

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

**TUESDAY, 26 JULY 2016
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP, acting chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
Nan Gutterman, FAIA
Suzanne Pentz

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

ALSO PRESENT

Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Bruce Adelsberger, Barton Partners
Robert Powers, Powers & Co.
Kevin McMahon, Powers & Co.
Kristen Aguirre
Anne H. Arfaa
Polly Koster
Michael Lipareli
Jim Cassidy, C2 Architecture
Vijay Vehmany
Jose Hernandez, JKRP Architects
Jim McKenna, JKRP Architects
Mary Ellen McNish
Mary Anne Hunter
Samuel Blake, Blake Development
Christy Kelly
Rich Cunningham, Blake Development
Sarah Maxwell
Mark Rutledge
Michael Schulson
Nina Tinari
Herb Reid, Maze Development
Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Architects
Bill O'Brien
Agata Reister, Landmark Architectural Design
Craig Sokolow

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Stein called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Gutterman and Pentz and Mr. D'Alessandro joined her.

ADDRESS: 2967 W SCHOOL HOUSE LA, ALDEN PARK

Proposal: Construct in-ground swimming pool

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: L3C Alden Park Apartmentstic I LLC

Applicant: Eric Comp, Briarwood Construction LLC

History: 1925; Alden Park; Edwyn Grant Rourke, architect

Individual Designation: 5/7/1981

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: Yes

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an in-ground swimming pool at the Alden Park apartment complex in Northwest Philadelphia. The Historical Commission considered a similar application in June 2016 and voted to table it for a period not to exceed 60 days and to remand a revised and/or supplemented pool application to the Architectural Committee. The Commission tabled the application to allow the applicants an opportunity to submit more information about the proposed pool as well as the landscape where it would be located. The Architectural Committee recommended approval of the pool at its May 2016 meeting. The current application proposes the same pool as proposed earlier, but provides additional information about the design of the pool, history of the site where the pool would be located, and alternate locations for the pool that were considered and rejected.

The pool would be located on a large lawn area adjacent to a formal garden. Despite significant investigation by the applicant, it remains unknown whether the garden was constructed as part of the Strawbridge Estate, which predated the Alden Park development, or as part of the Alden Park development. The lawn where the pool would be located included a bird bath and was ringed with a flagstone walk, but those features were lost many years ago. An English garden to the east and a pergola with walk to the west of the pool location would be retained.

Alden Park was listed on the National Register on 15 August 1980. It appears that the Historical Commission used the National Register nomination when it designated the complex on 7 May 1981. No landscape features are called out in the nomination and none were noted in the Historical Commission's and Committee's on Certification's minutes during the reviews of the nomination. The nomination notes that the apartment towers are set on spacious grounds, but those grounds are not described or inventoried in the nomination.

The Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia holds an easement on the property and has approved the pool design under its easement agreement. The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission reviewed a larger project that includes the pool as part of a tax credit application, approving the pool, finding that it satisfies the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Guidelines for Rehabilitating Cultural Landscapes, Alterations/Additions for the New Use (Recommended: Designing new features when required by the new compatible use to assure the preservation of the historic spatial organization and land patterns.)

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Bruce Adelsberger and preservation consultants Robert Powers and Kevin McMahon represented the application.

Mr. Powers explained that, following the last review, his staff did additional research on the history of the area where the pool would be located. He stated that they also provided information about the other locations that were considered but rejected for the pool. He stated that they have decided that the proposed location is the best location for the pool.

Ms. Stein asked the Committee members if they had questions about the application. Ms. Gutterman asked if the Cambridge Garage is being demolished. Mr. Powers replied that it is not. Mr. Powers explained that they investigated demolishing the garage and building a pool on the site. He observed that they abandoned that option when the Preservation Alliance and National Park Service objected to the demolition. He also noted that it would be more expensive to build a pool at that site. Mr. Adelsberger added that the garage location is not convenient for a pool. Ms. Gutterman asked why the new pool could not be located adjacent to the existing indoor pool. Mr. Powers explained that the space next to the existing pool is too small for the outdoor pool. Mr. Adelsberger added that the space is already used for many activities. He added that the site is larger enough for the pool itself, but not for any deck around it. Ms. Stein asked if the new pool needed to be adjacent to existing facilities. Mr. Adelsberger replied that it does not need to be near existing facilities; it is self-sufficient. He noted that the design team discussed using the locker room facilities at the existing pool and fitness center for the new pool, but then decided that the pool users, who all live at the site, would likely dress for the pool at their own apartments. He concluded that proximity of the new pool to the fitness center building is not crucial. Ms. Gutterman asked about storage for furniture and other items for the pool. Mr. Adelsberger explained that there is sufficient existing storage on the campus. The pool furniture and other items can easily be stored in existing facilities without constructing any new buildings around the pool. Ms. Gutterman asked about the height of the fence. Mr. Adelsberger stated that it would be 42 inches tall. He stated that the fence will be as minimally visible as possible. Ms. Stein asked about the decking materials. Mr. Powers stated that the terrace surface around the pool would be limestone or slate. Mr. Adelsberger noted that they have hired a landscape architect. Ms. Stein observed that the renderings make the surface appear like concrete. Mr. Powers assured her that it would not be concrete, but would be a natural stone. He stated that the lawn once had a perimeter flagstone walk. The deck around the pool will be reminiscent of that walk. Ms. Stein suggested a darker color. Ms. Stein asked about the fence. Mr. Adelsberger stated that it would be a pre-finished aluminum. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the deck around the pool would be set at the current lawn elevation. Mr. Adelsberger replied that the pool and deck around it would be set at the existing grade level. He noted that this location is the best for a pool because it will be handicap accessible.

Ms. Stein opened the floor to comments from the audience. Anne Arfaa, a tenant, introduced herself and stated that she represents several residents of the complex. She stated that she had researched the garden and provided some information to the Commission. The Committee members noted that they had received her information in their meeting packets. She stated that the garden has been in place since 1926, when Alden Park was constructed. She stated that Justus Strawbridge purchased his estate from someone else, who had laid out the upper garden. Ms. Arfaa stated that she spoke to Marianna Thomas, who compiled the easement documents many years ago for the Preservation Alliance. She asserted that Ms. Thomas had informed her that the easement documents may not have been clear; they indicate that the garden was square, but it was actually rectangular. She stated that the pool would change the ambience of a beautiful part of Alden Park. She stated that she and her group love the grounds

the way they are. She noted that the garden is protected by an easement with the Preservation Alliance. She stated that they were unaware of the plan for the pool and only had a short time to prepare for the meeting. It was noted that Ms. Arfaa and others attended the June meeting of the Historical Commission and objected to the pool. She claimed that the pool would disturb historic trees and other historic plantings. She said that she enjoys the lawn. It is used for yoga. She stated that she can invite two people to join her and have a drink on the lawn. People will love the pool, but it can be placed elsewhere. She claimed that the pool will create security issues. She claimed that the whole garden was put under easement. Mr. D'Alessandro asked Ms. Arfaa if the residents use the lawn today. She replied that they do yoga on the lawn and sit on the lawn, and children play on the lawn. She stated that the area is in the middle convenient to all of the complexes. One can play Frisbee on the lawn. One can place a chair on the lawn. It is used and loved. Black, white, young, and old all use the lawn.

Ms. Pentz noted that there are some existing stone retaining walls in the area. Mr. Powers stated that no garden structures will be removed. They will all be retained. Mr. Adelsberger added that the vegetation will be restored as part of the pool project. Ms. Arfaa interrupted, questioning the applicants. Ms. Stein asked her to allow them to speak. Ms. Arfaa continued argue against the pool.

Mr. Powers stated that the management of the complex contends that a vast majority of the residents are in favor of the pool. He contended that Ms. Arfaa represents a very small minority of the residents. He observed that some residents want the pool and some do not, but reminded everyone that the question at hand regards compliance with preservation standards. Ms. Arfaa stated that the management of the complex supports the property owner's position, but that is to be expected.

Polly Koster identified herself as a resident of the rental apartment complex. She stated that she has a mailing list of 200 residents. She stated that she polled them with regard to the pool and then wrote a letter with the results. She stated that she does not have the letter with her, but did provide a copy to the Preservation Alliance. She noted that one respondent asked: "Where am I going to put my arm?" When asked to explain, she stated that the man in question has a lame arm and stands on the edge of the lawn, resting his arm on a stone wall. He is concerned that he will not have a resting place for his arm if the pool is constructed. She reported that some residents have their visiting grandchildren play on the lawn. She complained that the management of the apartment complex has not communicated well with the residents with regard to the pool. She stated that the management does a poor job of maintaining one pool; they should not have two pools. She concluded that she does not see the need for a pool.

Ms. Stein asked the residents if they had reviewed the plans for the pool. They stated that they had not. Ms. Stein stated that the plans have been available to the public for review at the Historical Commission's offices. She offered them a copy of the plans. Ms. Arfaa claimed that no one associated with the pool project has provided them with any information. They did not know about the project until June, she asserted, when Ms. Koster attended a Preservation Alliance meeting. Ms. Stein pointed out that the Preservation Alliance, which holds an easement on the property, approved the pool project. Ms. Arfaa acknowledged that the Alliance had approved the project, but asserted that Marianna Thomas, who had prepared the easement documents in the 1980s, claims that the Preservation Alliance may not have understood the pool project. Ms. Arfaa stated that she was not able to present anything to the Preservation Alliance. It was noted that the Alliance process is not a public process. Ms. Arfaa stated that the pool "destroys the whole ambience." People "hanging out at a pool" will not behave like people

enjoying a garden. She concluded that the pool should be located elsewhere, even if it costs much more to build elsewhere; the management has enough money.

Ms. Pentz asked Ms. Arfaa to present her research on the garden. She claimed that a letter written in 1914 stated that the garden associated with the former Strawbridge estate, Torworth, had not changed in 50 years. The letter reported that Archibald Henderson created the garden in 1846. Ms. Koster added that a 1904 book cites the trees as important. Mr. McMahon responded that he is aware of the source cited by Ms. Arfaa. He contended that the garden discussed in that letter is not necessarily the garden that exists today. He stated that there is no basis to conclude that the Alden Park garden is the garden from 1846. Ms. Arfaa interrupted, claiming that the garden is historic and has been under easement since 1926. Mr. Powers responded that his firm did significant research including exploring the Strawbridge Collection at the Library of Congress in Washington D.C. and discovered no designer related to the garden in question. He explained that the Olmsted firm did correspond with the Strawbridges about designing a garden, but never undertook any work. The Strawbridges rejected the Olmsted firm. Mr. Powers concluded that, as of 1916, there was no garden on the site. Mr. Powers stated that he understands that a subset of the tenants enjoys the current space, but the property owner would like to provide an amenity that will be enjoyed by many more tenants. Mr. Power stated that qualified preservationists at the National Park Service, the state's Bureau for Historic Preservation in Harrisburg, and the Preservation Alliance have all reviewed the plans and have all concluded that the plans satisfy preservation standards; "they have no substantial impact on the physical fabric of the garden." He asserted that the area where the pool will be installed is a lawn, not a garden. It is a featureless lawn. He acknowledged that there is a formal garden adjacent to the lawn, but observed that that garden will not be altered for this pool. The pool will have no impact on the garden. Ms. Arfaa stated that she has lived at Alden Park for almost six years. She stated that she did her research at the Germantown Historical Society. She claimed that the garden predates the Strawbridges. Mr. Powers replied that he did not understand how her claim impacted today's decision. He admitted that there may have been a garden predating the Strawbridges somewhere at the site, but the question is whether constructing a pool on what is now a lawn satisfies preservation standards. Ms. Arfaa stated that her local research is more important than their research. Mr. McMahon responded that they are aware of all of Ms. Arfaa's sources, but do not consider them to be germane to the current conversation. Ms. Pentz asked about the so-called sunken garden. Mr. Powers replied that that garden is square and adjacent to the pool site; it will be completely preserved. Mr. Powers again said that the only area in question that will be disturbed is the lawn; it is an unadorned lawn. Ms. Pentz asked if the lawn is at the same elevation as the sunken garden. All parties agreed that the lawn is a few feet lower than the grade of the sunken garden. Mr. McMahon pointed out on a site plan and historic photograph where the pool would be installed.

Kristen Aguirre asked why the management would install a second pool near the existing indoor pool. She also asked why the management of the apartment complex had not done a better job communicating with the tenants. Mr. Powers stated that he is a preservation consultant hired by the management, but played no role in communicating with the tenants. He stated that he has been told by the management that most tenants favor the pool. Ms. Stein explained that questions about the reasons for a second pool and the communications between the ownership and tenants are outside the purview of the Historical Commission. She again advised the audience members that the question before the Committee is whether the application satisfies historic preservation standards.

Ms. Arfaa again interrupted, asserting that the pool would destroy the character of the complex.

Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance stated that the Alliance holds an easement on the property. He reported that the Alliance reviewed and approved the plans for the pool. He stated that the Alliance is confident in its decision that the plans satisfy historic preservation standards. He noted that the Alliance would consider other locations for the pool if the Commission fails to approve this application.

Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the analyses of other potential locations for the pool. He asked about the location adjacent to the existing pool house, which was deemed too small. Mr. Adelsberger responded that they had already answered that question and again stated that they studied the location and determined that it was too small for the pool and surrounding deck based on their projected usage. He stated that they explored the feasibility of several sites for the pool. Mr. D'Alessandro asked about other locations. Mr. Adelsberger explained why the other locations were not acceptable for the pool. He noted that handicapped accessibility was an important consideration. They also look at potential for flooding and other issues related to topography. He directed the Committee to the topographical map in the application. Mr. Powers observed that the land is significantly sloped in many areas.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the pool could be placed on an existing parking lot. Mr. Powers stated that parking is at a premium at Alden Park. Mr. Adelsberger added that their current zoning approval requires specific numbers of parking spaces and ADA parking spaces. He remarked that the parking is typically on the periphery, while the pool must be centrally located. Ms. Gutterman estimated that 50 or 60 parking spaces would be lost for a pool. Mr. Adelsberger asserted that they could not give up that many spaces and satisfy their zoning. Mr. D'Alessandro pointed to a large flat area that could be used for the pool. The applicants responded that they had already discussed that location. They stated again that it is the location of the underground parking garage, which was considered, but cannot be demolished, owing to preservation standards and cost.

Ms. Stein thanked the applicants and audience for the discussion and stated that the Committee would now make its decision. Ms. Gutterman reported that she would move to adopt the staff recommendation with the condition that the staff review the details of the paving and fence around the pool. Ms. Pentz stated that she would second the motion, but disagreed with it. An unidentified woman interjected that she had just arrived and wanted to comment on the application. Ms. Stein stated that the period for public comment had closed and the Committee was in the midst of making a motion to finalize its recommendation. The unidentified woman claimed that she was late because of traffic associated with the political convention. Ms. Stein responded that the review had been scheduled for the 15-minute period from 9:00 to 9:15 a.m., but had already run significantly over to 9:45 a.m. She informed the woman that she was 45 minutes late for the review. She noted that the woman would have an opportunity to voice her opinion at the Historical Commission meeting. The woman insisted on speaking. Ms. Stein reiterated that she was too late to participate.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee was unable to agree on a recommendation. Ms. Stein and Gutterman voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review paving and fence details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Guidelines for Rehabilitating Cultural Landscapes. Ms. Pentz and Mr. D'Alessandro dissented.

ADDRESS: 236 S 21ST ST, UNIT A, B, C, AND D

Proposal: Renovate front façade, replace storefront and windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Revocable Living Trust for Rebecca Epstein Sokolow and Joon Choe

Applicant: Vincent Mancini, Landmark Architectural Design

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to renovate the previously altered façade of 236 S. 21st Street to create distinct commercial and residential spaces. The property is listed as contributing in the Rittenhouse-Fidler Historical District. At the first story of the front façade, work includes introducing a new residential entrance with cast-stone stairs at the north end, as well as installing a pent roof and storefront at the south end. The pent roof would be loosely based on the historic storefront windows. Four historic second-story windows would be reopened to their original width and to nearly their original height. These windows would have a two-over-two pane configuration with new cast stone lintels and sills. At the non-original third story, the three dormers would be reconstructed, and a new asphalt shingle roof would be installed. Owing to the extent of past and newly proposed alterations, the application also proposes to apply a brick veneer over the first- and second-story masonry.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that a brick veneer not be applied over the façade and that a material other than PVC be used at the dormer windows and storefront, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Agata Reister and property owner Craig Sokolow represented the application.

Ms. Reister stated that the first story of the building has been altered tremendously and expressed her concern over matching the existing brick and maintaining a uniform appearance. She asked the Committee for suggestions. Ms. Gutterman asked if the wall has been painted, and Ms. Reister confirmed that the brick is painted. Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicant has attempted to remove the paint and tried to match the historic brick. Mr. Sokolow stated that the brick is stuccoed, and Ms. Reister clarified that only the lower portion is stuccoed, while the second-story brick is painted. Mr. Sokolow commented that existing original brick at the second story will be reused. He noted that infill brick was introduced when the windows were altered and that the infill brick does not match the historic brick. The solution to unify the masonry, he continued, is to apply a veneer over the entire façade.

Ms. Stein stated that she appreciates the effort to reopen the original windows and noted that existing fabric could be retained. Specifically, Ms. Stein indicated that the historic window heads remain, though they have been painted. Once the paint is removed, she continued, the brick can be reused and repointed. She identified a small area that would need to be reconstructed due to the installation of the current horizontal window.

Ms. Reister commented that less is known about the area below the awning, where a larger storefront existed previously. Based on original photographs, she continued, the storefront was rather extensive, and it is her assumption that the area has since been filled with non-original material. Ms. Gutterman noted that no probe has been conducted. Without having removed a section of stucco, she continued, the material underneath cannot be determined. She indicated

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JULY 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

her preference for using historic brick to infill areas rather than applying a veneer over the entire façade. Ms. Gutterman added that there are many sources for historic brick. Mr. Sokolow expressed his willingness to follow the Committee's recommendation and to use historic brick to match the original masonry.

Ms. Gutterman asked for clarification on the residential door and inquired whether the doorway is being raised. Ms. Reister confirmed that the application is proposing to raise the stairs and install a stoop. Ms. Gutterman noted that the residential door and stoop will be installed at the north end of the building, while a storefront occupies the remainder of the first story. The area requiring infill, she estimated, is approximately 6 feet by 10 feet. Mr. Sokolow stated that brick matching the original masonry could also be used for the new stair. Ms. Gutterman inquired about the construction of the retaining wall at the proposed stair. Ms. Reister replied that it is proposed as cast stone, but asked the Committee for suggested materials. She indicated that, should the Committee prefer brick, she would propose brick.

Ms. Gutterman asked why the proposal does not include the creation of an ADA-accessible entrance to the deli. Ms. Reister replied that they can consider creating ADA access, but she noted that a Bilco door exists below the large display window. Ms. Gutterman asserted that if they do not address the accessibility issue, they may need to install a ramp. Ms. Reister stated that the step is a current condition and added that the issue could potentially be resolved at the interior. Ms. Stein commented that Ms. Reister's suggested resolution would be preferred by the Committee.

Ms. Pentz observed that PVC trim is proposed in numerous areas and added that the material is not typically approved on a primary façade. The Committee suggested that wood or another material be used, and Ms. Reister proposed Azek, which would enable them to achieve the profiles and appearance of wood but would have more longevity. Ms. Gutterman asked for clarification on the window material. Ms. Reister answered that the owner is proposing Anderson metal-clad windows. Ms. Gutterman stated that that type of window would not be permitted at the front façade and deferred to Mr. Baron for more information on the window manufacturer. Mr. Baron responded that, in addition to metal clad, Anderson manufactures a sawdust and resin composite window that is paintable and rot-resistant. Ms. Gutterman asked the applicants to clarify that the window they are proposing is a wood composite material and not a metal window. Mr. Sokolow and Ms. Reister confirmed that the window will be a wood composite material.

Ms. Reister remarked that the proposed second-story windows are shorter than the original infilled openings. If left in their original location, she continued, the sills would be positioned approximately one foot above the floor, which would necessitate the installation of an interior fall protection system. She asked if the Committee would allow the sills to be raised one foot in order to be code compliant. Mr. Sokolow explained that the shorter window would match the dimensions of other historic windows within the neighborhood. Ms. Pentz reiterated that the original lintels exist, and Mr. D'Alessandro indicated that the application proposes new cast stone sills in existing openings. Ms. Reister clarified that the application is proposing to raise the sills. Ms. Pentz stated that, in looking at the photographs of the current building, the lintels appear to be in good condition and asked whether they can be reused. Ms. Reister replied that the awning has not yet been removed and the condition of the sills is not known. She then asked whether the Committee would allow the sills to be raised if the original stone can be reused. Ms. Stein commented that she would prefer that the sills remain in their original location and that the code-compliance issue be addressed at the interior. Other Committee members agreed. Ms. Stein further noted that moving the sills would result in more patched masonry,

which should be avoided. Mr. Sokolow contended that finding windows to fit the dimensions of the original openings would be difficult and stated that a safety issue would be created at the interior due to their length. He further argued that the windows would not match other historic windows in the neighborhood and asserted that the brick would be matched if the sills were raised. Ms. Pentz reiterated that the Committee would prefer that the sills remain in their original locations. Custom windows can be obtained and guard rails and other safety measures can be installed. Mr. Sokolow replied that he would leave them in place. Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicants could see the existing sills under the awning. Ms. Reister stated she did not know if they existed under the awning, but she could provide a photograph of the area prior to the Historical Commission meeting. Mr. Sokolow commented that he believed they no longer existed, because they are not visible at the building's interior. He added that it appears they were removed when the windows were infilled with brick. Mr. Sokolow confirmed that, should the original sills remain, he would reuse them.

Ms. Stein opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided no brick veneer is applied to the front façade; the existing second-story lintels and sills, if extant, and the historic window sizes are retained; historic brick is used in areas requiring infill; paint and stucco may be removed; wood or Azek is used instead of PVC at the 21st Street elevation; and the proposed windows be a wood composite, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

ADDRESS: 24-28 S FRONT ST

Proposal: Construct residential building

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Pelican Investment Group, LLC

Applicant: Jose Hernandez, JKRP Architects

History: Parking lot

Individual Designation: 10/7/1976, rescinded 5/13/2005

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a five-story, nine-unit building on a currently vacant lot at the corner of Front Street and Black Horse Alley that extends west to Letitia Street. The Historical Commission's jurisdiction is limited to review and comment only. The proposed Front Street elevation would feature a cast stone base and a large driveway portal to the garages of the townhomes behind. The upper floors of the Front Street elevation would be clad in brick and metal panels with asymmetrical vertical windows. The span over the driveway portal would be clad in grey and black metal panels with Juliette balconies and large sections of black metal panels topped with high, horizontal windows. The Letitia Street elevation would mirror the Front Street elevation. The Black Horse Alley elevation would feature nine townhouse-like units clad in cast stone, brick, and metal panels, with metal bay windows extending across the second and third floors. The rears of the townhouses, which would be accessed through the entrance portal on Front Street, would feature ground-floor garage doors. The ground floor would be clad in brick, and the upper floors in metal panels.

STAFF COMMENT: The staff comments that the proposed construction is generally compatible with the Old City Historic District in height and scale, but recommends reconsideration of

fenestration patterns, particularly along the Front Street elevation with the use of asymmetrical windows and metal panels, as well as the design of the sections over the driveway portals.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jose Hernandez and designer Jim McKenna represented the application.

Ms. Stein asked if the architects had anything to add. Mr. Hernandez responded that he would like to go through their process for developing the design. He directed the Committee's attention to the fourth sheet in the application. He noted that the site previously had four-story and two-story buildings on it. He explained that they saw this site as an opportunity to mesh the modern, contemporary designed building to the north, with the lower-scale historic building to the south. He noted that they saw the two adjacent buildings overlapping each other, and took cues from them for the brick with the lighter grey metal panels and larger windows.

Mr. Hernandez noted that Blackhorse Alley is a very narrow street, so, to improve the conditions along it, they plan to set the proposed construction back four feet from the curb line to create a more walkable landscape. He noted that they plan to repair the existing granite curb and maintain the existing cobblestone street. He noted that most of the utilities will enter the building from Front or Letitia Streets.

Regarding the staff's comments about the windows, Mr. Hernandez noted that they saw the design as an opportunity to play with old and new, and to differentiate the new from old.

Ms. Pentz asked Mr. Hernandez to explain the small renderings in the application. Mr. Hernandez explained that the small renderings depict the process and grid by which they developed the design in a merging or sliding of the new and old buildings to either side. He noted that the idea of the concept is to have the brick in front of the glass to give more prominence to the historic nature of the area.

Ms. Pentz asked Ms. DiPasquale to explain the staff recommendation of "reconsideration of the fenestration, particularly with the use of asymmetrical windows and panels," and whether the staff was recommending more or less symmetry. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff was recommending more symmetry. She noted that the staff does not feel that the strongly vertical windows mixed with metal panels that jump around from floor to floor is appropriate. Mr. Hernandez asked if Ms. DiPasquale meant within the masonry openings. Ms. DiPasquale responded affirmatively, noting that the openings themselves seemed proportional and appropriate, but the window and metal panel configurations within the openings do not.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the width of the driveway. Mr. Hernandez responded that it is a standard 22 feet in width. Ms. Gutterman commented that it appears more like 40 feet in the drawings, but that she understands the necessity for a 22-foot width.

Ms. Pentz commented that the spandrel piece or lintel over the portal appears overly weak, and recommended beefing it up. She noted that that may create some changes on the overall design if the applicant is trying to have a continuous band in line with the frieze of the adjacent building. Ms. Gutterman noted that in the rendering, the band does not appear to align completely with the adjacent property. Mr. Hernandez responded that the goal was to create a base, and that he does not think it would be an issue to continue the limestone or cast stone across that opening to create a continuous base.

Ms. Gutterman asked if Mr. Hernandez had any ideas how to address the staff's comments on asymmetry. Mr. Hernandez responded that they could explore utilizing more regular windows that occupy the full width of the opening, but that he would need to check on wall locations. He noted that some of the metal panels were utilized to maintain the overall width of the masonry opening where walls did not fall exactly right, but that they may be able to make some interior adjustments.

Ms. Gutterman recommended that the applicant include additional photographs of Blackhorse Alley in the submission to the Historical Commission. Mr. Hernandez responded that there is one image of Blackhorse Alley in the current submission. Mr. Hernandez noted that they would include a rendered image of the proposed construction along that block as well. Ms. Stein recommended showing the setback on the site plan. Mr. Hernandez responded that the dimension is present, but very small. Ms. Stein asked whether the bay windows extend out over the alley. Mr. Hernandez responded that they do not.

Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the brick piers along the Front Street elevation seem "leggy," and the windows seem very tall. He opined that, with no masonry mass connecting the brick piers, the design seems incompatible with the district. Mr. Hernandez responded that the idea of the brick piers with metal infill panels between was part of the concept of merging the historic and new buildings. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that he does not understand why the horizontal lines from the area over the driveway portal need to be continued across the remainder of the building. He recommended more masonry to connect the piers. Ms. Stein asked Ms. DiPasquale if that was part of the staff's recommendation. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff was more concerned with the window and metal panel pattern within the masonry openings. Mr. Hernandez reiterated that the concept was to have the grey metal panels slide behind the brick as a transition from the old to the new. By utilizing additional masonry, he commented, it defeats the idea of merging the old and new. Ms. Stein agreed with Mr. Hernandez, noting that she appreciates this design as an infill building. She opined that the combination of the brick and metal panels is appropriate in the context of an infill building in the Old City district. She agreed with the staff recommendation for more consistency within the masonry openings. She noted that, owing to the dark color of the panels, the mullion pattern would be an important part of the design, and there should be a bit more regularity.

Ms. Stein opened the floor to public comment. Mary Ellen McNish, resident of the adjacent building at 22 S. Front Street, commented that her condominium board had a very productive meeting with the applicant the previous day. She noted that their building has a beautiful garden and beautiful view, and thanked the architect for exploring some of the issues that the condominium board raised.

Job Itzkowitz of the Old City District commented that his board has not had the opportunity to review the plans yet and form an official opinion. He noted that he testified at the previous Commission meeting about a project by the same architects. He stated that his only request is that this development is consistent with the vision set out by the Old City District's Vision2026 plan. He explained that the plan largely speaks to density, walkability, pedestrianism, and accessibility. With this particular project on Front Street, Mr. Itzkowitz opined that there may be a case that it is more difficult to create a viable ground-floor commercial space. Nevertheless, Mr. Itzkowitz stated that the Old City District advocates for density, and that the number one concern he has heard from residents is the need for a grocery store. He noted that grocery owners need people to be able to walk to their grocery. He acknowledged that the Historical Commission is not the appropriate venue to discuss zoning matters, but opined that this project is exploiting a loophole that requires multi-family development in CMX-3 zones. These are

townhomes, he noted, and if they were townhomes that were individually deeded, they would not be by-right; they would require zoning. Because these units will not be deeded, but will be condominiums, he explained, they will be by-right. Mr. Itzkowitz opined that that was not the intention of the zoning legislation. He reiterated the need for density. He commended the architect for meeting with the Registered Community Organization on the last project, and hoped that the architect would do so for this development as well.

Mr. Hernandez stated that the proposed brick is not completely uniform, but that it is predominantly red. He noted that he could provide a sample of the brick at the Commission meeting.

Mr. D'Alessandro reiterated his desire to see additional masonry along the Front Street elevation. Ms. Gutterman disagreed with Mr. D'Alessandro. She noted that she understood his desire to have masonry across the top of the driveway portal, but that it goes against the intent of making the masonry façade slide past the metal panel wall by making it look too solid. She agreed with the issue of the window pattern and lintel over the drive look like it is supporting the apartment above, but she accepts the idea of the transparency between the masonry object and metal and glass object, which is sliding and transforming from old to new, and is not a heavy masonry wall.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented that the proposed construction is generally compatible with the Old City Historic District in height and scale, but recommended regularizing the glass and metal panel fenestration patterns along Front Street, and continuing the masonry base across the driveway portal.

ADDRESS: 148 N 03RD ST, UNIT C

Proposal: Construct roof addition with deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Ari Halbert

Applicant: Jim Cassidy, C2 Architecture

History: 1830; storefront added c. 1855

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a fifth floor addition and roofdeck on top of an existing four-story building. The addition would be clad in stucco and feature a long pilothouse arm extending out along the north side of the building. This arm would be highly conspicuous from N. 3rd Street, owing to a low building to the north, and would also be visible from Quarry Street. The deck would feature two tiers, and would surround two new large Velux skylights.

While a conspicuous rooftop addition would not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, an addition that is approximately the size of the proposed master bedroom portion of the currently proposed addition with a roof deck scaled so that it is not visible from N. 3rd Street would meet these Standards.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9, and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Jim Cassidy and Jessica Rotenberger represented the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JULY 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Ms. Stein asked if the architects had anything to add to the staff's introduction of the project. Mr. Cassidy responded that they somewhat expected the staff's comments. He clarified that the staff was contending that the increase in height for the master bedroom was not the problem, but the issue is the pilothouse and its visibility from N. 3rd Street. He noted that there is the opportunity to flip the scheme where the pilothouse would be on the south side of the building. Mr. Cassidy opined that, if the lower-scale building to the north were built out, the pilothouse would not be visible from the street. Mr. Cassidy asked if it would be acceptable if they switched the pilothouse to the south side of the building. Ms. Stein responded that the pilothouse would still be visible if located on the south side, according to the renderings submitted to the Committee. She noted that the Committee often recommends that pilothouses be back-sloped, which can help limit visibility from the street. She stated that the stair arm is the problem.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the removal of a portion of the roof for the addition. She noted that the roof currently continues to the back of the building, so the proposal removes a portion of the roof to make the master bedroom and roof access. Mr. Cassidy responded that there is an existing mezzanine at the rear of the building, but the ceiling height is not enough. Ms. Gutterman questioned how much of the existing roof is actually being removed by the time the stair and pilothouse and addition are reframed. Mr. Cassidy responded that the pilothouse is probably going to require cutting the joists back from the party wall, but that the bulk of the roof removal would be required for the bedroom.

Ms. Pentz noted that the deck is not directly accessible from the bedroom. Mr. Cassidy responded that it is not, owing to the lower floor level of the bedroom.

Ms. Stein noted that the Committee must look at the application before them, but that the applicant is welcome to revise the application prior to the Commission meeting.

Ms. Stein opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

Ms. Gutterman recommended that the applicant consider, with no guarantees of a future approval, flipping the pilothouse to the south side of the building, and sloping the roof of the pilothouse in order to make it inconspicuous from the public right of way.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9, and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 17 SUMMIT ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Blake Development Corp

Applicant: Samuel Blake, Blake Development Corp

History: 1861

Individual Designation: 8/2/1973

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear addition with garage and roof deck on this building, which recently sustained damage from a fire. The existing rear addition would remain, and the new addition would align in height with the existing addition. It appears that the

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JULY 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

rear wall of the main house, where the addition is proposed, has already been altered from its original condition. The addition would be partially visible from Bethlehem Pike, which runs behind the property, and would be clad in stone veneer. A new door opening would be cut into the rear of the main house to allow for access to a roof deck, which would sit on the new portion of the rear addition.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Bill O'Brien, designer Rich Cunningham, and developer Sam Blake represented the application.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the house is one of 90 historically designated properties in Chestnut Hill. He stated that the building has undergone at least five renovations since it was first constructed. He explained that the fire in 2014 substantially damaged the building, and that the applicant has submitted three permit applications for work to the building, all of which were approved by the staff, and this is the fourth and final application. He commented that there is evidence of a deck which was destroyed in the fire, which was behind and above the existing garage. He explained that the architect considered other options for the location of the deck access door, but there was nowhere else to locate the off-centered door owing to the interior layout.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the new two-inch stone veneer. Mr. Blake responded that it is actual Wissahickon schist that is between two and three inches in thickness, and will match well with the existing schist. Ms. Gutterman asked about the stucco portion of the existing rear addition. Mr. Blake responded that it is infill that was likely done 50 years ago. He stated that he intends to replace that section with the stone veneer as well.

Ms. Pentz asked about work to the cornice. Mr. Cunningham clarified that the cornice is covered under a separate permit which was approved by the staff. Ms. Pentz asked if there are designation photographs. Ms. Broadbent responded that there are no designation photographs of the rear of the building.

Ms. Stein stated that the new door for deck access does not enhance the rear façade, and asked why it cannot be centered below the upper windows. Mr. Cunningham responded that, if the door opening were to be moved, it would either encroach on the planned walk-in closet, or the planned laundry room. He stated that the solution was to create a hallway, although it is not centered as viewed from the exterior. Ms. Stein asked if it is possible to take out a portion of the closet and center the door so that it looks appropriate on the outside of the building.

Ms. Stein asked about the two stairs on the side elevation of the new addition, stating that it seems awkward and unnecessary. Mr. Blake responded that he prefers a ground patio as opposed to a raised deck, so it was designed that way for convenience. Ms. Gutterman asked if he could turn one opening into a window or an inoperable door, use the other opening as the operable door, and eliminate the steps at the window or inoperable door. Mr. Blake accepted the suggestion.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the material of the railing. Mr. Blake responded that it will be a composite material that will have the appearance of wood. He confirmed that it is not PVC, and stated that he could use the same material for the stair railing as well. Ms. Stein asked if there is a metal railing at the front of the house. Mr. Blake responded that there is not, and the reconstructed porch is much more decorative in design. He stated that the garage door will also

be composite and painted. He stated that the new windows are wood. Ms. Gutterman asked about the new decorative window surrounds. Mr. Blake responded that they can be wood, and explained that he is using wood windows for the front and rear replacement windows, owing to the staff's review and approval. He asked if he could use composite material as the surround, which will look like wood but not rot like wood. Ms. Gutterman asked if the staff would approve this request. Ms. Broadbent responded that the visibility of the rear is limited and at a great distance from Bethlehem Pike, so the staff could likely approve a composite window surround. Mr. Blake commented that the new cornice pieces are also a composite material. Ms. Gutterman stated that, if the railing and cornice are composite, then the window surrounds can also be composite, as long as the details match the historic appearance.

Ms. Stein asked for public comment. There was none.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the suggestion but not requirement that the applicant remove one set of stairs from the side of the new addition, and center the new door below the upper windows on the rear façade, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADDRESS: 219-29 S 18TH ST, UNIT 200

Proposal: Install window screens at second floor

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rittenhouse Regency Affil1708Chan

Applicant: Rittenhouse Regency Affil

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

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install window screens on nine windows at the second floor of the Locust Street facade of the building known as Parc Rittenhouse. The screens would fill the bottom halves of the window openings, and would sit under the top sash.

The screen manufacturer initially submitted an application that included screens that sat forward of the top sash, rather than under it, and the center mullion was 2¾ inches in width. At the staff's suggestion, the manufacturer revised the drawings with the screens under the top sash, but has indicated that the center mullion cannot be reduced in width less than two inches.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 2.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owners Michael Schulson and Nina Tinari represented the application.

Mr. Schulson explained that the new condominium unit has new windows that only open from the bottom, so he and Ms. Tinari are applying for permission to install exterior windows screens so that the windows can be safely opened. Ms. Gutterman asked if the screen manufacturer is claiming that the large screens are not structurally sound if they do not have the center mullion. Mr. Schulson responded that the large windows are approximately ten feet by six feet, and the manufacturer feels that in order for him to warranty the large screens, he needs the center mullion. Ms. Gutterman suggested an interior screen that is compression-fit on the inside. Mr.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JULY 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Schulson responded that he is not interested in interior screens, and has concerns about his children touching them. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the center mullion can be reduced to an inch in width. Ms. Broadbent responded that the manufacturer was unwilling to build it less than two inches in width. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that it is not impossible to have the center mullion one inch in width, with the strength not achieved in the front. Ms. Tinari asked for clarification. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that they use a different manufacturer. Mr. Schulson explained that his manufacturer is well-respected in the field, and is the millworker who made the new windows for the unit. Ms. Gutterman asked if he could modify the new windows so that the top sash is operable. Mr. Schulson responded that he is not looking to modify the existing windows, as it would be expensive.

Ms. Gutterman opined that the piece of wood in the center of the screen is the only concern with this application. Mr. Schulson asked about using multiple thinner muntins or mullions. Ms. Gutterman responded that it would need to match the muntins of the sash above it. Mr. Schulson asked if he could simply staple a screen to the sides of the window, if it does not have a center mullion. Ms. Gutterman responded that the perimeter frame is not the concern; rather, the only concern is the center mullion. She suggested that it be modified to look more like the sash above it, and that ideally the manufacturer would make a window sash similar to what exists, which would line up with the existing sash, and instead of putting glass in it, the manufacturer would use mesh. She clarified that it would fit under the upper sash, and the small screens to either side of the larger windows would remain as proposed. Ms. Broadbent asked for clarification. She stated that the existing sash have five panes horizontally, and asked if Ms. Gutterman was intending for the screens to have four vertical muntins. Ms. Gutterman responded that there could either be four vertical muntins, or two horizontal muntins, but the idea would be to carry something from the pattern of the window and match that, as opposed to seeing one piece of wood down the center. Mr. Schulson responded that this is a good solution. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the screens should be black to match the window sash. Mr. Schulson asked if the Committee has a preference for vertical versus horizontal muntins. Ms. Gutterman responded that the staff can review those details with the applicants, and the applicants should determine which option they prefer when looking out the window from the inside of the unit. Ms. Gutterman asked the staff if the Commission would need to review the application, assuming the revisions are made, or whether it could be approved instead by the staff. Ms. Broadbent responded that she would have to discuss the question with the rest of the staff to make that determination, but noted that the Architectural Committee has the authority to approve applications outright that are within the staff's purview to approve.

Ms. Stein asked for public comment, of which there was none.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 2, but suggested approval of revised screens that match the vertical and/or horizontal divisions of the existing window sash for the three large windows.

ADDRESS: 317 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Demolish rear dormer and roof; construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Margaret Petri

Applicant: Sean McMullan

History: 1815; storefront added in early 20th century; storefront removed 1958

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the majority of the rear slope and dormer of this house and construct an addition. This addition would demolish character-defining elements of this important, early, individually-designated house. Owing to its location at a corner, most aspects of the house including the rear dormer and roof are highly visible from the public right-of-way. Research into the rehabilitation of this house in the 1970s suggests that the front dormer was rebuilt at that time, but the rear dormer was existing and not rebuilt as part of that scope of work.

The Historical Commission reviewed a similar application at its 10 June 2016 meeting. At that time, the Commission voted to deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9, and 10. One Commissioner suggested redesigning the addition with a gambrel roof that would intersect the rear slope of the main building, with new dormers in the addition. It appears that this application is in response to that suggestion.

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

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

Ms. Gutterman asked how this design differed from the previous design. Mr. Baron explained that the mansard roof with a dormer came about as a result of a Commission member's suggestion. Ms. Pentz said that she finds the demolition of the roof structure and the dormer to be inappropriate. Mr. Baron explained that he had worked with the owner on a new submission that preserved more of the roof and all of the dormer, while constructing a room on the rear ell. The owner had been in agreement with that approach; however, he then submitted a different design. Mr. D'Alessandro said that the plans should be clearer and easier to understand. Ms. Stein expressed concerns with change to the roof profile particularly on an individually designated building and at a visible corner. All of the Committee members opined that a multi-story addition off the back of the building would be a more appropriate place for additional bedrooms.

Ms. Stein asked for public comment of which there was none.

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

Mr. D'Alessandro excused himself from the meeting.

ADDRESS: 1501-05 FAIRMOUNT AVE

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Mark J. Kreider

Applicant: Rotciver Lebron, Harman Deutsch

History: 1930; Overseas Motor Works; Samuel Brian Baylinson, architect

Individual Designation: 2/13/2015

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an addition on and adjacent to a one-story Art Deco commercial structure. The addition would be three stories in height on the historic building and four stories adjacent to the historic building, on what is now a surface parking lot. The addition would be set back 29'-4" from the Fairmount Avenue façade and 16' from the 15th Street façade. The addition would be clad in light gray aluminum composite panels at the three street facades and corrugated metal panels at the west façade. The one-story Art Deco building would be rehabilitated with storefronts based on historic photographs.

The Historical Commission reviewed a similar application at its 10 June 2016 meeting. At that time, the Commission voted to deny the application, but with the suggestion that the applicant submit a revised application that reflects the Commission's comments. The Commission suggested that the addition be set back farther from the Fairmount Street façade and/or allow for more breathing space for the tower of the historic building. The first application proposed a 13'-7" setback of the addition from Fairmount Avenue. Several Commission members suggested changing the materials to render the addition more differentiated from, but also compatible with, the historic building. The Commission generally commented that the addition would overwhelm the historic building, destroy spatial relationships, and that it was not compatible with the historic property in size, scale, proportion, and massing. The staff suggests that the revised design is improved in terms of setback, but still does not meet the Standards in terms of massing.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Herb Reid and architect Rustin Ohler represented the application.

Mr. Ohler explained that there are 55-foot tall buildings under construction on two sides of this building. Ms. Pentz found the revised application much more successful in respecting the existing building. It was noted that the fenestration no longer aligns with the storefronts on the first floor. Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Baron to explain why the staff still opposed the proposal. Mr. Baron replied that, in the past, the Commission has approved rooftop additions using two principles. The first, based on the Rooftop Guidelines, encourages additions to be inconspicuous. The second, as seen in the 10 Rittenhouse project, involved constructing the addition so that it is perceived as a separate building. This addition will be both conspicuous and perceived as part of, not separate from, the historic building. That said, he agreed that the new proposal is substantially better than the first design, not only because of the setback, but also because of the use of more of the open lot, which will shield the view of the overbuild from the north. Ms. Gutterman asked about the material of the base. She was told that it will be cast stone. Ms. Stein asked about the material on the west side. Mr. Ohler said that it will be clad in metal panels and will be mostly hidden by the three-story rowhouses to the west of this structure. Mr. Baron asked if they considered setting back the building one bay further from

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 JULY 2016

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Fairmount Avenue and adding an additional floor. Mr. Ohler said that they had met with and obtained approval from the community association for a zoning variance up to 55 feet, but that shifting the addition back and adding a fifth floor would bring them to 61 feet.

Ms. Stein asked for public comments. Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance explained that the Alliance has not had time to develop a formal comment. In general, they are not against the overbuild, but have always been concerned with respecting the historic building. He said that this additional setback has certainly made strides in that direction.

Ms. Gutterman suggested a motion to approve the proposal in concept, but for the staff to work with the applicants on refining the design of the storefronts and other details. Mr. Baron cautioned that the application was not proposed in concept. Ms. Gutterman agreed to offer a different motion.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:40 a.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 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

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

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

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

Guidelines for Rehabilitating Cultural Landscapes, Alterations/Additions for the New Use: Recommended: Designing new features when required by the new compatible use to assure the preservation of the historic spatial organization and land patterns.