

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

**TUESDAY, 26 SEPTEMBER 2017
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-029
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

PRESENT

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

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Chantry, 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
Brian Johnston, Johnston Design Studio
Dani Leiman, Blackney Hayes Architects
Marty Rosenblum, Martin Jay Josenblum & Associates
Lee Deddens, Martin Jay Josenblum & Associates
Peter Wiesel, Johnston Design Studio
Fon Wang, Ballinger
Brian Nunziato, Ballinger
Geoff Schwartz
Christopher Aker, Ballinger
Hans Stein, Stein Architecture
Devan Roberts
Darin Bielby, Tulpehocken Palazzo
Lionel Guerra
Chris Tantillo, Tantillo Architecture
Kevin Smith, Manayunk Neighborhood Council
John Hunter, Manayunk Neighborhood Council
David Orphanides, Orphanides & Toner
Billy Wang, Tantillo Architecture
Joe Ianoale
Henry Clinton
Jeff Watson
Craig Deutsch
Jay Tackett, Tackett & Company

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. McCoubrey called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Ms. Gutterman, Pentz, and Stein and Mr. Cluver joined him.

ADDRESS: 1200-02 CHESTNUT ST

Proposal: Install exterior lighting and signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Drexel University

Applicant: Robert Roesch, Bittenbender Construction, LP

History: 1916; Beneficial Savings Fund Society Building; Horace Trumbauer, architect

Individual Designation: 9/9/2006

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install signage and lighting at the former Beneficial Saving Fund Society Building, which is currently being rehabilitated for use as the Thomas R. Kline Institute of Trial Advocacy of the Kline School of Law at Drexel University. The signage proposal includes carving of the building's new name into the limestone parapet of the north (front) elevation, similar to the existing Beneficial Saving Fund Society signs, which are carved into both the north and east (side) entablatures. The lighting portion of the application proposes LED fixtures, which will highlight the building's architectural features, including the portico and parapet on the north elevation, and the columns, cornice, and parapet on the east elevation. LED uplighting installed along the bases between columns on the east elevation will have a 7 inch tall aluminum baffle in front of the fixtures, set back 10 inches from the face of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Gutterman recused, owing to her firm's involvement with Drexel University, the property owner. Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jay Tackett represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked if there is any historic precedent for signage at the top parapet. Mr. Tackett responded that there is not. Mr. Cluver stated that he is not in support of carving into the original stone. Ms. Stein asked if the carving will be visible from the street, and questioned the logic behind a permanent change to the historic material that is not very visible to the public. Mr. Tackett responded that it is more visible from further up the street. Mr. Cluver commented that there are three locations proposed to identify that work was done in 2017, which seems excessive. He expressed opposition to carving into original stone. Mr. Tackett commented that this is a permanent change to the building's identity. Mr. Cluver responded that Beneficial Saving Fund Society likely believed the same. Mr. Tackett commented that Drexel University is behind this project and is not allowed to change the building's name.

Mr. Cluver commented that he is concerned about glare from the LED lights along S. 12th Street. He asked about the height of the light shields. Mr. Tackett responded that they are seven inches tall and located approximately waist height and pushed back from the edge. Mr. Cluver suggested that the shields be made slightly taller, to approximately ten inches, so that the issue

of glare is resolved. Mr. McCoubrey commented that the sill is sloping and there is a water break there, so the whole box could be lifted up and spaced underneath.

Mr. Cluver asked about attachment methods for both the signage and the light fixtures. Mr. Tackett responded that the stones just discussed are monolithic, and will be anchored into. The sign over the door is on a bar which sits on top of the existing mullion. The bronze plaques can be anchored into mortar joints. Mr. Cluver commented that those plaques can be modified slightly in size or configuration to accommodate the ability to attach into mortar joints.

Mr. Tackett distributed two alternative options for signage on the top parapet. The first option showed a piece of new carved stone attached to the surface of the parapet. The second option showed individual bronze letters, which require individual attachment points into the historic stone. Mr. Tackett noted that the signage is approximately 65 feet above the street, so any repair of attachment points in the future would be minimally visible. Mr. Cluver asked how deep the recess is of the current parapet, and if the new piece of stone would be inserted into that recess. Mr. Tackett responded that the recess is a couple of inches. Mr. Cluver asked if the new stone would be inset, so that it would not project past the existing surround. Mr. Tackett responded that the new stone can be within the existing panel. Ms. Pentz commented that the option of adding a piece of new stone is preferable to carving into the original stone. Mr. Cluver commented that the two alternative options are more sensitive to the historic building when compared to the original proposal. Of the two options, Mr. Cluver favored the new stone with carved letters, because it is more subtle and in keeping with the character of the building. He expressed concern about how the new stone would be attached. He commented that he understands the desire to have signage that is visible from a distance, and again specified that the new stone should not be flush or proud of the existing stone at the parapet, so that it retains the appearance of a recess.

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

Mr. McCoubrey commented that he is sympathetic to carving letters into the existing stone, given the permanence of investment in the building. However, from a preservation standpoint, the option of an additive element with carved letters is preferable.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the signs at the doors, sign board, bronze plaques, and lighting, provided that the lighting is reevaluated to reduce and allow water to drain; denial of the carved signs, but approval of the concept of carved signs in new stone, with the staff to review details.

ADDRESS: 150 S INDEPENDENCE W MALL

Proposal: Install ADA entrance

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Leon Chudzinski, Carlyle Property Group

Applicant: Dani Leiman, Blackney Hayes Architects

History: 1923; Public Ledger Building; Horace Trumbauer, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install an ADA entrance on the primary/east elevation of the Public Ledger Building along 6th Street. The current accessible entrance for the tenant space on the south side of the building is through the parking lot to the rear. Other accessible entrances in the building along Chestnut Street do not have direct access to this space. The installation of the new door would require the removal of a granite base below an existing window, and the removal of a decorative bronze panel at the base of the window. The proposed door features minimal bronze framing and sidelites.

The staff suggests that shifting the proposed entrance one bay to the north would make the entrance less conspicuous.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and NPS Preservation Brief 32, "Making Historic Properties Accessible."

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects John Hayes and Dani Leiman represented the application.

Ms. Stein asked for clarification as to what the staff meant when they suggested that the entrance be moved one bay towards the north, and whether that meant towards the portico. Ms. DiPasquale confirmed that that was the suggestion.

Mr. Cluver asked whether the proposed door would match the doors on Chestnut Street. Ms. Leiman responded that the door would not completely match the Chestnut Street doors; it would be simplified and would match the window framing above in terms of color and sight lines. Ms. Leiman explained that the intention is to do minimal intervention to the window, and only remove the center portion of the glass and the bronze panel in that center portion of the bay. Mr. McCoubrey noted that he was not clear on how the new frame would be installed. He noted that it is difficult to tell from the drawings what is existing and what is new. Ms. Leiman explained that the window is divided into three separate lites and the center portion would be removed and the new frame inserted. Ms. Gutterman asked about the width of the proposed sidelites on either side of the proposed door. She noted that they are not shown in the plan. Ms. Leiman responded that the sidelites will probably be around eight inches in width. Ms. Gutterman asked whether there was a reason not to make them solid or slightly wider. Ms. Leiman responded that they could be solid, but that the owner wanted as much visibility as possible. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the proposed door is only three feet wide, but perhaps it could be three feet six inches instead. He noted that keeping the existing window frame will necessitate a new frame inboard of it that frames the edge of the panel. Committee members expressed confusion over the lack of detail in the drawings.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 SEPTEMBER 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Ms. Gutterman asked whether a push button door-opening system would be required for the door. Ms. Leiman responded that it is not required. Ms. Gutterman replied that usually when providing ADA accessibility, there is a request for it from the client. Ms. Leiman responded that the purpose of the entrance is really more to provide a location at the sidewalk that is accessible. She explained that, currently, people have to go around the back to a loading and trash area, or they get lifted up the portico steps, which is not safe. Mr. Hayes acknowledged that the door activation question has not been addressed yet, but agreed that it may come up sooner or later. Ms. Gutterman noted that, for many of the projects she has worked on, it was not part of the initial proposal or design, but that it became an issue over time. Mr. Hayes explained that it is a dialysis clinic currently, which makes the need even more immediate. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the architects ask their client the question about the automatic door opener, and not assume that because the client did not think of it and ask for it initially does not mean that it is not needed. Mr. Hayes agreed, noting that it probably is needed. Mr. Cluver opined that, once an automatic door operator is involved, there will be a chunky mechanism above the door head. Ms. Gutterman disagreed, noting that they can be designed to be nearly invisible. Mr. Hayes commented that the transom bar would need to be thicker than what is shown in the plans to accommodate the opener. Ms. Gutterman opined that the dimensions shown could accommodate the necessary hardware.

Ms. Gutterman questioned whether the slope of the sidewalk was going to present an issue with the sill of the door. Ms. Leiman noted that they may need to provide a slight transition, but it would not be a discernible change. Mr. Cluver noted that the drawing appears to exaggerate the slope more than the photographs depict.

Mr. Cluver asked whether, once the bronze panel and the bottom mullion of center bay have been removed, the bottom mullion gets set aside or lifted into the position of the window. He also asked whether the new frame would run the whole height of the center window. Ms. Leiman responded that the glass of the window would need to be replaced with a smaller piece, and the door system installed below. Mr. Cluver asked what would become the head of the door frame. Would part of the old frame be moved up with a system installed below, or just the new system installed? Mr. Hayes responded that he does not think that a portion of the bronze panel could be removed to make a frame.

Mr. Hayes explained that, while this tenant space is currently a dialysis clinic, it is a leased space, and the owner is looking to repurpose the building. He opined that providing wheelchair access is part of that, since there is no way to access the lobby from 6th Street currently. The owner, he noted, wants to maintain as much flexibility as possible for future reuse of the building. The discussion about moving the entrance north one bay makes it asymmetrical and pushes it into the corner, Mr. Hayes opined. He noted that there has been discussion about a hotel operator occupying one corner of the building, and they would want a direct entrance off 6th Street. Mr. Cluver replied that he would have thought that moving the entrance one bay to the north would provide more desirable corner space, whereas the proposed entrance and stair cuts the potential corner retail space. Mr. Hayes responded that retail is not a major player in this section of the city, and that the space would need to be more of a hospitality or residential use, or it may remain office space. He reiterated that they do not know the future use of the building. In response, Mr. Cluver asked why this proposal is coming now if there is so much flux. Mr. Hayes responded that it has been a habitual problem to bring disabled people around to the back of the building, and the back is being repurposed as well. He commented that it is a great building, but was not built with ADA in mind. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the space behind

the portico is all lobby. Mr. Hayes responded that most of it is tenant space. Mr. Hayes noted that the space has been used as many things over the years.

Mr. McCoubrey commented on the details of the proposed cutting of materials for the installation of the door. He argued that it is important that the colonnettes retain their profiles and mouldings, necessitating a very precise cut, akin to surgery. Mr. Hayes agreed, noting that the granite is thick and the removal of the materials will be difficult. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the existing 6th Street entrance shows the way the colonnettes have been retained. He opined that the frame may need to be widened because the colonnettes need a place to return. Mr. Hayes asked for clarification as to what Mr. McCoubrey described as colonnettes. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the existing bronze frame with decorative base has delicate piers with bases. Mr. Cluver noted that, once the glass has been removed, it would establish the plane line, and then the sidelites will allow for the return of the bronze pier details. Mr. Cluver argued that there are still details to work out that will be critical, and existing drawings are too diagrammatic when compared to the actual conditions. He opined that the concept of putting an entrance in is fine, that he understands the need for it, and that the basic approach good, but the applicants need to show the details. Mr. McCoubrey recommended removing the sidelites. Mr. Hayes responded that the door would be very large.

Ms. Stein expressed a larger concern over the lack of a master plan for the building and the number of tenant spaces on the ground floor. She noted that there are currently four tenant spaces and two lobbies, and she is concerned about the master plan for accessible entrances on this building. She argued that she would hate to see more applications to the Historical Commission for additional doors over the subsequent years as the use of the building is determined. She suggested that the building should have one accessible entrance on 6th Street and another on Chestnut, and that the locations of those entrances should be placed so as to serve multiple tenants that might end up being in this building in the future. Mr. Hayes responded that the reality of the situation is that there are already accessible entrances on Chestnut Street, and, although not each tenant space is immediately accessible, there is access to the additional spaces from the lobby on Chestnut Street. This application addresses the one part of the building that has no accessibility at all. He reiterated that he does not know what the long term outcome of this building will be, but they need to address the lack of accessibility for the space on 6th Street. Ms. Stein asked how the dialysis space is accessed currently. Mr. Hayes responded that there is an entrance from the lobby on 6th Street, but the accessible entrance is around at the back. He explained that most people come in Paratransit vehicles through the loading dock in the back. Ms. Gutterman asked if they would still come that way. Mr. Hayes responded that that is not the intention. Ms. Gutterman asked where the Paratransit vehicles would park. Mr. Hayes responded that it would become curbside drop off on 6th Street. Ms. Stein asked whether the applicants had considered providing an accessible entrance to the 6th Street lobby, which seems like it would be required long-term. Mr. Hayes responded that they thought about it, but could not figure out how to do it gracefully. He noted that they discussed installing a ramp, but think that that is worse. Instead, he noted, they are trying to internalize the transitions to the degree that they can. He explained that, ideally, the accessible entrance would be next to the front door, but they do not want to cut into the portico and destroy the portico. He argued that the center bay felt purposeful, while still providing the accommodation they want. He noted that they will probably need to provide some sort of access to the lobby from this new space in the future. Ms. DiPasquale commented that, in addition to the inconspicuousness, the proximity to the main lobby and the portico was part of the staff's reasoning in suggesting that the entrance be moved one bay to the north. Mr. Cluver agreed,

noting that it would be ideal if this entrance could serve the lobby as well as the tenant space. Mr. Hayes responded that, if he knew what was happening with the Tenant 3 space, then it would be easier to answer, but that space already has an accessible entrance from Chestnut Street. Mr. Hayes noted that the owner is not opposed to moving the entrance one bay north, but would prefer it in the proposed center bay, which keeps the most flexibility for the future. Mr. Cluver commented that he would accept the center bay as long as it is the only accessible entrance on 6th Street. He stated that he does not want to see new entrances start to multiply for each new tenant space when one entrance could have served multiple spaces. Mr. Hayes agreed, opining that this would be the only necessary accessible entrance. He noted that, ideally, the owner would like to have the flexibility to install the entrance in either the center bay or the bay to the north, as the master plan is developed. He reiterated that there is a short-term need to deal with the dialysis clinic tenant and the fact that the rear will be eliminated as an access point.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and NPS Preservation Brief 32, "Making Historic Properties Accessible," with the following provisions:

- the entrance is located in either the center bay or the bay to the north, with preference for the northern bay;
- the frame and glass installation is documented precisely, with the staff to review details;
- if the sidelites are six inches or narrower, they be eliminated;
- consideration is given to making the door push-button accessible;
- the detailing account for the returns of the collonettes, which should be retained, not altered;
- the door frame is limited to the new door system, and does not extend the full height of the glazing; and,
- this is the only ADA entrance on 6th Street, and serves the lobby and any tenant spaces.

ADDRESS: 331 S 4TH ST

Proposal: Rehabilitate front façade; construct rooftop addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: P. Ellen Jacobs

Applicant: James Lee Deddens, MJRA and Associates

History: 1950

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to make minor façade alterations and to construct a one-story rooftop addition. At the front façade, the application proposes to raise an existing stone door surround to allow for the installation of a transom and new door; to install a new garage door and a header course above the existing garage door opening; to lower the sills of the second-floor windows; and to install a new cornice and shutters. The proposed elements are in keeping with the Colonial Revival style of the house. The proposed rooftop addition would be set back 7-feet, 10-inches from the front façade, and would be inconspicuous, or completely invisible, from the public right-of-way owing to the taller buildings on both sides and the

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 SEPTEMBER 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

proposed cornice. A small deck would be located at the rear of the addition. The rear of the property is completely landlocked by taller buildings.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Marty Rosenblum and James Lee Deddens represented the application.

Mr. Rosenblum explained that the building is very basic and utilitarian, having been constructed in 1951 when few people were venturing into Society Hill. Now it is a valuable piece of real estate with a building that looks like it belongs on a back alley. He noted that they want to alter the building somewhat to make it more attractive. He noted that the current proposal was not their original intent, but that they revised the application based on a discussion with the staff. He noted that the staff had pointed out the building's character-defining features that should be retained, including the stone surround, which may actually be cast concrete, and suggested adding a cornice, which was not there before, and suggested adding a soldier course or lintel above the garage door for aesthetic reasons. He explained that they want to slightly alter the windows on the second floor to give the building better proportions, keeping the jack arches and keystones in place, and simply lowering the sills slightly. As was mentioned on the photographs, there is already a pilothouse visible on the adjacent property. The proposed addition would be set back to the same plane. He presented a sightline drawing showing that the addition would not be visible from the street. He noted that they feel the proposal is a vast improvement over the existing appearance.

Ms. Gutterman asked how many courses of brick the applicants propose to lower the windows. Mr. Rosenblum responded that they would be lowered two courses. Mr. Cluver noted that the entrance door is being elevated and the sills dropped. Ms. Gutterman asked how high the sills will be above the floor. Mr. Rosenblum responded that the floor height was irrelevant to them, as they could use tempered glass in the bottom sash. More important to them is that the existing windows are small, and this is the major living area and the only real opportunity for natural light. The rear of the property is totally landlocked. He noted that the client asked to bring more light in, and they knew that it would be inappropriate to add a third window to the front elevation, and dropping the sills seemed to be the least invasive option. Mr. Cluver noted that the proposed sill height would be around 24 inches, so furniture may end up in front of the window, but that he believes the proposal is acceptable.

Ms. Gutterman asked if aluminum clad windows were acceptable, and opined that they were not. Ms. DiPasquale responded that she had overlooked that note on the drawings. Mr. Rosenblum agreed to use wood windows.

Mr. Cluver questioned the roof section, noting that there appears to be a roof well at the front. Mr. Deddens noted that they are proposing to drop into the existing roof plane in order to lower the addition to the point that it is not visible from the street. He noted that they would be removing existing framing and adding a new scupper and downspout tucked into the corner on the south side of the front elevation. He noted that the neighboring property actually projects out eight inches from the plane of the façade, which allows for a nice corner into which they can tuck the downspout. Mr. Cluver observed that the roof line and scupper box do not align properly in the drawings. Mr. Deddens acknowledged that the drawing is not completely

accurate as to the location of the roofline, and that it would not drop down quite as much as shown.

Mr. Cluver noted that the proposed shutters are all shown as paneled rather than louvered shutters, and asked if the staff had any comments on that. He noted that, historically, most shutters were paneled on the first floor and louvered on the upper floors. He asked whether there was a preference or precedence for this proposal. Mr. Rosenblum commented that in many Colonial Revival buildings, shutters were frequently solid all the way up, since ventilation was less of an issue than in older historic buildings. Mr. Cluver agreed. Mr. Rosenblum opined that the brick on this building is not very attractive, and that they felt that, since there were no shutters on the ground floor, paneled shutters on the upper floors were appropriate. He noted that paneled shutters would also have greater longevity. Mr. Cluver responded that another argument in favor of the paneled shutters is that all of the other houses on the block have paneled shutters. Mr. Cluver clarified that the shutters would be installed with operable hardware. Mr. Deddens and Mr. Rosenblum confirmed that they would. Mr. McCoubrey opined that the proposed changes are a nice improvement to the façade.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10, provided the windows are painted wood rather than aluminum clad.

ADDRESS: 440 SPRUCE ST

Proposal: Construct deck on garage; install security gate

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Hillary Wiesel

Applicant: Brian Johnston, Johnston Design Studio, Inc.

History: 1770; Wm. Peden/James Sayer house; 1795 (addition); 19th c. storefront; 1977 restoration

Individual Designation: 1/26/1965

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a deck on top of a freestanding, non-historic garage, and to install a security gate over the door and transom of the 1795 entrance door on the 5th Street elevation of this Significant corner building. The deck would be accessed by a spiral staircase from the rear yard and would be enclosed with a simple black metal picket railing. The security gate would include a fan-shaped transom grate. The staff recommends that alternative and less visually impactful means of security be explored, such as the reinforcement of the door frame.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the deck, but denial of the security gate, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Brian Johnston and owner Peter Wiesel represented the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 SEPTEMBER 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Mr. Johnston commented that the garage is non-historic, the roof of which would be reconstructed to accommodate a live load. He pointed out that the proposed railing uses the same picket design as found on another balcony on the property. He noted that the deck would be accessed by a spiral staircase in the yard and would not be overly visible. He reported that the owner would like to increase the security at the side entrance, and therefore proposed the gate, which would use the same materials as the deck railing.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the staff had any concerns with the removal of the lattice on the side of the garage, and asked if it was on multiple sides of the building. Mr. Johnston replied that it is only on the east side of the garage, facing the parking lot. He noted that, since they are proposing to reconstruct the roof, the side wall needs to have a one-hour rating. Ms. Gutterman asked about the materials of the other walls. Mr. Johnston responded that the east wall facing the garden is wood framed with wood siding, and the other walls are masonry. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff did not have any concerns with the removal of the lattice, but noted that it would be nice if the color could be consistent throughout, whether through the use of brick or a darker stucco. Ms. Stein questioned whether the garden wall facing the parking lot is historic. Ms. DiPasquale responded that she does not know, but could research its history. Mr. Johnston noted that there are no proposed changes to that wall.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if there is a reason that the spiral staircase railing extends above the height of the deck railing itself. Mr. Johnston responded that they would try to get those railing heights to align as closely as possible. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the deck railing could be raised to align.

Ms. Gutterman asked if any other security options had been evaluated for the side entrance. Mr. Johnston responded that they did not evaluate any other options. Mr. Cluver observed that there may be buildings that have gates on them, but that there are many more that do not, and probably some that are removing the gates. Mr. Johnston responded that there are a number of houses in Society Hill that have gates at their entry vestibules. Ms. DiPasquale replied that the vestibule gates are typically seen on houses constructed during the mid-twentieth century when Society Hill was much different than it is today. Mr. Johnston asked if security cameras might be a more appropriate security measure. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the staff could likely approve relatively inconspicuous security cameras. Ms. Gutterman agreed that there were other ways to achieve security without the gate.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of all aspects of the application except denial of the security gate, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 37 SUMMIT ST

Proposal: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Bruce L. Rind

Applicant: John S. Leonard

History: 1870

Individual Designation: 8/2/1973

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish an existing one-story rear addition and to construct a two-story addition on the rear of this Italianate twin. The addition, which would be set back approximately 120 feet from the street, would be clad in horizontal wood siding or stucco and feature wood or aluminum-clad wood windows and a standing-seam metal roof. While the application offers several options for the configuration of the addition, the owner-preferred option forms an L-shape with the existing house, extending the addition approximately eight feet beyond the side elevation of the existing building at the first floor. The addition at the second floor would be limited to the rear of the existing building, and would be accessed by cutting down an existing window into a door.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owners John and Christy Leonard represented the application.

Mr. Leonard distributed supplemental materials to the Committee members. Ms. Stein asked if the addendum changed anything in the application. Mr. Leonard responded that it did not, but just provided additional clarification on the proposed materials and photographs to show the minimal visibility of the proposed addition from the street. He thanked the staff for being helpful to someone new to the process.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the staff accepted the L-shaped addition in Option A because it is inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. Ms. DiPasquale responded affirmatively. Mr. Cluver noted that the detailing, while sketchy, is evocative of a quality that would be in keeping with the historic character of the existing building. He noted that the second floor side elevation of Option A shows a double window and a smaller single window, but Option B shows two single windows, but programmatically the space is the same in both options, and opined that the window configuration of Option B looks calmer. Even if Option A is selected, the window option for second floor of Option B should be employed. Mr. Leonard agreed that that looks better to him as well.

Mr. Cluver noted that he does not have a strong feeling of Option A versus Option B, and may actually have a slight preference for Option A. Mr. McCoubrey agreed, and noted that it would probably be preferable to have a shallower addition, owing to the neighbor's rear addition. Mr. Leonard commented that there is a lovely stone patio on the side of the house that Option A would bookend nicely. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the drawing evokes an enclosed porch, which makes it seem like a natural addition to the house. He suggested that the more it can appear like an enclosed, glazed porch, the better. Mr. Cluver suggested that, on the rear elevation, the line between the first and second floors is carried straight down rather than jogging over, as

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 SEPTEMBER 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

though a single-story porch was added to a rear addition. Mr. Leonard asked for clarification as to what the Committee members meant when they suggested that it look more like a porch. Mr. McCoubrey responded that perhaps the windows are slightly enlarged. Mr. Leonard agreed, noting that that is the look they want, and the more light, the better.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of Option A, with the materials identified in the addendum, the second-floor side windows from Option B, and a real stucco, not a Dryvit or EFIS material, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

ADDRESS: 249-53 ARCH ST

Proposal: Construct ADA ramp; install signage and lighting

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Christopher Aker, Atlantis Investments, LLC

Applicant: Fon Wang, Ballinger

History: 1907; Corn Exchange National Bank & Trust; Seaman's Institute; Newman & Harris, architects

Individual Designation: 1/6/1977

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an ADA ramp at the primary entrance along Arch Street, and to install decorative lighting and signage. The applicants previously applied for a ramp at this location in August 2016 and received a recommendation of denial from the Architectural Committee. The applicants withdrew that portion of the application prior to the Historical Commission meeting to pursue the option of sloping the sidewalk to achieve accessibility, which the Streets Department has subsequently denied. The ramp railings would be painted steel and free-standing. The material for the ramp itself is not specified. The lighting package calls for a series of fixtures to be concealed behind metal fascia painted to match the limestone of the building. No details of the shape, dimensions, or placement of the fixtures or fascia are provided. The application also proposes three signage options, each of which would feature one sign on the Arch Street elevation and one sign on the 3rd Street elevation. Option 1 features a circular plaque with pin-mounted letters beneath. Option 2 would be limited to bronze plaques with raised lettering. Option three is for pin-mounted letters only. The staff notes that Option 2 would require the fewest penetrations into the masonry.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the ramp railing is in keeping with the character of the building; the fascia, lighting fixtures, and any conduit are inconspicuous; and masonry penetrations for the signage are limited, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, and NPS Preservation Brief 32, "Making Historic Properties Accessible."

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Fon Wang represented the application.

Mr. Cluver asked Mr. Baron about the staff preference for the design of the railing on the ramp. Mr. Baron suggested that a very simple design would be the best. Ms. Wang said that she had

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 SEPTEMBER 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

brought additional details for the lighting. She explained that the light fixtures at the window sills will have a C-shaped flange that will be colored to match the stone. She stated that they will try to reuse the penetrations from the existing lights. Mr. Baron asked about the flange shown surrounding the doorway. Ms. Wang said that there are two lights, one above the carved cartouche, which will be similar to the lights at the window, and a code-compliant down light to illuminate the door pathway. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the light above the capitals. Ms. Wang explained that strip light will be only one half inch high and three quarters of an inch deep. Mr. Baron asked if it could be affixed to the vertical joints rather than the horizontal to avoid water and ice infiltration. Ms. Wang agreed to that request. Mr. Cluver asked about the lights spanning the capitals again and it was clarified that they would be on the ledge under the carved "Corn Exchange" letters and not directly above the capitals. He asked that the lights be shielded with a flange to prevent glare if necessary. Mr. Baron asked if the lights are to change color like those on Broad Street. Ms. Wang replied that they would, but only occasionally. Ms. Gutterman asked if the light at the doorway could be electrified without a visible conduit. Ms. Wang responded that it would be very difficult to hide the conduit because of the metal sliding doors, which sit within a pocket and the limited space between those doors and the inner doors behind them. Mr. Baron asked if it is possible to hide the lights behind the capitals. Ms. Wang stated that there is also no room in that location. Ms. Wang said that it is not easy to drill through the stone and that there are pockets of asbestos which they are trying to avoid.

The discussion then shifted to the signage. The applicants explained that they have proposed three options, but have not yet decided which they prefer. The Committee members expressed a preference for signs that minimize the number of penetrations into the stone. All sign elements should be attached to a backer plaque, which can be affixed to the stone wall with four penetrations, preferably in mortar joints. Mr. Aker, the owner, said that he prefers Option 1 with the round logo above and the letters below. He asked if the Committee would recommend approval of a sign with two plaques and eight points of attachment. The Committee members replied that the staff could review the mounting details.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised ramp, the lighting with the addition of a flange for screening the SL2 fixture if necessary, provided the conduit and fixtures are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, and the signs, either Option 2 or Option 1 with a single plaque with four points of penetration.

ADDRESS: 329 S 25TH ST

Proposal: Demolish gable roof and rear wall; construct addition and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Geoffrey Schwartz

Applicant: Adam Montalbano, Moto DesignShop Inc.

History: 1855; front wall replaced, 1958

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 demolish the gable roof, rear wall, and both front and rear dormers of this contributing row house in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 SEPTEMBER 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

and to construct a third-floor addition with front mansard, roof deck, and pilot house. The roof deck would be set back ten feet from the front façade. New windows and entry door would be installed in the front façade, which was reconstructed in 1958.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of new windows and door at the front façade, with staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9; denial of the demolition and addition, pursuant to Standard 9 and Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, the prohibition against demolition.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Adam Montalbano and owner Geoffrey Schwartz represented the application.

Mr. Montalbano explained that the house currently has three bedrooms and one bath, but the owners would like more space. In particular, they find the head height at the third floor very limited. He suggested that perhaps the Commission would allow greater flexibility with this house because the front façade had been replaced. He noted that there are other mansard roofs in the neighborhood. He opined that the roof deck and pilot house may not be visible from the street.

Ms. Gutterman inquired about visibility of the rear of the house and asked if it is a through lot. Mr. Montalbano responded that it is not. Mr. Baron pointed out that this house and its twin neighbor are part of an earlier settlement that grew from the Schuylkill River. He said that the gable roof and dormers are probably the most significant part of this house because it is demonstrative of the earlier style of the buildings of that settlement. Ms. Gutterman pointed out that the one-story rear portion of the house could be demolished and replaced with a rear addition below the eave end similar to its neighbor. Mr. Montalbano asked if he could retain the front portion of the roof and start the addition back from the ridge line. Ms. Gutterman said that the rear roof and dormer are historic fabric and should be retained; however, the Committee members noted that they would entertain such a proposal if it is not visible from the public right-of-way. Ms. Pentz pointed out that the application now proposes the demolition of the rear wall, all the floors, and the entire roof. She said that that level of removal would constitute a demolition in the legal sense of the word. Mr. Montalbano explained that they wish to reconfigure the stair and are demolishing the floors for that reason. Mr. Baron reported that the staff agreed with Ms. Pentz that the removals would constitute a demolition and did place a demolition poster on the building announcing this review, indicating that the proposed work satisfied the legal definition of demolition. Mr. Cluver stated that the demolition of the front roof and dormer does not possibly satisfy the Standards. The roof deck and stairhouse are dependent on visibility and the construction at the rear is the most likely to receive a recommendation of approval. Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that the demolition of the rear slope may not warrant an approval. Mr. Schwartz stated he would be amenable to saving the front roof slope and dormer if required. Mr. Cluver explained to the applicants that the Committee could render a recommendation that would likely be for denial or Mr. Montalbano could withdraw his application, revise the proposal, and submit a new, better application. Ms. Gutterman pointed out that the re-submission should have a site plan that clarifies the visibility of the rear and deck and pilot house. It was pointed out that it may be visible from Fidler Square. Mr. Montalbano consulted with the owner and then withdrew the application.

ADDRESS: 240 W TULPEHOCKEN ST

Proposal: Construct enclosed exterior stair and elevator; install fence

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Tulpehocken Palazzo/Darin Bielby

Applicant: Adam Montalbano, Moto Design Shop Inc.

History: 1893; Harry K. Cummings Residence; Frank Miles Day, architect

Individual Designation: 3/9/2012

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove an existing non-historic rear fire escape and construct an enclosed stair and elevator as a primary means of egress from the second and third floors of this former single-family residence, which is being converted into five apartments. Three options are provided for the design and location of the stair enclosure, which would be constructed of metal and glass. The staff suggests that option A offers the best location and design of the three options. One dormer is proposed for the southwest corner roof. The applicant also requests approval of a 42 inch black metal fence with vertical pickets along Tulpehocken Street.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Adam Montalbano and contractor Lionel Guerra represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that three options have been presented, each with pros and cons. He stated that the staff had given some preference to Option A because it is closer to the building and therefore has less of a visual impact on the historic building. On the other hand, Mr. Baron explained that he had asked the architect to explore Option C, in which the stair tower is pulled away from the building, limiting the demolition of building elements, particularly the overhanging roof. Mr. Baron showed photographs of satellite views to give a sense of the substantial distance from Pastorius Street at the rear to the area of work. Mr. Baron pointed out that Option C may also necessitate cuts into the roof. Mr. Montalbano said that they have not worked out all details. He said they are looking for input, particularly in terms of how close the stair tower should sit to the existing building. Mr. Baron explained that the underlying reason for the proposal is to provide egress from multiple units, while still preserving the interior grand stair. Ms. Gutterman asked questions about Option C. She asked if section drawings were included in the proposal. Mr. Montalbano pointed to drawings 203 and 204 C. He explained that, in Option C, they would bridge over the roof to get to the dormer and restore the roof under that bridge. Ms. Gutterman asked about the location of the elevator door and whether there would be enough headroom. She asked if there will be 6'-8" of clearance. Mr. Montalbano said that they will cut down the sill of the dormer and that they would have enough clearance. Mr. Cluver asked if the elevator is a code requirement or part of the marketing of the units. He also asked about the current layout of interior stairs. Mr. Montalbano said that the building will have five units and this will be the main entrance. Mr. Cluver said that this glass box will glow in the dark all night and it will sit close to other windows on the building. He asked if it will need to be fire rated. Mr. Montalbano said that it does not need to be fire rated because it is outside the building envelope; it will provide weather protection for users of the stair. Mr. Guerra asked if the Committee was reviewing code requirements or aesthetics. Mr. Cluver replied that code

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 SEPTEMBER 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

requirements often affect aesthetics. Mr. McCoubrey opined that Option C may still be too close to the building to allow for proper drainage.

Mr. Baron asked the architect if the use of the upper floors is going to require modifications to the roof. Mr. Montalbano pointed out that they are requesting a dormer on a rear roof in a bedroom. Mr. Cluver said that it is shown differently on the plan than in elevation.

Returning to the stair tower, Ms. Stein stated that she agrees with the staff and prefers Option A because it is more compact and less visible. She urged the architect to think of the addition as a solid mass first, saying that glazing does not solve the massing problem. Mr. Cluver said that he prefers a modified Option B, with the proposed orientation of the addition pulled away from the building six to eight feet. He said it should be pulled away enough to avoid the roof as well as the windows on the main house. Mr. Cluver explained to the applicants that the Committee could render a recommendation that would likely be for denial or Mr. Montalbano could withdraw his application, revise the proposal, and submit a new, better application. Mr. Montalbano withdrew the application. He then asked for advice regarding fencing along the front yard on Tulpehocken Street. The Committee members asked him to describe the surrounding fencing. The two neighbors to the sides have stone walls. The stone wall on the left, when looking at the building, is about four feet tall and the wall on the right is approximately six feet tall. Mr. Montalbano suggested a metal picket fence about six feet tall with a radius top. The Committee members suggested that that might be acceptable, provided it did not have the radius top. They asked him to provide photographs of the context with his subsequent application.

ADDRESS: 241 W PASTORIUS ST

Proposal: Construct dormer

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Tulpehocken Palazzo LP

Applicant: Lionel Guerra, Armadillo Construction

History: 1893; Harry K. Cummings carriage house; Frank Miles Day, architect

Individual Designation: 3/9/2012

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a dormer on this former carriage house to allow for adequate ceiling height, light, and air at the second floor, which is being converted from storage to living space. The Historical Commission approved a smaller dormer in the street-facing roof slope of this building in November 2015. The proposed dormer would be faced in stucco and shaped to match the previously-approved dormer. The roof slope is perpendicular to and visible from W. Pastorius Street, a narrow service alley that provides access to carriage houses at the rears of large houses facing Tulpehocken and Walnut Lane.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Adam Montalbano, contractor Lionel Guerra, and property owner Darin Bielby represented the application.

Mr. Guerra explained that the dormer approved by the Historical Commission for this property in an earlier application was not large enough to accommodate their needs. Therefore, they are now proposing a second, larger dormer. Ms. Gutterman opined that the proposed addition is so large that it cannot be rightfully called a dormer. She asked if the mass could be broken down into three small dormers. Ms. Stein said that she could approve of one smaller dormer for the bathroom. She said that there is a need for better space utilization. She noted that the section in the middle of the attic with the greatest ceiling height will be taken up with large closets. She recommended that space be saved for living space and put the storage in the sections of the room with lesser ceiling heights. Mr. Guerra said that would make for some very cramped closets. He said that the middle of the room has a head height of seven feet. Mr. Cluver noted contradictions in the architectural drawings; he pointed out differences in the design of the addition in elevation and plan. He said that the applicant is trying to fit too much program into a small space. He noted that this building does not adapt well to this level of change. Mr. Guerra said that he needs this amount of space. Ms. Gutterman countered that he needs an accurate drawing. Ms. Pentz said that she was very confused by the labeling of the facades and said that they need to be keyed to the plans. Mr. McCoubrey observed that a large amount of space has been given over to closets.

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

ADDRESS: 502-04 S JUNIPER ST

Proposal: Demolish rear wall and roof; construct four-story addition with garage and roof decks

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: James Ernst

Applicant: Maggie Persofsky

History: 1830

Individual Designation: 12/31/1984

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the rear wall and roof of the historic three-story building and a portion of the adjacent non-historic, one-story garage. A brick four-story addition would be constructed on the garage site and would feature a garage at the first story, large sliding doors and Juliet balconies at the second and third stories, and two six-over-six windows at the fourth story. A large roof deck with a minimal setback is proposed on the addition. The application also proposes removing the sloped roof of historic three-story building and installing a standing seam metal roof-like structure that is cut away for a deck. A stair would connect the two decks, and the three-story building would be enlarged at the rear to occupy the full depth of the lot. Other work to the historic building includes replacing windows and doors, and installing new limestone lintels. The staff contends that, with the removal of the roof and entire rear wall, this application proposes a demolition, the destruction of a building in significant part, and is therefore prohibited by the preservation ordinance unless the Historical Commission finds that the buildings cannot be feasibly adaptively reused or that the demolition is necessary in the public interest. The application makes no reuse or public interest arguments.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, the Roofs Guideline, and the prohibition against demolition, Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 SEPTEMBER 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Hans Stein of Stein Architecture represented the application.

Mr. Cluver inquired about the property's status, questioning whether it is considered a single property and whether there was historically a second trinity on the garage site. Mr. Stein replied that the building and garage currently comprise a single property. Ms. Keller stated that she would defer to Mr. Baron, since he has a long history with the property, adding that her research indicated the garage site had been a lot and did not contain a trinity. Mr. Baron commented that the Juniper Street trinity and garage were once part of a larger property with the main house facing Lombard Street. The Lombard Street property, he continued, was subdivided and the Juniper Street trinity and garage were sold as a separate property and have been separate for a number of years.

Ms. Gutterman asked for clarity on the property's designation. Mr. Baron replied that the property is individually listed under the Juniper Street address. The Lombard Street property is not designated as historic.

Mr. Cluver acknowledged that trinities are small structures that do not meet modern expectations for a house. He observed that the proposed construction on the garage site is reasonable. He stated that his concern pertains to the extent of work proposed to the historic trinity, especially the roof deck and stair access, which he noted goes a step too far.

Mr. Stein explained that the building has been vacant for some time and that he submitted photographs to show its condition. The building, he continued, has openings and has been exposed to the weather and the proposal includes removing existing beams that have rotted owing to water infiltration. He indicated that the rear wall had collapsed and that it had been fixed, adding that photographs are included in the application. He noted that a rear roof deck had collapsed and was removed. All these conditions, he asserted, occurred prior to when the current owner purchased the property. Mr. Stein described the foundation as lacking footings and being stone rubble. He stated that his initial reaction was to demolish the building, claiming that he could make a good case for demolition. Ms. Gutterman replied that Mr. Stein is prohibited from demolishing the building without a letter from a structural engineer stating that the building cannot be saved. Mr. Stein responded that he is not proposing to demolish the building, though he is proposing to demolish the roof because it has dry rot and consists of wood shingles below two other layers of roofing.

Ms. Gutterman asserted that she reviewed the photographs and the issue is the extent of changes proposed to an individually designated property and no letter from a structural engineer was submitted to justify the proposal. She noted that the Committee can read photographs but it cannot accept Mr. Stein's description of the conditions without the engineer's letter stating that there is no alternative. Generally, she continued, other options include sistering structural members or replacing individual members, none of which equate to wholesale removal. She contended that there are other ways to repair historic structures.

Mr. Stein countered that he is not proposing wholesale removal but that he is removing the roof, because the whole roof exhibits dry rot in its wooden shingles. Ms. Gutterman responded that Mr. Stein is describing the roofing system and not necessarily the roofing structure. Mr. Stein contended that the roofing structure is also being removed owing to failing beams based on a

structural engineer's conclusion. Ms. Gutterman replied that Mr. Stein is presenting a demolition, which is not allowed by the preservation ordinance. She reiterated that the engineer would need to submit his conclusions in writing to justify to the Committee and Commission why Mr. Stein's proposal is the only option for the structure.

Mr. Baron observed that the proposal presents two issues. One, he noted, is the removal of certain features; the other, the addition of the stair and deck within the historic structure. He added that they are related, although one is a design issue resulting from the removal of features and the other is an issue of trying to preserve existing features. He asked that the Committee comment on the proposed design in addition to the issues of removal.

Ms. Gutterman agreed with Mr. Baron's observation and stated the design of the proposed addition shows sympathetic materials, with the exception of the massive roof deck. She remarked that the deck is too large and is inappropriate. She asked other Committee members for opinions.

Mr. Baron asked for comments on the design of the new building. Mr. Cluver opined that he understands the desire to maintain a garage at the first story, although his preference would be to eliminate the garage and lower the programming to minimize the addition. He then commented that the Juliet balconies, sliding doors, roof deck, and access stair between decks were serious concerns. Mr. Baron asked if Mr. Cluver would find the addition's height more appropriate if it were lowered from four stories to three. Mr. Cluver answered that the surrounding context of the site indicates that the addition should be three stories, which seems to be more appropriate, though he could be convinced otherwise. He noted that he did not know the zoning limitations for the site. Mr. Stein directed the Committee members to the cover sheet where the zoning information was provided.

Mr. McCoubrey suggested that, even with the necessity of replacing the historic building's roof, its original slope and character could be maintained, and the roof deck would be pulled back. Mr. Stein responded that the sightlines are such that the stair and deck are not visible from any angle. Several Committee members disagreed.

Mr. McCoubrey asked whether Mr. Stein was proposing to demolish the entire rear masonry wall. Mr. Stein affirmed, adding that the wall is structurally unsound. The fourth floor has no ties, he continued, because the joists run parallel to the wall. He noted that photographs included in the application show that the wall was repaired with stucco. He added that water has entered the foundation walls and that they are sinking. To rebuild the whole wall, he asserted, would not make sense. Mr. McCoubrey responded that the Committee has seen photographs of walls in worse condition, adding that it is difficult to discern the actual condition from the photographs in the application. Mr. Stein offered to show the Committee members the wall in person.

Mr. Cluver inquired about the views along Juniper Street from south of the building, which were not included in the application. Mr. Stein replied that there is no visibility due to the neighboring structure. Mr. Cluver stated that he understands that the northern neighbor obstructs the view from the north. He then reminded Mr. Stein that he indicated that the stairs and roof deck would not be visible from the street, and asserted that if one were to stand to the south of the building, then those features appear to be highly visible. Mr. Stein disagreed, claiming that the street is not wide and asked Mr. Cluver to refer to the section drawing in the application, which shows the angle of visibility. Mr. Cluver challenged Mr. Stein's assertion and observed that the section

shows a head-on view. Mr. Stein again disagreed and claimed that the stair and deck would not be visible from the side, which is the reason the photographs were included.

Ms. Stein asked whether Mr. Cluver was referring to the roof deck of the addition or of the historic building. Mr. Cluver answered that he was discussing the visibility of the historic structure's roof, as well as the stairs that would extend from the historic structure to the roof deck of the addition. Ms. Gutterman supported Mr. Cluver's assertion that the roof deck and stairs will be visible and referred to a photograph in the application showing the building in context along S. Juniper Street. Mr. Stein again disagreed and contended that he completed sightline studies. Ms. Gutterman questioned Mr. Stein's claim that the roof deck and stairs would not be visible. Mr. Stein reiterated that the four-story addition is positioned behind the neighboring structure. Ms. Gutterman attempted to clarify that, if one were to stand at the opposite side of the S. Juniper Street property, then the roof deck and stair would be visible. Mr. Stein claimed neither feature would be visible. Ms. Gutterman disagreed.

Ms. Stein inquired whether the chimney would remain. Mr. Stein stated that the chimney has been closed and boarded but that the mass would be retained. Ms. Stein asked whether the chimney above the roof would remain. Ms. Gutterman added that the chimney is not shown as being retained in the elevation drawing. Mr. Stein acknowledged that the chimney is not shown. Ms. Stein stated that the Commission does not have jurisdiction over the property's interior but does have jurisdiction over the entire envelope, which includes the brickwork, the shape of the roof, and character-defining features, such as chimneys. She argued that those features are important in maintaining the character of the trinity and suggested that a steel beam be inserted to support the chimney from the interior. Mr. Stein replied that he is not proposing to remove the chimney. Ms. Stein asked if he is maintaining the entire chimney structure, down to its foundation. Mr. Stein affirmed. Mr. McCoubrey observed that the chimney is not represented on the fourth floor plan where it would project through the roof.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, the Roofs Guideline, and the prohibition against demolition, Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance, and suggested that the applicant produce a letter from a structural engineer that substantiates the reasoning for the current proposal.

ADDRESS: 2108 SANSOM ST

Proposal: Construct third-floor addition with pilot house and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Joseph Ianoale and Amanda Korson

Applicant: Joseph Ianoale

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a third-story addition on a two-story former carriage house in the Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District. The addition would be designed to

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 SEPTEMBER 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

mimic qualities of the modern neighboring structure at 2101-07 Walnut Street; the addition's brick cladding and large window and door openings would resemble the cladding and fenestration of the adjacent structure. The application further proposes to cantilever a deck over the existing roof of the historic building at the third story, and to construct a roof deck and pilot house with pergola as part of the addition. The cantilevered deck would contain a five-foot setback, and both deck and addition would be highly visible from Sansom Street.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney David Orphanides and architects Chris Tantillo and Billy Wang represented the application.

Mr. Orphanides stated that the architects have met with staff to review the application and get recommendations on design. The clients, he continued, purchased the property several years ago and currently occupy the building. The proposal is to allow the owners to expand the living space, he noted. Mr. Orphanides explained that the building was part of a larger development project to restore the properties on Sansom Street, and the project then worked its way around Van Pelt Street. All buildings involved, he commented, are part of a homeowners association. He then commented that the property at 2108 Sansom Street abuts the 2101 Cooperative, which extends from Walnut to Sansom Streets and creates a very mixed block, with the large structure looming over the other properties and dominating the streetscape. In particular, he suggested, the building looms over his client's property, which is in the shadow of the large structure.

Mr. Orphanides summarized his involvement with nearby development projects, including one at 2108 and 2110 Walnut Street, and identified examples of visible third-story additions on two-story buildings in the immediate neighborhood. At this particular location, he continued, any addition quickly gets blocked by the 2101 Cooperative when viewed from the east. He noted that to the west, two-story structures exist on the north side of the street, with only the corner building spanning three stories in height, which leaves the view of the proposed addition from the west nearly impossible to eliminate. He indicated that the application includes renderings of these views, including from the west, and suggested that the addition would need to be reduced by half and moved back to the stairwell to minimize the view, although doing so would make the addition impractical. He argued that to address the visibility from the west, the architects employed modern materials similar to those of the 2101 Cooperative to blend the addition with the adjacent building. He acknowledged that making a portion of the building appear as if it extends over top of another building creates a somewhat odd condition, but stated that the goal was to minimize the impact of the addition to be more in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Mr. Orphanides described the front deck and railing, and asserted that the rear deck and pergola would be minimally visible from the street. He then indicated that if the front deck of the addition becomes a deal-breaker for the Committee or Commission, he would be open to discussing different railing options or a setback. He commented, however, that he found that the decks adds to the building rather than detracts. He opined whether a railing similar to the existing railing of the second story would be more appropriate and concluded that while the client would like to have the front deck, the living space is the more important aspect of the application.

Ms. Gutterman expressed concern over the front deck, because of its visibility and the inability to minimize it. She remarked that she likes that the addition is set back from the front façade

and that the design imitates the adjacent modern building. The proposed design, she commented, is a good start, though she asked whether the client would consider punched openings to lessen the amount of glass and reflectivity and to make the addition slightly less modern. She also inquired whether the deck could be reduced in size to make it less visible and whether the pilot house could be pushed back. She stated that, while the addition will never be invisible, it can be less conspicuous.

Ms. Stein questioned why the distance between the second and third stories is seventeen feet. She noted her concern over the height and commented that it contributes to the visibility of the addition. She added that five feet of that height seems unnecessary and may be due in part to the way the addition is being constructed, which she indicated is more like a deck. She observed that the floor plate and roof joists should align, and commented that the proposed drawings potentially show these as separate elements, though no details were provided. She suggested that the structure is being duplicated, which is contributing significant height to the addition. Five feet of space, she continued, could be removed from the height of the proposed addition simply by combining the two structural systems.

Mr. Tantillo responded that his concern was the unknown condition of the roof and joist framing and explained that the plan was to work off the two side walls and use them to support the middle section of the addition. Ms. Stein suggested that he sister the joists. She then recommended that he retain a structural engineer to investigate the current structure to see if the structural systems could be combined, since the addition's visibility is one of the Committee's major concerns. She added that a reduction of five feet will make a big difference, noting that the brick parapet shown in the rendering is less than five feet in height. Mr. Tantillo asked whether the addition would be more palatable with a five-foot reduction. Ms. Stein replied that the Committee would like the addition to disappear entirely from view.

Mr. Cluver stated that he considers the two-story properties along this block of Sansom Street as a related group of three, with a strong central figure and two flanking structures. He added that they all feel of a piece together and to place an addition on one would create a lopsided effect. He argued that an addition feels wrong on this one building, especially since it will be visible from the front. From the rear, he added, it will look like the addition ate the original building. Mr. Orphanides responded that the addition would not be visible from a public way and would only be visible from buildings that belong to the same homeowners association. Mr. Cluver admitted that the lack of rear visibility makes the addition more acceptable.

Mr. Tantillo asserted that the three-story building on the corner of Sansom and Van Pelt Streets creates a bookend for the four-building row. However, he stated he understood Mr. Cluver's concerns over the symmetry of the group of three related structures. Mr. Cluver replied that the addition throws off the balance and creates asymmetry. He argued that the block has such an intimate scale, despite the newer development along Walnut Street or the massing of the 2101 Cooperative. Mr. Orphanides suggested that the uniformity results from the simultaneous redevelopment of the properties and that while the window configuration may not change, the coloring may evolve over time, owing to individual owners. He contended that the current uniformity of the block may diminish over time. He then referred to the renderings in the application and stated that, in viewing the block as a whole, the buildings hold more presence than the small addition. He added that the modifications recommended by the Committee may make the addition less visible and asserted that Mr. Cluver's concern may be addressed if the addition has less impact. He acknowledged that the addition would be more difficult to disguise

if it were proposed at one of the neighboring buildings to the west. In its current location abutting the 2101 Cooperative, he contended, the addition's visual impact can be minimized.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that he finds the verticality, ceiling heights, scale of windows, and its depth to be problematic. He reiterated that the addition should be lowered and pulled back from the front façade to minimize the visibility. He also questioned whether the height of the addition's parapet could be reduced by setting back the roof deck.

Ms. Gutterman observed that the mechanical equipment on the building's existing roof would need to be relocated. She suggested pulling back the railing to provide space for those systems, assuming they would not be visible from the street.

Mr. Tantillo opined that eliminating the third-story parapet in addition to dropping the addition would have a substantial impact on visibility. Ms. Pentz responded that the Committee will need to review the revisions. Ms. Gutterman agreed that the applicant would need to resubmit the application for a second review by the Committee owing to the extent of changes suggested.

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

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

ADDRESS: 4044, 4046, 4048, AND 4050 MAIN ST

Proposal: Demolish buildings; retain façades; construct building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 4044 and 4046 Main St, Allegheny Distribution & Delivery

4048 Main St, 4048 Main LP

4050 Main St, Gary and Susan Gevurtz

Applicant: Rotciver Lebron, Harman Deutsch

History: 4044, 4046, and 4048 Main St, 1860

4050 Main St, 1850, Roxborough Mills/Fidelity Machine Works/Wilson ChildsWagon Works

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Manayunk Historic District, Contributing and Significant, 12/14/1983

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish most of the three rowhouses at 4044, 4046, and 4048 Main Street, leaving only a portion of the side façade of 4044 Main Street and the front facades of 4044 and 4046 Main Street intact. The building at 4048 Main Street would be demolished entirely, including the separate rear structure, to provide access to an interior parking area proposed to replace the ground level of the rowhouses. The mill building at 4050 Main Street would retain its exterior walls and the front slope of its gable roof. A multi-story addition is proposed to span the entire length of the site, with small setbacks at the north, east, and west facades. The proposed building would total four stories in height, and would be clad in light gray aluminum composite panels with anodized aluminum windows. The rear elevation, which faces the Schuylkill River, would feature balconies within the proposed addition, and several new openings would be punched through the existing second-story façade of the mill building. The staff contends that this application proposes a demolition, the destruction of a

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 26 SEPTEMBER 2017

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

building whole or in significant part, and is therefore prohibited by the preservation ordinance unless the Historical Commission finds that the buildings cannot be feasibly adaptively reused or that the demolition is necessary in the public interest. The application makes no reuse or public interest arguments.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, 10, and the prohibition against demolition, Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Henry Clinton and architects Jeff Watson and Craig Deutsch represented the application.

Mr. Clinton identified each property on an aerial photograph and explained that there are violations on 4044 and 4048 Main Street issued by the Department of Licenses & Inspections, which have been outstanding since November 2016. He noted that the violations were included in the application. The mill building, he continued, has been in the Gevurtz family since 1983 and has operated as a high-end furniture business, encompassing both the first and second floors. Mr. Clinton stated that Mr. Gevurtz would like to continue in the business but downsize. The application, he added, proposes commercial only on the first floor and residential on the second through fourth floors. He explained that the addition will contain a 22.5-foot setback from the Main Street façade, and claimed it will not be visible from Main Street. He then described the proposed plans for the rowhouses, which include the demolition of 4048 Main Street, currently subject to a Department of Licenses & Inspections violation, and the retention of the eastern and front façades of 4044 Main Street, as well as the retention of the front façade of 4046 Main Street. Mr. Clinton added that the demolished structure would become a drive aisle to access parking, which would consist of 27 parking spaces for the 42 proposed residential units. Of those 42 units, he continued, approximately 36 would be one-bedroom or one-bedroom with a den, and there would be parking behind the two retained rowhouse facades at 4044 and 4046 Main Street that would incorporate bicycle parking.

Ms. Gutterman asked whether the proposal calls for a “facademy” of the rowhouses. Mr. Clinton confirmed that 4044 and 4046 would maintain the eastern and front walls only.

Ms. Stein asked Mr. Clinton to review the street frontage for the Committee. Mr. Clinton stated that there is street frontage on Main Street at all four properties and that the frontage extends from 4044 Main Street to Shurs Lane. Ms. Stein inquired whether there would be access from Shurs Lane. Mr. Clinton answered that there would be no access from that street. Ms. Gutterman asked whether there is a small road at the rear of the property that extends off Shurs Lane. Mr. Clinton replied that there is no access, and Ms. Keller clarified that the properties back onto the Schuylkill River.

Mr. McCoubrey inquired about a street easement from Main Street to the river. Mr. Clinton replied that Shurs Lane does extend to the river, but that there is a concrete landing with no rear drive at the rear of the property.

Ms. Stein asked where the trash removal is located on the plans. Mr. Clinton answered that trash is removed through the front.

Mr. Cluver questioned the intent of the plans at 4048 Main Street, observing that the second floor is set back almost 30 feet from the front façade, but the façade at the third and fourth floors

is shown as flush with the two historic buildings. He then commented that in elevation all three buildings appear to be in the same plane. Mr. Watson responded that the intent at the second floor is to construct the new building behind the existing facades of the rowhouses. Mr. Cluver clarified that the plan would only apply to 4044 and 4046 Main Street and asked about the intent for 4048 Main Street. Mr. Watson stated that the building steps back. The Committee members asked for clarification on the setback and alignment of the buildings, and Mr. Watson clarified that the entire building steps back at the two end properties to align with the remainder of the new construction.

Ms. Gutterman observed that the two rowhouses are three-story buildings. Mr. Watson agreed and explained that the project maintains the facades of the two rowhouses and that the new construction would be located behind the facades. Ms. Gutterman confirmed that the plan would result in a “facademy.”

Mr. Cluver questioned why the project proposes to demolish 4044 and 4046 Main Street rather than incorporate them into the new building. Mr. Watson replied that there are many concerns associated with the existing structures. One, he noted, is the unsafe violation already issued to the property. Additionally, he continued, the properties are located in the floodplain and the goal with the proposed new construction is to prevent it from being situated in the floodplain owing to high insurance rates and restrictions for residential use. Ms. Gutterman agreed that residences could not be placed in the floodplain but countered that construction would be allowed. Mr. Watson responded that while construction is in the floodplain, none of the construction is interior or occupied. Any new interior or occupied construction would be located six feet above the baseline. Ms. Gutterman inquired about the existing retail, and Mr. Clinton replied that the retail will remain on the first floor. Ms. Gutterman stated that the retail space is in the floodplain.

Mr. McCoubrey mentioned the history of the site, noting that the front of 4050 Main Street consisted of the Wagon Works and that a second, parallel building existed behind. The new proposal, he added, straddles half of one building and the entirety of the other building. The Committee questioned whether there is a way to move the proposed construction off the front portion of 4050 Main Street by building behind the gable roof of the historic Wagon Works building. Ms. Stein argued that the construction should not simply be positioned behind the ridgeline but that it should be positioned behind the building entirely. Mr. Watson replied that he could consider the revision.

Ms. Stein addressed the demolition of the rowhouses that front on Main Street and questioned whether the complex could instead be accessed from Shurs Lane, behind the mill building. She added that from the site plan, it appears that it could be feasible. Mr. Watson answered that there is no easement on that side of the property. He explained that the dead end portion of Shurs Lane is a separate property. Ms. Stein then noted that the Shurs Lane side of the mill building would not qualify as street frontage.

Mr. Clinton stated that Ms. Stein’s recommendation for accessing the property was suggested at a community meeting where individuals asked that Shurs Lane be used for access to the rear of the property. He asserted that the plan would entail cutting into the building and removing the first-floor retail. He also noted a rear patio off the back of the building and that the grade drops steeply to the river from that point.

Mr. Cluver inquired whether the owner intends to maintain the retail aspect of the property, which is in nonconformance with the floodplain requirements. He also commented that the same is not proposed to maintain the residential portion. Mr. Clinton affirmed. Mr. Cluver asked if the current residences could retain their residential use. Mr. Clinton answered that there is a difference in height between the mill building and rowhouses, and there is concern that has been expressed by the community group and others over having residential space at the first floor. He added that he believes the community group is opposed to housing residential units at the second floor as well, though it remains more contentious at the first floor, owing to evacuation and first-responder issues. Those issues, he added, are why the plan does not incorporate residential use in the floodplain.

Mr. Cluver asked the staff if the Historical Commission has previously dealt with floodplain issues in Manayunk. Mr. Baron responded that there was discussion about having a basement window that opens to allow water to flow out of the building. He added that the window is designed for water evacuation in floodplains and that it has been proposed at one property.

Mr. Cluver observed that the applicant is making an argument for demolition, owing to floodplain issues. If the floodplain did not exist, he continued, it would be a different conversation. Ms. Gutterman stated that there are residences proposed for the second floor. She argued that only the first floor of the rowhouses could not have a residential use but that the floors above could. Mr. Watson responded that the second floor is situated above the floodplain. Ms. Gutterman replied that she understands, but the need to demolish one of the buildings and much of the other two is not really valid. She contended that the issue is not a question of whether the buildings need to be demolished owing to the floodplain. Mr. Watson stated that part of the reasoning for the proposed demolition of 4048 Main Street is the requirement from the community group wanting more parking. In order to provide additional parking for the property, he added, some modifications needed to be made and he believed the best approach was to demolish one rowhouse where additional space already existed from a gap between the rowhouse and mill building.

Mr. Clinton stated that the proposed demolition cannot be entirely attributed to the floodplain but is also resulting from the Department of Licenses & Inspections violations. Ms. Gutterman countered that the Department's violations can be corrected. Ms. Stein added that the application is proposing a multi-million dollar project. Mr. Clinton replied that he wants to make sure the answer to the need for demolition is fully amplified.

Ms. Gutterman questioned where trash pickup will be located for the multi-unit apartment building.

Ms. Stein observed that buildings currently encompass the entire property. The application, she continued, proposes to demolish buildings, while empty lots exist adjacent to the site. She inquired whether it is possible to purchase an adjacent lot or to obtain an easement from the property owners on either side of the site to allow access to the rear of the property. Mr. Clinton replied that the property owner has approached both neighbors multiple times, adding that Ms. Stein's question has also been asked by the community group.

Mr. Baron commented that the staff has met with the applicants several times and has suggested that the mass of the residential building be moved off the historic mill building. He then stated that the staff has suggested that all three rowhouses be retained and that entry be

made through the existing first story of 4048 Main Street without demolishing the structure. He contended that parking could be located on the ground floor, while the mass of the building could be retained and the upper stories used for residential units. He argued that it is not impossible to provide parking and parking access, while also retaining the buildings.

Mr. Cluver inquired whether parking access could be made through the existing loading gate of the mill building. The applicants did not respond.

Mr. Cluver asked whether the back half of the property is being retained. Mr. Watson answered that he is proposing to remove the roof of the rear portion of the building in order to build the addition. Ms. Gutterman questioned whether the plan requires the demolition of the masonry walls. Mr. Watson stated that it does not. Ms. Stein observed that the building does not align with the addition, and asked whether columns would be driven through the ridgeline of the historic building. Mr. Watson replied that additional columns may be necessary, but that as much of the existing structure would be utilized as possible.

Mr. McCoubrey opined that if the entire addition is set back and no structure penetrates the front building, then the front building would maintain its historic profile. It would be much less intrusive, he concluded, and would allow the historic Wagon Works to read as a building.

Ms. Pentz stated that with respect to the violations, the application proposes complete demolition of one of the three rowhouses. She read the demolition notes listed on the drawings for 4044 Main Street in which the façade and side wall will be braced to allow for the demolition of the structure behind the exterior walls. Ms. Pentz asked if that same strategy could be employed for 4048 Main Street. Mr. Watson replied that it could be considered, but what led to the proposal for complete demolition of 4048 Main Street was the Streets Department's width requirement for parking ingress and egress. The existing building, he continued, is not wide enough to be used as a pass-through.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the applicant's ability to reuse the existing loading dock of the mill building. Mr. Watson responded that the loading dock is connected to the commercial space and that the property owner would like to maintain the loading dock in its current capacity for deliveries. Ms. Gutterman countered that the design will need to provide space for residents to load and unload their possessions when they move in and out of the building. Mr. Clinton commented that the original concept was to place the entrances closer to the historic buildings, but, owing to the owner's experience with the building, it made more sense to move the entrance further west, closer to Shurs Lane. He explained that a tenant would access the building through a walkway with four or five steps that lead to the entrance.

Mr. McCoubrey opened the floor to public comment.

John Hunter of the Manayunk Neighborhood Council stated that the zoning committee has recently met with the applicant and that he is familiar with the proposal. Some of the council's concerns have already been raised by the Committee, he added. Mr. Hunter noted that the property is zoned ICMX, not residential, though he pointed out that the rowhouses at 4044, 4046, and 4048 previously served as residences. He explained that the Manayunk overlay has a height restriction of 38 feet and the floodplain is 8 feet above the sidewalk. He described multiple issues with the proposal, including the three-tier parking system, in which one of the tiers lies below existing grade and that it would be an automatic system. He noted that his

organization has had extensive conversations with this and other property owners about flooding, potential residential use, and the required evacuation strategy. In terms of historic preservation, he continued, 4050 Main Street is a significant building in the district and it is essential that the building not be unnecessarily modified. He expressed concern over the addition of two stories at the ridge of the roof, adding that the design results in internal bedrooms and other complex issues. He recommended that the addition be articulated and located to the rear of the significant building. He addressed the three existing rowhouses, noting that they are remnants of what were nine rowhouses, and asserted that the violation was issued to 4044 Main Street owing to a vertical crack between the façade and end wall. He explained that, at 4048 Main Street, the original house fronts on Main Street and behind it was an addition that extended to the river. He commented that the addition has fallen into total disrepair with walls being braced by steel beams. He stated that it would be understandable to demolish that addition, because it is unstable. Mr. Hunter also found it understandable that the applicant has chosen to penetrate the building in the chosen area, because it is the only area that can provide access wide enough to satisfy the Streets Department requirement. However, in doing so, he added, it creates a curb cut that exceeds the Streets Department requirements, because it results in a combination of the existing curb cut for the loading dock to the existing mill building in addition to the new curb cut. He urged the applicant to negotiate more strongly with the property owner of the Shurs Lane extension, who uses the property to place marquees for events and for tenant parking for a building that fronts on Main Street. He contended that the Shurs Lane property already has a parking and circulation use. In looking at the site plan, he continued, it is obvious that parking access should be positioned at either side of the proposed structure and that, should the building have a residential use, the parking be located toward the rear. Mr. Hunter then raised another issue regarding the building's commercial use at the first floor only and noted that the plans do not specify what that commercial use is. He asserted that it could be for maintaining the use of the existing store. However, he continued, the commercial space extends to the river and, with an eight-foot high floodplain calculation, he contended that it would not be an attractive space to lease when there is only one floor that offered no way to evacuate in case of a flood. He stated that the current store consists of two stories, so there is a possibility of moving some stock to the upper floor, provided there is advanced warning of a flood. He noted that in the future, that option will not exist and reiterated that the current development plan makes any commercial use less attractive. He then commented that his organization is trying to continue the commercial frontage on Main Street, adding that they are disappointed that several of the rowhouse facades would be retained with only bicycle parking behind them. He called the retention of the facades meaningless owing to the lack of commercial use behind. He remarked that his organization is not opposed to development at the rear of the property, but requested that it be done within the existing zoning constraints, meaning that the building not exceed the height limit, that residential units not be planned without an evacuation strategy, and that adequate parking be provided. He reiterated that the current proposal has many problems related to both Historical Commission and zoning requirements. He added that he hopes to discuss the proposal further.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, 10, and the prohibition against demolition, Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:57 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 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.