

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

**WEDNESDAY, 22 FEBRUARY 2017
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-029
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dan McCoubrey, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP
Rudy D'Alessandro
Nan Gutterman, FAIA
Suzanne Pentz
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

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
Christine Taber
Doug Taber
Dan Rocha
Michelle Conner
Joan Bedell
Roberta Reiner
Delores Shellaby
Frank Carter
Justino Navarro, Spring Garden Civic Association
Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch Architecture
Colin Laren
Greg Wilson, Harman Deutsch Architecture
James Pavlock
Ambrose Liu, Mural Arts
Julia Frayman
Olga Shorokova
Kiki Bolender, Bolender Architects
Logan Dry
Alex Aberle
Violette Levy
Karen Earley
Lois Krombolz
Jason Birl, Ambit Architecture
Nancy Weinberg, Save Our Sites
Scott Woodruff, DesignBlendz
Neil Sklaroff, Ballard Spahr
David S. Traub, Save Our Sites

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 FEBRUARY 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

W.N. Binderman, Save Our Sites
Charles Capaldi, CaVA architects, llp
Frances Carter

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. McCoubrey called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Ms. Gutterman and Stein and Messrs. Cluver and D'Alessandro joined him.

ADDRESS: 563 AND 565 JUDSON ST

Proposal: Construct three-story additions to two-story building on consolidated lots

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1601-03 Ridge Avenue LP

Applicant: Rotciver Lebron, Harman Deutsch Architecture

History: 1863; 1920 Colonial Revival alterations

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a third-floor addition and side-yard addition with roof deck on a two-story contributing rowhouse and adjacent lot in the Spring Garden Historic District. The two separate lots will be consolidated. The third-floor addition with roof deck is set back 10 feet from the front of the historic building and is clad in a light gray laminate panel. The side addition, which is approximately the same width as the historic house, rises three stories to the height of the proposed third-floor addition, and is clad in a four-inch red brick veneer with large aluminum clad windows.

The staff suggests that the proposed construction is inappropriate and overwhelms this cohesive row of two-story houses. It should be redesigned to be more sensitive to the existing historic building and context. The application appears to reference the height of the two properties on the southern end of this row, but those properties are considered non-contributing to the district and should not provide guidance on massing, scale or design.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Rustin Ohler and property owner Colin Laren represented the application.

Mr. Ohler explained that the intention is to remove the existing deck and place a third-floor, set-back addition on top of the two-story historic building, in addition to a three-story addition in the vacant parcel at 565 Judson Street. He stated that he worked with Randal Baron of the staff on material selection and punched openings, in addition to restoration details for the front façade of the historic building. Ms. Gutterman asked the staff if the existing roof deck was permitted. Ms. Broadbent responded that it pre-dates the historic district designation, and therefore is grandfathered in. Mr. Ohler explained that the site is currently two separate parcels that are not yet combined. Mr. Cluver asked about zoning. Mr. Ohler responded that it is a by-right project from a zoning perspective. Ms. Gutterman responded that, while it might be by-right according to zoning, was there any consideration given to proposing only a two-story building on the vacant lot, rather than proposing something so massive and which is so visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Ohler responded that it was considered, but other row houses in the

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 FEBRUARY 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

neighborhood are a comparable size, and they wish to build a three-story rowhouse, owing to the owner's needs and wants for a modern house that meets modern living standards. Ms. Gutterman asked about the heights of surrounding buildings on Judson Street. Mr. Ohler responded that the houses across the street are three-story rowhouses, and the three houses to the south are two-story rowhouses. Mr. McCoubrey asked about visibility of the overbuild from Brandywine Street. Mr. Ohler directed his attention to the renderings. Ms. Gutterman asked about the width of the nearby houses. Mr. Ohler responded that the lots to the south are of a similar width, and the lots across the street are wider. He explained that his combined lot would be 24 feet in width. Ms. Stein noted a discrepancy on the drawings regarding the height of surrounding buildings. Mr. Ohler stated that he is proposing a 12-inch parapet on the third-floor addition, and a 24-inch parapet on the new building. He commented that he could lower that parapet by 12 inches. Ms. Gutterman asked if there is a way to lower the third-floor height in an effort to lower the overall mass. Mr. Ohler responded that there is a nine-foot ceiling proposed so it may be able to be lowered. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the renderings clearly show that the overbuild is highly visible from the public right-of-way and does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed. Mr. Cluver stated that, if one accepts that an argument can be made for a three-story building on the vacant lot, the proposed building is not respectful of the context of the other three-story buildings. It has a third story that is proportionally taller than the first and second stories, which works counter to a traditional design. The scale of the window openings and the materials in general are inconsistent with the historic district. He concluded that the third-story addition on the historic building is also inappropriate.

Ms. Pentz arrived after the start of the review.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment. Doug Taber submitted written opposition to the proposal, and explained that the neighbors have concerns regarding the inappropriateness of the height, width and appearance of the proposal. He commented that the height should be no more than two stories. He commented that the proposed twelve-foot width would extend onto the sidewalk by one foot. Dan Rocha, a nearby resident on N. 23rd Street, submitted photographs of the street and surrounding context. He commented that Judson Street has a small village feel, and the proposed addition is completely out of character for the street. He opined that it amounts to constructing a McMansion in the middle of a historic district. He commented that the neighbors are not opposed in any way to development in the neighborhood, but that new construction should conform to historic standards and be compatible with the character and context of the neighborhood. Fran Carter, a nearby resident of the 2200 block of Brandywine Street, commented that she is a 30 year resident and is also speaking on behalf of a Judson Street resident. She commented that the context of Brandywine Street and N. 23rd Street is very different than the context of Judson Street. The newer houses that have been developed on Brandywine Street and N. 23rd Street have been consistent in design and scale for those streets. However, Judson Street is small and charming, and should be thought about separately from the other streets, because new construction on those other streets is not a model for new construction on this small street. She commented that the three-story houses across the street are small and historically scaled, and it is not beneficial to the neighborhood to develop Judson Street differently than how it was historically intended in terms of size, scale, design and materials. Jim Pavlock, a nearby resident of the 2200 block of Brandywine Street and the block captain for that street, commented that he has been a resident for 25 years, and he chooses to walk on this quaint street because it is unique. He distributed historic photographs from 1931 showing 563 and 565 Judson Street both as two-story buildings. He commented that this proposal does not satisfy Standard 9 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He opined that it would be better suited for a strip mall in the suburbs, as it does not

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 FEBRUARY 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

fit with the historic context of the quaint street. He distributed a photograph of five new townhouses on N. 23rd Street, and explained that the neighbors worked with the Civic Association and its architect to reach a successful design for that project that respected the character of the historic district. Lastly, he distributed a photograph of new construction at a corner just outside of the historic district, which he considered to be unsuccessful and out of scale for the neighborhood, and warned that this proposed project has the same potential. Joan Bedell, a resident of the block, asked that the Committee take into consideration longtime residents of the street. Delores Shellaby, a 45 year resident, commented that Judson Street is a beautiful little street that reminds people of France, and new construction should look like the rest of the houses on the street. Roberta Reiner, a resident of the block, commented that she is a 40-year resident and she loves Judson Street and her house on it. Justino Navarro, president of the Spring Garden Civic Association, commented that the Committee has the Association's letter of opposition to the proposal. He commented that the project is out of scale and massing for its context, and would permanently alter the landscape of this quaint historic street. He urged the Committee to adopt the recommendation of the staff and recommend denial of the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the height of the black aluminum railing and roof access. Mr. Ohler responded that the railing is a standard 42 inch high railing, and there is no roof access structure, but rather it is an open well that is not visible from the street. Ms. Gutterman asked for clarification regarding the location of the roof deck. Mr. Ohler responded that the roof deck spans both structures, but is set back from Brandywine Street and the addition on Judson Street to minimize visibility. Mr. Cluver asked for clarification on the red brick veneer. Mr. Ohler responded that it is a true depth brick veneer, at four inches, which is typical in new construction.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10. Ms. Pentz abstained, owing to her arrival after the start of the review.

ADDRESS: 2222 DELANCEY PL

Proposal: Construct roof decks with pilot house

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Alex Bastian & Marta Parentes Ribes

Applicant: Charles Capaldi, LCaVA Architects, llp

History: 1877

Individual Designation: 9/12/1974

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 construct roof decks and a pilot house on the main block and rear ell of this property. The pilot house would provide access to a front deck, set back 12 feet from Delancey Place, and a rear deck, set back nine feet from the rear wall. The pilot house would be partially visible from Fidler Square, as is the pilot house at the next door property at 2220 Delancey Place, which the Historical Commission approved in 2002 along with a deck on the rear ell.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided a mockup demonstrates that all rooftop construction is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guidelines.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 FEBRUARY 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Charles Capaldi represented the application.

Mr. Capaldi asked for clarification regarding the staff recommendation, noting that the pilot house will be visible from Fitler Square. Ms. Broadbent responded that he is correct, but that the Roofs Guidelines calls for rooftop construction to be “inconspicuous” from the public right-of-way, but not necessarily “invisible.” Ms. Gutterman asked if the pilot house will be as inconspicuous as the neighbor’s, and if that is the standard for inconspicuousness. Ms. Broadbent responded that the neighbor’s pilot house and rear deck was approved by the Commission in 2002, and the only visibility of it appears to be from Fitler Square. Ms. Gutterman asked if the railings would be invisible, or if they too only needed to be inconspicuous. Ms. Broadbent responded that the staff’s intent is for inconspicuous, not invisible, and that a mockup can be utilized to determine the threshold. Mr. Capaldi noted that there will be visibility from Fitler Square, but the intention is to make the railing as inconspicuous as possible. Ms. Broadbent directed the Committee to Photograph C in the application, which shows potential visibility from Fitler Square. Ms. Gutterman asked about the chimney. Mr. Capaldi responded that the chimney is on the party wall. Mr. D’Alessandro suggested that the pilot house roof be sloped to look less like an addition, with headroom at the landing. He opined that it will decrease the massing of the structure. Mr. Capaldi responded that the pilot house can be sloped if the Committee decides that it will look better. Ms. Stein suggested that the cantilevers on the pilot house be removed to make it more minimal in appearance. She suggested that the railing be changed to a black metal picket railing. She asked about mechanical units. Mr. Capaldi responded that three units will be placed on the rear deck, near the pilot house. Mr. Cluver commented that, in the past, the Committee has had discussions regarding locations of decks, with preference generally given to decks on the rear of buildings. He asked the logic behind permitting a deck on the front half of the building. Ms. Broadbent responded that the staff believes there will be no visibility of the front deck, although it would require a mockup to confirm, and the Roofs Guidelines calls for decks to be constructed so that they are “inconspicuous from the public right-of-way...and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.” She commented that the staff determined that, despite its location on the main block of the house, it does not violate the Roofs Guidelines. Ms. Gutterman questioned the continued invisibility once umbrellas and chairs are added. She suggested that the mockup should account for the height of an umbrella. Mr. Capaldi responded that the front deck is set back 15 feet from the front, on a 50-foot wide street with three-story houses. Ms. Gutterman countered that it could be visible from the corner of 23rd Street and Delancey Place. Mr. Capaldi responded that visibility is unlikely but that he would assess it. Ms. Gutterman reiterated that a seven-foot-tall umbrella may be visible. Ms. Stein commented that the rear elevation does not show the deck on the front of the building, and a front elevation should be included.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a mockup demonstrates that the rooftop construction is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, including to a potential height of seven feet to account for umbrellas; the railing is changed to a black metal picket; a front elevation is provided; and the pilot house roof and walls are minimized, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guidelines.

ADDRESS: 613 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct additions at front and rear

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Igor Frayman

Applicant: Paul Kreamer, Alfa Engineering Inc.

History: 1990; Stephen Varenhorst, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a second-story addition at the Pine Street façade and a third-story addition at the rear. The building is identified as Contributing in the Society Hill Historic District. However, the current building was constructed in 1990, replacing the c. 1980 structure, which was classified as Contributing in the inventory because of the involvement of the Redevelopment Authority in its construction. The addition at the front façade would mimic the elements of the building's original detailing, such as its precast stone trim, slate roofing, red brick veneer, metal railings, and window configurations. Similarly, the rear would incorporate slate roofing and precast stone trim at the cornice, and would duplicate the existing window configurations of the second story.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Olga Sorokova and owner Julia Frayman represented the application.

Ms. Frayman stated that she and her husband purchased the home for their family and commented that the building is not a historic structure but does replicate the character of the neighborhood. The proposed addition, she continued, respects the scope and space of the neighborhood. She asserted that no other building on the block consists of a single story and argued that the proposed second-story addition would not be incompatible. The existing rear third-story, she added, contains a solarium that she would like to convert to a room to resemble the rest of the building. She noted that she had reached out to Paul Boni and the Society Hill Civic Association, and he indicated no objection to the plans.

Ms. Sorokova commented that they will match the addition's materials to the existing brick walls as best as possible. The stone and other details, she added, will be matched as closely as possible to existing features.

Ms. Gutterman inquired whether the applicant would need to increase the height of the chimney currently adjacent to the one-story portion of the building. The applicants responded that they would not need to increase the height, as the chimney currently extends approximately two-and-a-half stories in height. Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether the chimney is functioning, and Ms. Frayman replied that she believed it is. Ms. Gutterman reiterated that there is a height requirement of the chimney relative to the roof and stated that the applicant would need to be certain of the code requirement.

Ms. Sorokova noted that the building is located midblock and the rear is not visible from either 6th or 7th Street. Ms. Gutterman commented that Ms. Sorokova indicated that she would attempt to match the brick and slate and asked how successful the applicants have been in identifying

samples. Ms. Frayman replied that they have not attempted to match the materials of the building yet, but stated that her family previously restored the Bouvier building and worked with Randal Baron of the Historical Commission's staff. She asserted that she successfully matched an extensive amount of brick required in the restoration of the 200 year-old building.

Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the applicant may need to use a custom brick to match the façade. Ms. Frayman said they would use custom brick if required, adding that it is the façade of the house, and she would not want a drastically different color brick. Ms. Stein also indicated that the façade contains a special brick pattern that should be replicated.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

ADDRESS: 15 BANK ST

Proposal: Install mural on side wall

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: ASI Management

Applicant: Ambrose Liu, Philadelphia Mural Arts Advocates

History: 1855

Individual Designation: 11/4/1976

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a mural on the north wall of 15 Bank Street. An application for the same mural was approved by the Commission at its 8 July 2016 meeting, but at that time the application proposed to install the mural on a similar wall located at 304 Arch Street. The wall at 15 Bank Street is a former party wall, is constructed of brick, and is currently stuccoed. The proposed project will be a collaboration between artist Marcus Balum, students at Mastery Charter School–Lenfest Campus, and the Mural Arts Program. The mural would incorporate a series of sixty-three brushed-aluminum composite panels of various sizes, printed with photographs taken by students. Each panel would be anchored to the wall by 12 four-inch masonry screws. The mural would be concentrated at the west end of the wall and would not obstruct any existing masonry openings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that stainless steel fasteners are used, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Ambrose Liu of the Mural Arts Program represented the application.

Mr. Liu stated that Mural Arts was forced to abandon the proposal the Historical Commission had previously approved at the 304 Arch Street wall, owing to a tightening budget and high costs. He explained that finding another wall took time but that he is working with the same property management company. The company, he continued, recommended the Strawberry Court property at 15 Bank Street, although the wall is slightly smaller. He noted that the wall measures 16-feet by 32-feet and that they intend to use sixteen 4-foot by 8-foot composite panels, as opposed to the Arch Street wall where the artist proposed many fragmented panels. Mr. Lui commented that the artist has been asked to redesign the original mural to fit within the

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 FEBRUARY 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

16-foot by 32-foot dimensions. The mural, he explained, will be fastened to the wall by channels and fasteners. He also noted that Mural Arts has been working with Roe Fabricators, who have provided technical information that Mr. Lui offered to share with the Committee members. He then clarified the attachment system, stating that he intends to use 3-inch by 1-inch aluminum C-channels for anchoring. The 16 panels, he continued, will then be fastened to the channels using ¼-inch Hilti self-tapping screws to fasten the panels and framing. Then the channels, he added, would be attached to the wall with 1 1/2-inch by 4-inch Hilti stainless steel sleeve anchors.

Mr. McCoubrey responded that an important consideration is to ensure the channels do not trap moisture against the wall and advocated for a drainage system. Ms. Gutterman asked if the panels would be mounted vertically or horizontally. Mr. Liu answered that they will be oriented in both directions. Ms. Gutterman opined that shims may be necessary to raise the panels from the wall to allow water to flow behind. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed, adding that a rain curtain would be necessary, since the wall behind the panels will get wet. He recommended that the system not obstruct water egress, so moisture would not be collected at any point on the wall and air could flow to allow for drying. Mr. Liu replied that the panels would be raised approximately 1-inch from the wall. Mr. D'Alessandro countered that there still would not be direct sunlight or air.

Ms. Gutterman inquired about the stucco joints and whether they were score marks. Mr. Cluver observed that the lines are not parallel with the wall. Ms. Gutterman asked if those lines currently contain mortar or sealant and asserted that they would need to be tight for maintenance purposes before the wall is covered. Mr. Liu agreed.

Ms. Stein asked if the entire stucco wall would be painted blue behind the raised panels. Mr. Liu replied that the mural would only be printed on the panels. On the Arch Street proposal, he elaborated, the proposal included painting the stucco wall and incorporating panels. He explained that the current proposal abandons the blue paint, and the mural would be printed on panels, with only the panels being installed on the wall. The wall itself will not be painted, he added. Ms. Gutterman asked if the wall will remain the current beige color. Mr. Liu affirmed, and stated that he gave the property management company a choice to install a tradition mural where a gel fabric is glued to the wall or to have panels fastened. The company, he continued, decided to have the mural fastened, since it is more easily removed and only simple patching of holes would be required.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether the rendering included in the application is representative of the actual installation. Mr. Liu answered that it would be a variation of the design scaled to fit the dimensions of the wall. Ms. Gutterman observed that the mural would be vertical and would not include a wider lower portion. Mr. Liu agreed.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided stainless steel fasteners are used and that the details include wall spacers and spacing to allow airflow behind the panels, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 1635 WAVERLY ST

Proposal: Construct four-story single family residence

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Robert Saltzman

Applicant: Logan Dry, KCA Design Associates

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct four-story, single-family residence with a front-loaded garage and a roof deck with pilot house. The house would be clad in brick for the first three stories with limestone details and aluminum-clad casement and fixed windows. The fourth floor would feature a shallow, standing seam mansard roof with a large dormer window. A roof deck would be accessed by a sloped pilot house, and enclosed by a parapet wall on the sides, but a metal railing at the front and rear.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff comments that the proposed construction is generally compatible with the Rittenhouse Fidler historic district in materials, but the very tall building is incompatible in massing and height when judged against the block of three-story buildings.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Project Coordinator Logan Dry represented the application.

Mr. Dry began to introduce the project. Ms. Gutterman interjected, stating that Mr. Dry had five minutes because the Committee was running behind schedule.

Mr. Dry explained that the owner of this property also owns the adjoining 1632 Pine Street, and is seeking to construct a house for himself and his two daughters. Given the small lot size, Mr. Dry explained, this design will require a zoning variance for lot coverage. He noted that the height is permitted by zoning because the property is located in a commercial district. He noted that he attempted to design a building that kept the general massing of the neighboring three-story buildings through the use of three floors of red brick, and then the fourth story as a mansard roof to break down that massing. He explained that drawings SK-2 and SK-4 show how the pilot house was determined, which is by the minimum clearance height necessary. He noted that the pilot house is located in the middle of the building, away from the street edges, to break down the massing.

Mr. McCoubrey questioned the notch out of the first floor, asking if there is an alleyway easement. Mr. Dry responded affirmatively, noting that the garage on the adjacent property is set in from the property line, so the full archway will not be visible at this time. He noted that the purpose of the recessed garage door is to allow for a proper turning radius without the use of bollards. He commented that the notch also would also them to conceal any utility meters.

Ms. Stein noted that she recognizes that the Committee only has review and comment jurisdiction, but that she is surprised this will be an owner-occupied unit because the volume of this development does not fit with this neighborhood owing to its fourth floor, and she cannot imagine that it will be popular in the neighborhood. She stated that everything else on the block is one to three stories, and this building will stick out like a sore thumb. She opined that the openings, the materiality, and the limestone trim do not have any response to the immediate context.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 FEBRUARY 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the street is commercial. Mr. Dry responded that, although it is zoned CMX2.5, all of the uses on the block are residential. He noted that there used to be some shops along Pine Street which made that zoning make sense, but the zoning there has not been redone. He reiterated that zoning allows for a height of 55 feet, and that the property owner feels the height is necessary in order to create a living space for himself and his daughters. Mr. Dry conceded that it is a tall building for the block. Ms. Stein argued that the roof deck on top of the fourth floor with the parapet wall and pilot house makes the four-story building even taller and significantly out of scale with the block.

Mr. Cluver asked for clarification as to the location of the roof deck railings versus parapet. Mr. Dry responded that the metal railing is set back five feet from the front façade, and there is a metal railing at the rear edge of the roof. Mr. Dry noted that the only reason the sides are parapet walls as opposed to open railings is because they are on the property line, so the fire rating has to continue up. Mr. Cluver responded that he is surprised by that because he has seen numerous roof decks with open railings on the side as well. Mr. Dry replied that his understanding of the building code is that the party walls have to have the rating carried up. Mr. Cluver asked Ms. DiPasquale if that is something she has seen before. She responded that she has not. Mr. Dry replied that he would be willing to do an open railing, but believes the plans examiner would reject it and require a parapet.

Mr. Cluver noted that the design shows a cornice line around the third floor, and asked if that is intended to align with the adjacent properties. Mr. Dry confirmed this, noting that it may be a foot or so higher or lower. He explained that they were able to match the height of the neighboring properties by not installing steps that protrude out and by using higher ceilings on the lower floors.

Mr. Cluver expressed confusion over the partial side elevation. Mr. Dry responded that the parapet is set back five feet from the extreme-most front plane of the front façade, not the top of the mansard. Mr. Cluver noted that the side facades will be very visible and opined that the design feels like it is waiting for something to be built up against it.

Ms. Gutterman asked where the mechanical equipment will be located. Mr. Dry responded that the condensing units will be located in the rear yard.

Ms. Gutterman opined that the pilot house is worse for the neighbors because it adds an addition seven feet in height on top of the fourth-floor roof. Mr. McCoubrey agreed that it is highly visible.

Ms. Stein asked Ms. DiPasquale about the history of the lot. Ms. DiPasquale responded that, historically, there was a three-story building on the parcel; it was not the rear of 1632 Pine Street. Ms. Stein asked if it was ever consolidated. Ms. DiPasquale responded that she did not believe so, despite being identified in the district inventory as "See 1632 Pine Street." She noted that she looked at maps and deeds for the property, and it appears that the lot was vacant at the time of designation.

Mr. Cluver addressed the detailing of the front façade, opining that the cast stone end keys are too fussy, and that masonry arches usually extend for the width of the arch before terminating in end keys. He suggested eliminating that detail and using all brick lintels. He also opined that the large, unadorned windows seem out of place with the block. He noted that, while the building is brick and has a cornice line above the third story, so much else feels out of character, including the height, fenestration, arched door and garage door, and pilot house.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 FEBRUARY 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the size of the windows. Mr. Dry responded that the owner wished to set the windows even with the ceiling. Mr. Dry noted that the windows would be tempered glass. He wanted to keep the massing down, so he opted for eight-foot ceilings, but selected larger windows to make the rooms feel larger.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that the large, wide dormer also makes the building seem out of scale. He also noted that the cornice between the first and second floor is not typical of the street.

Ms. Stein noted that the whole fourth floor is only necessary to create a parking space, and that is counterintuitive to urban life. She argued that the whole building could drop down to three stories and be in keeping with the block if the parking space was removed. Mr. Dry responded that, while that is true, there are quite a few garages on this block. Ms. Gutterman responded that the buildings on the block are either one-story garages or three-story buildings; it is an either-or rather than both. She opined that, while it may be permitted by zoning, it is highly inappropriate. She reiterated her opinion that the building is too large for the block.

Ms. Pentz opined that the cantilevered three stories is somewhat alien, and does not fit into the context of the neighborhood. Mr. Dry responded that there are other buildings on the block that have that cantilever, but conceded that they are only three stories tall rather than four. Ms. Pentz replied that the three stories of cantilever make the building seem heavy.

Mr. McCoubrey encouraged the applicant to think about these elements relative to the neighboring buildings. He thanked Mr. Dry for including the massing of the neighboring buildings in his drawings. Mr. Dry asked if the reconfiguration of the windows would be helpful, and whether they should consider double-hung windows. Ms. Gutterman responded that she does not know if they need to be double-hung so much as a punched opening with less glass. She reiterated her opposition to the entire massing.

Mr. Cluver recommended getting rid of the garage and dropping the whole building by a floor, but if not, then he would recommend eliminating the arches at the first floor creating a lintel over the garage, using three punched openings at the second and third floors, and using a double-dormer with single windows in each in the mansard.

Mr. D'Alessandro noted that SK-4 shows that the head room for the opening onto the deck actually appears to be 10 feet. Mr. Dry responded that that is the height permitted by zoning, with the sloped roof portion being dictated by the slope of the stairs. He noted that they could probably reduce the height by one foot. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the lower height would actually make it easier to maintain.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee offered no formal comment, but commented that the applicant take into consideration all of the suggestions offered during the discussion.

ADDRESS: 2500 SPRING GARDEN ST (15 BOATHOUSE ROW)

Proposal: Replace siding and trim; restore windows; insulate walls

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Sedgeley Club

Applicant: Karen Earley, Sedgeley Club

History: 1902; Sedgeley Club, 15 Boathouse Row

Individual Designation: 1/5/1984

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes, in-concept, to replace the existing cedar shingle siding with CertainTeed Sawmill Shingles and the existing wood trim with Cellular PVC trim with profiles and dimensions to resemble the existing historic materials. The application also proposes to restore or replace seven original windows and to insulate the walls, items which can be reviewed for approval at the staff level.

Standard 6 suggests that "Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence." Standard 6 allows for the use of substitute materials when it is not "possible" to use the original materials. The applicant contends that it is not possible to use the original materials for financial and maintenance reasons. The club has limited resources and maintenance problems are exacerbated by the adjacency to the river and busy roadway.

The staff notes that the CertainTeed Sawmill Shingles are a very good match for cedar shakes. The staff questions whether all of the profiles of the trim can be replicated precisely with PVC trim.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided all trim is matched precisely in size, shape, profile, color, and texture.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. President and board members of Friends of Historic Sedgeley Club Lois Krumholtz, Karen Earley, and Kiki Bolender represented the application.

Ms. Earley distributed additional information to the Committee members.

Ms. Stein questioned the board's process, asking whether they have hired a contractor or architect to help complete the work. Ms. Earley responded that, so far, she has done the majority of the planning and design work. She noted that they have a contractor who replaced the roof last year, and he also does siding and is hoping to complete the project moving forward. Ms. Earley noted that Ms. Bolender is also on the board, and has reviewed some of Ms. Earley's work.

Mr. D'Alessandro questioned the documentation in the addendum, asking whether it was intended to supplement or replace the original submission. Ms. Earley responded that it is intended to supplement the application by showing photographs and profiles of some of the existing pieces of trim.

Mr. McCoubrey questioned the extent of the scope of work. He asked how much of the trim, railing, balusters, etc. are in need of replacement. Ms. Earley responded that the Club does not have much money, so the primary focus has been to shore up and seal the house, which is exposed to significant wear and tear on the river. She explained that they plan to scrape and paint from the curb of the lighthouse towards the street, which is where people see it up close, until it is necessary to replace something. When they encounter an element that needs to be replaced, she noted, they would like permission to replace it with an Azek-type material. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if anyone has discussed an epoxy wood consolidation process with them. Ms. Earley responded affirmatively, noting that they plan to use epoxy to repair the existing windows on the street-facing elevation. She noted that they would like to keep the window casing in place, but if it is necessary to replace it, would like to use a maintenance-free material. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the contractor understands the process of using a dutchman system to replace rotted portions of wood trim. Ms. Earley was not familiar with that process. Mr. D'Alessandro explained that there are many types of tools that allow a contractor or carpenter to remove and replace sections of wood and then plane the new material to match the surrounding profiles without necessitating full replacement.

Ms. Gutterman noted that, if the applicant is not proposing wholesale replacement of an element, the PVC elements do not exactly match the profiles of the existing trim, so they will end up with unusual jointing. Ms. Bolender responded that that is a good point, and that perhaps the response would be that when elements are identified that are so damaged that they need replacement, the Club will replace the whole piece, and if that is right next to another similar element, it will replace that piece as well. Ms. Gutterman noted that if she understands correctly, the contractor will start at one point, and may encounter, say, a two-foot section that needs to be replaced, but then would face an issue where the two-foot section is not going to match. Ms. Gutterman stated that she does not understand how the applicant proposes to incorporate the PVC elements. Ms. Earley responded that they would do a whole section of trim, not patches. Ms. Gutterman responded that the building has a curve that may be about 30 feet, and by that estimation, would have to replace the entire length, even if only a small portion needs to be replaced. Ms. Earley responded that they would keep it consistent until there was a break point in the material.

Ms. Gutterman noted that she is troubled by the replacement of these 100+ year old materials. She understood the Club's issues with financing and that they are not able to restore the whole building at once, but questioned why the applicant does not want to restore the building in smaller sections, and do it so that it maintains the wood fabric as opposed to putting in an Azek material that is not a forever material and which still needs to be maintained. Mr. McCoubrey and Mr. D'Alessandro noted that Azek also behaves differently than wood in terms of expansion and contraction.

Ms. Bolender suggested discussing the issues of siding and trim separately. She noted that if there are some trim pieces that are at accessible locations and thus easier to paint, the Club could consider wood replacements for those. For areas that it is hazardous to paint, she noted, she would like to see the use of Azek, which will hold the paint better than the wood. Ms. Gutterman responded that she does not know that Azek will be better than wood in 20 years, longevity-wise. Ms. Bolender asked if the Commission has not been approving Azek. Ms. Gutterman responded that it is not that the Commission does not approve Azek, but that in this situation, the applicant is asking to remove pieces of 100+ year old wood and put in Azek, which she does not know will last as long. Ms. Earley responded that she does not think they are saying that it will.

Ms. Earley directed the Committee members to pages 4 and 5 of the submission, opining that the wood is not worth scraping and painting. She noted that she is hoping to get something that is not lumpy and alligatoring. She noted that the contractor had suggested that if they could replace it with a different material, the lead paint issues would go away. Mr. McCoubrey responded that what gives him pause is that it is not clear where the Club would decide to use the Azek trim or not. He opined that wood trim like this will probably last another 50 years if painted correctly, and to be removing trim just because it is lumpy and the owner does not want to scrape it is concerning. He opined that Azek should be used in a very judicious way, if at all. Ms. Earley asked whether the issue is with using the Azek or with removing the wood. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the photographs of the wood make it look like the wood is perfectly intact and that it just needs to be painted. He noted that he does not see any rot, just wood that needs maintenance. Mr. D'Alessandro explained that that is why he recommended Dutchmen. If the contractor hits a section that is beyond repair, that portion could be replaced as needed rather than wholesale. Ms. Bolender asked what kind of removal the Committee would look for in this kind of situation. Mr. McCoubrey responded that he does not see any wood in the photographs that he would remove. Ms. Bolender clarified that she meant what kind of paint removal would the Committee recommend.

Ms. Gutterman noted that a contractor needs to also indicate how much of the trim needs to be removed to replace the cedar siding, which is somewhat different. She questioned whether the wood trim that would need to be removed to install the siding is in good enough condition that it can be reinstalled, or whether it will become wood that gets replaced with new painted wood or Azek. She noted that part of the question is having someone determine what needs to be removed. Ms. Earley responded that the apron under the sills has to be removed for the siding to be installed underneath it, but she does not know about any other pieces.

Ms. Bolender commented that the goals of the Committee and the Club are the same, but that she is not sure how that works in terms of the approval process for the trim. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that part of the issue is that there is so much paint on the existing trim that it is nearly impossible to get an accurate trim profile. He suggested stripping some sample areas to get a better understanding of the profiles. Ms. Earley stated that they do not have the money to hire a fancy architect. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that a contractor could strip a section of trim. Ms. Bolender suggested that if the Club could get staff approval for replacement versus rehabilitation of materials, then the other issue is the siding itself. She asked if there is a way to settle the trim issue.

Mr. Baron thanked Ms. Earley for the set of photographs. He noted that the staff would be amenable to replacement if the pieces matched precisely, but that the piece in the proposal that shows the profile of the existing trim and provides a sample of the proposed replacement clearly does not match the photograph of the existing piece. He explained that the question is not simply a matter of material, but also design. He noted that, conceivably, one could take Azek and mill it to match the existing profiles, but of course there would be a cost difference between stock profiles and milled profiles. Ms. Bolender noted that each piece would need a sample and research.

Mr. Cluver commented that the issue at hand is an old house problem, which is that at a certain point, materials reach the end of their useful lives. He noted that there seem to be differing opinions as to whether this wood has reached that point, but that once it has reached the end of its useful life, the question is what is the appropriate replacement, in-kind or with an alternative material. He questioned whether Azek or a substitute product is the best material for the long-term viability of the building. He noted that it is known how wood behaves and how cedar

behaves. He conceded that the cedar available today is not the same quality that was available 100 years ago, but there is still a body of understanding of how wood works, and that while it requires maintenance, that also means that it is maintainable. He noted that some of these newer products do not require maintenance, but that also means that when they fail, they have to be removed wholesale and there is a more robust replacement cycle. He opined that it is not an easy discussion and not one that can necessarily be determined at this meeting. Ms. Bolender responded that that is a good point, especially when it comes to the curve of the building, and expansion and contraction. She suggested that the wood on the curve should be restored or replaced in-kind. Ms. Bolender asked if the window casing and sills could be replaced with Azek since the windows will be restored, and the existing paint would look bad in comparison to the restored windows. Mr. Cluver suggested that the owners should keep in mind how these products age over time, noting that products like Azek start to cup and sag with age.

Ms. Bolender conceded that the proposed siding is a new product, and that is the problem with new products. Mr. Cluver noted that he would be concerned with the proposed siding because it gets its thickness from a ribbing, which may over time get little cups between the ribs. Ms. Bolender explained that CertainTeed is rolling out this product in Nantucket, and they have offered to donate the siding to the Sedgeley Club, which is a hard offer to resist. In terms of color, she explained that the Club would like to use the option that looks the most like a painted surface rather than new cedar, which will forever look like new cedar. Mr. Cluver asked whether CertainTeed has completed any aging studies on the product. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the proposed material may be more compatible to the area than a comparable fiber-cement product. Ms. Earley responded that the fiber-cement material is not possible for the radius. Ms. Bolender noted that the CertainTeed product cannot do the woven corner detail, and that the Club would need to replace the woven corner with a flat corner piece. Ms. Bolender presented a photograph of a possible corner detail. She noted that if it is not possible to do a woven corner in Azek, they could use wood. Ms. Earley explained that the siding colors are mixed on site, and that they would like to use the darkest of the grey shades, and could paint any wood replacement pieces the same shade to blend in. Ms. Earley noted that it is possible to use the CertainTeed product around the lighthouse radius. Mr. McCoubrey asked how spacing would be addressed. Ms. Earley responded that the installer looked at that issue, and the product comes in smaller pieces down to three inches in width.

Ms. Gutterman asked how the product compares in terms of thickness and exposure to real cedar shakes. Ms. Bolender responded that she believes they are comparable. Ms. Earley noted that they would need to compare to be certain, but that the widths vary.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the applicants know when the siding was first painted. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that it may have originally been a stain rather than actual paint. Ms. Earley responded that the material is currently coated with a heavy stain rather than a paint. She noted that there is a photograph of the building from 1912 that shows the siding as brown with creamy trim. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that the siding needs to breathe, so painting it is inappropriate.

Mr. D'Alessandro addressed the question of insulation, noting that one of the primary reasons for exterior paint failure or termite damage is the use of blown-in cellulosic fiberglass insulation. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that another detailing issue with insulation is what is known as "pillowing," where the fiberglass and loose insulation does not stay where it is put, settles, and adds pressure from the inside. Mr. Cluver agreed, noting that the idea of insulation is one where the applicant needs to be careful of unintended consequences. A wall section that has insulation in it also relies on the vapor retarder doing its job, and typically, walls like this do not have that retarder. This creates the potential for dew point occurring within the wall. He explained that one

of the beautiful things about these old wood shingled buildings is that they are so leaky that they stay dry. He noted that the reason cedar shingles fail today is because the buildings are designed so tightly that they cannot breathe. Ms. Bolender suggested withdrawing the insulation component of the application.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment, of which there was none.

Mr. Cluver opined that the concept of needing to do selective replacement has some appropriateness to it. He noted that 100-year-old wood can only be painted so many times. He opined that the question is how and what it is replaced with, and suggested that the owners need to look long-term. He suggested that the first step is doing a serious mock-up using the alternative materials in one section that shows all of the proposed replacement elements and how they fit in. Ms. Gutterman agreed, suggesting that the applicants use the worst window as a trial and work with the staff to determine whether the PVC pieces will match the profiles of the existing trim. Ms. Bolender asked how the Club should coordinate the trim replacement with the siding installation. Mr. Cluver suggested that the Club take off some of the siding in an area with a corner, and do a mock up. He noted that one of the bigger issues is the joints, and how they meet up with other materials and turn corners. Ms. Bolender responded that there does not seem to be a good place to do that, as the building is highly visible.

Ms. Earley asked whether it would be appropriate if the Club withdrew consideration of the Azek-type trim and replaced any trim necessary in wood to match the existing trim. Mr. McCoubrey responded affirmatively, noting that that would meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Mr. Cluver reiterated his concerns over the issue of longevity and maintenance cycles. Mr. McCoubrey noted that another potential issue is multiple replacement cycles if different materials are being used, and opined that it might be easier to just scrape and paint everything at once. Ms. Earley explained that the Club has to look good, as it is a high profile place, and the appearance is necessary for membership. She stated that she does not want the painter to just do a quick sand and paint and end up with alligatoring again. She also stated that she does not want to sand it and get lead paint dust and ruin trim profiles. Ms. Gutterman responded that chemical strippers are usually used to remove lead paint and to preserve trim profiles. Mr. D'Alessandro noted that that is expensive. Ms. Gutterman noted that a stripper would bring the material down to bare wood and then the Club could see what they need to patch. Mr. Cluver noted that arguments can be made that there are points at which materials need to be replaced, and that he does not want the applicants to think they cannot replace anything. However, he continued, if they are able to properly restore historic material, it often can drastically increase the material's longevity.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that much of what the applicants are suggesting can be reviewed by the staff, and asked if the staff has any concerns. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the Committee seems to be going down a path of not approving Azek replacement if an area needs to be replaced. Ms. Gutterman responded that her preference would be to use wood, and suggested a full scale mock-up on the worst window to determine how the paint can be removed, which pieces may need dutchmen, which can be epoxied, etc. She noted that this would allow the Club to budget. Ms. Gutterman noted that the mock-up should include the frame, trim, skirt, etc. to see how the Azek and wood work together. Mr. D'Alessandro commented that flat pieces may be able to be replaced with Azek.

Mr. Cluver opined that his biggest concern with the siding is how the corners get treated, and noted that he does not understand entirely why there cannot be a woven corner. Ms. Earley responded that it may be possible but the company will not warranty it at this point. Mr. Cluver

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 FEBRUARY 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

wondered why they would not warranty it. Ms. Bolender suggested that she speak with CertainTeed to determine whether they would eliminate the entire warranty or just the corner.

Mr. Cluver suggested that the Committee recommend denial as presented, with additional research to be done to look at it holistically. Ms. Bolender replied that that leaves the Club nowhere, and asked for conditional approval for the siding if a woven corner can be achieved. Mr. Cluver asked whether the Club would wait to do the siding until they know what they are doing with the trim. Ms. Earley agreed to replace all trim pieces with wood to match the existing profiles.

Ms. Stein stated that she is highly uncomfortable with the proposed siding, arguing that it is such a significant property, that it is individually designated, and that she cannot imagine approving the proposed siding. Ms. Earley responded that the reason for the siding is that the building looks horrible, with the existing siding cracking and peeling. She noted that from a maintenance perspective, it is like having a beach house. Ms. Bolender asked what would be an acceptable siding material. Ms. Gutterman responded that she has just completed a project with cedar shakes and they came out fine.

Ms. Gutterman reiterated her suggestion of a full sized mock-up of a window sash and with the trim to determine which components get repaired and which gets replaced, working with staff. Ms. Bolender stated that the applicants said they will use do wood, and asked why they should do a mock-up.

Ms. Stein commented that applicants typically come to the Committee with an assessment of the building already done, noting that it is impossible to know what the scope is for this project. She suggested that the applicants return to the Committee after they have assessed the building and can define which areas they want to replace with Azek. She noted that the applicants are currently asking the Committee to have trust in a situation where the contractor is basically on site pulling pieces off the building and making determinations about what should be Azek or wood on the fly, and that the Committee does not have the whole picture. Ms. Bolender asked what the Club should be presenting in terms of a report. Ms. Stein responded that the Committee does not have information about how much trim is proposed for replacement and where they would like to use the Azek. Ms. Bolender asked how they are supposed to know that before they get in the field. Ms. Gutterman responded that that is why they should do a mock-up, or hire a contractor to go to every window and assess its condition and note that on an elevation.

Ms. DiPasquale clarified that, if the Club proposed a true restoration and replacement of pieces of wood trim in-kind, the staff would approve the application at the staff level. The question before the Committee, she stated, is the concept of whether it is appropriate for the Club to move forward, working with the staff, on replacement with Azek. Ms. Earley stated that the Club would withdraw the Azek trim from consideration. Ms. Bolender clarified that the Club could move forward with wood trim replacement with a staff approval without a mock-up.

Mr. Cluver encouraged the applicants to speak with CertainTeed about the siding material to make sure they are comfortable with the longevity of the material. Ms. Bolender responded that, although she too is wary about new materials, it is difficult for the Club to pass up the opportunity for free siding.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial of the use of PVC/Azek trim, and were split evenly with
ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 FEBRUARY 2017
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

regard to the replacement siding, provided the corners are able to be woven as per the original design, with the staff to review details.

ADDRESS: 125 CHRISTIAN ST

Proposal: Rebuild third-floor gable wall; construct roof deck at rear

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Alex Aberle

Applicant: Alex Aberle

History: 1820

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck on the pitched roof of the rear ell of this corner property. The deck would be accessed via an existing dormer window, which would be cut down to create a door. The wood deck structure would be supported on approximately four, five-foot tall painted posts and enclosed by an open, wood balustrade on the street side, with a five-foot high privacy fence at the party wall.

The proposed construction would be highly conspicuous from both Christian Street and S. Hancock Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline, which stipulates that decks should be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jason Birl and owners Violet Levy and Alex Aberle represented the application.

Mr. Baron said that the application also includes the rebuilding of the gable wall. He said that it will no longer include cutting windows in that wall and the staff looks forward to working with the mason on the design to salvage and reuse the bricks for the rebuild of portions of the wall. He noted that the architect did not meet with the staff as recommended by the Committee during the earlier review. He understands, however, that the storefront restoration part of the project is not included in this application. He said that the Historical Commission has in the past approved some visible decks on rear ells; however, this one is quite visible. He suggested it could be made less conspicuous by shortening the deck and removing the privacy fence.

Mr. Birl said that he has a structural report recommending that portions of the wall need to be rebuilt, but that the salvaged bricks can be reset. He said that in terms of zoning they can have a deck as of right. They first proposed a deck with a more solid skirt to hide the bottom of the deck, but removed the skirt at the suggestion of the staff. He said that the extensive size of the deck is caused by the need to have a bridge to get from the dormer to the main deck floor. He said the size of the deck is approximately 19 by 24 feet. Mr. Baron asked if they could pull the deck back to the east. Mr. Birl said that he could, but thought that this looked better. Mr. McCoubrey asked if they are proposing a cantilevered platform that would hang off the building in front of the dormer. Mr. Birl confirmed that this was the case. The dormer would be cut down creating a well in the roof in front of the dormer leading to this platform. Mr. Birl said that their previous proposal would have avoided this situation, but involved cutting away the roof and building a stairhouse.

The Committee members asked if the stairhouse could be built on the roof of the rear ell. Mr. Birl thought that that was not feasible. Mr. Birl said that, in response to the Secretary of the Interior Standards, they have now proposed this design to avoid removal of the roof. The Committee members suggested a stairhouse on the rear ell. Mr. Birl said that the Committee had rejected a similar design in the past. He said that he had proposed removing the entire roof to make the stairhouse lower. The Committee members said that they objected to removal of the entire roof. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested a small spiral stair to get up to the roof deck from the rear ell. Mr. Birl rejected that idea. Ms. Stein opined that perhaps this may be a building that cannot accept a roof deck. She suggested looking at developing the yard. The owners said that the yard is only about 5 feet wide.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment. There was none.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the masonry work, with the staff to review details, but denial of the deck, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline, which stipulates that decks should be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

ADDRESS: 2322 PINE ST

Proposal: Construct addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Kyle Wharton

Applicant: Scott Woodruff

History: 1960

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an addition at the rear and on top of a two-story building that is classified as Contributing to the Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District. The addition would be set back approximately 26 feet from the front façade with a roof terrace at the front. The Committee reviewed a similar application at its January 2017 meeting. In that application, the addition was set back 17 feet from the front façade; the Committee recommended denial and encouraged the applicant to revise the application to set the addition back to a location where it would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, or to limit the addition to two stories, instead of three. The current application sets the addition back, but it remains conspicuous, overwhelming the two-story building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Scott Woodruff represented the application.

Mr. Woodruff stated that he set the addition back farther than he had in the previous application, making it now invisible from Pine Street. He also set the roof deck back to the furthest point from the street. He explained that the addition was simplified to a brick wall to avoid drawing attention. Mr. Cluver stated that, although the Committee previously recommended removing the pent roof from the front wall of the addition, it is now too stark. He opined that the addition should have simple windows and a cornice. Ms. Gutterman commented that the building is almost like four floors with the deck and pilot house. Mr. Baron suggested that, if the Committee

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 FEBRUARY 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

was going to recommend in favor of a third floor, that the deck is likely to be less visible on the roof of the two-story building with access via a door in the addition. Mr. Woodruff stated that, if he moves the deck to the roof of the existing building, he can set back the railing of the deck 15 feet from the front wall. Mr. McCoubrey recommended lowering the addition by removing the parapet.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment. There was none.

Ms. Gutterman recommended denial of the application as proposed, but with suggestions of a modified proposal that would add a window and door to the south façade of the addition, remove the deck from the addition and relocate it to the roof of the two story house with a setback of approximately 15 feet from Pine Street, remove the parapet, and place mechanical equipment in a hidden location that is not on the roof.

Mr. Cluver asked if the Committee is in agreement with decks on this row in similar locations as proposed. Ms. Gutterman responded affirmatively, if they are not visible from Pine Street. Mr. Cluver suggested a condition that the staff reviews a mockup to determine that such a deck would not be visible from Pine Street.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application as proposed, but approval, with the staff to ensure no visibility of the additions from Pine Street, provided the following:

- the inclusion of a window and door the south façade of the addition,
- the relocation of the deck from the addition to the roof of the existing house with a 15-foot setback,
- the removal of the parapet, and
- the relocation of the mechanical equipment to a hidden location not on the roof.

ADDRESS: 1710 PINE ST

Proposal: Replace window sash

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Sophia Rosenfeld & Matthew Affron

Applicant: Keith Yaller, Architectural Window Corp.

History: 1845

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove the existing one-over-one double-hung sash at the front façade windows and to replace them with either two-over-two or one-over-one double-hung sash. The existing frames and brick mold would remain. Based on the building's date of construction and the existing clamshell brick mold at windows along this block of Pine Street, the original window sash would likely have been six-over-six double-hung sash. However, the application argues that changes to the entry door and transom, as well as extensive renovations at the interior, reflect characteristics of a later period that warrant a later window style.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

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

Mr. Baron said that the main evidence for a six-over-six muntin configuration was the fact that the row was built as a development row with a uniform design. Original six-over-six windows survive on several houses on the block. There are some one-over-one windows. Mr. Baron said that the staff did not find the change to the front door substantial enough to warrant a change of design for the whole building. Ms. Stein asked if there were early photographs. Mr. Baron displayed a photograph from the early 1960s showing a preponderance of six-over-six windows. Mr. Cluver asked whether the windows in this house were one-over-one at the time of designation. Mr. Baron said he thought that was the case. Mr. Cluver thought that one-over-one was acceptable because it existed at the time of designation. He thought two-over-two was completely inappropriate and agreed that that six-over-six was the most appropriate. Ms. Gutterman asked about the recent application in the row where the Commission had asked for six-over-six. She asked if that building had six-over-six at the time of the application. Mr. Baron said that that building also had one-over-one. The applicant had proposed one-over-one but did not object to the change to six-over-six. Ms. Gutterman asked if this applicant's objection to six-over-six windows was based on cost. Mr. Baron said that the applicant expressed his preference based on stylistic compatibility with other elements of the house. Ms. Gutterman said that the interior of the house is not determinate for the exterior of the house. Mr. Cluver asked if the installation details as shown looked compatible. Mr. Baron said that jamb liner installation was compatible as shown. Mr. Baron suggested that, when owners replace worn out windows or other pieces, they should restore to the original design. In this way, the historic district is gradually restored to its period of significance.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment, of which there was none.

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

ADDRESS: 1918-20 SANSOM ST

Proposal: Completely demolish building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 1911 Walnut Street LLC

Applicant: Neil Sklaroff, Ballard Spahr LLP

History: 1910; Dolan Garage

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the complete demolition of the building at 1918-20 Sansom Street. The property is not individually designated, but is classified as Contributing in the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District. The building was constructed as a garage in 1910 and subsequently housed offices for a construction company, marketing firm, and other businesses before being converted for use as a funeral home. The building has been vacant since 1997.

Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the preservation ordinance limits the Historical Commission to approving demolitions in two instances only, when the demolition is necessary in the public interest, and when the building cannot be reasonably adapted for any purpose. The application

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 FEBRUARY 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

contends that the building is in very poor condition and therefore cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. The case that the building cannot be reused is made in an affidavit with supporting exhibits. The affidavit recounts the recent history of the property and attempts to redevelop it. The exhibits include a series of reports by consultants regarding the existing conditions at the property as well as schematic architectural designs, construction cost estimates, and financial analyses for three proposed reuses, restaurant/retail, single-family residential, and office. The application concludes that none of the likely reuses is financially feasible.

The Historical Commission retained a consultant, RES, with expertise analyzing the feasibility of the adaptive reuses of historic buildings to assess the application and make a recommendation to the Historical Commission regarding the validity of its claims. The consultant inspected the building inside and out, evaluated the real estate market in the area, retained an independent construction cost estimator to evaluate the cost estimates, interviewed numerous persons with knowledge of the site, real estate market, business climate, property history, and other aspects of the application, verified the financial models and their results, and has prepared a report on the application. The report concurs with the applicant's claim that the building cannot be reasonably adapted for any purpose.

The application is being reviewed by the Committee on Financial Hardship and Architectural Committee before being presented to the Historical Commission. The Committee on Financial Hardship has the primary role in the review, evaluating the claim that the building cannot be reasonably adapted for any purpose and offering a recommendation to the Commission. The Architectural Committee will play a secondary role, potentially advising the Commission on the architectural aspects of the application including conditions assessments, schematic architectural designs, and construction costs. The Historical Commission will consider the recommendations from both committees and make a final decision.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Southern Land Company Senior Vice President Dustin Downey, architect Clara Wineberg, and attorney Neil Sklaroff represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked why this is not considered to be a case of demolition by neglect. He questioned how much of the cost is simply to bring the building back to a safe and workable condition, compared to how much of the cost is related to the fit-out and restoration work. Mr. Sklaroff responded that the question as to whether it is financially feasible must work within the existing circumstances. Southern Land Company acquired a number of parcels in February of 2015, and had no control over the property prior to that time. The Philadelphia Parking Authority had acquired the property in the 1990s. He stated that some remediation work was done at that time, but they do not have the records of it. The reports from Keast & Hood and Pennoni document the hurdles that would have to be overcome. He explained that three scenarios are identified as to what would be viable in the marketplace. Those scenarios are based on bringing the building into a condition that will support those uses, consistent with the requirements of the historic preservation ordinance. He stated that there is a tremendous amount of remediation work that is needed, and, while Mr. Cluver's point is understood, the current owners are not responsible for the current conditions. Mr. Cluver disagreed with that opinion, stating that it would allow every property owner to let a building deteriorate, then sell it, and the new buyer could say that he or she is not responsible. He asked about the purchase price used in the application. Mr. Sklaroff responded that the less it costs, the more difficult it is to reach the burden. The cost is in the report, but there was also an appraisal done, which appraised the land constrained by the limitations of the existing buildings. It did not factor in the ordinance or

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 FEBRUARY 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

the amount of work needed to remediate the environmental conditions. The value was listed at \$480,000. The Econsult report used that figure, but also used a zero cost, and by using a zero cost, it made the burden more difficult to prove, but in spite of it, the result still came to a substantially negative value.

Ms. Pentz asked if a contractor that specializes in drying was consulted. Mr. Downey responded that a general contractor that is very familiar with the drying process was used, because any cost for mechanically drying would be significantly higher than naturally drying. If a price for mechanically drying was used, it would put the project even further from financial viability.

Mr. D'Alessandro commented that the Architectural Committee should not be reviewing the financial aspects of the application, but rather should be looking at the architectural impact and the historic value of what may be lost. Mr. Cluver asked if the Committee should also consider other opportunities that were not reviewed, or any failures of assumptions. Mr. Sklaroff responded that three scenarios were focused on, but there were many more considered that were dismissed as being impractical. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the different reuses were not that much different in cost, which shows how much of the cost is associated with cleanup and remediation.

Ms. Pentz asked about the testing result of the bricks which were removed. Mr. Downey responded that the testing result was to show the moisture content of the bricks, and it was concluded that the bricks were thoroughly saturated. He explained that, a long time ago, the building was repointed with a very hard mortar, which has placed extra stress on the bricks and has caused some to pop out, and others to disintegrate.

Mr. Cluver asked if the building were in a good exterior envelope condition, would the cost of these scenarios still be reuse-prohibitive, or if the condition of the building is tipping the balance. Mr. Downey responded that this deep, two-story building is of a unique shape, with no windows on the sides or back, and as such it does not lend itself to any modern reuse very well. He explained that they have worked with community groups and the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia in the most honest way possible to show that this building would be very difficult to adaptively reuse.

Mr. Farnham explained that Real Estate Strategies, the City's independent consultant who evaluated the application, employed a separate construction cost estimator for this application. That estimator went through all of the numbers, toured the building, met with Intech, and negotiated numbers where he determined they were too high or too low. In the end, there was an agreement on the numbers used for construction costs. The construction cost estimator was working on behalf of the City. Mr. Farnham explained that this Committee could choose a narrow purview and conclude that demolition of a contributing building or an individually designated building never satisfies the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, but it can expand beyond that purview if it chooses to do so.

Ms. Stein commented that the square foot costs are believable. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the size of the building is an issue, at just under 6,000 square feet.

Mr. McCoubrey asked for public comment. David Traub, representing Save Our Sites, displayed a rendering of the block that his organization made in 2004, which showed their vision for the streetscape of this block. He stated that this application is different than the proposed demolition of Jeweler's Row because this building is already listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Although it is only one building, Philadelphia is being chipped away at, one building at a

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 FEBRUARY 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

time. He challenged the notion that contributing buildings in historic districts are less important than significant buildings, because a historic district would be nothing without the contributing buildings. He commented that the façade of this building is beautiful and the entry portal is a distinguished piece of architecture. The three historic buildings have fused together over time as a trio in the public consciousness, and to destroy one is to spoil the integrity of the whole. He opined that tourists want to enjoy a mix of old and new buildings, and the city needs to retain its low buildings like those found on this block. He suggested that the front façade and approximately 20 feet of the existing building be retained and incorporated into the new construction project. He commented that the building is not much larger than a typical townhouse, and townhouses are always having their front facades restored. He opined that it cannot be considered a burden for a development company as large as Southern Land. He referenced the Divine Lorraine, which was vacant for many years prior to its ongoing restoration.

Patrick Grossi, representing the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, commented that the Alliance largely agrees with the spirit of Mr. Traub's comments, but in this case it is voicing non-opposition to the demolition of this building. He explained that the original hardship claim called for demolition of all three buildings, but, as it is before the Committee, two of the three buildings will be repurposed for affordable housing. The developers have made many concessions to immediate neighbors and stakeholders as to the project as a whole, not necessarily having to do with preservation. He suggested that the door surround and other ornamental features may be able to be repurposed. He concluded that, for the reasons just stated, the Alliance is voicing non-opposition to the demolition.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the plans for new construction. Mr. Sklaroff responded that it is outside of the application being discussed at this meeting. Ms. Gutterman countered that, typically when the Committee is reviewing a demolition proposal, it is provided a drawing of what is being proposed for new construction. Mr. Sklaroff responded that the application for new construction will be before the Committee within a few months. He commented that it has been vetted through the stakeholders group, which is endorsed by the Center City Residents Association, and of which Project Home and the Preservation Alliance are members. He explained that they have helped to design the project. Mr. Downey added that the new construction will integrate itself into the two buildings that are being preserved, but that project is not before the Committee at this meeting. Mr. Cluver asked if approval of demolition can be contingent upon approval of new construction, to avoid a situation where a building gets demolished but nothing gets built in its place. Mr. Farnham responded that the Commission has, in certain instances, included provisos in an approval of demolition regarding the subsequent project, but he advised against it. He reminded the Committee that in this case the question is whether or not this building can be feasibly adaptively reused. He cautioned against demolition approvals with provisos. He reiterated that the question is if this building can be adaptively reused, and if it cannot, then requiring its preservation is potentially a regulatory taking, and the Commission needs to be cognizant of that constitutional question. He confirmed that the Commission will maintain full jurisdiction over the site regardless of the outcome of this application.

Mr. Sklaroff asked the Committee to recommend this application favorably to the Commission. Ms. Gutterman commented that she is not in favor. Mr. Cluver commented that the application is thorough, and he was unable to determine other approaches to reusing the building that would change the results. He asked that the Committee on Financial Hardship take into account that demolition by neglect could inflate the cost of reuse. He opined that no additional studies need to be undertaken as part of the analysis and there is nothing else that could have been analyzed in terms of the purview of the Architectural Committee. Mr. McCoubrey agreed, opining that the

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 22 FEBRUARY 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

case was made that it would be a significant financial hardship to rehabilitate and reuse the building. Mr. Farnham commented that the Committee is not compelled to make a recommendation. He stated that it could conclude that demolishing this building does not satisfy the Standards; it could also conclude that, from an architectural perspective, the application appears to be thorough and complete.

Ms. Gutterman referenced a previous comment, questioning whether a facadectomy would be appropriate to maintain the scale and character of the street, and whether an approval of demolition precludes that from happening. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the report consistently states that the façade cannot be retained in its current condition. Mr. Cluver commented that the reuse of the façade should be taken into consideration for the design of the larger project.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend that the Historical Commission deny the application, owing to the demolition, which does not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, unless the Commission finds that the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, pursuant to Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the Philadelphia Code. The Committee additionally recommended that the application is thorough and complete; no other studies or analyses are required.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

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

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.

14-1005(6)(d) Restrictions on Demolition.

No building permit shall be issued for the demolition of a historic building, structure, site, or object, or of a building, structure, site, or object located within a historic district that contributes, in the Historical Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Historical Commission finds that issuance of the building permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted. In order to show that building, structure, site, or object cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted, the owner must demonstrate that the sale of the property is impracticable, that commercial rental cannot provide a reasonable rate of return, and that other potential uses of the property are foreclosed.

14-203(88) Demolition or Demolish.

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