

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

**TUESDAY, 24 MARCH 2015
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP, chair
Nan Gutterman, FAIA
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

Jonathan E. Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Kim Broadbent, Historic Preservation Planner I
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner I

ALSO PRESENT

Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Stephen Maffei, Abitare Design
Logan Dry, Abitare Design
David Glancey
Bryan Hanes, Studio Bryan Hanes
Rebecca Jee Klein, Studio Bryan Hanes
Jessica Resinger, Joseph B. Callaghan, Inc.
Ke Feng, University of Pennsylvania Office of the University Architect
Daniel Sawron
Georgene Parks
Steve Cobb, Office of Councilman Johnson
Frank Esposito
Chris Yuan
Charles Peruto
José Hernandez, JKR Partners
Marissa McMurtrie, JKR Partners
Hercules Grigos, Esq.
Theresa Aldamlouji, Aldamlouji & Parker Architects

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 2309 MADISON SQ

Project: Legalize windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jack Wallace and Georgene Parks

Applicant: Georgene Parks

History: 1872; Charles Leslie, developer

Individual Designation: 9/28/1971

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of vinyl windows on the front façade of the house at 2309 Madison Square. The house had vinyl windows for many years before it was recently damaged by fire. The owners hired a contractor to repair the building after the fire. The homeowners' contract for the rehabilitation work stated that the contractor was responsible for obtaining all necessary permits and approvals. However, the contractor did not obtain permits and approvals, installed square-head vinyl windows in arched openings, and has refused to correct the illegal work. The contractor was paid with insurance proceeds following the fire. The owners claim that replacing the windows with the historically appropriate windows would create a financial hardship and have submitted documentation seeking an unnecessary hardship exemption.

When an application claims unnecessary hardship, the Rules & Regulations direct the staff to confidentially review tax and other records documenting the applicant's financial circumstances and then certify whether the applicant is eligible for an unnecessary hardship exemption. The Rules stipulate that the Architectural Committee "shall limit its review to design and refer the matter to the Commission."

The staff has reviewed documentation of the owners' income and extraordinary medical expenses and certifies that the owners qualify for an exemption under the unnecessary hardship provision. The staff also contends that the vinyl windows do not satisfy Standard 6 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE: The staff recommends that the vinyl windows do not satisfy Standard 6.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO THE HISTORICAL COMMISSION: The staff certifies that the owners qualify for an exemption under the unnecessary hardship provision and recommends legalization of the vinyl windows for the term of the current ownership, pursuant to Section 14-1105(6)(e)(.7) of the historic preservation ordinance.

Section 14-1105(6)(e)(.7)

In specific cases as will not be contrary to the public interest, where, owing to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the provisions of this Chapter 14-1000 would result in unnecessary hardship so that the spirit of this Chapter 14-1000 shall be observed and substantial justice done, subject to such terms and conditions as the Historical Commission may decide, the Historical Commission shall by a majority vote grant an exemption from the requirements of Chapter 14-1000.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Georgene Parks represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the Architectural Committee does not review the hardship documentation or offer a recommendation on that aspect of the application. The Architectural Committee should only address the architectural appropriateness of the windows. The Historical Commission will consider the hardship question.

Ms. Parks stated that she has surveyed the windows on Madison Square and found very few that are not vinyl windows. She stated that these windows were installed after the date of historic designation, and some were installed rather recently. Ms. Hawkins responded that some of these windows may have been installed illegally and that the staff can look into this matter; however, it will not impact a decision on this case because each case has to be reviewed according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. She noted that, if the Commission had reviewed the proposed window replacement before work started, there may have been ways to improve upon the vinyl windows, perhaps with vertical muntins.

Ben Leech, the Director of Advocacy of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, asked if the windows would simply be legalized if the Commission approves this application based on hardship, or whether the violation would remain to be enforced with the next owner. Ms. Parks stated that she hopes to pass down the property to her daughter. Mr. Baron explained that the staff recommendation suggests legalizing the windows during the ownership of this applicant.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend that the vinyl windows do not satisfy Standard 6.

ADDRESS: 2026 RITTENHOUSE SQ

Project: Construct rear addition

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: CFNV Charitable Real Estate

Applicant: A. Charles Peruto, Peruto Development, LLC

History: 1900

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to convert a former carriage house or garage into a residence. The applicant proposes building a two-story rooftop addition set back 40 feet from the front façade. Much of the roof would be demolished for this addition as well as a sunken deck, which would sit back 16 feet 3 inches from the front façade. The applicant proposes to retain the front 16 feet of the roof structure, which would hide the addition and deck.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in concept, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Real estate developer Charles Peruto represented the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 MARCH 2015

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Mr. Peruto explained that he drew the plans accompanying this in-concept application, but will hire an architect to prepare real architectural drawings for the final review.

Ms. Hawkins raised concerns about the accuracy of the floor levels as drawn. Ms. Gutterman asked if the addition would be visible from Spruce Street. Mr. Peruto responded that the addition would be inconspicuous, if not entirely invisible, from Spruce Street. All of the Committee members stressed the importance of an actual mock-up to accurately determine the visibility of the proposed addition from the public right-of-way. Ms. Hawkins explained that the addition may need to be pulled back from the street façade if the mock-up shows that the addition will be conspicuous. Ms. Stein asked about plans for the front façade. Mr. Peruto responded that he intends to reconstruct the second-floor doors, install a safety railing, and possibly restore the masonry arch of the carriage door. He stated that he intends to retain a garage function.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept, provided that mock-ups of the addition and deck railing demonstrate that they will be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guideline.

ADDRESS: 418 AND 420 WOOD ST

Project: Demolish non-historic rear, rehabilitate and add to building, construct building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: William Nadu

Applicant: Logan Dry, Abitare Design Studio

History: 1750; third floor added, c. 1855

Individual Designation: None

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 modify a building that has been altered several times. The original c. 1750 house had its roof and dormer removed and an Italianate third floor and cornice added about 1855. In the twentieth century, a large garage door was inserted in the front facade and large workshop addition constructed at the rear. The adjacent building at 420 Wood was demolished for the construction of the 5th Street underpass under the Ben Franklin Bridge and the lot on which it stood was narrowed to a sliver. This application proposes to demolish the one-story rear structure and construct additions on the historic building and a house at the rear. An addition to the historic building would be constructed on the sliver of a lot and a mansard fourth story with roof deck would be constructed on the historic building. The garage opening in the historic building would be reconfigured.

A four-story structure in a contemporary style would be constructed along 5th Street, behind the historic building. The Commission enjoys full jurisdiction over this new construction because the site is not considered undeveloped; the non-historic rear addition to the historic building stood on the site. The new house would be differentiated from the old, but would be compatible in massing and rhythm of openings. It would have its own identity, which is appropriate for a building that is neither an addition nor part of a row or intact streetscape.

The Architectural Committee reviewed an earlier iteration of this project in January 2015 and recommended denial but offered numerous suggestions. The architects have modified the design to incorporate many of the suggestions. The mansard on the old structure has been modified to become a true wrap-around mansard with a lower height. Documentation showing many examples of mansards in Old City, mansards over a bracketed wood cornices, and mansard additions approved by the Commission have been provided as justification for this design. The old structure and its addition would now be linked by a glass structure rather than a metal beam as proposed and rejected during the earlier review. The addition has been simplified to be more modern. The new house at the rear of the lot is shown in two variations, both of which are more closely tied to the architecture of the addition.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Stephen Maffei and Logan Dry represented the application.

Mr. Baron noted that Mr. Maffei presented an earlier version of this project to the Committee in January of 2015, and has attempted to incorporate many of the comments he received at that time into this current design.

Ms. Stein opined that a mansard addition is not appropriate in the Old City Historic District. Mr. Dry directed the Committee's attention to three photographs in the application showing mansards in Old City. Mr. Baron explained that a photograph of the Union League is included to address Mr. Cluver's concern from the January 2015 Committee review regarding the appropriateness of combining a mansard with a bracketed cornice. Ms. Hawkins commented that the Union League is a high-style building and the subject property is vernacular. Mr. Baron showed the Committee a photograph of a vernacular building with a mansard over a bracketed cornice located in Old City, but Ms. Stein dismissed it as an anomaly. Mr. Dry explained that they are utilizing a mansard as a way of minimizing the massing and achieving an additional floor without altering the position of the existing historic cornice. He stated that they explored the option of a setback addition, but because of the high visibility of the corner location, they had not found a location where the addition could be inconspicuous and had therefore worked with the staff to develop a design that is compatible with the architecture of the historic building.

Ms. Gutterman addressed three concerns regarding the design. She opined that the cresting looks like a fence rather than ornamental cresting, an interior wall would not allow light into the glass link between the new and old structure, and the new building is too tall for Old City, especially with a railing on top of it. Mr. Dry responded that the cresting serves to hide the setback deck but they can remove the cresting. Ms. Hawkins commented that the cresting is not helping the design. Mr. Dry stated that they can open up the wall behind the glass and let it serve as a window. Mr. Baron pointed out two nearby buildings of much greater height in the photographs of the existing building. Ms. Hawkins opined that the height of the windows is out of scale for the new building, which is contributing to problems of proportion. Mr. Dry responded that they can explore lowering the ceiling heights of the new building to make them more in proportion with the historic building.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the garage on the new structure is permissible by right. Mr. Maffei responded that they may need to apply for a zoning variance. Ms. Hawkins voiced her opposition to the addition of garages in the city. Mr. Maffei commented that he understands the

visual impact of a garage, but added that there is no street parking on that side of North 5th Street.

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor to public comment. Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia commented that this project was reviewed by the Preservation Alliance's Advocacy Committee. The Advocacy Committee thought that the concept was acceptable but did not like the vocabulary of the addition. David Glancey, a neighbor at 316 Lawrence Street, commented that he wishes to speak to the architects regarding the design but that he has no comment for the Committee at this time.

Ms. Stein suggested a motion of denial of the fourth-floor addition on 418 Wood Street because the mansard is inappropriate as an architectural expression for this particular building, and approval of the rear addition with the changes as discussed including lowering the roof height, pulling the railing back from the street façade, and eliminating the garage door on the new addition. Ms. Hawkins clarified that the rear addition is in fact a separate building; it is a separate townhouse, not an addition. Ms. Gutterman stated that she would second the motion, which garnered unanimous support from the Committee.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the fourth-floor addition on 418 Wood Street; approval of the new building provided the height is reduced, the railing is pulled back, and the garage on N. 5th Street is eliminated, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 10-18 CALLOWHILL ST

Project: Demolish non-contributing building, construct 5 townhouses

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: National Realty Investment Advisors

Applicant: Paul Knepley, JKR Partners

History: 1960; fruit and vegetable warehouse

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a one-story, non-contributing building and to construct five four-story, single-family dwellings, one single family residence fronting on Callowhill Street and four townhouses facing Water Street. Given that a structure occupied this location at the time of designation, the Commission has full jurisdiction over this project. The proposed stand-alone building facing Callowhill Street features a front-loading garage, recessed entry, and is clad in brick, wood siding, and grey vertical metal paneling. The Callowhill side elevation of the northernmost Water Street townhouse features a beige metal paneled bay window with wood siding between the windows, dark grey fiber cement panels, vertical grey metal panels, and red brick veneers. The townhouses fronting on Water Street also feature front-loading garages and recessed entries.

It should be noted that the proposed development is part of a larger block that holds high archaeological potential. That potential may be slimmer for this particular location, as historic maps indicate that the majority of the proposed construction area once featured masonry

buildings which covered all but a small portion of the southeastern edge of the site, and likely disturbed any archaeological materials.

The staff contends that although the proposed design would be incompatible in the heart of the Old City Historic District, given its location at the edge of the district and its proximity to large scale development along the waterfront, the proposed construction is acceptable for its site.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect José Hernandez, project coordinator Marissa McMurtrie, and attorney Hercules Grigos represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked Ms. DiPasquale if she had explored the zoning regulations regarding garage doors, and Ms. DiPasquale responded that she did, but is not a zoning planner, and thus did not feel fully qualified to make interpretations of the zoning regulations. Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Hernandez whether front-loading garages are allowed at this location by right. Mr. Grigos responded that the property is zoned CMX-3, and that garages are permitted as of right. However, he continued, since the property is in the Central Delaware Overlay District, any above-ground garages must be approved by the Planning Commission. Mr. Grigos noted that the Central Delaware overlay is for larger-scale development, and that they had met with the Planning Commission, who had agreed to grant a waiver for these garages. Ms. Hawkins responded that the Architectural Committee of the Historical Commission reviews projects for their architectural merits, independently of other departments' approvals or considerations.

Ms. Hawkins commented that she never ever wants see a front-loading garage anywhere on a walkable street in Philadelphia. She noted that she is familiar with the location of this property, and that one of the fabulous things about the site is that nearby sites will be developed in the near future. She stated that she hopes that the pedestrian traffic in this area increases.

Ms. Stein asked if the applicant had considered a more durable material at the base of the building, noting that there are portions of the base that would be clad in metal panels; she suggested that the base should be brick or masonry of some kind. Mr. Hernandez noted that there will be a low masonry watertable at the base of the building, and that the metal and fiber cement would come down and rest on that base. They had considered, he noted, whether the watertable should be higher along Callowhill Street, but had decided against it in order to maintain the strong line from Water Street. The only area of concern, he commented, would be one side of the building on Callowhill Street, which is tight to the property line. Ms. Stein asked whether the proposed elevation facing Delaware Avenue would be clad in metal, and Mr. Hernandez confirmed that it would.

Ms. Hawkins asked whether the applicant was proposing a full-scale brick or a brick veneer and Mr. Hernandez confirmed that they are proposing a full-scale brick.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the material of the roof deck railing and where the mechanical equipment would be located. Mr. Hernandez responded that the parapet wall would extend 42 inches in height from the proposed roof deck, and that the railing would be set back five feet from the street edge. Ms. Hawkins asked why the applicant needed a secondary railing, and Mr. Hernandez responded that the railing was a code requirement for occupied space. The

mechanical units, he noted, would be placed on roof on the east side of the stair tower on the smaller side of the roof deck. Ms. Hawkins asked whether all of the mechanical equipment would be lower than the parapet height, and Mr. Hernandez confirmed that it would.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the proposed material for the pilothouse. Mr. Hernandez responded that they are currently proposing stucco. Ms. Hawkins asked whether it would be real stucco or EIFS, and Mr. Hernandez responded that it is acrylic, or EIFS. Ms. Hawkins asked whether EIFS would be used anywhere else on the building, and Mr. Hernandez responded that they were not, but would be using metal, brick, and fiber cement. Ms. Hawkins and Ms. Gutterman noted that the EIFS seemed like an unnecessary addition to an already broad palette of materials and colors. Mr. Hernandez responded that the color of the EIFS would be similar to a color used on the lower portion of the building.

Ms. Stein noted that the parapet walls seem tall. Mr. Hernandez responded that they had struggled with whether to have a low parapet with a translucent railing system above, but had decided on a taller parapet to hide the roof decks behind. Ms. Gutterman asked whether the parapet would have a metal cap, and Mr. Hernandez responded that it would, and that the cap would match the metal panels.

Ms. Hernandez noted that the project probably seems to stand out, but opined that the context is unique, and that there are many types of buildings nearby. He noted that the majority of the base is stone, and that the proposed construction is masonry for most of the Water Street elevation, while they took advantage of the corner location with the use of a bay to give presence at the corner.

Ms. Stein pointed to a line on the drawings at the top of the bricks and asked whether it was flashing. Mr. Hernandez responded that it was a band of stone to match the stone at the base. Ms. Hawkins asked if there was the possibility to relocate the garages to the rears of the buildings. Mr. Hernandez responded that they would have to reduce the sizes of the homes considerably in order to relocate the parking to the rears. Mr. Grigos commented that front-loaded garages is the only parking solution. Mr. Hernandez noted that the triangular wedge shown on the site plan is not included in the parcel, so it would be impossible to turn into two of the units.

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor to public comment. Ben Leech, the Director of Advocacy of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, commented that, unlike several of the other projects later in the agenda, the Historical Commission has full jurisdiction over this particular development. He noted that the Commission has reviewed many similar projects and lamented that it was limited to Review and Comment jurisdiction. With this project, the Commission has full jurisdiction and should exercise it. He seconded Ms. Hawkins comment that front-loading garages are inappropriate on the street level on both Water Street and Callowhill Street, and that a design that reduced the number of vehicular openings on both elevations would be much more appropriate.

John Scorsone of the Central Delaware Advocacy Group and the River's Edge Civic Association noted that this is the first time he has seen the proposed project. He reiterated Mr. Leech's sentiments, noting that the preferred solution would be an active street front, and commenting that these townhouses should be fronting on Callowhill Street, perhaps with access to below-ground garages. He noted that the main difficulty seemed to be with parking for one of the

townhouses, and that perhaps the development should be limited to four townhouses rather than five, which would alleviate some of the complications with parking. He further commented that he hoped that the applicants would present their project to the Central Delaware Advocacy Group (CDAG), the registered civic organization for the area, for its approval as well.

Ms. Gutterman made the following recommendations for improvements to the project: eliminate the front-loading garages on Callowhill and Water Streets; reconsider of the proportions of the parapet wall; reconsider of the materials of the pilothouses, with the suggestion that they be clad in a material used elsewhere on the building, such as fiber cement; study of the relationship of the metal panels to the street with regard to its durability, and the possibility of increasing the height of the stone base.

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

ADDRESS: 120-24 RACE ST

Project: Construct 10 townhouses

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: National Investors

Applicant: Jose Hernandez, JKR Partners

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct ten, four-story, single-family townhouses on a currently vacant lot. The Commission's jurisdiction is limited to Review and Comment. The first floors of the proposed townhouses would be clad in brick, while the upper floors would be clad in beige metal and grey stucco panels, and would feature dark grey metal bay windows. The roof level would feature roof decks with pilot house access. Nine of the proposed townhouses would face N. Front Street, and be accessed through recessed front entries. Rear garages would be accessed via a shared drive connecting to Race Street. The proposed rear drive would extend behind the townhouses from Race to Quarry Street. One townhouse would be freestanding and would face Quarry Street.

It should be noted that construction has already begun on these properties, as a permit was issued in error by the Department of Licenses & Inspections without the Historical Commission's review. Despite that, the applicant has chosen to submit for review and comment.

STAFF COMMENT: The staff comments that the proposed new construction is compatible with the Old City Historic District in terms of materials, scale and proportion, and massing.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect José Hernandez and attorney Hercules Grigos represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked for clarifications on the materials. Mr. Hernandez explained that the creamy panel she was describing is a ribbed metal panel. Mr. Hernandez noted that they thought it was appropriate to use the brick at the entire base to maintain a pedestrian nature on the street.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 MARCH 2015

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Given the height of the buildings and the brick wall across Front Street along the edge of the highway, they opted for lighter colors on the upper floors to create a lighter feeling.

Ms. Hawkins asked whether the mechanical equipment would be located behind the parapet wall. Mr. Hernandez confirmed that they would not be visible from the street.

Ms. Stein commented that the proposed design needed more brick on the upper floors in order to be in character with the three and four-story rowhomes in the Old City Historic District. Mr. Hernandez responded that it may appear more consistent in an elevation drawing to have the brick carried through to the upper floors, but noted that, given how they are staggered along the street, carrying the brick to the upper floors would actually require significant structural modifications to the design. Ms. Gutterman noted that a compromise may be to use a darker color similar to that of the brick rather than the beige color currently proposed.

Ms. Hawkins noted that there should be some additional relief along the Front Street elevation of the corner unit, even if that relief is just an enlarged window opening. She noted that, given the size of the proposed panels, the tiny windows did not seem appropriate. Ms. Hawkins commented that, even if it is not desirable to have visibility through an enlarged window opening at that location, a translucent glazed panel might be appropriate.

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor to public comment. Ben Leech, the Director of Advocacy of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia, asked whether there had been any investigation into the cause of the Department of Licenses & Inspections error, and noted that it was troubling that the application had gotten to the point of construction without review by the Historical Commission. Ms. DiPasquale responded that she was unsure of the exact cause of the error, but noted that Dr. Farnham was looking into the situation. Mr. Hernandez commented that the Department had subsequently changed its protocols.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented that the applicant should explore: maintaining darker color panel along Front Street elevation to a three-story height in lieu of the champagne-colored ribbed panel, and the possibility of carrying that around to the façade on Race Street; adjusting the window proportions at the corner building from the currently proposed narrow ribbon window to the full height of the panel; and ensuring that the mechanical equipment is not visible from the street.

ADDRESS: 151-59 N 02ND ST

Project: Construct 7 townhouses

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Phil McFillin

Applicant: Nichole Howell, JKR Partners

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct seven single-family townhomes on a vacant lot. The Commission's jurisdiction is limited to Review and Comment. The proposed townhomes would be accessed from a shared drive running off N. 2nd Street. The N. 2nd Street elevation is divided into three visual masses. The elevation of the northernmost mass is three stories in height and features a stone base and two narrow, vertical windows. The upper floors are composed of light brown fiber cement panels with narrow windows on the second floor and square windows on the third floor, with red fiber cement accents between the two.

The central mass is four stories in height and features a ground floor entry and three windows of varying widths. The upper floors are clad in brick, and have punched window openings. A black metal cornice tops the building.

The southern building is four stories in height and features a stone base with a vehicle entry portal to the townhomes behind. The second and third floors are clad in brick and feature an off-center dark grey metal bay window. The fourth floor is clad in light brown fiber cement paneling, with three punched windows.

The interior court, which is accessed from N. 2nd Street, features five townhomes. The ground floor of each townhome is clad in stone, and features a garage and entry door. The upper floors are clad in brick and fiber cement panels. Each townhome features a metal bay window and at second and third floors.

STAFF COMMENT: The staff comments that the proposed new construction is compatible with the Old City Historic District in scale and massing, materials, and features, but notes that the windows on the northernmost building should be widened to be more in keeping with the rhythm of the neighboring buildings.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect José Hernandez and attorney Hercules Grigos represented the application.

Mr. Hernandez noted that they took their cues for this construction from the many different styles, proportions of buildings, and materials on 2nd Street. The idea, he noted, was to utilize a carriage entrance to the garages of the townhouses behind, while maintaining a strong base along 2nd Street. The window sizes for the main building are punched openings consistent with other properties in the area, while the narrow windows on the northernmost building are intentionally small.

Ms. Stein commented that the drive-through entrance works out well, because the garage doors are concealed from view.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 MARCH 2015

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Ms. Stein asked about the precedent for the base of the building. She mentioned that JKR Partners was completing a project on Bank Street that is successful because it mirrored some of the marble pilaster articulation common in Old City. However, she noted that this project has large stone panels that could use another layer of finesse to provide more articulation to the base, perhaps to resemble the pilasters found on many Old City storefronts. Ms. Stein noted that the height of the windows and how far they come down should resemble the fabric of Old City. Ms. Hawkins added that the first floor could also benefit from the addition of a base, perhaps in a similar material, that grounds it and may establish the window heights or the floor height for the first-floor door.

Ms. Hawkins opined that the use of Hardie-board at the second and third-floor levels of the northernmost building is inconsistent with the Old City Historic District. She commented that she appreciated the contrast between the upper floors and the base, and that it may be appropriate for higher floors, but not for a three-story proportioned building. She suggested that the Hardie-board could perhaps be changed to a different color of brick in the same palette.

Ms. Stein commented that the narrow windows on the northernmost building were also inconsistent with the district, and should be widened. Ms. Gutterman agreed. Mr. Hernandez responded that they could consider those recommendations. Ms. Hawkins further noted that brick could provide additional scale not present in the large fiber cement panels or boards. Mr. Hernandez commented that the scale of the buildings along the block varies greatly, and the idea behind the proposed design was to continue that variety.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the relationship of the fourth-floor fiber cement façade on the southern building to the adjacent brick wall of the center building. Mr. Hernandez responded that the fiber cement façade is set back approximately one foot from the brick façade. Ms. Hawkins and Ms. Gutterman commented that that relationship should be reevaluated to create some sort of relief, perhaps by lowering the roof height or increasing the setback of the fourth floor of the southern building.

Ms. Stein asked whether there would be a fence across the driveway opening, and Mr. Hernandez responded that there would not be.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented that the proposed design is generally compatible with the Old City Historic District, but asked the applicant consider: dividing the stone base to create a more articulated base with a field area above; reevaluating the design and proportions of the windows on the northern building; replacing the Hardie-board for upper floors of northern building with a more compatible material such as brick; and reevaluating the relationship of fourth floor of southern building to brick of center building to create relief of the height such as through the use of a cornice.

ADDRESS: 117-31 QUARRY ST

Project: Construct 10 townhouses

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: Phil McFillin

Applicant: Nichole Howell, JKR Partners

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct ten townhouses on a currently vacant lot. The Commission's jurisdiction is limited to Review and Comment. The proposed townhouses would be constructed in two sets of five, facing inward towards a driveway accessed through a curb cut off of Quarry Street. The ground floor of each unit would be clad in brick and feature a garage and entry door. The upper floors would be clad in dark grey and beige metal panels, green fiber cement panels, and grey stucco. The first floor level facing Quarry Street would be clad in brick, with high, horizontal windows flanking the driveway, and two punched openings at the far ends of the proposed construction.

STAFF COMMENT: The staff comments that the proposed new construction is incompatible with the Old City Historic District in scale, massing, materials, and features.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect José Hernandez and attorney Hercules Grigos represented the application.

Ms. DiPasquale distributed a letter from a neighbor who was unable to attend the meeting. Mr. Hernandez noted that they attempted to include brick at the base of the building, as well as on portions of the buildings on the internal drive. He noted that, given the proximity of properties across Quarry Street, they wanted to use a lighter material on the upper floors. He noted that the proposed buildings are actually set back five feet from the property line in order to maintain the same sidewalk width as that along the side of Fireman's Hall at the corner of 2nd and Quarry Street. The sidewalk on the city plan, Mr. Grigos noted, is one and one half feet in width.

Ms. Stein opined that her primary concern with the proposed design is that it does not contribute any street life to Quarry Street. Mr. Hernandez responded that the majority of the properties on the other side of the street feature front-loading garages. Ms. Stein noted that, despite the garages, the adjacent properties also have front doors, and asked whether it would be possible to modify the end units so that they turn towards the street. She commented that rowhomes with side entrances are common in the city, and make a beautiful plan. She opined that front doors and windows on Quarry Street that give the sense that the properties are occupied would be much more compatible with the Old City Historic District. She further noted that it might make the units more salable as well.

Mr. McCoubrey questioned whether the grey material shown on the upper floors is a bay, and Mr. Hernandez responded that it is an ornamental bay that projects approximately one foot, but is not occupied space. Mr. Hernandez noted that the bays within the courtyard are of a similar configuration. Ms. Gutterman questioned material locations, and Mr. Hernandez commented that they felt it was better to wrap the material around the corner to create a volume for the bay

rather than a plane. Ms. Hawkins commented that the corner units may be an opportunity to create a more three-dimensional treatment.

Ms. Hawkins asked whether it was possible to pull the pilothouse back from the Quarry Street elevation so that it did not extend up directly from the façade. Mr. Hernandez responded that they needed to revisit that element, as the internal configuration was driving the current proposed design. Ms. Hawkins replied that, if the end units were treated differently, as previously recommended, the treatment may give them the opportunity to address the pilothouse issue. She noted that the relocation of the entrance to Quarry Street, and thus the relocation of the stair, could help alleviate the current odd condition.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that the dark grey material seems dark, and that there are five different colors used on the building, and no windows into the stairs.

Ms. Hawkins commented that reconsidering the end units as their own entities would release the architect from having to maintain every aspect of the building to be consistent with those on the internal drive.

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor to public comment, but there was none.

Mr. McCoubrey concurred with the staff comment, with the additional comments that the Quarry Street elevation should be reconsidered both for friendliness on the street with more openings, and that the end units should be treated differently. Ms. Hawkins amended to suggest that the rear elevation of the rear volume of the mass be treated as an elevation that wraps the corner.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee concurred with the staff comment that the proposed new construction is incompatible with the Old City Historic District in scale, massing, materials, and features.

ADDRESS: 1631-37 ARCH ST

Project: Remove windows, install louvers

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Bell Telephone Co. of PA

Applicant: Theresa Aldamlouji, Aldamlouji & Parker Architects

History: 1915; Bell Telephone Building; John Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: 12/12/2008

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install louvers in four windows on the 12th floor of the building, three on the (east) 16th Street elevation, and one on the (south) Arch Street elevation. The current application proposes to retain the window frames, but to remove the sash, which the firm of O'Donnell & Naccarato has confirmed are galvanized steel. The building is currently used to house telecommunications equipment for Verizon.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that the muntin system is retained or recreated, with the louvers installed behind, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Theresa Aldamlouji represented the application.

Ms. Aldamlouji commented that they were willing to remove the window and retain it on site for potential reinstallation at a later date as the staff had recommended. Ms. DiPasquale explained that Ms. Aldamlouji was misunderstanding the staff recommendation. Ms. Aldamlouji presented photographs of existing louvers present on the building, and noted that she was not sure how to install the louvers behind the windows. Ms. Gutterman responded that it was possible, and that the louvers would just be set back about three inches from the window. The glazing would be removed from the sash, the sash would be fixed, and the louvers would be installed behind.

Ms. Gutterman asked if any of the proposed replacements are replacement of louvers. Ms. Aldamlouji responded in the negative; four new sets of louvers would be installed. The masonry opening and wood frame would be retained, she noted. Ms. Hawkins responded that, if they are retaining the wood frame, then the wood sash can also be retained, without the glazing, which creates a negligible loss in the amount of free air.

Ms. DiPasquale asked Ms. Aldamlouji whether she believed the windows are metal, and Ms. Aldamlouji responded in the affirmative; she explained that she believes they are, based on a note from a 2011 field survey that reads “scrape and paint metal window and spandrel, typ. each elevation.” Ms. Hawkins and Ms. Gutterman expressed doubt that the windows are metal. Ms. Aldamlouji agreed that they look like they are wood, but that at a recent project at 900 Race Street, she had been surprised that windows she thought were wood were metal. Ms. Hawkins suggested that she get clarification before the Commission meeting.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that the louver color should be dark. Ms. Aldamlouji responded that they have been painting the louvers the same color as the window frame that they retain. Ms. Gutterman replied that now that they are setting the louvers back, they should be painted dark grey.

Ms. Stein noted that she had never done that kind of detail herself, and asked Ms. Gutterman whether the applicant would have to flash under the sash. Ms. Gutterman responded that the applicant could build up the bottom of the louver so it aligns with the bottom of the glazing and weeps out over the sash, or that they could raise the lower sash an inch, and flash louver under the sash and on top of the sill, while ensuring that the sill of the louver is high enough to allow the water out.

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the frame, sash and muntin system are retained or recreated, with the louvers installed behind and painted a dark color, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 9.

ADDRESS: 1921 WALNUT ST

Project: Remove gate, install roll-up door

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 19 Walnut Assoc LLC

Applicant: Frank Esposito, Frank Esposito Construction Co.

History: 1897; McKean-Moore House; Cope & Stewardson, architect

Individual Designation: 11/4/1982

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace a non-historic black metal swing gate with an automatic overhead mesh metal roll up gate. The application also proposed to replace an existing pedestrian gate with a new decorative metal gate.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Contractor Frank Esposito and owner Chris Yuan represented the application.

Mr. Esposito described the project, noting that there are currently two swing gates and a personnel gate, which they wish to replace with a roll-up mesh gate. Ms. Gutterman asked if the roll-up gate would be 23 feet wide, and Mr. Esposito confirmed that it would.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the size of the housing, and where it would sit in relationship to the existing brick pier. Mr. Esposito responded that it would sit 10 feet high, and be supported on independent steel posts. One steel post would sit adjacent to the existing eight-foot high brick pier. The housing for the gate would be approximately 18 inches in height. The proposed pedestrian gate would be 7 feet tall.

Ms. Gutterman asked what was on the other side of the pedestrian gate, and Mr. Esposito responded that it is a shared brick garden wall with a small return for the gate. Ms. Hawkins asked whether the existing gate width would remain, and Mr. Esposito responded that it would.

Ms. Hawkins asked why the applicant was going from a swinging gate to a roll-up gate, and Mr. Esposito responded that the roll-up gate would be automatic. Ms. Hawkins and Ms. Gutterman replied that any gate can be made automatic, including swing gates. Mr. Esposito commented that the existing gate is in poor condition. Ms. Hawkins clarified that she was not suggesting that the gate did not need to be replaced, but that a swinging gate can be made automatic.

Ms. Gutterman noted that 23 feet is a very wide span for a single gate, and that the applicant would likely end up with two, eleven-foot gates with an intermediate post, unless there was substantial bracing or sizable housing. Mr. Esposito noted that he had installed that sort of free-standing gate before.

Ms. Stein asked what sort of character Moravian Street has, and noted that it is in the Rittenhouse Fidler District, and thus is in a highly pedestrian area. Ms. DiPasquale responded that the property is highly visible from Sansom Street as well as 20th Street, as there is a large surface parking lot immediately to the north. Ms. DiPasquale showed the block on Google Streetview.

Ms. Hawkins commented that her concern with the gate as proposed is that it has the effect of deadening street life as opposed to creating it. She opined that a simple, mechanized swinging gate similar to what is there currently is more appropriate than the proposed roll-up gate.

Ms. Gutterman noted that the pedestrian gate should also be kept simple, and that the proposed gate is too ornamental. Ms. Hawkins concurred, noting that the scroll work is too stylish for a secondary elevation. Mr. Esposito noted that they may be able to repair the pedestrian gate.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that, if the applicant did not need the full width of the opening, then they could potentially use a sliding gate. Ms. Hawkins noted that they could add an intermediate brick pier, creating two separate openings, or one fixed panel and one opening to provide a variety of options for operation. Mr. Yuan responded that having two openings, or one fixed opening, would be difficult because of the necessary turning radius.

Ms. Hawkins 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.

ADDRESS: 3220-60 SOUTH ST

Project: Install ADA ramp, lower grade and alter wall

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Trustees, University of Pennsylvania

Applicant: Richard Russell, University of Pennsylvania

History: 1899; Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, UPenn; Wilson Eyre, Frank Miles Day, Cope & Stewardson, architects

Individual Designation: 2/28/1961

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes repair and alterations to site walls along 33rd and South Streets at the University of Pennsylvania's Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology. Along South Street, an ADA ramp would be installed to convey people from the public sidewalk along the street up about eight feet to the garden level. The installation of the ramp would require the removal of two small sections of existing walls. In addition to the construction of the ramp, the work along South Street would include the cleaning and pointing of various brick site walls.

The application also proposes to alter the area adjacent to the museum along 33rd Street to bring more light into the lower level of the building. A garden to the west of the museum building was removed and the area regraded about 1958, when 33rd Street was continued south of South Street. A non-historic platform with brick site walls, where a statue of Provost Smith stood after the 1958 reconfiguration of the area until the statue was relocated to Smith Walk in the 1970s, would be removed. The land between 33rd Street and the building would be regraded and a site wall creating wells around windows would be altered. The area would be replanted and the sidewalk along 33rd Street replaced.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review masonry cleaning and pointing samples, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Accessibility Guideline.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 MARCH 2015

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Landscape architect Bryan Hanes, architect Rebecca Jee Klein, engineer and project manager Jessica Resinger, and University of Pennsylvania senior architect Ke Feng represented the application.

Mr. Feng stated that there is currently an ADA entrance on the east side of the museum, but it is quite a distance away from the main entrance. Ms. Gutterman asked if other options were explored for ADA access. Mr. Hanes responded that his studio studied various options, and that the original proposal was for a ramp that would start on 33rd Street and run along the side of the building. They decided on the current proposal in part because it meets the intent of the ADA code, so that all users of the building are entering at the same location.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the material of the ramp. Mr. Hanes responded that the ramp will be brick to match the existing walkways. Ms. Gutterman commented that brick is extremely slippery when wet and icy, has a tendency to freeze, and therefore may not be the best material for a ramp.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the visibility and design of the railing. Mr. Hanes responded that it will be black painted steel, with intermediate posts at approximately every eight feet, with no pickets. He confirmed there is a need for some type of guard near the wall. Ms. Hawkins asked that this information be included in the drawings that will be reviewed by the Historical Commission. Ms. Stein asked if a bottom rail is required by code. Mr. Hanes confirmed that a bottom rail will be required in one section.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the depth of brick where the grade change is proposed on the west side of the building. Ms. Resinger confirmed that the brick does go down to the foundation, and they will not be excavating down that far.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the applicant submits information about the ramp railing, with the staff to review masonry cleaning and pointing samples, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Accessibility Guideline.

ADDRESS: 219 CARPENTER ST

Project: Demolish rear of the building, construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Christine Leszuk & Estate of Frank Piotrowski

Applicant: Daniel Sawron

History: 1845

Individual Designation: 5/31/1966

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate the three-story brick rowhouse at 219 Carpenter Street, which backs up to Hall Street.

The application proposes restoration work to the front façade, including window, door and lintel replacement, and cornice repair or replacement. There is a lack of information and inconsistencies between the drawings and the notes regarding this work, however the staff has been in contact with the applicant and will work with him to ensure that the restoration satisfies the Standards.

The application proposes to demolish the northwest corner and rear wall of the main block of the rowhouse. A deck would be constructed on the rear ell, accessed through a new door in the third-floor rear wall of the main block. A nine-foot section of the rear of the rear ell would be demolished and a new rear wall of the rear ell constructed to make room for parking in the rear yard. The cover letter states that the “entire rear of home to be stuccoed.”

A concrete block wall at the rear of the property along Hall Street would be demolished and a gate for parking installed. The initial staff recommendation was for denial, owing to incompleteness. The applicant has just now provided updated drawings that address some aspects of the project that were initially lacking in information.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, owing to incompleteness, pursuant to Section 6.7 of the Historical Commission’s Rules & Regulations.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Equitable owner Daniel Sawron represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked for a clarification of the scope of work for the front façade. Mr. Sawron responded that the front façade restoration includes new wood windows, a new six-panel door, new stone lintels, restoration of the cornice, and paint removal from the stone base. Ms. Hawkins commented that the new basement windows should have several divisions instead of single lites, and she asked about the discrepancy between the window schedule specifying casement windows whereas the window drawings show double-hung windows. Mr. Sawron clarified that he will install double-hung windows, with wood for the front façade and aluminum clad for the side and rear façades. Mr. Baron asked about the door frame. Mr. Sawron responded that he will retain the existing door frame if it is in good condition. Ms. Hawkins commented that the transom above the door should be retained, and noted that the building originally had shutters, but the applicant is not obligated to install new shutters. Mr. Sawron responded that he will consider the addition of shutters. He also commented that the existing stoop is marble and is not part of the scope of work, but he desires to replace the existing brick sidewalk with a concrete sidewalk. The sidewalk proposal was met with disapprovals from several Committee members. Mr. Baron commented generally about the need for accurate drawings of the front façade. Ms. Hawkins thanked the applicant for not proposing a roof deck on the main house or a garage.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the new gates for vehicular and pedestrian use at the rear of the property on Hall Street. Mr. Sawron responded that both gates will be solid wood swinging gates, located in a new brick wall that will replace the existing cinderblock wall. Ms. Stein asked about capping of the brick wall, suggesting a cast-stone cap. Mr. Sawron responded that he is amenable to a cast-stone cap. Ms. Stein suggested that the wood gates drop one to two inches below the cast stone so that they do not project above the wall. Ms. Hawkins asked about the mechanics of the vehicular gate. Mr. Sawron responded that the gate will have to swing out over the sidewalk on Hall Street. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Streets Department may not approve

this type of out-swing because it will obstruct the sidewalk. Ms. Stein stated that the property is 15 feet wide, and an architect should check the rear gate elevation to ensure that a car can fit through it. She speculated that the gate is too narrow, and the turning radius will not be sufficient, when attempting to turn a car into an opening that is between brick piers on a narrow street. Ms. Hawkins summarized that the Commission will need to see a site plan that shows property lines, width of cartways including sidewalks, dimensions of the rear yard, and existing street trees.

Ms. Gutterman requested that the drawings show where the mechanical units are to be located on the roof. Mr. Sawron responded that the units will be placed on the rear ell between the proposed roof deck and the main house, so that they are not visible from the street.

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor to public comment. Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia commented that this project was reviewed by the Preservation Alliance's Advocacy Committee, and the Committee felt that the demolition and reconstruction of the rear is essentially a demolition rather than an alteration, for the purposes of private parking. Mr. Sawron responded that the demolition of nine feet of the rear ell is in response to structural concerns from his engineer and contractor, and he referenced the letter from his engineer that discusses the cracks in the foundation that are visible from inside of the basement. Ms. Hawkins asked that he provide additional information about this structural concern to the Commission, such as a photograph showing the crack on the exterior. Mr. Leech commented that the Preservation Alliance's concerns are related to whether this demolition is actually to accommodate parking rather than correct a structural problem, and if there are other alternatives that can be explored. He stated that the allowance of the removal of nine feet of historic fabric to create room for parking would set a dangerous precedent.

Ms. Hawkins stated that more information is needed to determine whether parking can even be accommodated at the rear of this property. Mr. Sawron showed a photograph of the neighbor's property that has a gate that swings out over the sidewalk. Ms. Hawkins responded that the neighbor's situation may not be legal, but this Committee has no way of knowing this information, and urged Mr. Sawron to provide more information at the time of the Commission review. It was suggested that the applicant measure the neighbor's parking gate to determine if it could also work for his property.

Mr. Sawron stated that, apart from the nine feet of demolition, there is an existing chimney on the side of the rear ell, not visible from the street, where the brick is bowing out and is considered dangerous. This chimney is not part of the proposed demolition area, but would also need to be removed owing to structural concerns. Ms. Hawkins stated that there is the option to rebuild the chimney.

Ms. Hawkins summarized that the drawings are now more complete than they were initially, but there are still many aspects of the project that require more information.

Ms. Broadbent used Google Street View to show the Committee a view of the property from Hall Street. Ms. Hawkins asked if a tree that is visible in Google Street View will be removed for the parking, and commented that the curb cut would eliminate a public parking space on Hall Street. Mr. Sawron responded that the tree will need to be cut back, but could remain, because it is located to the right of the proposed wall. Ms. Stein commented that the Streets Department may not allow the removal of a public parking space for the addition of a private parking space, but

that decision will be rendered by the Streets Department and is out of the purview of the Historical Commission.

Mr. Sawron asked about the review process going forward, if he omitted the demolition and parking components from the application. Ms. Hawkins responded that the restoration of the front façade can be reviewed and approved administratively by the staff. Mr. Baron stated again that the applicant will need to work with the staff on the details for the front façade.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to incompleteness, pursuant to Section 6.7 of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations.

ADDRESS: 264 S 20TH ST

Project: Install storefront, signage, and lighting

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Cao & Son LLC

Applicant: Quoc T. Doan, QD Designs

History: 1920

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate the storefront of a three-story building at 264 S. 20th Street. A wood facing would be placed over the brick storefront surround. No details are provided regarding the wood covering, but it would apparently stand proud of the adjacent buildings. The large fixed storefront window would be replaced with two pairs of operable windows. A "channel letter internally illuminated wall mounted sign" would be installed over the storefront. No details are provided for the sign; it is unclear how a sign can be both internally illuminated and have channel letters. Goose neck light fixtures would be installed over the lighted sign. The trim including vinyl shutters would be painted brown. The vinyl shutters, which were added after designation without the Historical Commission's approval, should be removed. Currently, the shutters exist at the second floor only, but are shown at the second and third floors in the elevation drawing.

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

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

The Committee members discussed the project and agreed with the staff that the application is incomplete and the proposed work does not comply with preservation standards.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to incompleteness, and pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:56 a.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

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

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

Accessibility Guideline: Recommended: Providing barrier-free access that promotes independence for the disabled person to the highest degree practicable, while preserving significant historic features.

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.

Section 14-1105(6)(e)(.7)

In specific cases as will not be contrary to the public interest, where, owing to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the provisions of this Chapter 14-1000 would result in unnecessary hardship so that the spirit of this Chapter 14-1000 shall be observed and substantial justice done, subject to such terms and conditions as the Historical Commission may decide, the Historical Commission shall by a majority vote grant an exemption from the requirements of Chapter 14-1000.