations and profiles of the historic windows. Aluminum windows are appropriate in this instance because the windows are all simple one-over-ones with thin frames, rails, and stiles set deeply in masonry openings. The masonry surrounds, which will be retained, ornament the windows. The missing front porch columns would be replaced with fiberglass replicas and the porch restored. The stolen cornice would be replaced with a fiberglass replica. Most of the terra cotta tile roof, which is at the end of its life and has failed, would be replaced with synthetic terra cotta tiles to match. The tiles on the turret would be retained and repaired. Missing and damaged balustrades and other ornamental pieces would be replaced with glass fiber reinforced concrete elements to match the originals. Exterior doors would be replaced to match originals. The masonry would be cleaned and repaired. A recessed porch would be infilled with non-reflective glass panels to create additional interior space.

Mr. Nolen and his architects have worked for years with the National Park Service, Department of Housing & Urban Development, Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission, Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency, Office of Housing & Community Development, and Historical Commission to develop appropriate, feasible reuse schemes for the Presser and Nugent buildings. The Presser building has been completed, but the Nugent building has not, owing to the complexity and configuration of the building. The current proposal may be the last chance for this building, which is threatened by vandals and the elements.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the rehabilitation and addition to the Nugent building and the site work, with the staff to review window, door, cornice, column, roofing, masonry, and other details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10. Approval in concept of the location and footprint of the new building, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Commission's approval in concept of July 2007.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developers Jim Nolen and Rick Sudall, architects Deidre DeAsanis and David Urffer, preservation consultant Cindy Hamilton, and engineer David Plante represented the application.

Mr. Nolen explained that the Historical Commission approved in concept two versions of his housing projects for this site before the real estate market crashed. With the crash, he was forced to reevaluate his options. However, the basic site plan has remained the same. He devised a scheme to rehabilitate the two buildings, Presser and Nugent, for elderly apartments using various credits and other incentives. He reported that he was able to rehabilitate the Presser building, but the subsidizing agencies rejected the plans for the Nugent building, claiming that the unit cost was too high. Mr. Nolen noted that the Nugent building is in a precarious state. He reported that, despite his best efforts to keep the building secured, it is vandalized on a daily or weekly basis. He observed that the building is deteriorating rapidly. Mr. Nolen explained that he has worked with consultants to assist with preparation of applications to the Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency (PHFA) for the Presser and Nugent buildings. The first consultant told him that it was infeasible to rehabilitate the buildings and refused to take the job. The second consultant concluded that Presser could be rehabilitated, but Nugent could not. Mr. Nolen reported that the Presser project has been completed and is 90% leased. He explained the financing of the Presser project and observed that it was only able to be completed with Recovery Act funding. The Presser building rehabilitation won two preservation awards, one from the Preservation Alliance. He stated that his team applied for the same sort of subsidies the following year for the rehabilitation of Nugent building, but were denied. PHFA determined that Nugent could not be feasibly adaptively reused. The 31 units that fit in the building could not possibly fund the exterior restoration work, which is very expensive owing to the complexity of the building. He continued, explaining that they revised their application to PHFA the following year, but were denied again because of the unit cost. Mr. Nolen explained that they are now proposing to construct the addition to reduce the unit cost. He also explained that they must construct an addition rather than a separate building because it is not feasible to replicate the systems like elevators in two buildings. The only feasible way to rehabilitate the Nugent building is to construct an addition with sufficient units and all of the requisite support systems.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the freestanding building would be constructed at the same time as the addition. Mr. Nolen stated that it would not. It would be built as a later phase and subject to full Historical Commission review at that time, as Mr. Farnham explained during his overview. Mr. Nolen explained that the total site unit count has not risen from the approved in concept plan. They simply shifted units from the freestanding building to the addition. Mr. Nolen again explained that he cannot formulate a profitable project for market-rate condominium units at this site in this real estate market. Therefore, he would like to rehabilitate the Nugent building as elderly housing, the only feasible reuse at the moment, and defer the separate new building until a later date. Mr. Nolen stated that he has been studying this problem for four years. He stated that he has explored every possible scenario very fully. Mr. McCoubrey asked why he was not proposing to build a larger new building and no addition; the income from the new building could subsidize the rehabilitation of the Nugent building. Mr. Nolen explained that that was simply not feasible in this economic climate. He said that there is no viable funding available to construct the new building to offset the cost of the Nugent investment. He stated that no lenders are willing to fund such a project in this economy. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that Mr. Nolen has contended that economic decisions are driving the plan to construct an addition on the Nugent building. He asked Mr. Farnham if this application would be better reviewed in the financial hardship realm. Mr. Farnham informed the Committee that Mr. Nolen had not submitted a hardship application and was not asking the Commission to relax its standards owing to hardship. He stated that the Committee should and must apply the review criteria in the ordinance and Secretary's Standards to this application as it would to any typical application. Mr. Farnham remarked that the applicants may consider submitting a hardship application if this application is unsuccessful. He contended that, if this application is unsuccessful, the applicants

probably could present a cogent hardship case. Mr. Farnham suggested that the Committee apply the normal review criteria. He stated that the staff contends that this application satisfies the Standards and other criteria. Mr. Farnham continued, explaining that he has been intimately involved with these two properties since they were first proposed for designation in 2004. He stated that he feels that he has an obligation to the Nugent building because he worked very hard to defeat the plan to demolish the buildings and promised the neighborhood that the designation would lead to the preservation and adaptive reuse of the building. He noted that he lives about five blocks from the site and passes by it several times a week. He reported that, over the last several years, he watched the Presser and Nugent buildings deteriorate quickly, especially because of the unrelenting vandalism. He stated that Mr. Nolen's rehabilitation of the Presser building was nothing short of miraculous. It saved a building that was nearing the brink. Mr. Farnham added that he has grave concerns about the future of the Nugent building, which is in very poor condition. He stated that it is not hyperbole to claim that the currently proposed project may be the last hope for the building. He suggested that the Committee should apply the Standards, but it should apply them liberally. He observed that the building is at a critical moment. If it is not rehabilitated soon, it may be lost. He recommended that the Committee should not let minor misgivings about the new addition prevent this project from moving forward. The best and perhaps only way to preserve this building is to recommend approval of this project and allow construction to begin. The site will not be secure until the rehabilitation begins.

Mr. Urffer introduced the Committee to the design of the addition. He stated that the design team had revised the design in response to comments offered by the staff before the formal submission. He explained that the addition would be located at the rear of the historic building, largely out of sight of the public right-of-way. The addition would be shorter than the historic building and would link to it with a thin glass and metal connector attached to a bay of windows that have already been significantly altered for a fire escape. He stated that the colors and materials of the exterior of the addition were drawn from the palette of the historic building. The materials would be brick and a true stucco with cast stone details. He stated that the window patterns and proportions were drawn from the historic building. The windows would be aluminum. He showed photographs of the rear of the historic building including the altered opening at the fire escape and the fire-damaged porch.

Mr. Evans asked about a note on the drawings related to the replacement of lintels and sills on the historic building. Ms. DeAsanis responded that there are some cracked and damaged lintels and sills on the historic building. Those that could not be repaired would be replaced in kind with new to match the historic. Ms. Hawkins asked about a note related to the repair of the dormers. Ms. DeAsanis explained that the wood elements on some of the dormers are extremely deteriorated. The missing and deteriorated dormer elements would be replaced with elements to match in shape, but constructed from a synthetic material owing to the difficulty of accessing the dormers for maintenance. She added that the front porch floor would be replaced with a synthetic decking material to match the appearance of the extant wood decking. The missing porch columns would be replaced in fiberglass.

Mr. McCoubrey asked why the addition would be faced with brick and stucco and not brick alone. Mr. Urffer responded that there are two reasons. First, the change in materials breaks the addition down into components, reducing its overall mass. Second, the stucco is less expensive. Ms. DeAsanis added that the stucco portions of the façades would project out about 18 inches past the brick to give the façade some articulation and variation.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she is a neighbor and knows that the historic building is stunning. She objected to the flat roof on the addition because it gives it a blocky appearance. She asked if the

flatness of the roof could be mitigated. She asked if a parapet could be incorporated into the design. Mr. Nolen explained that the addition already includes a parapet. He stated that the parapet and flat roof allowed them to locate all of the mechanical equipment for the historic building on the addition. There will be no mechanical equipment on or around the Nugent building. Ms. Hawkins acknowledged the reason for the flat roof, but asked the applicants to articulate the roof line as the facades are articulated to provide visual relief.

Mr. Evans suggested that the architects reverse the locations of the triple and single windows on the addition, placing the triple windows on the projecting stucco sections. Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that the triple windows are used on the projecting sections of the historic building. He also suggested slight modifications to the string courses on the addition to increase the vertical orientation of the addition. Ms. Hawkins suggested reversing the brick and stucco, with the brick on the projecting sections. She also suggested a highlight at the tops of the projecting sections, again stressing the verticality. Mr. Urffer noted that, if they reverse the stucco and brick, then the end bays on the facades would be stucco, not brick. He opined that the end bays should be brick, not stucco, because the brick is weightier, book-ending the addition. The other Committee members agreed with Mr. Urffer. Ms. Hawkins suggested that the bays should be the highlights. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the back of the historic building is very plain. He suggested that they should simplify their design of the addition rather than making it more complex, as some Committee members have recommended. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the architects reduce the size of the cornice on the addition, to defer to the main building. Mr. McCoubrey also suggested that, if the applicants accept the suggestion of Ms. Hawkins to articulate the roofline, it should not be done in stucco or another material that will stand out. Any roof articulation should recede so that it will be nearly imperceptible. Ms. Hawkins noted that the application did not delineate where the mechanical equipment would be located on the roof of the addition. Ms. DeAsanis responded that none of it would be visible; it would be behind the parapet. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the glass connector was well designed. He asked if the trash rooms in the addition could be reconfigured to pull the addition away from the rear right corner of the historic building.

Mr. Evans asked about the scope of the roof replacement. He said that it was not clearly defined in the application. Ms. DeAsanis stated that the cover letter in the application clearly defines the scope of the roof replacement. The graduated tiles on the turret will be preserved and repaired. The remainder of the tiles will be replaced. She explained that the terra cotta tile roof is at the end of its life and must be replaced. They are proposing to replace it with a synthetic replica of the terra cotta tile that would match the tiles in size, shape, and color. She pointed out the drawing of the existing and replacement tiles on page A3.3 of their architectural drawings. She stated that they have met with the roofing contractor and he assured them that he could replicate the spacing and pattern of the historic tile with the new tile. Ms. DeAsanis stated that she could provide a sample of the tile. Mr. Farnham noted that the staff would typically review such details.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Alliance has been involved with this property since it nominated it in 2004. He stated that he has “mixed feelings” about this project. He asserted that, if an addition is to be constructed at this building, it must be a “quality” addition. He stated that the proposed addition is not of the “quality” that he had hoped. He asserted that, if this design is predicated on financial considerations, then the applicants should submit a hardship application. Mr. Gallery also asserted that the current owner is responsible for the poor condition of the building. Mr. Gallery conceded that the current design for the addition is significantly improved over the earlier version. Mr. Gallery distributed copies of the National Park Service’s brief on additions to historic buildings. He suggested relocating one of the

elevators from the addition to the historic building to allow the top story of the connector to be deleted. It was noted that such an elevator would need to protrude through the roof, creating an unsightly addition on the historic building. Mr. Gallery suggested swapping the brick and stucco on the addition, but he conceded that the ends of the addition should be brick as the applicants have proposed. He stated that the east façade of the addition is better designed than the west. He stated that the design of the addition would be acceptable, but not entirely what he had hoped for, if the brick projected forward and the stucco was recessed. He objected to the parking lot proposed for the spot adjacent to and east of the Nugent building.

Mr. Evans asked the applicants to discuss the site plan. Mr. Sudall pointed out on the site plan that the entrance driveway with security gate and the parking lots beside and behind the Presser building have already been constructed as part of the Presser final approvals. Mr. Evans asked about the plans for the parking around the new construction. Mr. Sudall explained that the parking behind the new building would not be constructed until the building was constructed many years from now. Until then, it will be grass. The paving would be completed up to the circle at the addition. Ms. Hawkins asked if the parking lot to the right of the Nugent building would be constructed as part of the first phase that includes the addition. Mr. Sudall stated that it would. Mr. Gallery stated that he had not seen the connection to the street from the parking lot beside the Nugent building on the plan because it is covered by a tree. He objected to it. Mr. Sudall stated that the gate, driveway, and parking next to the Nugent building exist today. Mr. Farnham held up a photograph and emphasized that the driveway entrance and parking directly adjacent to the Nugent building exist today and existed at the time of designation. The parking will be reconfigured slightly, but neither the parking nor the entrance would be new. Ms. Hawkins asked if the parking will meet or exceed the zoning requirements. Mr. Sudall reported that the parking is designed to meet the one-space-to-one-unit zoning requirement. He explained that, as elderly housing, the development could have qualified for a reduced parking requirement, but that the neighbors insisted that it meet the one-to-one requirement. The same neighbors that have told Mr. Gallery that they want lawns in front have also insisted on the maximum parking at the site. Ms. Hawkins asked if they could provide landscape screening for the parking near W. Johnson Street. Mr. Plante, the site engineer, stated that they intend to screen the parking with plantings. Messrs. Sudall and Nolen reiterated Mr. Farnham's assertion that there is already a parking lot in this area; they stated that they will be improving the appearance of that parking lot, which predates designation. Nonetheless, they expressed a willingness to revise the current design for that parking lot.

Mr. Gallery stated that the agenda lists this application as an application for final approval. He suggested that it should be considered as an in concept application. Mr. Evans stated that he has reservations about the proposals for the site. He stated that no site plan has been submitted. The applicants strongly disagreed, stating that a detailed proposed site plan was included in the application. They also noted that the Commission approved a very similar site plan in concept in 2007. They noted that the only changes to the site plan are the inclusion of the addition and the slight revision of the parking to accommodate the addition. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he made some suggestions for the elevations of the addition and would like an opportunity to review the revised design. He stated that he would like to see how they resolve the order of the brick and stucco on the addition. Other Committee members agreed. Ms. Hawkins stated that most of the feedback has been positive. The location, size, and scale of the addition are appropriate. She stated that they mainly need to resolve the stucco and brick issue. She stated that the current plans show the main walls as brick and the projecting sections as stucco. She noted that the Committee appears to prefer the reverse, with the brick projecting. Mr. Evans strenuously objected to his fellow Committee members' recommendation for projecting brick. He stated that it would be "structurally illogical" for the brick to project beyond

the stucco in a traditional building. He asserted that the design as currently proposed, with the stucco projecting beyond the brick, is the appropriate relationship for a traditional building. Mr. McCoubrey suggested minor modifications to the front parking lot to shift some spaces back away from Johnson Street.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she believes that a majority of Committee members have concluded that the application warrants an approval in concept, but not a final approval. She asked Mr. Farnham if they could simply convert the application to one in concept. Mr. Farnham replied that, without the consent of the applicant, converting it to a review in concept posed a legal problem. The Commission is bound to act on the applications presented to it. If it does not act on the application for final approval, it will be deemed approved in 60 days, unless the applicants accept the conversion to approval in concept. Therefore, the Committee should offer a recommendation of approval or denial of the application for final approval or obtain the applicants' consent to convert it to an application for approval in concept.

Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Nolen if he would accept an approval in concept. Mr. Nolen asked if there was an alternative. Mr. Nolen stated that he is "under the gun." He stated that he needs a final approval from the Commission so that he can obtain his final zoning approval in time to submit the entire package to the PHFA for funding by its deadline. He asked the Committee not to compel him to choose between a recommendation of approval in concept and denial of final approval. He stated that he is not opposed to any of the suggestions that the Committee has made. He stated that they are all relatively minor and he would have his architects attempt to implement them. He noted some disagreement between Committee members.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee was only willing to recommend approval in concept. She contended that the approval in concept should be sufficient for the zoning approval. Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Nolen if he was "comfortable" with the approval in concept. Mr. Nolen indicated that he would accept it if it was his only alternative. However, he again stated that he believed that the application warranted a final approval.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of the application including the rehabilitation of the historic building, the height, massing, and connection of the addition, and the site plan with the footprints of the addition and new building, with the understanding that the design of the front parking lot adjacent to the Nugent building and the designs of the facades of the addition including the relationship of the brick and stucco, the window configurations, the plans of the trash rooms, and the roofline would be reconsidered based on the comments provided.

ADDRESS: 400 S 40TH ST

Project: Rehabilitate house, construct seven-story building

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: University of Pennsylvania

Applicant: Jonathan Weiss, Azalea Gardens Partners, LP

History: 1853; John P. Levy House; Colonial Revival alterations and additions for David P.

Leas, 1902; additions for convalescent home, 1964, 1975

Individual Designation: 11/1/1973

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application in concept proposes to restore a grand house and to construct a 7-story apartment building adjacent to the house. The house has been significantly altered and encased in non-historic additions. It is vacant and in poor condition. It would be largely restored to its 1902 Italianate-Colonial Revival appearance. The property is individually designated; it is not within a historic district.

The house was constructed in the Italianate style in 1853 for John P. Levy, a partner in the Neafie & Levy Ship & Engine Building Company. It was substantially altered and expanded in the Colonial Revival style in 1902 for David P. Leas, a partner in Leas & McVitty, a leather tannery. From the construction of the house in 1853 until 1907, the lot at 400 S. 40th Street was much smaller than it is today. A larger house that stood to the south at 402 S. 40th Street was demolished and its lot subdivided in 1907. The northern portion of the 402 S. 40th lot was consolidated into the 400 S. 40th Street property. Eight houses facing Baltimore Avenue were constructed on the remaining land to the south. Therefore, the southern portion of the property at 400 S. 40th Street, where the apartment building would be constructed, was not originally part of the property. When the Italianate-Colonial Revival house was converted into a convalescent home in 1942, it still retained its 1902 appearance. In 1964 and 1975, the house was significantly altered and almost entirely encased in a series of unsympathetic concrete block additions. Although the Historical Commission designated the property on 1 November 1973, it appears that it did not review the 1975 additions and alterations.

In July 2007, a different developer petitioned the Commission to rescind the individual designation of the property so that he could demolish the building and erect a hotel building. The developer claimed that the building was so altered at the time of designation that the Commission, which appeared to be unaware of the alterations, erred when designating it. The Commission denied the rescission request and suggested that the applicant develop a scheme for his hotel project that would allow for the retention and restoration of the historic house. The applicant followed that advice and developed a scheme for a 10-story hotel building with a connector to the restored house. The Commission approved that proposal in December 2008, but the project was not undertaken.

The current in-concept application solicits the Commission's opinions on three aspects of the design:

1. the exterior restoration plan for the historic house,
2. the siting of the new building, and
3. the massing and style of the new building.

The application proposes to remove the unsympathetic concrete block additions dating to 1964 and 1975 and restore the house in most regards to its 1902 appearance. The front porch and doorway, which were lost in 1964, are not slated for restoration. A replica of the historic

windows that flanked the central doorway would be installed where the doorway had been. All other exterior aspects of the house would be restored to their 1902 appearances. The interior of the house would be converted to 10 apartments.

A 7-story, L-shaped apartment building would be constructed in the side and rear yards. The new building would be located on approximately the same footprint as the approved 10-story hotel building and also the extant non-historic additions and rear driveway. The building would house 114 residential units and support facilities. The stucco building would include 6-story projecting metal bays and a recessed seventh floor to break up its large mass. The divided-light windows would be set in punched openings. All facades of the building would be fenestrated; the building would not have large blank party walls. The building would be topped by a green roof. The grounds would be landscaped. Parking would be off site.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in concept of the exterior restoration plan for the historic house and the siting, massing, and style of the new building, provided the front porch and doorway of the historic house are also restored to their 1902 appearances, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, and 10 and the Commission's approval of December 2008.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Evans recused, owing to employment at the architectural firm that prepared the application, and left the room.

Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Sam Olshin and Paul Avazier and developer Jonathan Weiss represented the application.

Mr. Farnham explained to the Committee and audience that, during the December 2008 review that led to the approval of the 10-story addition, the Law Department advised the Commission extensively about the scope of its review authority at this site. Mr. Farnham summarized that advice. He explained that, most significantly, the Law Department advised that, because this property is individually designated and not within a local historic district, the Commission must limit its assessment of the potential impacts of this project to those that may occur at this tax parcel. Potential impacts to any National Register districts, so-called "de-facto" districts, the general surroundings, streetscape, and neighboring properties, whether designated or not, are immaterial to this review. He explained that the Law Department interpreted Section 14-2007(7)(k)(.4), which authorizes the Commission, when making a determination of appropriateness, to consider:

(.4) The compatibility of the proposed work with the character of the historic district or with the character of its site, including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings and the streetscape;

The Law Department stated that the Commission may only take into account "the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings and the streetscape" when the property in question is in a locally designated historic district. The Commission cannot consider the effects of the project on the surroundings for sites that are only individually designated because the Commission has never defined or characterized the surroundings of such sites.

Mr. Farnham stated that, in addition to limiting its review to impacts to the site itself, the Commission should not base its determination of the appropriateness of this application on its impacts on parking, congestion, trash, noise, use, ownership, light and air on surrounding properties, or views from neighboring properties. Mr. Farnham suggested that the Committee address two review questions: Does the proposed rehabilitation work to the historic house, site,

and appurtenances meet the Standards? And, does the construction of the new building meet the Standards when applied to this property? In other words, would the construction of the new building adversely impact the historic house, its site, and/or appurtenances? He concluded that the Committee's objective is to protect historic resources at this site, not substitute itself for another regulatory agency such as the City Planning Commission or the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

Mr. Olshin introduced the project using a Powerpoint presentation. He discussed the 1964 and 1975 additions, illustrated with a 1960s site plan and a current aerial view. He explained that the additions envelop the historic building. He explained that the only façade of the historic building that retains much integrity is the south façade, which is enclosed in a courtyard. He stated that the project proposes demolishing the non-historic additions and restoring the historic building. Mr. Olshin displayed photographs of the house before and after the alterations and additions. He then turned his attention to the new building. He noted that, unlike the earlier hotel design, it would not connect to the historic mansion. He displayed a site plan. The Committee members asked about the setback of the building from the property line. Mr. Olshin stated that it would be set back four feet from the side and rear property lines. He showed typical floor plans of the apartments in the historic house and new building and stated that the house would have 10 units and the new building would have 114 units. Mr. Olshin then displayed drawings of the proposed restoration of the historic house. Extant elements would be restored. Missing elements like the northern bay would be reconstructed. He showed a section through the house and apartment building, which would be 70 feet tall to the roof and 73'-6" to the parapet. He showed a photomontage depicting the visual impact of a 70-foot building when seen from Woodland Terrace. He showed a slide with images of proposed building elements including a green roof, metal bays, cast stone elements, and stuccoed walls. He concluded with a rendering of the proposed project.

Ms. Pentz asked if the front porch would be restored. Ms. Olshin stated that they are not proposing to restore it, but only to restore the front façade where the porch connected to the building. Ms. Pentz asked if the porch was extant at the time of designation. Mr. Farnham answered that it had been demolished in 1964, almost ten years before designation. Several Committee members opined that the porch should be restored or, at a minimum, alluded to with some porch-like element. Mr. Weiss stated that they would be willing to do some to indicate the porch, but that they did not want to restore it because it would reduce the amount of open space at the front of the complex. It was noted that the proposal already exceeds the maximum percentage of the lot that can be occupied; rebuilding the porch would exacerbate the violation of that zoning limit. The Committee members questioned the inclusion of a parapet, which adds height to a building many claim is already too tall. Mr. Olshin said that the parapet is required for safety reasons for maintenance of the green roof and also serves to architecturally terminate the building. The Committee recommended eliminating or reducing the parapet.

Ms. Hawkins invited the public to offer comments. Peter Manoogian explained that he lives at 509 Woodland Terrace and is a member of the Woodland Terrace Homeowners Association. He stated that the Homeowners Association has taken no formal position on the project. He stated that he personally objects to the project. He asserted that the building should be appropriately scaled for the neighborhood. He contended that there are three options for this site. First, the historic building could be demolished and a new building of appropriate size and scale constructed in its place. Second, the historic building could be restored and a new building of appropriate size and scale constructed on the remainder of the lot. And third, the historic building alone could be restored as condominiums.

Richard Tyler stated: "I should like to recommend the denial of an approval in concept of the proposed rehabilitation of the somewhat compromised Evans [sic] House at 400 S. 40th Street and the further development of the site. Like its predecessors, this proposal does not respect the scale of the site, its context and of zoning.

The proposed building is also much too complex architecturally, immodest and 'busy' for its context, especially the mansion.

The Committee should also consider the impact of the development on the abutting and proximate properties that appear on the Philadelphia Register. Section (7)(k)(4) mandates that the Commission consider 'The compatibility of the proposed work with the character of the historic district or with the character of the site, including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings and the streetscape..."

More broadly, the context and preservation of the National Register Historic District, the Woodlands and Woodland Terrace also warrant your attention.

As I stated before the City Planning Commission and the Zoning Board of Appeal [sic] previously concerning this site, this section of West Philadelphia is remarkable for its compliance with the zoning code. This too merits preservation. The preservation ordinance is part of the Zoning Code. If these broader preservation values and the economics of rehabilitation of the Evans [sic] House argues for a seven story building, the applicant must present a hardship case as provided by the preservation ordinance to justify the damage this massive building will inflict on the existing house and the neighboring structures, the surroundings and the streetscape.

Thank you."

Mathew Grubel of 4233 Regent Square asserted that the applicants have not made a case that the construction of the apartment building is necessary to restore the house. He contended that the history of the neighborhood and the context must be taken into account before the Committee renders a decision. He recounted the history of the neighborhood as a garden suburb. He claimed that the house in question is very significant.

Marianna Thomas stated that she owns a property at 40th Street and Baltimore Avenue. She claimed that her property is closer to this site than the others addressing the Committee. She disagreed with Mr. Grubel and contended that the house in question is not historically significant. She stated that the proposed building is twice the height of the historic house and would "overshadow" it. She asserted that the proposed building is not compatible with the historic house. She acknowledged that the height has been reduced and the arms of the building set back further from the street than the proposal approved in December 2008. She stated that she was prepared to take the City to court to contest the approval in December 2008. She asserted that the materials of the proposed bays on the new building are "alien" to the setting. She stated that the brick of the new building is "alien" to the Italianate house. She questioned the detailing of the bays. She questioned why the parapet on the new building was included, when it merely adds height to the building. Ms. Thomas concluded that the owner has never proposed to demolish the building. She stated that the owner would need to demonstrate that it was a hardship to retain the building in order to obtain an approval to demolish it. She contended that the Commission should grant a finding of hardship because the construction of this building would demolish the neighborhood. She claimed that the owner has made a hardship case, but has not provided the details to back it up.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance disagreed with the Law Department's interpretation of the section of the historic preservation ordinance related to context. He stated that the interpretation was too narrow. Mr. Gallery asserted that the porch should be restored. He contended that the new building would envelop the property, especially the wing extending out toward Pine Street. He suggested cutting that wing off in line with the historic house. He claimed that the new building would be overwhelming. It is too large and too close to the historic house. He noted that Mr. Olshin's image of a potential bay for the new building is an image of a bay from a building constructed at 11th and Spruce Streets. Mr. Gallery noted that he objected to the proposal for that building at the time and feels his objection was justified now that the building is completed. He said that this type of bay is not typical of historic sites. He suggested taking elements from historic settings for the backdrop building, not incompatible elements.

Emanuel Kelly, a resident of Spruce Hill, stated that it is unfortunate that the Commission cannot consider the National Register District. Mr. Kelly claimed that the new and old buildings would be fighting with one another. He cautioned the Committee to take the building and its landscape into account. Mr. Kelly stated that he is involved in rewriting the zoning code. He asserted that this is one of the most stable neighborhoods in the city and should be protected. He claimed that the R5A zoning protects the neighborhood and noted that this proposal does not comply with that zoning. He observed that the new building is too dominant. He objected to the loss of the rhythm of house and landscape. He objected to the height of the proposed building. He again asked the Committee to consider the context.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he approved of the proposed project. He stated that the restoration proposal for the historic house was appropriate. He stated that the new building was situated far enough from the old building to allow the public to see the old building. He stated that he could not find a reason not to support the proposed massing of the new building. He asserted that the general style of the building was acceptable. He questioned the necessity of the parapet, but asserted that that aspect of the design was a detail outside the scope of an in-concept review.

Ms. Pentz observed that she would be in favor of a recommendation of approval in concept. She remembered the 2008 discussion and stated that the Commission has moved beyond the questions related to context. She observed that the Committee has a very narrow scope. She stated that the decisions of 2008 should not be revisited. She stated that the overall restoration of the house is "commendable," but she noted that the omission of the porch concerns her. She asked the applicants to consider rebuilding the porch or "some gesture to the porch." She again stated her support of an in concept approval.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that he agreed with Ms. Pentz's comments. He noted that the designs of the facades of the new building could be simplified. He questioned the need for all of the bays. He also suggested pulling the building back from Pine Street.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of the exterior restoration plan for the historic house and the siting, massing, and style of the new building, provided the front porch and doorway of the historic house are also restored to their 1902 appearances, the height of the parapet is reduced to the minimum, the wing extending toward Pine Street is reduced in length, and the facades of the new building are simplified, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, and 10 and the Commission's approval of December 2008.

ADDRESS: 32 S 22ND ST

Project: Legalize new roof

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Wilson Eyre Condominium Association

Applicant: Helen Heintz, Wilson Eyre Condominium Association

History: 1888; Saint Anthony's Hall; Wilson Eyre Jr., architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of a new rubber roof. This building was designed by famed Philadelphia architect Wilson Eyre Jr. for an elite club. The original roof on the property at the time of construction in 1888 was terracotta tiles. The terracotta roof appears to have been removed sometime before 1920. It was not present at the time of designation of the building in 1995 and a terracotta tile roof was also not present at the time of the illegal roof work in October 2010. The roof at the time of the illegal alteration was a black rubber roof, and the illegally installed roof matches it. New white aluminum flashing was also installed at the time. The condominium association has received one bid for the installation of a shingle roof that would approximate the look of a terracotta tile roof. The association claims that the cost would create a hardship. This application, however, does not present a financial hardship claim and the application should be reviewed based solely on the Rehabilitation Standards. A terracotta tile roof is a character defining feature of a building of this style. This building is a superb example of Eyre's architecture.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Helen Heintz represented the application.

Ms. Heintz stated that the building is divided into three condominium units. She explained that the roof was leaking and that they had hired a roofing contractor to perform the necessary repairs. Ms. Heintz assumed that the contractor would get a permit, which he did not. Ms. Hawkins noted that the information provided by the applicant was more appropriate to a hardship case. Ms. Heintz answered that the three unit owners would not pay for a new roof that cost more than \$30,000. She acknowledged that the existing roof is not aesthetically pleasing.

Ms. Pentz noted that the second quote provided by the contractor includes gutter work. She asked if the work done in 2010 included any gutter repairs. Ms. Heintz answered that she did not know with certainty, but that as far as she knew, gutters were not included in the earlier repair. Mr. Danta stated that the white flashing installed during the illegal work may have covered up a pole gutter. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed. He stated that the illegal roofing work may be hiding bigger issues. He stressed the importance of getting building permits. He recommended that the roof be looked at by a roofing consultant. Mr. D'Alessandro expressed concern about the structural integrity of the roof. Ms. Heintz stated that, in her opinion, the roof structure was in very sound condition. Ms. Hawkins agreed with Mr. D'Alessandro's statement that the roofing work and the flashing may be hiding other problems that could become bigger issues if not dealt with properly. She advised Ms. Heintz to evaluate the condition of the roof with a professional.

Mr. Evans stated that the Commission would probably not require that a real terracotta tile roof be installed on this building. He stated, however, that the black rubber roof does not meet the

standards for Rehabilitation and that a more compatible roofing material should be considered. He stated that the application for the Nugent Home, reviewed earlier in the day, proposed a synthetic tile product that may work on this building as well.

Ms. Pentz stated that, if the applicant is considering a hardship application, then the price comparison between the illegal roof and an appropriate roof could not be made, since the illegal roof does not meet the Standards and it is not a satisfactory alteration.

Ms. Hawkins advised the applicant to withdraw the application and work with a roofing consultant to better understand the issues and seek possible solutions.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

ADDRESS: 1718 PINE ST

Project: Construct rear addition and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Martin J. Rosenblum

Applicant: Jenniffer Arnoldi, Martin J. Rosenblum & Associates

History: c. 1845

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to reconstruct a non-original rear addition with roof deck, and to construct a one-story side yard addition. The rear of the property faces a service alley. Currently, a non-original addition provides access from the fourth-floor of the property to a roof deck on top of the rear ell. The proposed addition would maintain the same configuration and massing as the current addition. The reconstructed roof deck would also retain the same footprint as the existing. The new addition would be finished in smooth stucco and have two paired French doors for access onto the roof deck. The proposed one-story side yard addition would allow access to an apartment without altering the original interiors of this rowhouse. It would also be finished in smooth stucco.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Martin Rosenblum represented the application.

Ms. Evans stated that the rear addition at the fourth-floor should not be categorized as non-historic, but rather as non-original. He stated that the charm of the city's heritage is the overwhelming retention of original front facades, while the rears of properties have been greatly altered. The Committee members agreed that the proposed alterations and additions were appropriate.

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

ADDRESS: 219-29 S 18TH ST, UNIT 2001

Project: Construct roof terrace

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rittenhouse Regency

Applicant: Deidre DeAsanis, JKR Partners, LLC

History: 1925; Penn Athletic Club, Parc Rittenhouse; Zantzinger, Borie & Medary, architects; alterations, Cronheim & Weger, architects, 1957

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to finish a terrace at the penthouse level of Parc Rittenhouse. This penthouse is a non-historic addition, which was constructed recently. The terrace would have a metal railing on top of the parapet wall. The terraces and decks on the non-historic portion of the building below this penthouse all have metal railings on the parapets. The railing is a design feature of the addition and the proposed railing would continue that feature. The terrace would be accented by pergolas supported by columns. The public may notice the pergolas from different vantage points throughout the square, but they will be inconspicuous. Also, the perception of these alterations would be confined to the non-historic portion of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Deidre DeAsanis represented the application.

Ms. DeAsanis specified that the columns supporting the pergola would be set back about six feet from the parapet. Ms. Pentz asked when the addition had been built. Ms. DeAsanis answered that the addition was constructed about six years ago. Ms. Pentz noted that, in her opinion, the addition is one of the most successful additions recently built in the city.

Homer Robinson of the Kaiserman Company stated that he represents the Rittenhouse Claridge, a building that is immediately north of the subject property. He stated that the owners of the Rittenhouse Claridge and the Parc Rittenhouse entered into a restrictive covenant in 2006 granting the Rittenhouse Claridge the right to comment on any alterations or additions to Parc Rittenhouse. Mr. Robinson stated that they had not been formally presented with the plans for the terrace yet, and had only learned of this work through the public notice of the Architectural Committee meeting. He stated that, although they did not object to the terrace in practice, they objected in principle. Ms. Hawkins stated that the restrictive covenant between two private parties was outside the purview of the Committee or the Commission. She advised the applicant and Mr. Robinson to speak after the meeting.

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

ADDRESS: 109-31 N 02ND ST

Project: Demolish sections, construct additions

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: National East Associates

Applicant: Hyman Myers, Preservation Consultant

History: 1958; National Products Building; Sabatino & Fishman, architects

Individual Designation: 11/8/2002

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the retention and rehabilitation of the significant Modern Style orange tile wall of the former National Products building and the construction of a six-story building behind it. The proposed building would be six stories tall, would stand along N. 2nd Street, and would extend south to Arch Street, where a non-contributing loading dock currently stands. This loading dock would be demolished for the new construction. The orange tile wall sits in front of altered late nineteenth-century buildings. These buildings would be removed for the new construction. The Commission determined in the past that the tile wall and not the much altered buildings behind is the significant historic resource at the site.

The Commission has reviewed several applications for the rehabilitation of this site. The Commission approved in-concept applications for similar projects at this site in March 2003, August 2004, and November 2006. In March 2007, the Commission granted final approval of a project that included the complete demolition of the orange tile wall and its faithful reconstruction, and a new residential and commercial building that would have been six stories on 2nd Street and 10 stories on Arch Street. That approved development would have also included an underground garage and 10 townhouses. The current proposal scales back noticeably from the scheme granted final approval in March 2007.

The current application proposes retention and restoration of the tile wall. Most of the historic tiles would be conserved in situ and a select number would be replaced with exact replicas. The application proposes two minor modifications to the stainless steel storefronts along 2nd Street. First, it proposes to remove one door and insert two doors in the northern storefront; the new storefront elements would maintain the dimensions, profiles and details of the original storefront. The new doors would lead to the lobby and a retail space. Second, it proposes to replace an existing steel two-leaf door with a single door with sidelights. This door also stands along 2nd Street and would lead to a retail space.

The new construction differs significantly from the proposal approved in March 2007. The proposed building is the same height throughout, six-stories, both on 2nd Street and Arch Street. The earlier proposal was six and 10 stories. The currently proposed building is very responsive to the historic architecture surrounding the site, not in style, but in rhythm and articulation. All three facades are articulated with recessed planes where balconies are located. The recessed areas of the wall would differ in cladding material from the plane of the wall. The breaking up of the wall plane responds to the widths of historic buildings surrounding the site. The shifting of the planes of the façade also helps to break up the massing of the building and make it more compatible to the varied streetscape. The proposed materials vary throughout the façade; they include aluminum, corrugated metal panels, and cementitious panels. The Arch Street portion of the building would have a large garage entrance at grade. The ground-floor of this facade would be finished in brick.

The proposed development is very similar to the one reviewed and approved by the Commission in March 2007, except for two important distinctions. The current proposal retains the historic tile wall, a significant improvement from a preservation perspective. The current proposal is arguably more sympathetic to the surrounding district in scale, rhythm, height, and massing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, and the Commission's approval of March 2007.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Preservation consultant Hyman Myers, attorney Anthony Forte, architects Daryl Carrington and Farek Farid, developer Erik Gabell, and contractor Paul Horning represented the application.

Mr. Forte, the attorney, stated that he has been involved with the redevelopment of this site for many years, going back as far as its earliest proposals. He reported that the prior approval included the demolition of the tile wall and its reconstruction. That project was not undertaken, owing to economic factors. He explained that the current proposal is more modest and does not require extensive expensive excavation. Without the excavation, the preservation team has identified a way to preserve the orange tile wall in place. He noted that there are two components of the previous project that have not changed; the retention of Flag Pole Park as open space, and the separation of the small building at 128 Elfreth's Alley from the remainder of the site and its donation to the Elfreth's Alley Association. Mr. Forte distributed a letter outlining revisions to the current project made based on comments received from public and private organizations and other stake holders.

Mr. Myers, the preservation consultant, introduced the preservation aspects of the project. He stated that the proposal is not to restore the tile wall, but to preserve it. He noted that there is significant damage on the wall, most of which is hidden. They will repair the damage. He described the proposed changes to the storefronts as modest. They include the replacement of a single door with two separate doors, and the replacement of a double-leaf door with a single-leaf door to comply with ADA requirements. He noted that the new doors would replicate the design of the original doors. Mr. Myers presented a sample of the tile to be used in areas of the wall where the original tile is missing. He also presented a sample of the reglazing treatment to be applied on the surface of tiles that have lost their glaze. He explained that the tiles that are treated with a surface paint would be properly sealed to prevent any water absorption.

Mr. Myers noted that, before any demolition work begins, the tile wall would be secured structurally and properly sealed to prevent any water infiltration that could lead to additional deterioration. He stated that the wall would be protected through the demolition and new construction stages of the project. He explained that the preservation portion of the work to the tile wall would not begin until the demolition of the existing buildings and significant new construction had been accomplished. Mr. Myers stated that the reuse of the wall is a key component of the rehabilitation project. He stated that all signage on the facade would be retained.

Mr. Forte pointed out that reuse is truly important to this project. He stated that, in some instances, salvaged facades become decoration in front of new buildings, but not in this case; the historic façade will actually be used. He noted that the doors on 2nd Street would lead into the lobby and the two commercial spaces. He contended that the tile wall façade would be fully integrated into the new construction.

Mr. Carrington, the architect, presented the design. He stated that the design team wanted to create a contextual building that respected the historic tile façade and also the integrity of the neighborhood. He stated that the two critical views of the new construction were the south and north views on 2nd Street. He stated that the context is incredibly varied with various types of buildings with many types of materials, signs, and details. He explained that they sought to design a building that responded to the general scale and articulation of its surroundings instead of replicating any specific details from the neighborhood. He noted that the cladding material on the new construction will be two shades of gray. He explained that the pale gray is intended to integrate with the recessed vertical granite panels in the historic wall and to complement the stainless steel storefronts in the historic wall. The projected bays are proportioned to correspond to the neighboring buildings. The recessed balconies were inspired by the fire escapes found throughout the neighborhood.

Mr. Forte stated that the proposed design was influenced by the addition to the Western Union Building in Washington Square. He noted that, rather than setting the entire building back, the architect for the Western Union addition created a reveal to separate the historic building from the addition above. He noted that the same concept is being utilized in this project. Mr. Carrington stated that the entire third-floor is set back 18 inches to create a reveal between the new construction and the historic tile wall below.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the tile wall. Mr. Carrington answered that the tile wall and the new construction would be structurally separate, but that the tile wall would be tied back to the new structure. He clarified that the new construction would be erected behind the walls of the buildings that currently support the tile wall to create a total set back of 27 inches from the face of the tile wall to the face of the third floor. The set back would be reduced to 18 inches above the third floor. He noted that the tile wall extends about nine inches beyond the property line and into the public-right-of-way. The new construction would be retained within the property line. Mr. D'Alessandro asked how they had arrived at the 18-inch set back. Mr. Carrington answered that the limitations of the materials for the new construction dictated the number.

Mr. Carrington continued to describe the elevations of the new construction along Flag Pole Park and Elfreth's Alley. He explained that the new building is pulled back away from the homes on the south side of Elfreth's Alley. The set back creates a private open area. Mr. Carrington described the Arch Street elevation. He noted that the base would be clad in brick along Arch Street. He pointed out that the Arch Street elevation is simpler than the 2nd Street elevation. This façade has been simplified with only two registers of bays. Mr. Forte clarified that the garage opening would have a see-through gate along the sidewalk, not a roll down gate. He also pointed out a lobby for the residences on Arch Street.

Mr. Carrington noted that the floor plan of the lobby and retail spaces have been designed with the preservation of the tile wall in mind. He explained that they had created uses for the spaces abutting the tile wall, such as resident storage, that would guarantee the preservation of the wall; there is no need to cut windows into the tile wall. He stated that limiting the parking to grade, without any excavation below grade, is also a preservation methodology. It minimizes the construction and disruption of the site and allows for the retention of the tile wall. Mr. Forte added that the wall posed many challenges. He explained that the team had considered creating a retail space along Flag Pole Park, but that the design team chose the best preservation practices over redevelopment pressures and refused to cut new openings along that elevation. He stated that the entire team truly felt that maintaining the wall as intact as possible was the best approach.

Mr. Evans acknowledged that he lived in Elfreth's Alley when the earliest redevelopment proposals were presented nearly a decade ago, and that he was a former member of the Old City Civic Association's Developments Committee. He stated that this redevelopment proposal includes many positive improvements when compared to the early proposals. He pointed out, however, that the earlier proposals included extensive massing studies to ensure that the new construction fit within the varied conditions of the site. For example, they provided for low density along Elfreth's Alley and increased height along Arch Street. He noted that drawing A3.03 incorrectly showed the houses along Elfreth's Alley. It showed three-story houses on the south side of Elfreth's Alley, but in fact those houses are only two-and-a-half stories tall. He stated that the massing of the new building along Elfreth's Alley is significantly larger than what was approved earlier. He noted that the garden of the Elfreth's Alley Association will be very close to the proposed building, which exceeds the current zoning height restriction of 65 feet. He encouraged the design team to reconsider the massing along Elfreth's Alley. He suggested that the previous proposal, with higher density along Arch Street, was much more protective of the National Landmark street. He also noted that the earlier proposal was more successful in the use of a deep set back. Mr. Forte pointed out that Elfreth's Alley is a very narrow street. He stated that visitors would not be able to see the new construction owing to the steep angle of visibility. Mr. Evans stated that the Elfreth's Alley museum has a gate into the garden at the rear and that visitors can look through that gate toward the new construction. He also stated that he would consider the garden behind the museum as a public space. Mr. Forte reiterated that the new construction would not be visible from the alley itself. He conceded that the new building would be visible from the rears of the houses, but contended that any construction on the site, even a one-story building would be visible from the rears.

Mr. McCoubrey asked why they had proposed such a dark color palate. Mr. Carrington answered that they wanted a neutral and contemporary color palate. He stated that the gray color relates to the recessed panels in the tile wall. He noted that it is very difficult not to clash with an orange façade. Mr. McCoubrey expressed concern about the darkness of the palate. Mr. Meyers pointed out that the Modern architect that installed the tile wall chose gray as a background color to paint the altered nineteenth-century buildings behind the wall. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the gray color in that instance had been utilized as a highlight. Mr. Forte stated that they are open to suggestions regarding the final color scheme. He pointed out that in previous applications the comments had consistently guided the color choices towards the neutral darker grays, or creams and tans. He noted that any other color choices would clash with the orange of the tiles. He stated that they were responding on Arch Street to the color palate of 108 Arch Street, which is dark. Ms. Hawkins stated that the subject site is within a historic district and that it should respond to the dominant scheme throughout the district. She noted that the district is mostly red and that the new construction should be more related to that dominant color. She was not opposed to the gray color as a highlight. Others disagreed, claiming that a red building would not be compatible with the orange tile.

Ms. Hawkins objected to the balconies and questioned the claim that they are analogous to the fire escapes found throughout the district. Mr. Carrington stated that this is a new residential building and not an old commercial building; balconies are appropriate on residential buildings. Ms. Hawkins stated that the balconies should be better integrated. Ms. Hawkins stated that 18 inches may not be sufficient setback for the new construction. She objected to the large garage opening and suggested that it be broken into two openings to minimize the impact on the street and maintain the rhythm of the historic streetscape around it. Ms. Hawkins appreciated the breaking up of the plane of the façade and the irregular roof line. She noted those two elements as positive design features. Ms. Hawkins asked for the reason behind the irregular fenestration. Mr. Carrington answered that they were following the Secretary of the Interior's directive to be

compatible yet differentiated. He noted that they wanted the building to be recognized as a contemporary building. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the irregular pattern is more common on secondary elevations or rear elevations. He encouraged the architect to regularize the fenestration on the main facades. Mr. Evans pointed out that 108 Arch Street is a good example of regular fenestration on the front façade and irregular fenestration on the sides and rear. Mr. McCoubrey objected to the irregularity of the fenestration in the bays. He stated that bays are traditionally very regular. Mr. Carrington noted that it is difficult to compare his proposal for the National site to 108 Arch Street, because 108 is a high rise and the National is not. He stated that the proportions and type of construction between the two are very different. He stated that the design team would be open to revising the fenestration pattern.

Ms. Pentz asked if there are basements in the old buildings behind the tile wall. Mr. Carrington answered that there are partial basements that would be filled in as part of the new construction. Ms. Pentz asked if the depth of the tile wall foundation was known. Mr. Carrington answered that they did not know that dimension yet. Mr. Carrington explained that they are proposing to retain 14 feet of the foundation walls of existing buildings to allow the tile wall to remain. The tile wall façade would be reinforced with a new steel structure behind it, and then the new building would be tied to this structure. Ms. Pentz stated that it was wonderful that they had found a way to retain the tile wall.

Ms. Hawkins acknowledged the receipt of a letter from the Philadelphia Archeological Forum suggesting a Phase 1A archeological study for the site. Mr. Evans stated that he believed an archeological study had already been done at the site. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that, although the excavation may be much less than what has been previously proposed for this site, they are likely to disturb areas of the foundations that have not been disturbed in a long time, and that those disturbances could impact archeological artifacts. He stated that such impacts should be considered. Mr. Myers explained that the only areas where undisturbed soil would be impacted by excavation would be in areas along the tile wall to anchor the supporting structure. Ms. Hawkins added that the footings for the new construction would also have the potential to disturb archeological artifacts. She reiterated that the archeological component should be considered and that the development team should be mindful of its importance.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the documentation submitted did not completely describe the impact of the new construction on Elfreth's Alley. Mr. Myers reiterated that the new construction had been set back significantly to protect the view sheds along the alley. He asserted that it would be impossible to see the new building over the Elfreth's Alley houses. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed that that was true, but contended that it should be documented nonetheless. Mr. Evans stated that the previous schemes had deliberately dropped the height of the new building along Elfreth's Alley to lower than 40 feet, when 65 was allowed by right. He noted that the current proposal has a height that exceeds the allowable 65 feet limit.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance suggested that the application should be denied. He stated that the retention of the tile wall is wonderful. He stated, however, that the proposed new construction is unacceptable. He disagreed with the notion that the new construction was compatible with the surrounding historic district. He stated that the proposed 18 inch set back is not analogous to the one at the Western Union Building. He explained that the set back at the Western Union Building is significantly deeper and has a deep shadow line. He suggested that 18 inches could not achieve the visual break found at the Western Union Building. He stated that projecting bays are not part of the character of Old City and neither are balconies that turn the corner. He objected to the notion that breaking up the planes of the wall respects the rhythm of the historic buildings surrounding the site. He stated that the irregular fenestration pattern is

totally arbitrary and inconsistent with the character of the district. Mr. Gallery objected to the elevation on Arch Street as well. He noted that the 100 block of Arch Street is an intact historic streetscape. He described the proposed color scheme as “depressing.” He also objected to the introduction of black louvers for HVAC on the façade. Mr. Gallery said that the proposed plan, scale, and massing are fine, but that the facades need to be substantially redesigned and regularized. He acknowledged that there are balconies in Old City. He stated that they are found across the street on the new construction and are universally disliked. He stated that there are no balconies on the historic buildings in the district. He said that he is very sympathetic to the plan and the redevelopment of the site, but not in the current design. He felt that the character, materials, and irregular fenestration pattern are not compatible with the district and would yield an unsuccessful addition to the district. He noted that there are two different contexts for the buildings, one on Arch Street, which is mostly brick, and one on 2nd Street. He stated that the Arch Street elevation should be red brick. He stated that there is no reason why both facades should be identical; rather, they should be more contextual.

Mr. Baron of the Commission’s staff stated that brick is the predominant façade material throughout the district, but that the National Building is an anomaly and unique in the district. He described the tile wall as a deliberate break from its surroundings. Mr. Baron stated that it is important to relate the new construction to the district, but it is even more important to relate it to the tile wall. He noted that the new design responds to elements of the tile wall. He asserted that the proposed design was appropriate because, like the historic tile wall, it is unique. He stated that this site is very unique and therefore requires unique design choices. He advocated for a recommendation of approval.

Mr. Forte stated that designing the new building is a tremendous challenge because it must not clash with the orange tile wall and also be contextual to the surrounding district. He noted that the notion of placing red brick on top of orange tiles was deemed unacceptable during previous reviews. He stated that the previous proposal initially did not include balconies on Arch Street and that the Architectural Committee had suggested introducing them to correspond to the neighborhood’s fire escapes. Mr. Forte stated that they are trying to be very responsive and thoughtful.

Mr. Carrington stated that the historic context on Arch Street is not very regular. The largest historic building is neither red nor brick. He disagreed with the notion that a bland brick building would be the solution. Mr. Evans noted that the Committee was not suggesting such a building. Mr. Forte reminded the Committee that the current building on Arch is a dead wall with a loading dock. Mr. Myers stated that the orange tile wall is not liked by all, and that many residents of Old City are of the opinion that it should be removed because it is not contextual to the district. He stated that the design of the new construction and specifically the scale of the proposed development is the right fit for the district. Mr. Myers objected to the notion that the new construction would be seen from Elfreth’s Alley. Mr. Evans stated that it would be visible from rear yards and through a gate.

Ms. Hawkins acknowledged that the application requested final approval and asked the applicants if they were willing to accept an approval in concept of the scale and massing, and then refine the façade designs as well as provide studies to show the impact of the new construction on Elfreth’s Alley, which would be reviewed during a later round. Mr. Forte stated that the schedule for this project is very tight and the sequence of approvals does not allow for a slip in the schedule. He stated that they must have the Historical Commission’s approval in October so that they can then seek approvals from the Planning Commission and the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Mr. Forte asked if the Committee could offer a recommendation that would

allow for a final approval at the Commission meeting on 14 October 2011. Ms. Hawkins answered that the Committee can make a recommendation based on an application for final approval, which may be for denial, and that the applicant can respond to the Committee's comments prior to the Commission meeting by revising the application. Mr. Carrington requested that the Committee enumerate the revisions that the Committee requires.

Mr. Evans noted that certain rear garden walls along Elfreth's Alley would have to be rebuilt and that information of this sort should be included. He also added that the rear wall of 128 Elfreth's Alley would have to be rebuilt or altered in some way as part of its separation from the larger National site. He asked that information on this intervention also be submitted. Mr. Forte stated that the rear of 128 Elfreth's Alley would just be sealed with a simple stucco wall. Mr. Evans clarified that all they have to do is annotate the drawings to provide that kind of information. Mr. Farnham stated that such alterations would routinely be approved by the staff without referral to the full Commission, owing to its location, lack of visibility from the public-right-of-way, and lack of historical significance. He noted that he had already committed to the applicants that he would approve the minor repairs to the rear of 128 at the staff level. Mr. Evans noted that there are some rear garden walls that are visible and would be impacted. Mr. Farnham indicated that such proposals could be reviewed and approved at the staff level.

Ms. Hawkins summarized her opinions of the proposal. She stated that she sees the elevation on Arch Street as separate from the elevation on 2nd Street. She asked for the Arch Street elevation to be redesigned, specifically, the ground floor. She alluded to perhaps unifying the entire elevation and making the ground floor better integrated with the building above. She noted that she was not designing the building on the spot and that these were merely comments. She requested that information be submitted on the visual impact of the new construction on Elfreth's Alley. She acknowledged that there is room for improvement on the fenestration pattern. She suggested that the balconies be treated more like a Philadelphia balcony, where the balcony has a knee wall and is surrounded by masonry, rather than a projecting element. She noted that this may not be the right answer, but she observed that, as currently designed, the balconies do not look like fire escapes. She stated that Old City is very much a flat street wall district.

Mr. Evans suggested that an architectural model of the proposed building and its context may answer many questions regarding the depths of the planes of the façade, and how the shifting planes work together. Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Mr. Evans and noted that it is hard to visualize the shifting planes in an elevation drawing. He suggested a detailed section that would help to explain the shifting planes of the new construction and their relationships to the tile wall.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicants if they wanted to convert the application to a review in concept. Mr. Forte asked the Committee to review the application as original submitted for final approval. He noted that the design team would take all of the Committee's suggestions into consideration and, if possible, present the results to the Committee at a later date. Ms. Hawkins stated that such a review by the Committee was not possible. Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission has approved projects in the past that granted the Committee the authority to review the final details for approval. However, he noted that such approvals often create confusion.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the proposal meets all of the requirements for an approval in concept, but not for final approval, owing to all the concerns expressed by the Committee members and the public. Mr. McCoubrey summarized all the details or design elements that should be revised. He listed the regularization of the fenestration, the use of a lighter color that

is not gloomy, and more compatibility with the surrounding district, the submission of section drawings of the front facade, and clarification on the materials and louvers. He concluded by stating that Arch Street should be treated as an independent façade within its own context, which is not related to the tile wall on 2nd Street.

Ms. Hawkins noted that archeological resources may be impacted and that a Phase A1 archeological study may be necessary. She also reiterated the importance of providing information on the visual impact and scope of the project on Elfreth's Alley. Mr. McCoubrey clarified that the tile wall is an applied element and, to safeguard its uniqueness, the new construction should be compatible, but be a backdrop, so as not to overwhelm the tile wall.

Mr. Forte asked for clarifications. He asked if the Committee would approve the proposal in if the enumerated details were revised. Ms. Hawkins objected to the notion that the suggestions involved mere details. She stated that issues were more than details. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he wanted to review all of the details including louvers and balconies as well as all other elements of the façade.

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

ADDRESS: 140 N CHRIS COLUMBUS BLV

Project: Install doors, windows, canopies, steps, clean masonry

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Philadelphia Live Arts Festival and Philly Fringe

Applicant: Gabe Canuso, D3 Development

History: 1902; High Pressure Fire Service Station

Individual Designation: 4/6/1972

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate the former Fire Pumping Station at the corner of Race Street and Columbus Boulevard. The property would be rehabilitated for the Philadelphia Live Arts / Philly Fringe. The building would house performance and administrative spaces to support the functions of the organization. The exterior of the building would be rehabilitated in two phases. Phase One proposes work to the exterior that would allow the organization to occupy the building. Phase Two, which would be completed at an undefined later date, would finalize the exterior rehabilitation.

Phase One proposes the installation of new aluminum doors and windows in select openings of the façade. The building does not retain any original windows or doors. All openings are currently built-down with brick or glass block. The new windows would replicate the muntin pattern of the original windows. It is not know, however, if they would replicate the exact dimensions, details and materials. Presumably, the original windows were wood. The proposed windows would be aluminum. The application does not include any window details. The proposed doors would not replicate the original doors to the building. The selective installation of new windows and doors proposed under Phase One is as follows: on the north elevation one door with window above would be installed in the third bay from Columbus Boulevard. On the east elevation along Columbus Boulevard, the central door and window would be reopened. A historic brownstone spandrel is present in this location. The application proposes to cap it with metal. On the west elevation, an emergency egress door would be installed into an enlarged

window opening. This would require cutting down the masonry sill of the window opening. The door would open onto new concrete steps. Also, during Phase One, the applicant proposes to demolish a brick chimney. The chimney is located along the south elevation toward the rear. The chimney is proposed to be demolished in order to create space for a hallway.

Phase Two would include the reopening of all other remaining windows and doors, the restoration of missing modillions on the cornice, and the restoration of the exterior masonry. In addition, the application also proposes the installation of a canopy along the north elevation of the building. The canopy details are not finalized and were not included with the application. Banners and signage would be installed on the Columbus Boulevard elevation. The details for those signs were also not included.

The drawings and renderings submitted include a plaza space adjacent to the building. This space would be constructed on what is currently a street. The application does not include any information regarding this plaza.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the aluminum windows and doors, provided they match the design, proportions, and details of the historic windows and doors, and approval of the masonry restoration, with the staff to review the details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9; denial of the demolition of the chimney and the capping of historic brownstone lintel at the front entrance, pursuant to Standard 5; denial of the signage and canopy, owing to incompleteness.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Gabriel Canuso and architect Antonio Fiol-Silva represented the application.

Mr. Canuso clarified that only one door would be installed on the north elevation during Phase One. He stated that they had come prepared to show the Committee details of the proposed canopy. He also clarified that the plaza space is currently an open street, Race Street, which would be stricken and annexed to the property, but it is not part of the property as of yet.

Ms. Hawkins asked if an ADA ramp would be constructed as part of Phase One. Mr. Canuso answered that the plaza space, ADA ramp, and any other sidewalk improvements would take place under Phase Two and not as part of the initial rehabilitation of the building during Phase One. Mr. McCoubrey asked if they were seeking approval of both phases, or only Phase One. Mr. Canuso answered that they were seeking approval for both phases. Mr. Cluver asked what the time frame would be between the two phases. Mr. Canuso answered that the time frame is directly tied to funding. He noted that ideally the two phases would happen very soon provided the funding is in place. Mr. Canuso explained that they see the rehabilitation as a single project with a unified vision and plan. They have chosen to divide the work into two phases because of the funding limitations.

Mr. Evans asked if the interior work was proposed as part of Phase One or Two. He clarified that, although the Committee had no purview over the interior, he wanted to understand how the interior work would dictate the exterior work. Mr. Fiol-Silva stated that the Fringe loved this building and envisioned a very open floor plan. He noted that the windows on the north façade would illuminate the black box stage as well as the café space. He explained that the views from inside the building towards the Benjamin Franklin Bridge are part of the experience and an important component of the rehabilitation.

Mr. Evans stated that it made no sense to create a café in an area of the building that currently has blocked windows and not open them as part of the initial rehabilitation of the space. He

noted that opening the windows at a later date would be a major disruption to the operations and interior finishes of the café. Mr. Canuso answered that those windows are a major priority, but that they are not included in Phase One, owing to funding limitations. He explained that the café would be mostly open space and very casual. He stated that their installation at a later date would probably cause minor disruptions. He noted that, owing to the location of the performance space and the conscious decision to include the large windows on the north façade as part of the experience, they intend to install windows in all of the north faced openings as soon as funds are available. He pointed out that the final floor plan will be very open and that the users would experience all the windows from either the café or the theater space.

Ms. Pentz asked if they were building any new floors. Mr. Fiol-Silva answered that they were not constructing any new floors. Ms. Hawkins asked if they were penetrating the roof or installing any rooftop equipment. Mr. Fiol-Silva answered that they were not planning any new rooftop equipment. Mr. Canuso explained that there are five major components for which they are seeking approval: the installation of windows and doors, the removal of the chimney, the restoration of the masonry, restoration of the modillions at the cornice, and the installation of the canopy. Ms. Hawkins asked if they would also like to get approval for the plaza space. Mr. Canuso answered that ideally they would like to get approval for it as well, but he reiterated that the proposed plaza is not on land that is currently part of the designated lot. He added that in his opinion it was a matter for the Streets and Water Departments to review and approve. It was noted that it is within the historic district and under the Commission's jurisdiction. Ms. Hawkins asked if the two parcels would be consolidated. Mr. Canuso answered that the City would retain ownership of the property on which the plaza would be built. He clarified that the two parcels would not be consolidated. Ms. Pentz asked if the street is paved with historic pavers or stone. Mr. Canuso answered that the street is currently paved with asphalt.

Mr. Evans asked if the fire exit door proposed for the rear of the property could be inserted into the flat wall to the south. Mr. Fiol-Silva answered that they could not, because that wall was a party wall that delineated the property line.

Ms. Hawkins asked why the chimney had to be demolished. Mr. Canuso answered that the interior space is very limited. He explained that this building fits their program. He noted, however, that the space is still a little too small for the program, thus maximizing the interior space had become a priority. He stated that the office spaces and back of house spaces are limited and the retention of the chimney flue would pose a serious obstacle to the interior lay out. He added that the retention of the chimney would also impose a tremendous expense on the theater company. He estimated that the cost of structurally reinforcing the chimney below the roof would exceed \$10,000 and that they would rather spend that money on the restoration of the café space windows where it would have a bigger visual impact. Mr. Cluver asked if they would need a chimney to vent furnaces or other climate control equipments. Mr. Canuso answered that they would not need to vent them. Ms. Hawkins asked where they were planning to install the mechanical equipment. Mr. Fiol-Silva explained that the equipment would be located inside the building in the attic space, not on the exterior of the building. He pointed out that the only penetrations would be louvers for fresh air intake and exhaust. Mr. Cluver asked how louvers on the roof would work in terms of rain and snow protection. Mr. Fiol-Silva answered that they would be properly drained. Mr. Danta stated that, if the final set of plans includes mechanical equipment that does not comply with the Commission's approval, or, if the staff is not able to approve the equipment, then the application would be forwarded to the Committee and the Commission for their review and approval. Ms. Hawkins asked if they would be replacing the roof as well. Mr. Canuso answered that they would not replace the roof. Ms.

Pentz asked if the ventilators would be removed. Mr. Canuso answered that they were not planning to remove them.

Mr. Canuso introduced detailed drawings for the proposed canopy. Ms. Hawkins asked if they were also submitting details for the banners. Mr. Canuso answered that they were only ready to submit details for the canopy. He noted that the banners were secondary and could be reviewed at a later date. Ms. Hawkins asked if there would be any signage associated with the café during Phase One of the project. Mr. Canuso answered that none were proposed at this time. Ms. Hawkins asked the rest of the Committee members if they wanted to review a consolidated signage package that included the awning, the banners, and any other exterior signage at a later date. Mr. Cluver stated that it would be best to review all signage comprehensively. Mr. Evans stated that he did not see anything objectionable on the canopy drawings that the applicant had just distributed. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the canopy should span all three bays with doors on the north elevation, rather than just two. He pointed out that typically canopies should not run in front of pilasters on a primary façade. Mr. Fiol-Silva clarified that the canopy had been placed above the main two entrances to the space to differentiate them from the rest of the façade and the café space. He noted that the canopy will define the main entrance and provide shelter from rain to the patrons. He pointed out that the letters would be minimal and not intrusive. Mr. McCoubrey noted that extending the canopy to incorporate the third bay would not take away from any of the reasons and would enhance the overall design of the façade.

Mr. McCoubrey asked to shift the focus of the conversation on the items that could be approved during this round of reviews and those that could be reviewed at a later date, when more details are finalized. Mr. Fiol-Silva stated that they would be willing to remove the canopy and banners from the discussion in order to move forward with an approval on the critical aspects of the application. Ms. Hawkins asked if the critical items were the windows and doors, masonry restoration, and the demolition of the chimney. Mr. Fiol-Silva answered that those were the critical items. Mr. Canuso clarified that the windows and doors that take priority are two doors and two windows, not all windows and doors at once. Ms. Hawkins stated that, since Phase Two would include the same windows as Phase One, it made no sense to break them up; an approval of one would mean an approval for both phases. Ms. Hawkins expressed concern about the difference between the historic windows and doors and the proposed. She noted that the proposed windows and doors appear very flat and without historic moldings. Mr. Fiol-Silva explained that the original windows were heavy wood frames, and that the proposed windows would be strutted aluminum. He explained that they will follow the same muntin patterns, but the new windows would not be operable. Mr. Canuso noted that an exact replication of the windows and doors would be cost prohibitive. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the Committee cannot make a recommendation based on cost, but only on the Rehabilitation Standards. Mr. Canuso reiterated that they want to recreate the windows as close as possible in aluminum, rather than wood. Mr. Fiol-Silva explained that the windows will replicate the original windows as close as possible. Mr. Canuso reiterated that his comment on cost is linked to the ability of getting the restoration done. He explained that they would prefer to install a window that closely resembles the original window in order to restore the façade as soon as possible. Ms. Hawkins asked if the proposed windows are a standard storefront system without any shapes or moldings. Mr. Fiol-Silva answered that it is not. He explained that the proposed windows have profiles and moldings and would not be flat. Ms. Hawkins asked how close the dimensions of proposed window replicate the known dimensions of the original windows. Mr. Fiol-Silva answered that there would probably be some slight variations, but that the exact dimensions would not be known until the manufacturer's drawings are finalized.

Mr. Evans asked for information on the capping of the historic brownstone spandrel mentioned in the staff overview. Mr. Danta answered that the spandrel in question is located on the east elevation. Mr. Fiol-Silva stated that they would not cover it and would install the window above it without any capping to the stone.

Mr. Canuso asked the Committee members if they were supportive of the proposal as submitted. Ms. Hawkins stated that there was not enough information to review the windows. She also noted that the proposed doors look like storefront doors and do not replicate the original design of the doors, which is known through photographs. She described the information related to windows and doors are "thin." She stated that she agrees with the staff's recommendation to deny the removal of the chimney. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the proposal was missing documentation and details. He noted that the windows and doors have too many variables that are not known at this time. Mr. Evans pointed out that he understood from the plan the need to remove the chimney, but he questioned whether the plan could be altered to keep the flue intact and still meet the needs of the program. Ms. Hawkins reiterated her objection to the proposed doors. She stated that the original doors had lower panels and the proposed doors did not. She encouraged the applicant to match the original design of the doors. Mr. Evans stated that he would accept a more contemporary door that did not incorporate the lower panel, given that the original doors do not survive and are only known through photographs. Ms. Hawkins reminded Mr. Evans the precedent they had set with the Walnut Street Theater door application and the insistence on a sympathetic restoration. Mr. Evans noted that he viewed this case slightly differently. He noted that this was a rehabilitation of a former industrial building, not the restoration of a National Landmark theater.

Mr. McCoubrey asked Mr. Danta about the staff's position on the windows and doors. Mr. Danta answered that the staff had recommended approval for all windows and doors in aluminum, provided that they replicated the original designs as close as possible. Mr. Danta explained that the staff would review the shop drawings and compare them to the photographs in order to ascertain whether the replication was close enough. Mr. Fiol-Silva stated that they would submit supplemental information at the Commission meeting to show the details of the proposed windows and doors. Mr. Evans stated that he was in agreement with the staff's recommendation. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed as well. Ms. Hawkins reiterated that the canopy and all signage would be reviewed at a later date and that the applicant would return for that review. She reminded the applicant that they had withdrawn this portion of the submission earlier in the discussion.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the aluminum windows and doors, provided they approximate the design, proportions, and details of the historic windows and doors; approval of the masonry restoration; with the staff to review the details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9; denial of the demolition of the chimney and the capping of historic brownstone lintel at the front entrance, pursuant to Standard 5; denial of the signage and canopy, owing to incompleteness.

ADDRESS: 136 N. 3RD ST

Project: Construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 136 N. 3rd St. L.P.

Applicant: Daniel Bosin

History: c.1845

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

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

Preservation Easement: No

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of a roof deck on this loft building, which has been converted to rental residential use. The deck would be set back more than 16 feet from the front façade. The applicant constructed a mock-up. The staff reviewed it and determined that the deck would be inconspicuous.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

Mr. Bosin was not at the meeting, but had explained in advance to Mr. Baron that he would be out of town. The application shows the visibility of the mockup from five different points. From each point, the deck will be inconspicuous. It will be accessed through a hatch. The Committee members agreed that the deck would be inconspicuous.

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

ADDRESS: 2101 LOCUST ST

Project: Rehabilitate exterior

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: PNC Bank & Madeleine Q. Ewing Trustees

Applicant: Richard Thom, Richard W. Thom. AIA

History: 1889; Anna Neil House; attributed to Wilson Eyre Jr., architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the rehabilitation of the house at 2101 Locust Street. It has suffered from deferred maintenance and the coping and other masonry at the gable end have recently failed. The roof and coping would be restored. An interior stair would be removed to gain more interior space. An exterior stair house would be removed from a rear roof. What the applicant calls a "plant shelf" would be removed from the side façade. The staff believes that the so-called "plant shelf" is the base of a lost bay window. The staff contends that the "plant shelf" should be retained and repaired. The application also proposes to replace the windows at the "plant shelf" as well as the basement windows and a stone stoop. Research and a site visit should be undertaken to determine the original designs of the basement windows and stoop.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the removal of the “plant shelf,” but approval of the remainder of the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 5, and 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Richard Thom represented the application.

Mr. Thom explained that the recent earthquake damaged the building. The coping, which posed a danger to pedestrians, had to be removed immediately. He explained that he sought the staff’s advice before undertaken the emergency work.

Mr. Thom explained that he thought that the plant shelf was a later addition because the windows in the opening above it appear newer and the detail of the element, which the staff contends is the base of a bay window, appears different than the bases of the other two bays. The Committee members explained that Wilson Eyre is known to have designed houses with irregular and varied details on the same facade. They thought that the plant shelf should not be removed unless documentation proves that it was not part of the original Wilson Eyre design.

The Committee members did not object to the removal of the stair house. They agreed that the replacement of the stoop and basement window should be reviewed by the staff for accuracy.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the removal of the “plant shelf,” but approval of the remainder of the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 5, and 6.

ADDRESS: 224 S 20TH ST

Project: Demolish outhouse

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: TKFOP Partners, LP

Applicant: Bobbi Mason, Central Salvage Co. Inc

History: c. 1875

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 the demolition of an outhouse. The outhouse, which shares a party wall on the property line with another outhouse, is located adjacent to a public right-of-way. The outhouse in question is part of a collection of outhouses that are the most intact and visible examples of a humble but important historic building type in the city. Because they are typically not visible from the public right-of-way and are no longer used, outhouses are a highly endangered and increasingly rare building type in the city. The applicant attributes several quality-of-life problems to the outhouse, but those problems could be solved with interventions other than demolition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial pursuant to Standards 2 and 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Bobbi Mason represented the application.

Ms. Mason explained that they have had a terrible problem with rats in their basement. She claimed that the outhouse was the source of the rats. She said that the rats from this outhouse have invaded Rittenhouse Square as well. She said that the building is in terrible condition and homeless people get in and use the area as a toilet. Mr. Baron explained that typically, when a flush toilet was installed in an outhouse, a sewer pipe was installed from the outhouse to the basement. He said that, if such a pipe exists, it should be capped to prevent access from the outhouse to the basement. He reminded the applicant that she had sought and received the Commission's approval to remove the fence that used to prevent access to the outhouse. He also noted that the preservation ordinance mandates that all owners must keep their historic buildings in good condition. As owner, the applicant has an obligation to repair the building. The Committee members concurred and determined that demolition was not an appropriate solution to the problems.

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

ADDRESS: 2405 PINE ST

Project: Remove rear wall, roof, and dormer, construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Janet Milkman

Applicant: Janet Milkman

History: c. 1835

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 the remove of the rear wall, rear roof slope, and rear dormer of this early nineteenth-century house to allow for an addition. The rear of the building is not visible from a public right-of-way.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Janet Milkman, architect William Westhofer, engineer Neil Fisher, and builder Robert Hankin represented the application.

The applicants explained that the owners of the two adjacent properties had constructed large additions with the Commission's approvals that are similar to their proposed addition. The Commission had approved the application for 2403 Pine Street, the adjacent building, in 1999 that included the removal of the rear roof and dormer of that structure. Mr. Baron said that the staff based its staff recommendation for denial on Standards 9 and 10 because of the removal of a large amount of historic fabric. The applicants noted that Mr. Baron had not objected to the removal of fabric at 2403 Pine, when he reviewed the project. Mr. Farnham said that he had agreed with the staff recommendation, but understood that the Commission would likely approve the application. He noted that the staff has much less discretion than the Commission and bases its recommendations on a strict reading of the Standards.

The applicants said that they would update the plans to show the support for the front chimney.

Mr. McCoubrey said that because of the particular context of this house, he did not find the rear roof and dormer to be unique features and could support their removal. Other Committee members agreed. Mr. Evans pointed out that he was uncomfortable with the owner's assertion that this was the model for a "green renovation" because it proposed removing much of the historic house. However, he agreed to recommend approval because the changes would be at the rear, out the public view.

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

ADDRESS: 4654 HAZEL AVE

Project: Legalize demolition of rear porch

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Maurice Curtis Thomas

Applicant: Lamont Dawkins, DMA Construction

History: 1910; Clarence R. Siegel, builder

Individual Designation: 12/2/1976

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the demolition of a rear porch. This property is at the end of a row. It is individually designated and not within a district. The porch is highly visible along the public right-of-way, since this house is the end of the row and is built up to the property line. The demolished porch was original to the construction of the house. The contractor did not acquire a permit for the demolition of this porch. The contractor intends to reconstruct the decking and steps of the porch, but not its roof supported by columns.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 6.

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

Ms. Pentz asked why the porch was demolished. Ms. Sell stated that she did not know why it had been demolished. Ms. Sell explained that a complaint call from a neighbor alerted the Commission that there was work in progress on the exterior of the building without a permit. She stated that she discovered the porch demolition during a subsequent site visit to the property.

The Committee members reviewed the application materials and determined that the demolition of the porch and its partial reconstruction does not meet the Standards.

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

ADDRESS: 1112 LOCUST ST

Project: Construct rear deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Gibbs Connors

Applicant: Gibbs Connors

History: c. 1815

Individual Designation: 11/24/1959

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a second-story rear deck on the historic section of this row house. In June 2009, the Commission approved a three-story side addition with a third-story rear deck for the building. The deck would have a metal rail designed to match the third-story deck rail on the side addition. An original window opening would be cut down for a door to access the deck. The door would have an 18-light window with glazing proportions similar to the original window. The alterations would be minimally visible from Quince and Sartain Streets.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Gibbs Connors and architect Kevin Rasmussen represented the application.

Ms. Pentz asked Mr. Rasmussen to explain the photographs submitted with application. Mr. Rasmussen explained that the red arrows on the site plan show the views of the proposed deck from various locations. He added that there is an existing garage that obscures the view from Locust Street, but that it would be slightly visible for a short distance along the west side of Quince Street. He explained that there are six to seven-foot walls along Quince Street at the property adjacent to the property in question. Mr. Cluver noted that the railing would be seen above the masonry wall in the photographs. Mr. Rasmussen agreed that it would be slightly visible, but inconspicuous. He explained that the proposed railing would match the one that exists on the third-story of the addition. He remarked that the profiles of the railing would be as thin as possible and made of black steel. He summarized that the deck is intended to be lightweight to reduce visibility. Mr. Cluver noted that there is a difference between the deck on the new side addition and this proposal for a contemporary deck on the historic building. Ms. Hawkins argued that the use of contemporary materials makes this deck proposal thinner than the use of wood or other material. Mr. Rasmussen added that they are proposing to use columns in the corner and isolate the structure from the historic building to minimize the number of attachments to the historic building. The Committee members discussed the proposal and concluded that it was appropriate because it would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

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

ADDRESS: 5 BOATHOUSE ROW

Project: Replace windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Joseph Ferry, Crescent Boat Club

History: 1870; Crescent Boat Club; alterations and additions, Charles Balderston, architect, 1890

Individual Designation: 1/5/1984

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install vinyl windows on the front façade of the Crescent Boat Club's boathouse. Boathouse Row is a National Historic Landmark. The existing wood windows are deteriorated and in need of replacement. The windows are unique and character-defining features of the Tudor Revival building. The proposed windows would fit within the existing masonry openings, but would not match the historic materials, configurations, or proportions. For example, original wood one-over-one double-hung sash with arch tops would be replaced with vinyl six-over-one double-hung sash with square tops.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Joseph Ferry of the Crescent Boat Club represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins explained that the Committee would not recommend approval of vinyl windows because they do not satisfy the Standards. Mr. Ferry stated that there are already vinyl windows in the building. Ms. Pentz asked if the staff considered the remainder of the proposal for composite wood half-timbering. Ms. Sell explained that the staff has already approved the replacement of damaged half-timbering with real wood to match the existing in shape and proportions. Ms. Hawkins clarified that this application is limited to the windows only.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicant if the brickmolds would remain. Mr. Ferry responded that they intend to replace the original brickmolds in-kind. He added that the proposed vinyl windows are Pella products. Ms. Hawkins stated that the applicant should discuss the project with his contractor to better understand how the windows would be installed. She explained that vinyl window replacements typically come within a subframe and that frame is fit within the existing opening. She added that the subframe causes the sizes and proportions of the glass to change. Mr. Ferry responded that the specifications indicate that the windows would fit within the masonry opening and the wood frames will be reconstructed. Ms. Hawkins explained that matching the historic configurations would be appropriate.

Mr. D'Alessandro opined that the sashes could be repaired. He stated that repair is often the best solution for old wood windows. Mr. Cluver objected to the bright white color of the vinyl windows. Mr. Ferry stated that he was present for at least one generation of window replacements and that not all of the windows in the building are original. The Committee members explained that this is the appropriate time to replace non-historic windows with replicas of the historic windows, not additional non-historic windows.

Ms. Hawkins recommended that the applicant gather as much documentation as possible about the current windows to support the application at the Commission meeting. Mr. Evans clarified that, regardless of the shapes or configurations, vinyl is not an appropriate material for window

replacement on this building. He noted the prominence and significance of Boathouse Row. Mr. Ferry asked the Committee if they consider window deterioration or cost for replacement when making recommendations. Ms. Hawkins responded that the Commission has a financial hardship process. She advised the applicant that he could submit the paperwork to attempt to document his claim of hardship. She added that current application does not have sufficient documentation showing the level of deterioration. Mr. Cluver explained that even if sufficient documentation was provided confirming that the windows are in need of replacement, the Committee would recommend that the windows be replaced in-kind with wood and the historic proportions. He added that vinyl windows do not exist that would match the historic proportions. Mr. Baron stated that the Commission does not have a history of approving vinyl windows and offered a list of manufacturers that would be able to provide the windows suggested by the Committee.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

ADDRESS: 822-38 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Remove canopy

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: BFH Commercial Owner

Applicant: Stephan Potts, Stanev Potts Architects

History: 1925; Benjamin Franklin Hotel; Horace Trumbauer, architect

Individual Designation: 1/7/1982

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove the glass and metal canopy over the main entrance on the Chestnut Street façade of the Benjamin Franklin Hotel. The applicant contends that the building did not have a canopy originally. The staff contends that a canopy was added by the architect of the original building before its construction was completed.

The building was designed by architect Horace Trumbauer from 1923 to 1924 and completed by 1925. Architectural drawings from 1923 show the main entrance with revolving doors flanked by carved limestone shields and bracket stonework, but without a canopy. A rendering made prior to the completion of construction shows the main entrance flanked by large lanterns. However, two entries in Trumbauer's drawing ledger in August and September 1924 seem to indicate that the main entrance was revised and a canopy or "marquise" [marquee] was added at this location. No original architectural drawings survive to confirm this revision. However, renderings drawn shortly after the completion of construction depict a metal canopy at this location attached at the same locations that are currently utilized. Photographs from 1963 show the original canopy with later, non-historic signage wrapped around the base of the metalwork. In the mid-1980s, the canopy was removed and replaced with a modified version of the original design using modern materials and simplified framing, but some of the original canopy pieces. The application proposes removing this replacement canopy and original attachment hardware and patching the masonry to give the appearance that no canopy existed. Although the extant canopy is a replacement, it appears to adequately replicate the original canopy.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 5, and 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Stephan Potts represented the application.

Mr. Potts acknowledged that the current canopy is a replacement canopy designed to reflect the earlier canopy. He stated that, according to the records, a canopy was added toward the end or shortly after construction. He noted that the canopy was not included in the original set of drawings. He explained that there is original ornamental stone carving and detail that is hidden by the canopy. He contended that the canopy was not part of Trumbauer's original concept because there is no reason to produce shop drawings of the carvings, spend money on the carvings, and install them into the elevation only to drill holes into them for a canopy. He argued that it is possible that the canopy was added by the owner after the completion of the building. Mr. Potts also explained that the building that stood on the site before the current building had an open portico in roughly this location, which was significant because President Lincoln delivered his pre-inaugural address from it. He contended that it is historically sensitive and an improvement to the building to remove the canopy.

Mr. Evans asked why the owner would want to remove the canopy, which appears to be in fine condition. Mr. Potts explained that there has been a change in ownership and it is the new owner's intention to restore the building to its former architectural glory. He continued that they plan to clean the façade, perform general maintenance, and architecturally light the balcony. He stated that the owners want to improve the value of their asset and that they view the canopy as an eyesore. Ms. Hawkins asserted that a canopy is part of the history of the building, even if it was not part of the original conception.

Mr. Cluver argued that, as architects, there are many situations in which the original conception is not constructed. He concluded that the renderings, ledger entry, and date of the canopy indicate that Trumbauer was involved in the canopy design. He acknowledged that it may not be original, but is historically significant nonetheless. He noted that the original canopy was more delicate and sensitive to the architecture. He asserted that the building should have a canopy.

Mr. Potts argued that the connection points of the canopy appear to be arbitrary. Ms. Pentz asked if there were steel columns in the building and if the canopy tied into them. Mr. Potts responded that he believes that the canopy connects to the building's frame.

Mr. Cluver asked how the building will be used. Mr. Potts responded that the use will stay the same; mostly rental residential units and commercial space. Mr. Cluver opined that a building of this size requires a canopy. Mr. Potts asserted that there is a stone overhang and the entryway is open to the street, providing coverage for pedestrians. Ms. Hawkins countered that the canopy covers people going into their vehicles.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Alliance has an easement on the exterior of the building. He stated that he reviewed the Alliance records of the easement and found that it was donated while the building was being renovated in the 1980s. He stated that photographs from the file show that it was under rehabilitation at the time. He noted that there are two construction drawings of the Chestnut Street and 9th Street facades. He explained that the 9th Street drawing highlights the canopy and has notes to "clean and repair." He stated that the Chestnut Street drawing also highlights the canopy and has the note "see Sheet 31," but Sheet 31 is missing. He concluded that the present Chestnut Street canopy was part of that renovation. He asserted that the Alliance would not approve removal of the canopy unless it was part of a restoration of the building and evidence proves that it was not there at the time of building's completion. He stated that his initial reaction to the application was similar to the

Committee members' comments and positions. However, he explained that, after looking at the masonry details hidden by the canopy, he rethought his position. He asked the Committee members if their views would be different if the proposal was for restoration of the entire entrance to the original Trumbauer design shown in the 1923 architectural drawing. He stated that he could not say if the Alliance would be opposed to that option. He clarified that, short of a full restoration, the Alliance would not approve the removal of the canopy.

Mr. Baron stated that the Commission has reviewed several canopy proposals for buildings of this type in this Center City. He noted that building owners seek to indicate main entrances and offer shelter with the canopies. He stated that he was surprised that the owner sought to remove this canopy when typically owners seek to install canopies. He explained that this canopy is part of a pair of canopies on the building and should be retained. He opined that the masonry ornament behind the canopy is not hidden and can be perceived by pedestrians. He stated that the acanthus leaf detail on the extant canopy is much richer than modern canopy details. He opined that it is possible the acanthus leaf detail was removed from the original and reinstalled on the current canopy. He explained that acanthus leaf detail is not only present in the canopies, but is a theme carried over to the windows and integrated into the design of the building. He opined that, if this owner removes the canopy, a future owner may seek to reinstall it.

Ms. Hawkins stated that, if there was a photograph that depicted the building the way it was originally built, that would aid the Committee. She explained that architect's drawings are not reliable because designs depicted in drawings, even construction drawings, are often not executed.

Mr. Potts noted that he finds it unusual that the architect had all of the stone installed, only to cover it with a canopy. Ms. Hawkins stated that it is possible that it was the owner's will, but that it is still a part of the building's history. Mr. Evans stated that we may never discover why the canopy was added and that the Committee can only rely on material evidence. The Committee members concluded that Standard 4 clearly indicates that changes that had acquired their own significance should be retained, even if they were not present on the day the original construction was completed.

Mr. Gallery commended Ms. Sell on her masterful research. Ms. Sell responded that she was doing her job.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 4, 5, and 6.

ADDRESS: 1429 W DIAMOND ST

Project: Stucco rear ell

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Templetown Rentals

Applicant: Jeff Frask, Equinox Management & Construction

History: 1889; Angus Wade, architect; John Stafford, builder

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install stucco on the rear ell of this property. The stucco would adhere to a wire mesh and the color would be brick red. The rear ell remains intact, but the window openings have been infilled with cinderblock and smaller windows. The building was once part of a row. However, the neighboring buildings have been demolished, exposing the rear ell to Diamond Street.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. John Weiss and Jeff Frask of Equinox Management & Construction represented the application.

Mr. Weiss stated that they have owned the building in this condition for a long time. He explained that the interior was renovated and the window openings were reduced with framing and insulated drywall around the window wells. He explained that there is water infiltration and that the plywood infill around the reduced window openings is not a permanent solution.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the concrete blocks were installed flush with the window openings. Mr. Weiss clarified that there is a mix of concrete block and plywood infill. Ms. Hawkins asked if the plywood could be recessed into the opening. Mr. Weiss responded that there is interior framing with insulation and drywall so it is unclear if they can be recessed. Ms. Hawkins stated that framing is on the inside and that there may be something else holding the plywood in the opening that is nonstructural. She opined that it may be possible to shift the wall plane of the plywood back a few inches to allow stucco to cover the recess and not come forward to the existing brick wall. Mr. Weiss responded that they would have to research that possibility to determine how the plywood is tied into the inside. Ms. Hawkins noted that there are alternatives to stuccoing the entire wall. Mr. Cluver asked if the window alterations occurred prior to designation. Ms. Sell explained that at the time of designation there were several neighboring buildings that have since been demolished, exposing the rear ell to Diamond Street. The designation photographs do not show the rears of these properties. Therefore, it is not known when the work was done. She noted that the property was designated in 1986. Mr. Weiss noted that they have renovated other properties along Diamond Street and have been stewards of the corridor. Ms. Hawkins stated that installing stucco on the entire façade is not an appropriate solution to the water infiltration problem. Mr. Cluver added that, if future owners desire to install full size windows, they would need to remove all of the stucco and restore the brick. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed that covering the elevation with stucco is not a solution. Mr. Weiss explained that they cannot reframe the block openings. He added that they will explore how the framing ties together, but the apartments are occupied and it is not feasible to tear apart the walls. Ms. Hawkins noted that painting the block openings may be an option. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that it is not possible to put stucco over rotted wood. Ms. Hawkins concluded that they need to understand how the infill is constructed.

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

ADDRESS: 2411 SPRUCE ST

Project: Replace front façade windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rafael & Carol Lissack

Applicant: Rafael Lissack

History: 1880

Individual Designation: None

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

Preservation Easement: No

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the installation of aluminum commercial windows with a 3-¼ inch “master frame” in the six openings of the front façade Queen Anne Revival rowhouse. The building retains its elaborate bracketed Queen Anne window frames. Because no drawings of the proposed windows have been provided, it is unclear whether the existing frames would be retained or how the 3-¼ inch frames would fit into the openings. Based on material alone, the proposed windows do not meet Standard 6.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Crystal Lacey and property owner Rafael Lissack represented the application.

Ms. Lacey questioned whether the property was located within the boundaries of the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. She noted that the north side of the 2400 block of Spruce is outside of the district. Ms. Hawkins asked for clarification on the designation of this property. Mr. Farnham stated that the attorney was incorrect. He explained that the property is designated; it is within the boundaries of the historic district and is listed as a contributing property in the inventory. Ms. Lacey stated that 67% of the properties on the block have similar windows to those proposed. She added that seven properties have vinyl windows on the front façade. She stated that they do not believe they should be subjected to the requirements of the Historical Commission, but, in an effort to comply, the proposed windows would have similar form and dimensions to the original windows. She added that the proposed windows would not change the character of the block.

Mr. Lissack stated that the proposed windows are the same configuration as the existing windows. The only difference would be the material of the proposed window. He noted that the proposed windows would appear the same as the existing when viewed from the street. He explained that the proposed windows would provide much better insulation to the apartments than the current windows. Ms. Hawkins asked if any supplemental information on the condition of the existing windows had been submitted. Ms. Lacey answered that none had been submitted. Mr. Lissack reiterated that the windows were deteriorated. Mr. Evans stated that, even if the existing windows are deteriorated, the replacement windows should replicate the original designs in material and configuration, according to the Standards. Property owner Carol Lissack joined the meeting. She stated that the existing windows had been replaced prior to their purchase of the property. She added that the windows do not function properly. Mr. Evans reiterated that the windows could be replaced, but that the windows should be replaced with

units that meet the Rehabilitation Standards. Mr. D'Alessandro advised the owners that they could repair the existing windows. Mr. Lissack noted that repairing the existing windows would not deal with the draft and loss of energy. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that storm panels could be added. Mr. Cluver stated that the issue is not the replacement of the existing windows, but the adherence of the replacement units to the Rehabilitation Standards. Mr. Lissack requested clarification on the Standards they have to follow. Mr. Cluver answered that the replacement windows should replicate the dimensions and materials of the original windows. Ms. Lacey asked how other properties on the block could have vinyl or aluminum windows on the front façade when those would not meet the Standards either. The Committee members noted that the properties with vinyl windows cited by the attorney may not be designated, the inappropriate windows may be grandfathered, or they may be illegal and subject to enforcement.

Ms. Cote asked if the mouldings or the frame would be replaced as part of this project. Ms. Lissack answered that only the sash would be replaced, not the frames. Mr. Evans noted that the proposed windows could not be installed in the existing frames without additional alteration. The proposed windows would necessitate a subframe, which would disrupt the spatial relationship and proportions of the original design. He added that the subframe would likely make the glass size smaller. Ms. Lissack stated that the windows would be installed from the inside. Ms. Hawkins explained that the installation would not change the fact that a subframe would be required.

Ms. Lissack stated that she would just have to allow the building to deteriorate. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Property Maintenance Code prohibited allowing a building to deteriorate and that, as a property owner, she needed to maintain her property. Ms. Lissack answered that she was trying to maintain her building, which had prompted her to purchase the energy-efficient Anderson windows. Mr. Baron stated that the staff approves many window replacements at the staff level on a daily basis and that there are many options for window replacements that meet the Rehabilitation Standards and achieve the desired energy efficiency. He volunteered to provide information on several manufacturers whose products meet the Rehabilitation Standards. Ms. Hawkins advised the owners that, if they feel this project would pose a financial hardship, they could present a financial hardship application or propose a replacement schedule allowing the replacement of the windows over time rather than all the windows at once.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

ADDRESS: 3 AWBURY RD

Project: Construct garden improvements

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Najjia Mahmoud & Mark Sellers

Applicant: Peter DiCarlo, Levy DiCarlo Partners, LLC

History: 1922; Anna Cope Evans House

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Awbury Arboretum Historic District, Significant, 5/14/2010

Preservation Easement: No

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a schist stone shed with a cedar shingle roof along with a schist garden wall. The shed would be located at the rear of the Anna Cope Evans

House in the Awbury Arboretum. The shed and garden wall appear to be compatible with the historic house and the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Mark Sellers represented the application.

Ms. Pentz asked if the fire wood would be protected from the weather with only a pent roof. Mr. D'Alessandro explained that, as long as the top layers of wood are protected from the rain, the firewood would not rot. The Committee members commended Mr. Sellers for a beautiful and appropriate design.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 3:15 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 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.