

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

**TUESDAY, 26 JUNE 2012
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, Chair
Nan Gutterman
Dan McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II

ALSO PRESENT

James Timberlake, KieranTimberlake
Richard Maimon, KieranTimberlake
George Ristow, KieranTimberlake
Shelley Saunders, Rodeph Shalom
Thomas Perloff, Rodeph Shalom
Roy Feinberg, Rodeph Shalom
Martin Rosenblum, architect
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Benjamin Leech, Preservation Alliance
Lorna Katz-Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association
Bernice T. Hamel, Society Hill Civic Association
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents Association
Brian Emmons, Toll Brothers
Shawn Frawley, Toll Brothers
Kiki Bolender
Gerry Maguire
Jonathan Merz
Andrew Lengel, Blackney Hayes Architects
John Hayes, Blackney Hayes Architects
Martin McNamara
Stephen Mileto, QB3 Design

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Gutterman and Pentz and Mr. McCoubrey joined her.

ADDRESS: 609-17 N BROAD ST

Project: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Congregation Rodeph Shalom

Applicant: Thomas Perloff, Congregation Rodeph Shalom

History: 1928; Rodeph Shalom Synagogue; Simon & Simon, architects; altered, 1957, 1966

Individual Designation: 11/1/1973

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes an addition and renovation project at Rodeph Shalom Synagogue at 609-17 N. Broad Street. The synagogue was designed by architects Simon & Simon and constructed in the late 1920s. It replaced an earlier synagogue by Frank Furness. The synagogue building is comprised of two sections, the ornate, limestone-clad, Byzantine-style section to the west, which faces Broad Street and houses the sanctuary and other public spaces, and the utilitarian, brick section at the rear, which houses school and other facilities.

The application proposes the construction of a 28,000 square foot addition to the south side of the existing building to house a new entry lobby and gallery, an early learning center, administrative and rabbinical offices, and a medium-sized worship and multipurpose space for 250 people. The addition and renovations would not only provide needed space, but would also improve life safety, accessibility, thermal efficiency, and way finding in the existing building. The addition itself would be constructed on the parking lot at 601-07 N. Broad Street, which is not designated as historic, but the project would fall under the Commission's jurisdiction because the addition would attach to and require alterations to the historic building.

The proposed addition is designed to maintain views of and light to the important stained glass windows on the south side of the building. The addition would gently attach to the south façade of the front, limestone-clad section of the historic building below the sills of the stained glass windows. The front section of the addition would be one story in height. The addition would rise gently up to the south to create the new worship space, while maintaining views of the side of the historic building. A non-historic fire escape would be removed from the south façade of the historic building. A new door opening would be cut in the south façade near the front façade to provide ADA access to the lobby of the historic building. The front section of the addition would be glazed and clad with limestone.

At the rear, utilitarian section of the historic building, a stair tower would be removed and a new four-story elevator and stair tower would be constructed, providing ADA access to the upper floors. The rear section of the addition would be two stories in height and would include new pre-school and office spaces. The rear section of the addition would be faced with stucco.

The addition would be arcaded at the south, with bronze and mosaic-clad columns, and would open onto a landscaped entrance and drop-off area along Green Street.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Thomas Perloff, Roy Feinberg, and Shelley Saunders of Rodeph Shalom Synagogue and architects James Timberlake, Richard Maimon, and George Ristow represented the application.

Mr. Maimon provided a brief summary of the history of the congregation and site. The congregation was founded in 1795. The congregation moved to its current site in 1871, where it had erected a Moorish style synagogue designed by prominent architect Frank Furness. The congregation outgrew the Furness building and in 1928 erected the current synagogue, designed by Simon & Simon in the Byzantine style. At the time, a large Presbyterian church stood to the south of the synagogue, where the addition is now proposed. During the twentieth century, this section of North Broad Street changed considerably, transitioning from a residential and institutional area to a zone dominated by the automobile industry. Rowhouses once stood to the east of the synagogue. After the Presbyterian church was demolished, a car dealership stood on the site. Currently, the remainder block around the synagogue is used as parking lots.

Mr. Maimon explained that the congregation is currently growing. It is becoming a regional, rather than local, congregation. The project is designed to accommodate its expanding congregation and needs. The project will address the needs of the very young through the early learning center and the elderly, with expanded accessibility. The project is also intended to transform the historic building through enhanced connectivity. Currently, the grand worship space at the front of the building and the rear school space are not well connected. The addition will accommodate the activities that take place in the building, which have changed considerably since the current building was erected in 1928.

Mr. Timberlake explained that they began this project more than three years ago with a feasibility study. He stated that the interior of the existing building is very complex and the east and west sections as well as the various levels are not well connected. He also noted the various grades or levels of the spaces on the first floor. Their project will enhance connectivity and accessibility throughout the building. The stair and elevator tower along with the hallway in the addition will provide the needed circulation paths. He pointed out the places where the existing building will be modified. The changes to the existing building are largely restricted to the east or more utilitarian half. He pointed out the distinction between the western, limestone façade section of the building and the brick-faced, utilitarian section.

Mr. Timberlake turned to the plans for the addition. He pointed out the drop zone to the south of the addition. An accessible entrance is critical. He pointed out the new rationalized circulation paths through the enhanced building. He pointed out the landscaped zone to the south, the memorial garden and playground, and the parking, which is necessary for the regional congregation. The first floor of the addition includes the entrance, a chapel, and circulation space. The second floor includes a rabbinical suite, classrooms, and a pre-school. The rear section of the building has five levels. The addition will make the lower floor accessible.

Mr. Timberlake stated that the addition is a long, low mass to allow light to the stained glass windows and views of the south façade of the historic building. He displayed drawings that showed the evolution of the design. The addition would be clad with limestone at the east and plaster at the west. The arcade along the south side would have decorative bronze and mosaic tile columns. The limestone wall at the front of the addition connects with the historic building in materials and mass. It also provides screening for the interior activities from the noise of Broad Street. The chapel has a slight “swag” to the ceiling, which connects to the tent, a form that has deep religious meaning to the congregation. The glassiness and openness of the chapel is intended to contrast with the inwardness and solidity of the Byzantine sanctuary.

Mr. Farnham distributed copies of a letter from the Preservation Alliance regarding the project. He noted that he had emailed it to the Committee members prior to the meeting.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if the monumental front doors would still be used. Mr. Timberlake responded that they will continue to be used, but one set will be converted to swing in the opposite direction to satisfy egress requirements. He noted that they are only used for ceremonial events at this time.

Ms. Hawkins asked the architects to confirm that the only changes to the front limestone section of the building are the minor alterations at the south façade. Mr. Timberlake confirmed that that is correct. They will remove a non-historic fire escape and infill the non-historic opening and cut a new opening from the addition to the front lobby. Ms. Gutterman remarked that they are also cutting a new door in the south façade into the sanctuary. Mr. Timberlake responded that that door already exists and will be retained and reused.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the connection of the glass box to the south side of the building at the front lobby. Mr. Timberlake explained that that small glass box would connect the end of the new gallery to the front lobby. He stated that it projects above the roof of the addition to gather light into the interior of the connection to the lobby. He stated that it is very carefully detailed to work with the historic building. The corner of the addition will replicate the detailing on the synagogue to create a symmetrical condition around the glass box. The structure will be metal. It will not be supported by the historic building. It sits between the pilasters and is not attached to the pilasters. Mr. Timberlake explained that most of the south limestone is blank, without detailing, below the window sill level.

Ms. Gutterman noted that the architectural vocabulary of the historic building is very powerful and includes arches. She noted that the addition is very horizontal. She asked why the addition is not based more directly on the architectural vocabulary of the historic building. Mr. Timberlake explained that the addition is designed to complement but not compete with the historic building. He stated that any vertically-oriented addition with the arches and other forms of the historic building would compete with it and detract from it. Ms. Pentz stated that she found the addition to be appropriately deferential to the historic building. She advocated for a recommendation of approval.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the detail of the connection to the south façade. Mr. Timberlake should a detail drawing of the flashing connection. He noted that the gallery that runs along the south wall of the historic building will have skylights that allow views up to the historic building and stained glass windows. Ms. Hawkins asked about the other detail on the page. Mr. Ristow explained that it is a detail of the connection to the south wall in the reveal, where the historic wall steps back. The connection of the gallery to the wall is slightly different in this area, owing to the change in plane.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance distributed copies of the National Park Service's preservation brief on additions. He stated that the Standards require additions to be compatible. He claimed that word "compatible" appears first in the Standard that addresses additions and "differentiated" follows. He concluded that compatibility is more important than differentiation. He asserted that new additions should be subordinate to, not compete with historic buildings. He stated that there must be a balance between compatibility and differentiation. Additions should not copy or be in stark contrast with historic buildings. Mr. Gallery asserted that the addition should be set back from the front façade of the historic building so that it does not compete with the historic building. He contended that the proposed addition does not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards because it is not compatible with the historic building. He said that compatibility is the "primary characteristic" of the standard. He stated that a number of elements contribute to the lack of compatibility. The first is the sloping roof. The second is the chapel,

which has a blank wall; also, the frosted glass is not appropriate. It is in stark contrast to the historic building. The third is the horizontality. The circulation tower is the dominant element. It overpowers the building. It also stands too far from the historic building. He suggested that the addition could be pushed back to the utilitarian section of the building, and maybe rap around the rear of the building.

Martin Rosenblum, a preservation architect, stated that he was speaking for himself and not as a member of the board of the Preservation Alliance. He stated that he has worked on the building for 25 years and did the original master plan, upon which this design is based. He is no longer working on the building, but has a very long history with it. He stated that this building was designed by Simon & Simon as two separate buildings, with no shared spaces. It was designed and built as a separate sanctuary building and school building, with no real connections. That is why the circulation does not work. He stated that the elements of the addition must be placed where the architects have placed them. He stated that the addition is intended to rationalize the very convoluted circulation in the building. The addition must be located as it is to provide access to all parts of the building. He disagreed with Mr. Gallery and explained that the stair and elevator tower is very carefully placed to correspond to a similar tower in the historic building. He stated that he has no comments on the sloped roof or materials, but only wants to point out that this building has some very unique problems that the proposed addition solves. He also noted that the uses of the spaces in the synagogue have changed considerably. The sanctuary was reserved for formal occasions for people dressed in coats and ties. Now, it is used for many, many activities including children's activities and must be better connected with the rest of the building. He stated that this project will allow this building to continue to be used and useful. He noted that some in the congregation wanted to abandon the building for a more contemporary, better designed space, but the congregation decided to try to make this building work. He stated that one cannot understand this project with a casual glance, but must take the time to really understand the historic building. He disagreed with Mr. Gallery and asserted that this design was the best solution for this unique building.

Ms. Hawkins stated that she thought that the design worked well, especially as it addressed the circulation problems. She stated that she thought that the stair and elevator tower worked well with the historic building, bringing a vertical element to the design. She also liked its rounded nature. She stated that she would have preferred to have the addition pushed back from Broad Street, but she recognized the reasons for its location and indicated that she found it acceptable. She asked the architects to find some ways to introduce some verticality to the design.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that reorganization of the circulation system was handled very well and it creates clarity out of a Gordian knot. Ms. Hawkins agreed. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he liked the horizontality of the addition and opined that the historic building will, in fact, take on more meaning when its verticality is juxtaposed with the addition's horizontality. He contended that any attempt to make the one-story addition vertical would be futile. He contended that the design satisfies the Standards and follows from the many restrictions and conditions at the site. He noted that the rear section would actually be more success if it was three stories instead of two. He advocated for a recommendation of approval.

Ms. Gutterman stated that she "had no problem with the verticality." She added that she does not "like the horizontality."

Mses. Hawkins and Pentz and Mr. McCoubrey voiced their support for the staff recommendation of approval. Ms. Gutterman did not.

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

ADDRESS: 410 S FRONT ST

Project: Construct new multi-family building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Toll PA XV, LP

Applicant: Shawn Frawley, Toll Brothers Inc.

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

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a four-story residential building on the former New Market site. The site is bounded by Front Street and Market Square. The Historical Commission has reviewed and approved several proposals for this site, none of which were built. The Commission approved the demolition of the New Market, and the construction of a ten-story hotel building in December 2000. The market was demolished, but the hotel was never built. In November 2008, the Commission reviewed and approved a 15-story mixed-use building. That building was also never constructed.

The current proposal presents a smaller, four-story building. The proposed building would meet the sidewalk along Front Street and it would be set back from Market Square with an enclosed private garden around it. The proposed set back along Market Square is consistent with the original set back held by New Market. The building would have a T shape plan, and would be mostly occupy the middle of the parcel with generous set backs from neighboring backyards along Lombard and Pine Street. The main entrance would face Front Street.

The ground floor, along Front Street, has been articulated with several other individual entrances with steps. This articulation creates a pedestrian scale and honors the rhythm of steps and entrances in the district. A garage entrance is proposed for the southern corner of the building. The two previously approved proposals also included garage entrances along Front Street. An elevator extension on the center of the building would allow access to a deck on the roof. The building would be clad in limestone at ground floor and brick above with metal panels. The residential units would have projecting balconies.

The proposed building is a very sympathetic addition to the district. The proposed massing and materials are very appropriate.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Brian Emmons and Shawn Frawley of Toll Brothers represented the application.

Mr. Danta informed the Committee that the staff had received an email from the Archeological Forum requesting the Committee to consider recommending requiring a Phase I Archeological investigation for this project.

Mr. Emmons stated that the development team had had several meetings with the Society Hill Civic Association, the Preservation Alliance, and the immediate neighbors. He clarified that

those meetings are still ongoing, and that the plans presented to the Committee are the same plans that have been presented to the interested parties. No formal endorsement has been received yet from the Society Hill Civic Association. He noted that he hoped that any changes requested by the Society Hill Civic Association would be minor.

Mr. Emmons described the project. He stated that the team hoped to create a development that was “understated” and appropriately scaled to the neighborhood. He noted that the proposed entrance plaza off 2nd Street currently includes a water fountain. He stated that this fountain may not be built and that the Society Hill Civic Association has suggested a sculpture or other work of art instead. Mr. Emmons stated that they want the entrance to their property along 2nd Street to be connected to the neighborhood and to have the vitality it once had when New Market stood on the site. He asserted that a work of art may help draw people into this section of the property and help achieve that connection.

Mr. Emmons described the elevation along Front Street. He noted that this elevation includes several entrances that open directly into individual units. The entrances will enliven the façade and recreate a more human scale. Mr. Emmons characterized the cladding materials of surrounding buildings in the neighborhood as heterogeneous. He stated that the brick and limestone cladding of the proposed building would blend with the older fabric of the district, while the metal panels would provide a clear sense of its contemporary construction. He described the metal panels as anodized metal, which would not have a shiny or reflective finish. He noted that the glass balconies are important for unobstructed views of the river.

Ms. Hawkins asked for a clarification on the proposed material for the cornice and lintels. Mr. Emmons answered that they may be limestone or cast stone. Mr. Emmons asserted that they would probably be cast stone, since they currently use it broadly in many of their projects. He noted that, from an economic standpoint, they would prefer cast stone, but that the development team would certainly consider natural limestone if the Committee directed them to do so. Ms. Hawkins asked for further clarification on the use of natural limestone versus cast stone. Mr. Emmons answered that it would be safe to assume that the ground floor would be natural stone and that all stone elements above the ground floor would be cast. Ms. Gutterman asked about the material of the windows. Mr. Emmons answered that they would be metal. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the setbacks on the ground floor would also be finished in limestone. Mr. Emmons stated that those areas would also have natural limestone. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the use of such a distinct band of limestone on the ground floor created a very different vocabulary from the rest of the building, and visually separated the ground floor from the upper stories. He suggested that brick be incorporated into the ground floor to soften the transition and unify the base with the upper stories. He also suggested the elimination of the “Egyptian Revival” flair at the cornice level between the ground and second floors. Mr. Emmons clarified that cornice at that level extended upwards to act as a parapet for private decks at the second floor. Ms. Hawkins agreed with Mr. McCoubrey and reiterated his suggestion to investigate including more brick at the ground floor.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the materials for the steps and railings along Front Street. Mr. Emmons answered that the steps would be cast stone and have anodized aluminum railings. Ms. Pentz expressed her support of the proposal. She stated that whether the stone is natural or cast makes very little difference to her. She described the current proposal as a much more successful proposal than the previous proposals approved by the Commission. Ms. Pentz asked if the entrance along 2nd Street would be accessible to the public. Mr. Frawley stated that the entrance would be accessible up to a certain point, where fences with gates would the private areas for security reasons. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the “plaza” along 2nd Street is sloped. Mr.

Emmons explained that the space has a slight slope in grade, approximately six feet across its length, and that the paving would follow that slope; he clarified that the brick wall proposed for the northern half of the plaza is necessary owing to steps that lead to the neighboring property, the Ross House. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the brick wall appeared visually intrusive and made the space feel smaller. Mr. Emmons stated that they would revisit the design of the plaza. Ms. Hawkins stated that the brick planters seemed unnecessary. Messrs Emmons and Frawley agreed. Mr. McCoubrey described them as unnecessary tripping hazards.

Ms. Pentz asked if the development team would be open to a Phase 1 Archaeological investigation. Mr. Emmons stated that they would likely need to excavate four feet below the existing grade for their construction, and that he would have to know more about the requirements of such an investigation before agreeing to such a request.

Bernice Hamil, the president of Head House Conservancy, expressed her support for the development. She stated that the scale and materials are appropriate for the neighborhood. She stated that the “plaza” is a great element of the design and she welcomed the open space in front of the shambles.

Lorna Katz-Lawson of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that the Committee’s comments echoed most of the concerns expressed by her group at its meeting. She agreed with Mr. McCoubrey’s comments regarding the brick wall in the plaza. She suggested that this aspect of the design be reconsidered. She also stated that the neighborhood would be interested in receiving more information in regards to the lighting and signage proposed for the new building. Mr. Emmons stated that they would provide a lighting scheme to the Association for its review. Ms. Lorna-Katz stated her preference for natural stone instead of cast stone. She also stated that the Association is opposed to panelized brick, and that the proposed brick cladding should be a traditional full brick. Mr. Danta asked Mr. Emmons if they could clarify the size of the proposed brick. Mr. Emmons stated that they would use a traditional four inch brick, and not a brick veneer or panel. Ms. Lorna-Katz expressed concern regarding the balcony overhang along Front Street. Ms. Hawkins clarified that the balconies would not project over the sidewalk and would be confined to the property. Ms. Lorna-Katz suggested that the glass balconies be reconsidered, since they would get dirty easily, and would be difficult to clean.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance expressed his support, stating that “the overall project is great.” He stated that the scale is very appropriate. He stated that he and others “often joke about Toll Brothers, negatively of course,” but that it was refreshing to see a Toll Brothers design that has an urban feel and relates to the historic district. Mr. Gallery stated that the plaza is really a ramp, and that it may be best to terrace this space, which would make it more useful to the public. He agreed with the Committee’s recommendation to reconsider the amount of limestone used on the ground floor.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the cladding materials are natural stone and brick as much as possible, the design for the plaza along S. 2nd Street is reconsidered, and a Phase 1 archeological study is conducted, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADDRESS: 247 S VAN PELT ST

Project: Construct third-floor additions

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: David Fetkewicz and Jon Merz

Applicant: Andrew Lengel, Blackney Hayes Architects

History: 1860; new façade in Moderne style on 247, Morris J. Rosenthal, architect, 1941

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, in concept, proposes to construct an addition on this nineteenth century carriage house and modify the front façade. The present façade does not date to the nineteenth century. The façade was demolished and replaced in 1941 in a “moderne” style. The proposed addition would be a mansard with a single window centered on the mansard. The mansard would be finished with shingles. The alterations to the front façade include the removal of the ornamental balcony at the second floor and its replacement with a single projecting balcony on the middle bay; that bay would be cut down to accommodate a French door. The flanking windows in the second floor, which currently have steel windows from the 1941 alteration, would be replaced with casement clad units. The garage door would be replaced.

The Commission has reviewed and approved several additions to two-story carriage houses throughout the city. The majority of those additions, however, have been set back from the front façade of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR 247 S. VAN PELT STREET: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 249 S VAN PELT ST

Project: Construct third-floor addition

Review Requested: In Concept

Owner: Jon Merz

Applicant: Andrew Lengel, Blackney Hayes Architects

History: 1860

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, in concept, proposes to construct an addition on a nineteenth century carriage house. The addition would have a seven-foot set back from the front façade; a small deck would be located in this area. The deck would have a metal railing. The addition would be clad with brick on the front and stucco on the sides. The design of the addition is very reminiscent of the historic façade of the carriage house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR 249 S. VAN PELT STREET: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION OF 247 AND 249 S. VAN PELT STREET APPLICATIONS: Mr. Danta presented the applications to the Architectural Committee. Architects John Hayes and Andrew Lengel represented the application.

Mr. Hayes stated that 247 S. Van Pelt Street has been heavily altered through the years, while 249 S. Van Pelt Street is in a restored condition. He noted that the proposed design for 249 reflects extensive conversations with neighboring property owners, as well as Randal Baron of the Commission’s staff. He explained that the lots are non-conforming and have rear yard

setback requirements per zoning. He noted that if the addition is set back from the front façade, while retaining the rear set back as per the zoning requirement, it would make the addition very small and useless. Mr. Hayes stated that there is a neighboring deck at the rear, which would be completely blocked of light and air if the addition is pushed to the rear. He explained that they had tried to make the addition sympathetic with the carriage house, and that, in his opinion, since the façade of the carriage house had been so greatly altered, an addition that aligns with the front façade would be acceptable. He noted that such an approach is sympathetic yet differentiated, while also consistent with historic precedent in similar cases found throughout the district.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the mansard addition is grossly inappropriate. She stated that the addition gave the building a Second Empire aesthetic that it never had. She also stated that roof top additions on historic buildings should be set back from the front façade, even if it is at odds with zoning regulations. Ms. Hawkins stated that she was more sympathetic to the addition on 249 S. Van Pelt. She added that it would be best to set the 249 addition back even further to the rear. Ms. Pentz agreed with Ms. Hawkins and stated her opposition to the mansard addition.

Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the slope of the roof on the addition at 249 S. Van Pelt Street be reversed and sloped from back to front to help diminish its visibility. He also suggested that the cladding material should be changed to something other than brick. He characterized the proposed brick cladding as inappropriate, owing to its close relationship to the historic building below. He stated that the “differentiated” aspect of the Standards should be carried further in this particular design. Mr. McCoubrey reiterated the opinions expressed by other Committee members on the inappropriateness of the mansard addition at 247 S. Van Pelt. He stated that such an addition would fundamentally change the character of that building. Ms. Gutterman stressed her opposition to the use of brick cladding as well as the replication of a historic vocabulary on the addition at 249 S. Van Pelt. Ms. Pentz agreed. She noted that a brick addition alludes to a load-bearing wall that would carry through to the ground floor, when in fact; it is not there and spatially could not be there. She suggested that the brick cladding be replaced by a lighter material more in keeping with an addition.

Michelle Fetkewicz, the owner of 247 S. Van Pelt Street, stated that the proposed addition is really the only option that would work. She stated that, if the addition is pushed to the rear, it would adversely affect her neighbor’s roof deck, rendering it useless. She noted that this project was an expensive undertaking and that the amount of space they gain is small; further reducing the square footage of the addition would make it financially impractical. She asked if the Committee members could envision any other options that could work. Ms. Hawkins answered that the Committee does not design for applicants. She encouraged the applicant to explore other options with her architect.

Kiki Bolender stated that she is very grateful that the owners of 247 S. Van Pelt are not seeking a zoning variance, since it would be very detrimental to her property to the north. She characterized the setting of the street along Van Pelt Street as a “quirky urban space,” which is very narrow with a strange assemblage of carriage houses, most of which have been altered. She stated that characterizing the addition on 247 as “Second Empire” was one way of looking at it, but that many of these carriage houses had artist’s lofts added in the early twentieth century that are very similar to the proposed addition. Ms. Bolender stated that she does not feel the proposed addition on 247 would intrude on the streetscape, owing to the width of the street, the tight the view angles, and the presence of two tall buildings at the intersection with Locust Street.

Jonathan Merz asked if historic additions were built set back in the nineteenth century. Ms. Hawkins answered that they probably were not. Mr. Merz then stated that the proposed addition is "unique." Mr. Hayes reiterated that the proposed addition on 247 S. Van Pelt is the only option that would work.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR 247 S. VAN PELT STREET: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR 249 S. VAN PELT STREET: The Architectural Committee could not reach consensus. Two members voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9. Two members voted to recommend approval in concept, providing a different cladding material is substituted for the brick.

ADDRESS: 2020 RITTENHOUSE SQ

Project: Construct 3-story house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Michael G. Maguire

Applicant: James Campbell, Campbell Thomas & Company Architects

History: 1970

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Non-contributing, 2/8/1995

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a one-story garage and construct a three-story house within the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. The garage is non-contributing to the district. The new building would have a garage on the first story, and two bays of double awning windows on the second and third stories. The exterior would be brick and finished with a string-course parapet. A roof deck is also proposed and would be set back eight feet from the front façade. The rear would have French doors with side lights on all three stories, balconies on the second and third stories, and would be clad with stucco. The rear is landlocked and not visible from the public right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect James Campbell and property owner Gerry Maguire represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the brick cladding will be a real or a veneer. Mr. Campbell confirmed that it would be a full-sized brick with stone at the base. Ms. Hawkins asked if the deck railing would be metal. Mr. Campbell stated that he could specify a metal railing. Ms. Pentz asked if there was a curb cut for the existing garage. Mr. Campbell explained that the garage was originally part of a property on Spruce Street and was subdivided in the 1970s. He stated that he proposes to repave the sidewalk and create a curb cut in accordance with the Streets Department requirements. Ms. Hawkins asked what materials are proposed for the windows and doors. Mr. Maguire stated that the windows would be an aluminum clad and the front door would be wood. Ms. Hawkins asked if the garage door would be a painted metal door. Mr. Campbell confirmed that it would be a painted metal garage door.

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

ADDRESS: 339 S 21ST ST

Project: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Martin McNamara

Applicant: Stephen Mileto, QB3, LLC

History: 1870

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a one-story garage and construct a one-story garage with a plant roof and an access tower for a wheelchair lift. The first story would have a sliding garage door with architectural metalwork. The elevation of the addition would be clad with "stacked" stone.

In March 2005, the Historical Commission reviewed and approved a similar application to demolish the garage and construct a two-story modern addition. The first story of the addition would have had a garage entrance with fold-away doors and the second story would have been a terrace with a glazed rail. The façade would have been clad in stone.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Martin McNamara and architect Stephen Mileto represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the proposed materials for the facade. Mr. Mileto stated that a stacked real stone is proposed for the exterior with the proportion in height to pick up on the height of the brick. He explained the stone would be 36 inches long and two and one-half inches tall. He added that a bronze screen and a garage door would complete the façade. He stated that the bronze would be treated to have a dark patina and match the color of the window system. He explained that, although the addition is a new language, it picks up on proportions and elements of the existing building. Ms. Gutterman asked about the material for the watertable. Mr. Mileto responded that it would be a cast, bush-hammered concrete that would be poured in-place. Mr. Mileto explained that a more architecturally ambitious project was approved in 2005 that included a terrace. He stated that the proposal was blocked by a neighbor and the project was abandoned. Ms. Pentz asked about the material of the adjacent watertable. Mr. Mileto stated that it is marble and that he would like to pick up on the tones of the existing marble. He showed a scale model of the proposal and explained that the project is 250 square feet in area. He stated that they would like to treat it like an open garden space that serves as a second means of egress. He explained that the wheelchair lift has been in place since the approval of the last project. Ms. Hawkins asked if the interior walls would be clad. Mr. Mileto explained that the rear is CMU that will be clad. Ms. Hawkins confirmed that no exterior brick would be clad. Mr. Mileto explained that the structural condition of the garage is so poor that it needs to be rebuilt. He explained that their proposal is to rebuild the garage in the same footprint and re-clad the whole exterior so that it is uniform. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the drawing shows the stone in line with the brick of the historic building. Mr. Mileto stated that the stone will be set back. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the addition should be set back to provide a reveal. Mr. McCoubrey stated that, although the model's colors are jarring, they are not accurate. He stated that he considers the material and color proposals to be compatible with the historic building and environment. Mr. McCoubrey suggested using granite or other stone with a compatible color for the base, rather than the concrete. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the

addition be set back a minimum of two inches. She suggested that the architect study the setback question.

Lenore Millhollen of Center City Residents and Preservation Alliance asked if there would be a skylight in the garage. Mr. Mileto explained that they are proposing a skylight to get light into the space. Ms. Millhollen asked if the deck has been eliminated from the proposal. Mr. McNamara confirmed that, based on objections about the previous proposal, they are not proposing a deck with this application.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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.