

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

**TUESDAY, 28 MAY 2019
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18-031
DAN MCCOUBREY, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:00

Ms. Gutterman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. The following Committee members joined her:

Committee Member	Present	Absent	Comment
Dan McCoubrey, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C, Chair		x	
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP	x		
Rudy D'Alessandro	x		
Justin Detwiler	x		
Nan Gutterman, FAIA	x		
Suzanne Pentz	x		Arrived at 9:05 a.m.
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP	x		

The following staff members were present:

- 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 II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner I
- Megan Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner I

The following persons were present:

- Christina Carter, John Milner Architects
- Rich Leimbach, Logan Square Neighborhood Association
- Molly Gallagher
- Patrick Boyle, Spring Garden CDC
- Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
- Agate Reister, Landmark Architect
- Michael Caine, Old First Church
- Sara Pochedly, Toner Architects
- Charles Dombrowski
- Leon Sowisdral
- Anthony Palimore
- Larry Wind, H+W Apts
- Jon Harris, Harris Architect
- Kate Jacobi, Mural Arts
- Cynthia Ballock
- Kate McGlinchey, Old City District

John Toates, John Toates Architecture
Mark Hoffman, John Toates Architecture
Jonathan Broh, JKRP
Karen Buchholz
Ramune Bartuskaite, JKRP
Cindy Hamilton, Heritage Consulting Group
Arwa Abdelmoula, Esq., Ballard Spahr
David Gest, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Troy Hannigan, Community Ventures
Morris Zimmerman, BWA Architects
Patrick Isaac, Community Ventures
David La Fontaine, Community Ventures
Frank Kakos, Frank Kakos Architects

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 6160 RIDGE AVE

Proposal: Reinstall sign

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Zheng Shu Zhi and Lin Xiao Fang

Applicant: Enoc Echanarria, L&H Contractor LLC

History: 1849; Third floor added in 1896

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Ridge Avenue Roxborough Thematic Historic District, Contributing,
10/12/2018

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

BACKGROUND:

The building at 6160 Ridge Avenue has a commercial ground-floor unit currently occupied by a nail salon. A large illuminated sign was installed without permits in late 2018. The Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation, and the sign was removed by the tenant to comply the violation. The tenant is seeking approval to reinstall the sign with proper permits.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Reinstall sign on pent eave.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *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.*
 - The proposed sign is inappropriate for this building in terms of massing, scale, and proportions. While Ridge Avenue in Roxborough contains a wide array of business signs, the historic district is thematic in nature and any proposed work should be compatible with the building itself.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:00:16

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- No one represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee asked if the staff discussed alternatives for signage or location with the tenant.
 - Ms. Chantry responded that a permit expeditor has been the staff's contact for this proposal, so there has been no direct contact with the tenant to date.
- The Committee discussed the sign shown in a photograph from 1951, and noted that the sign band appears comparable in size to the proposed sign, but the letters were clearly smaller than the proposed sign. A potential compromise was discussed where the sign band is the same size as proposed, but the lettering is minimized and not internally illuminated.
- The Committee asked for the date of the pent eave installation.
 - Ms. Chantry responded that she was unable to find a record of its installation, but that perhaps one option to accommodate signage is to remove the pent eave and install a flat wall sign above the storefront.
 - Ms. Gutterman suggested an additional alternative, being the installation of a simpler overhang to protect the entrance and the installation of a simpler sign.
- The Committee agreed that the sign as built is not appropriate for this building.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- While Ridge Avenue in Roxborough contains a wide array of business signs, the historic district is thematic in nature and any proposed work should be compatible with the building itself.
- A photograph from 1951 shows a wide, flat sign projecting above the storefront, but no pent eave.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed sign fails to satisfy Standard 9, owing to its inappropriateness for this building in terms of massing, scale, and proportions. The existing sign is not a candidate for reinstallation, regardless of where or how it is placed on the building.

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

ITEM: 6160 Ridge Ave MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Detwiler SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					x
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 2026-28 SPRING GARDEN ST

Proposal: Construct four-story multi-family dwelling on vacant lot

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: David Altenhofen

Applicant: Susan Uhl, Landmark Architectural Design

History: 1886

Individual Designation: 5/1/1975

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

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

BACKGROUND:

The vacant lot at 2026 Spring Garden Street was historically the side yard of the double-wide lot for the building at 2028 Spring Garden Street. This applicant submitted an in-concept application in 2018 to gain clarity from the Historical Commission as to its level of review for new construction on the lot at 2026 Spring Garden Street, and to elicit comments on a proposed four-story, full-width building on the site. At its 13 July 2018 meeting, the Historical Commission unanimously voted to approve the application in concept. This in-concept approval was for a four-story, full-width building on the lot. As required, the applicant has submitted an application for final approval which closely resembles the prior in-concept application.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Demolish non-historic vestibule and site wall.
- Construct four-story multi-family building on vacant lot.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 3: Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.*
 - Aspects of the proposed front façade, including door and windows, replicates the next door building to a level that is not preferred on new construction. These elements do not need to replicate historic elements exactly, but rather should be

compatible with those historic elements but not to a degree that it creates a false sense of history.

- *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.*
 - The proposed building is compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, but is differentiated from the old in terms of width.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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.*
 - The building is proposed for construction on a vacant lot.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10, and the 13 July 2018 in-concept approval by the Commission.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:06:15

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Agata Reister represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee questioned the appropriateness of metal windows on new construction.
 - Ms. Reister clarified that the proposed windows are metal clad wood windows.
- The Committee agreed with Ms. Reister's suggestion for a slate-alternative on the mansard, rather than real slate.
- The Committee asked about the idea of simplification of façade details.
 - Ms. Reister explained that her client is willing to match the next door building in every detail, which is what the community group requested when the project was initially going through the zoning process. She noted that her client agreed to it despite it driving up the cost of the project considerably. She explained that she and her client pursued that route, but now it appears that it is not the most appropriate approach to the project.
- The Committee agreed with the proposal for a front façade with a granite base and marble on the upper floors.
- The Committee suggested that the overall detailing of the façade can be a little less literal in many ways, so that the building tells the story that the next-door building was there first. The Committee explained that the new building does not need to be a wider duplicate of the historic building, but rather should pick up on the predominate features of the historic building and incorporate those in a streamlined manner, while maintaining window alignment and cornice height. Mr. Detwiler suggested that the marble could be a different color or darker gray than the historic building so that it does not read as one single mass.

- The Committee suggested simplification or streamlining of the following façade elements:
 - Marble cladding
 - Stone detailing
 - Mansard and dormer
 - Roof cresting
 - Stone window surrounds
 - Stone return at side elevations
 - Upper floor “shoulders”
 - Corbelling detail at end of cornice
- Mr. Cluver asked about the tunnel alley for accessible access, and if it would have a gate or door.
 - Ms. Reister responded that the client would likely prefer to have a gate.
 - Mr. Cluver responded that the gate should be shown on the drawings submitted for review by the Commission.
- The Committee asked about the egress windows and grates.
 - Ms. Reister responded that the upper window would be a fixed awning window, with an operable sash below to meet the egress requirement, and the grate would be black metal.
- The Committee asked about visibility of mechanical units and pilot houses.
 - Ms. Reister responded that no mechanical units or pilot houses will be visible from the public right-of-way.
- The Committee asked about the material of the proposed cornice.
 - Ms. Reister responded that it will be either a wood, metal, or PVC replica of the cornice next door, which is metal with small marble corbels.
 - Mr. Cluver noted that PVC comes with more maintenance issues related to painting, so bent metal may be a better choice.
- The Committee asked about the material of the steps and railing.
 - Ms. Reister responded that the steps will be marble, and the railing will be black metal.
- Mr. D’Alessandro suggested that Ms. Reister prepare as-built drawings of the existing site wall, fence, and non-historic vestibule so that there is a record of what existed.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the accessible unit at the rear and the code requirements for that unit. He stated that he believes that the Code requires that the entire unit be accessible.
 - Ms. Reister responded that she believes that the Code requires that only the entry to the unit be accessible, but that she would review the Code to confirm.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Historical Commission enjoys plenary jurisdiction over the lot known in the Historic District inventory as 2026 Spring Garden Street.
- A similar application for a four-story, full-width, multi-unit building was approved in-concept by the Commission at its 13 July 2018 meeting.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Aspects of the proposed front façade replicates the next door building to a level that is not preferred on new construction. These elements do not need to replicate historic elements exactly, but rather should be compatible with those historic elements but not to a degree that it creates a false sense of history, per Standard 3.
- The proposed building is compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, but is differentiated from the old in terms of width, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, with the recommendation that the applicant make some of the revisions discussed to simplify the façade in a manner that allows it to be consistent with the character of the adjacent building.

ITEM: 2026-28 Spring Garden St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					x
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Guterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 6605 AND 6607 RIDGE AVE

Proposal: Remove rear additions; construct multifamily dwellings on subdivided lots

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: 6605 Ridge Realty LLC & 6607 Ridge Realty LLC

Applicant: Ian Toner, Toner Architects

History: 1868

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Ridge Avenue Roxborough Thematic Historic District, Contributing,
10/12/2018

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

BACKGROUND:

The buildings at 6605 and 6607 Ridge Avenue are three-story stone twin houses with historic two-story rear ells and non-historic one-story rear additions. Historically, the twin occupied the same parcel, which featured a frame stable at the rear. The land to the southeast of 6605 Ridge Avenue, at the corner of Gorgas Lane and Ridge Avenue, has never been developed.

This in-concept application proposes to remove the one-story additions on the historic houses, constructed in 1940 (6605) and in the 1980s (6607), and to subdivide the properties and construct three multi-family buildings on the subdivided parcels. The new "Building 1," which

would be constructed to follow the angle of the corner of Ridge and Gorgas, would be set approximately 10 feet from the existing building at 6605 Ridge.

While the Historical Commission has full jurisdiction over the proposed construction, given the purpose of the thematic, not geographical, district to protect historic buildings along Ridge Avenue, the staff recommends that the Commission treat the new construction at the rear of the property with greater flexibility. The staff recommends that the applicants provide greater consideration to the compatibility of the proposed "Building 1" with the site and the existing structures.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Demolish rear additions.
- Subdivide properties.
- Construct three, three-story multi-family buildings.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The replacement of intact or repairable historic materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
 - The buildings at 6605 and 6607 Ridge Avenue have a historic spatial relationship with the intersection of Ridge Avenue and Gorgas Lane. The proposed Building 1 alters this spatial relationship.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed exterior alterations and related new construction do not destroy historic materials that characterize the properties. The new work is differentiated from the old, but additional information should be provided showing the massing and materials of the proposed construction in relationship to the existing structures.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in-concept of Buildings 2 and 3, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9, with the recommendation that additional studies and renderings be provided showing the relationship of Building 1 to the existing buildings.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:36:26

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Sara Pochedly represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee opined that the context of the proposed development is difficult to glean from the materials provided. They requested additional site context materials.
 - The applicant responded that there are a mix of property types along portion of Ridge Avenue, including several nearby shopping plazas and some new construction residential development similar to what is proposed.

- The applicant noted that the intersection is interesting in that it transitions from the wide, pedestrian Ridge Avenue to a country lane along Gorgas Lane.
- Ms. DiPasquale stressed that this property is not located in a geographic historic district, but a thematic one.
 - The Committee asked what the theme is that is represented by the Ridge Avenue Thematic Historic District.
 - Ms. DiPasquale responded that Ridge Avenue Thematic District focuses on the development along the road from the late seventeenth century to 1908, when a new sort of automobile-focused residential development began.
- The Committee opined that the proposed construction makes the site too dense and suggested that the applicants consider limiting the new construction to two buildings as opposed to three.
- The Committee noted that the proposed Gorgas Lane buildings feel removed from the existing historic buildings and are less troubling than the proposed Building 1 at the corner of Ridge Avenue and Gorgas Lane.
- The Committee opined that Building 1 is too visible and detracts from the character of the historic property.
- The Committee noted that the general heights of the proposed buildings are in keeping with the historic property.
- The Committee disapproved of the use of a mansard roof on Building 1 and suggested a simpler design that speaks more to the vocabulary of the adjacent historic buildings.
 - The applicant replied that she believes the client would be willing to eliminate the mansard roof.
- The Committee asked whether the proposed Buildings 2 and 3 align with the neighboring properties along Gorgas Lane.
 - The applicant responded negatively, noting that they are located along a steep slope.
- The Committee noted that Buildings 2 and 3 are set high off the street level.
 - The applicant responded that there is a retaining wall there currently that the Planning Commission will not allow to be removed owing to the steep slope regulations.
- The Committee suggested that Buildings 2 and 3 be rectangular in plan rather than trapezoidal and oriented in the same way as the neighboring properties along Gorgas Lane.
- The Committee argued that vinyl siding is an inappropriate building material in a historic district and on a historic property, but suggested that siding that more closely replicates wood clapboard siding may be appropriate.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The demolition of the non-historic, one-story rear additions is acceptable.
- The proposed construction is overly dense for the site.
- The overall height of the proposed buildings is appropriate, but the form, materials, and density of the proposed construction is inappropriate for the historic property.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed construction alters spatial relationships that characterize the historic property, failing to satisfy Standard 2.
- The proposed construction contains architectural features and materials that are incompatible with the historic property, failing to satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 6605 and 6607 RIDGE AVE					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					x
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 2000 SPRING GARDEN ST

Proposal: Construct five-story multi-family building

Review Requested: Review In Concept

Owner: Ramy Shraim

Applicant: Hyon Kang, KCA Design Associates, LLC

History: 1875; PA Prison Society; Stone cladding 1970

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Non-contributing, 10/11/2000

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

BACKGROUND:

This in-concept application proposes to construct a five-story, multi-family building on the southwest corner of 20th and Spring Garden Streets in the Spring Garden Historic District. The demolition of the existing building, which is listed as non-contributing in the district, was approved at the staff level. The Historical Commission has full jurisdiction over the proposed construction.

The proposed construction would feature a cast stone base, brick first through third floors, and metal panel-clad fourth and fifth floors. The first three stories of the proposed building would align with the adjacent property. The front façade along Spring Garden Street would approximate the details of the neighboring property, with arched window and door openings. The side and rear elevations would be more modern in appearance, with contemporary aluminum windows and metal bays, and balconies.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Construct a five-story, multi-family building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 MAY 2019

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The majority of the proposed new construction is differentiated from the old, but the front elevation too closely replicates the historic appearance of the property's twin. The staff recommends that details of the front elevation be differentiated from the old, perhaps through the use of rectangular openings rather than arched.
 - While the first through third floor levels align of the proposed construction aligns with the adjacent property, the top floor features a series of cantilevering decks surrounded by solid parapet and glass railings. The staff recommends simplifying the planes of the fourth and fifth floors, particularly at the corner of 20th and Spring Garden Streets. The staff recommends eliminating the recessed corner with the overhanging deck and utilizing a contemporary mansard roof at this corner.
 - The proposed materials of brick and cast stone are compatible with the environment of the district.
 - The proposed project partially complies with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in-concept, with conditions, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 00:50:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- No one represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee opined that the proposed construction is incompatible in height with the neighboring property and the historic district, and suggested that four stories would be more appropriate than five.
- The Committee argued that the garage openings and balconies on 20th Street are inappropriate.
- The Committee stated that the upper floors of the building should be reconsidered, and that cantilevering planes are incompatible with the district.
- The Committee opined that the length of the proposed building seems too great, but noted that the application does not provide a site plan that shows the proposed building in relationship to the neighboring properties.
- The Committee agreed with the staff recommendation that the front façade should not try to replicate the exact details of the historic property to the west and suggested that the design of the front and side/rear elevations be more cohesive.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Patrick Boyle of Spring Garden Civic Association presented a letter from the association and opposed the application owing to the proposed building's size, massing, and incompatible design.
- Neighbors Molly Gallagher and Charles Dombrowski opposed the application, highlighting the loss of visibility of the rear of their property at 2002 Spring Garden.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Commission enjoys plenary jurisdiction over the proposed construction.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed building is not compatible in scale, massing, or features with the historic district, failing to satisfy Standard 9.

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

ITEM: 2000 SPRING GARDEN ST					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					x
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Guterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 125 N 10TH ST

Proposal: Remove sections of rear of building; construct rear addition; rehabilitate front facade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: PZ Zhangs Associate LLC

Applicant: Anthony Palimore, Anthony Palimore, RA

History: 1831-32; 1906; 1910; 1967-71; Chinatown YMCA, Chinese Cultural and Community Center; Yang Chou-Cheng

Individual Designation: 6/14/2013

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

The property at 125 N. 10th Street is a mid-block parcel between Cherry and Arch Streets in the Chinatown neighborhood. Originally constructed c. 1831 as Federal-style rowhouse, the building's existing elaborate façade and tile roof were constructed between 1967 and 1971 by the Chinese Cultural and Community Center, but the original gabled-roof building is still extant

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 MAY 2019

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

behind the facade. The nomination for the property, which was designated in 2013, identifies the period of significance as 1955-2006, beginning with the year that the Chinatown YMCA opened on the second floor of the building, prior to the construction of the existing façade. In 1966, T.T. Chang, founder of the Chinatown YMCA, purchased the property and formed the Chinese Cultural and Community Center.

The application proposes to remove the second and third-floor side walls, floor joists, and roof of the rear ell, and the rear wall of the main block, and to construct a large rear addition. The front façade would be rehabilitated.

The proposed drawings have been revised from an earlier application that would have demolished a considerable portion of the main block as well as the rear ell. In this proposal, the main block including the rear roof and dormer will be preserved. A portion of the rear roof will be removed to construct a passageway to the rear ell. Much of the rear ell will be demolished and a four-story full width structure will be added.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Retain main block of building.
- Demolish a small portion of the rear roof slope of main block.
- Demolish second and third-floor side walls and piazza of rear ell.
- Construct four-story addition at rear.
- Rehabilitate front façade.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alterations of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - The proposed project retains the building's primary character-defining features, the elaborate front façade and roof. It proposes to remove portions of the building that do not fall within the period of significance, but which do speak to the building's evolution. The proposed project complies with this standard.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
 - The proposed addition is compatible with the massing, size, and scale of the environment. The project complies with this standard.
- *Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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.*
 - The proposed demolition of the rear ell is not reversible. The project complies with this standard.

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

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:06:15

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 MAY 2019

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Anthony Palimore represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked how many feet of the main roof will be removed.
 - Mr. Palimore responded that approximately four feet will be removed on the rear slope.
- Mr. Detwiler asked whether the new passageway can connect to the roof with a cricket to shed water.
 - Mr. Palimore responded that he would do that.
- Mr. Cluver asked about the design of the new door and other façade improvements.
 - Mr. Palimore responded that he will work with the staff to ensure that the designs of those elements are correct.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The primary significance of the building resides in the main block rather than the rear ell.
- The revised proposal now retains most of the significant fabric.
- The alterations will not be visible to the public.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed project retains the building's primary character-defining features, the elaborate front façade and roof. It proposes to remove portions of the building that do not fall within the period of significance, satisfying Standard 2.
- The addition to the main roof is removable and satisfies Standards 9 and 10.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend Approval, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10, with the staff to review details.

ITEM: 125 N 10th St MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: Stein SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					x
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 1830 RITTENHOUSE SQ, UNIT 6A

Proposal: Replace Windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Paul and Wendy Rosen

Applicant: Leon Sowisdral

History: 1913; Frederick Webber, architect

Individual Designation: 5/4/1972

District Designation: None

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

BACKGROUND:

A unit owner proposes to replace windows in this condominium building. The owner proposes to remove eight historic windows (F) with the large wood mullions on the front façade and install picture windows without mullions. In 2002, the Historical Commission approved the same project for the same owner for a unit on the 15th floor. The owner is now moving from that unit on the 15th floor to the unit in question on the 6th floor and would like to recreate the window configuration. During the 2002 review, the owner pointed out that several units in the building have picture windows without the wood mullions. Those units may have been modified before designation or without the Historical Commission's approval. In 2002, both the staff and the Architectural Committee recommended against removal of the historic windows, contending that the project failed to meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. However, the Historical Commission approved the alteration. This time, the windows slated for replacement are more visible from the street because they are on a lower floor. The application also proposes to remove several vinyl and metal windows on the side facades of the building and replace them with one-over-one wood windows. The removal of the metal window (G) in wood on the side façade may not meet the Standards because the metal window is likely original.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Remove eight windows to create large picture windows on the front facade.
- Replace windows on the rear and side facades.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alterations of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
 - The project would remove character-defining features, the distinctive original front windows.
- *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.*
 - The proposed windows will not match the historic windows in design.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the restoration of most side windows; denial of the removal and replacement of original front windows, pursuant to Standards 2, and 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:17:00

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Carpenter Bill Kane, contractor Leon Sowisdral, and owners Paul and Wendy Rosen represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Architectural Committee noted that many windows are shown on the drawings and questioned which windows are included in the current application. The Committee asked whether the transoms will be removed. The Committee members expressed confusion because the application includes drawings of the front as well as the side and rear windows.
 - Mr. Kane responded that, although they propose to replace side and rear windows at a later date, only the front window marked “F” on the drawings is in question today. He noted that they have shown alternates that either remove or retain the transom windows on F.
 - Mr. Kane noted that the current applicants previously received approval to install a picture window at the 15th floor. They bought this 5th floor unit assuming that they could modify the window in the same way. Mr. Kane said that they will spend considerable money to restore windows on the side and rear facades.
- Mr. Cluver questioned whether the original windows on this building were casement or double-hung windows.
 - The applicant showed a photograph of the building from 1920.
- The Committee questioned why not all of the windows can be restored or replaced in kind.
 - Mr. Kane responded that they could restore the windows but that the owners would like to get a better view.
 - Mr. Rosen explained that they would be willing to retain the two side windows and even retain the transom at “F,” but that they would like to remove the wide central mullion.
- Mr. Detwiler noted that the window in question is quite visible and sits within a decorative masonry frame on the facade, making it one of the chief areas of significance on this façade.
- Mr. Cluver noted that he is troubled by the lack of consistency for the building and said that the Commission should develop a standard for the building to work toward.
 - Mr. Baron responded that following Standard 6, which bases all further work on following the original design and retaining original fabric, would lead to the consistency that Mr. Cluver seeks. The building still has more original fabric that has not been changed than altered fabric.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The applicant proposes to remove significant original window mullion dividers on the front façade of the building.
- The new work differs from that approved for the 15th floor in that these windows are more visible at the 5th floor and sit in a particularly significant architectural surround which highlights this part of the building.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The removal of the original architectural window features in either alternate proposal does not meet Standards 2 and 6.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the removal and replacement of original front windows, pursuant to Standards 2, and 6.

ITEM: 1830 Rittenhouse Sq, Unit 6A					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: D'Alessandro					
SECONDED BY: Pentz					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					x
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 1624-28 LOCUST ST

Proposal: Install Illuminated channel-letter sign

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: CP Acquisitions 45 LLC

Applicant: Natalya Atroshyna, EZ Signs LLC

History: 1948, Thalheimer and Weitz, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND:

The office building at 1624-28 Locust Street is classified as non-contributing to the Rittenhouse Fitler Historic District. This application proposes to install an illuminated channel-letter sign on the sign band above the front entrance. Most of the block is institutional including the Curtis School of Music and St. Mark's Church.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install illuminated channel-letter sign.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 MAY 2019

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

- The proposed sign is not compatible with the existing streetscape.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:40:06

PRESENTERS:

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

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Baron explained that, when the building is non-contributing, the focus of the review shifts to the effect on the streetscape and the historic district.
- Mr. Baron noted that there is no other illuminated signage on this block. He explained that the staff has approved a non-illuminated sign for this location.
- Ms. Gutterman opined that she was troubled by the font of the proposed sign which she finds too heavy. She recommended a graphic on the door.
- Ms. Stein asked whether the staff had determined the proposed location of the sign to be appropriate.
 - The staff determined that the proposed location is appropriate and approved a non-illuminated version of the sign administratively.
- Mr. Cluver opined that the sign should be placed in the recessed entryway.
- Mr. Baron asked the Committee to comment on the issue of an illuminated sign.
 - The Committee members found the illumination inappropriate but concluded that, if the sign were inset into the vestibule, the lights in the ceiling of the vestibule could light the sign.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The illuminated signage would adversely affect the streetscape.
- The illumination, font, and location of the proposed signage are inappropriate.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The signage does not meet Standard 9 because it negatively effects the appearance of the streetscape.

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

ITEM: 1624-28 Locust St MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					x
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 323 ARCH ST

Proposal: Install mural

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Holly Anne James

Applicant: Kate Jacobi, Mural Arts Program

History: 1850; West elevation stuccoed 1968

Individual Designation: 11/30/1965

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

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

BACKGROUND:

Originally part of a row of four-story buildings, 323 Arch Street is now a free-standing building adjacent to the fountain court of a fire station constructed in 1967. The west party wall of 323 Arch Street features a stucco ghost of a building that predated the four-story structure demolished in the 1960s. Historic photographs indicate that the building's west party wall once contained a mural painted onto plywood and attached in the location of the current proposed mural.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Install painted cloth mural on stuccoed portion of party wall using acrylic gel adhesive.
- Seal mural with clear coating and UV protectant coating.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
The proposed mural would be applied only to the existing stuccoed portion of the party wall and would be compatible with the historic structure and its context.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 01:46:46

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Kate Jacobi of Mural Arts represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Keller noted that the applicant was not present and explained that Mural Arts submitted the application for this meeting, because the mural is soon to be publicized. She noted that the application was submitted in concept, because it does not include content at this time, but the staff requested that the applicant change to final approval, since the Commission does not regulate content. She asked that the Committee to comment on the location and scale of the proposed mural to determine whether it would be appropriate for the location.
 - The applicant, Ms. Jacobi, joined the meeting and introduced herself.
- Ms. Stein argued that the Committee should review the content prior to making a recommendation to ensure that the mural is tasteful. She further contended that the proposed location is immediately adjacent to Franklin's tomb.
 - Ms. Keller stated that the applicant intends to make the content available before the Commission meeting.
- Mr. Cluver asked whether the mural is intended to cover the entire façade.
 - Ms. Jacobi clarified that the diagram in the application shows the exposed brick of the party wall and the area that is currently stuccoed. She explained that the mural would only be attached to the stuccoed portion.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired whether the wall contains reinforcements.
 - Ms. Jacobi answered that it does not. She explained that what appears to be some kind of reinforcement is dirt buildup and mold. She noted that the wall will be cleaned.
- Ms. Pentz asked for clarification on when painted cloth is more appropriate than painting directly on the building.
 - Ms. Jacobi responded that Mural Arts has transitioned more to painted cloth, because it allows the organization to hold Paint Days with communities and engage participants in a sort of paint-by-number approach to creating the mural. She added that it is rare Mural Arts has an artist paint directly on the wall unless there is a particular artist who uses a style with spray paint or is abstractly sprayed onto the surface.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired whether the mural is painted on cloth on the ground and then applied to the wall and whether it is done in a warehouse.
 - Ms. Jacobi answered that the mural is painted in a studio. She described the mural as "outdoor wallpaper," where the mural is in 5-foot by 5-foot sheets and then glued to the stucco wall.
- Ms. Gutterman asked whether the applicant has sounded the stucco to make sure it is secured to the wall.
 - Ms. Jacobi replied that the stucco was checked and that it needs to be cleaned due to vegetation near the wall in the past.
- Ms. Pentz questioned whether the cloth is removable.
 - Ms. Jacobi stated that the mural would be removable and similar murals have been removed at several sites already, though most people choose not to remove their murals. She added that for this particular mural, she wants community participation and that Mural Arts will hold a Paint Day at the

- firehouse and a few other locations. The goal, she continued, is to have a couple hundred people to help create the mural.
- Mr. D'Alessandro asked whether scaffolding would be erected.
 - Ms. Jacobi responded that the existing brick planter would be covered with boards and that scaffolding would be erected above, though she has considered an aerial lift. She noted that those logistics have not been finalized.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro requested to clarify whether the cloth would be finished before installation or whether people would come to the site to paint the cloth on the wall.
 - Ms. Jacobi explained that the mural would be painted on the cloth before it gets installed on the wall. She added that the mural would not be installed on the wall until the fall. She reiterated that the cloth would be laid out in a paint-by-number format with 50 or 60 sheets that will cover the stucco area when installed. She elaborated that participants put down base coats, which then get touched up in the studio before being hung on site.
 - Mr. Cluver stated that while the Committee typically does not comment on the art itself, the Committee has never reviewed an application without content. He suggested that the Committee provide an approval in-concept and allow the Historical Commission to make its own decision. He added that he is not comfortable offering full approval without knowing the content. He noted that he could not tell from the application where the mural was being applied.
 - Ms. Jacobi explained that the reason she applied for this particular month was that she has been working on this project for several years doing research and fundraising. Mural Arts, she continued, had a schedule planned and pitched several ideas to WaWa, who selected this particular mural. She elaborated that WaWa fast-tracked the project, so it progressed more quickly than anticipated. She added that the goal was always to have the design ready for July; however, she originally applied in-concept, because WaWa will have a press announcement for Welcome America on July 3 that will identify the project and show a design concept. She stated that she would be happy to come back for the July Historical Commission meeting. She added that she did not want to circumvent the June meeting, so that the announcement would be made before the Historical Commission learned of the mural. By the June 14 Commission meeting, she noted, there will be a concept to show the general content depicting imagery of Ben Franklin in his fire gear as the founder of the Union Fire Company, different tools of the trade, and apparatus over the decades. She noted that it will not be a final design.
 - Mr. Cluver commented that the application was presented to the Committee for final approval.
 - Ms. Keller clarified that the applicant applied for in-concept approval but that the staff asked that the application move forward for final approval.
 - Mr. Cluver stated that the Committee could offer a recommendation on the concept and the Commission could decide how to act on the request for final approval.
 - Ms. Pentz inquired about the stucco that runs the full height of the building adjacent to the front façade.
 - Ms. Jacobi replied that she was unsure how to incorporate that area and was considering painting it a solid color. She asked whether it could be painted the color of the brick to match the wall.

- The Committee asked Ms. Jacobi to include the proposal for that aspect in her application.
- Mr. D'Alessandro discussed the silhouette of the Ben Franklin created against the wall from a certain viewpoint and stated that it will be lost with the addition of a mural.
 - Ms. Jacobi disagreed, adding that the statue will be worked into the design.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The mural would be located only on the stuccoed portion of the wall.
- The stucco should be sounded and the mildew treated before the mural is applied.
- The mural content has not yet been provided and should be reviewed prior to approval, though the Historical Commission does not consider content when reviewing murals.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed location of the mural is appropriate and will not alter spatial relationships, satisfying Standard 9.
- The application of a cloth mural is reversible and will not cause damage to the building, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to the lack of a mural design.

ITEM: 323 ARCH ST MOTION: Denial MOVED BY: Cluver SECONDED BY: Stein					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					x
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 2213 GREEN ST

Proposal: Replace illegally-removed brownstone pilasters with cast stone

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: H+W Apartments LP

Applicant: Lawrence Wind, H+W Apartments LP

History: 1886

Individual Designation: 2/28/1967

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

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

BACKGROUND:

Constructed in 1886, the semi-detached Renaissance Revival-style residence is significant in the Spring Garden Historic District. The building's front façade features brownstone cladding and ornately carved brownstone detailing. Between May and September 2018, the applicant removed four brownstone pilasters that divide five windows at the fourth story of the front façade. The work was done without a permit. The applicant noted that the pilasters were flaking and delaminating, though the staff contends that they were in repairable condition. The applicant now proposes to replace the illegally-removed brownstone pilasters with cast stone versions.

SCOPE OF WORK:

- Replace four illegally-removed brownstone pilasters with cast stone.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alterations of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.*
The removal of the brownstone pilasters does not comply with this standard.
- *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.*
Each replacement pilaster would be cast in three pieces and would introduce two ½-inch mortar joints. The replacement pilasters would not match the old in design or material and would alter the historic appearance of the fourth-story windows. Therefore, the proposed work does not comply with this standard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 6.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:01:32

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Lawrence Wind represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Keller noted that the applicant has revised the application and has an updated plan, though not an updated drawing.
 - Mr. Wind asked to read a letter for the record:

“Prior to the committee meeting today I had a conversation with your associate Meredith Keller regarding the building permit submission for approval of the pilasters as described in the plan prepared by SDA our consulting engineers. SDA had previously assisted with the replacement of the decorative columns and cast front steps on the adjacent building 2213 Green Street. Both buildings are owned by H & W.

“She advised the preliminary assessment was to reject the multiple castings for the pilasters because the pieces were too segmented. Instead a single piece casting would be more consistent with the prior design.

“We discussed the one-piece design with the structural engineers, and they are able to redesign the pilaster into a single cast piece. Due to the Memorial Day holiday, they were unable to get a new drawing in time for our meeting.

“For the record, H & W is agreeable to a one-piece design and will submit a new drawing for approval for a single piece of cast stone for each of the pilasters.”

- Mr. Cluver asked if the proposed cast stone is to replicate brownstone.
 - Ms. Keller affirmed, clarifying that the Committee would still need to consider whether it would accept cast stone as a substitute material, but added that the design is now for a single piece of cast stone rather than three pieces with joints.
- Ms. Gutterman asked if the profile or shape of the historic pilaster is known.
 - Mr. Wind replied that the current owner has owned the building for 12 years and is familiar with the building. He stated that the pilaster was a slab of brownstone that was not carved or ornate. He noted that it had a chamfered edge that dovetailed into the chamfered arch above.
- Mr. D'Alessandro inquired whether the pilaster sat on a base before connecting to the sill.
 - Mr. Wind responded that there was no base or any piece that flared at the bottom.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the photograph shows what looks like a plinth.
 - Mr. Wind commented that the pilasters were removed in the dead of winter after pieces of the façade were found at the front entrance. He contended that the pilasters presented an imminently dangerous condition and contacted the structural engineers that had worked at the site in the past. The engineers, he continued, identified a problem with the pilasters and suggested that something had to be done immediately. He noted that the engineers worked with the carpenters to design a temporary support for the arch. The permanent solution was to create a support clad with three pieces of cast stone, which the engineer contended would be lighter and easier to hoist into place.
- Ms. Stein questioned how Mr. Wind would ensure that the color could be matched.

- Mr. Wind answered that there were four Jahn color swatches affixed to the adjacent building a couple years ago and that he has requested samples from the company casting the pilasters. He added that he would submit samples to the staff and choose the best match.
- Ms. Stein recommended that the staff review the samples on site, adding that it is difficult to match brownstone, because so much pigment needs to be added to achieve the dark color. She noted that multiple samples may be required.
- Ms. Pentz stated her confusion over the cast iron columns.
 - Mr. Wind explained that the columns are to be installed behind the façade. The structure will be a column with a base and will be steel. The casting, he continued, will be cast in conjunction with the steel, which will then be tied into the brick behind the brownstone. He explained that the cast stone will have rebar embedded in it.
- Ms. Gutterman asked that Mr. Wind confirm with Cathedral Stone as to whether they allow steel embedded inside their castings. She also asked that he confirm that the color will be maintained over time. Because it is so dark, she continued, the colors sometimes changes over time. She added that Cathedral Stone should provide a shop drawing of the casting.
- Ms. Pentz observed that there is no top plate or another means to get the load into the column.
- Ms. Gutterman questioned why the applicant is not considering brownstone and inquired whether it can be sourced.
 - Mr. Wind explained that when he replaced the brownstone columns on the adjacent façade, he got the brownstone from a Connecticut facility that was in the process of closing.
 - Ms. Pentz observed that the replacement columns do not match the existing brownstone.
 - Mr. Cluver noted that brownstone contains natural variation and color. He added that Jahn has a long track record of patching brownstone, though he acknowledged Ms. Gutterman's concern about the color shifting over time. Brownstone, he continued, is a notoriously difficult material to repair, though he argued that the applicant is taking the right approach and proposing to replace the pilasters with an appropriate material.
- Mr. Wind noted that in replacing the pilasters, he would need to erect four stories of scaffolding, which will be expensive. He asked whether other repairs could be made at the same time.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that the staff can visit the site and review any other matters.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The applicant revised the application and now proposes to replace the removed brownstone pilasters with a single cast Jahn pilaster rather than a pilaster consisting of three pieces with joints.
- The historic brownstone pilasters were chamfered but had no carved or decorative elements.

- The castings would wrap structural columns and would include rebar embedded in Jahn.
- Substitute brownstone can change color over time.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- Jahn is an appropriate material for brownstone repair and replacement, satisfying Standard 2.
- Under the revised proposal, the replacement pilasters would replicate the original in color, design, and appearance, satisfying Standard 6.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised application that proposes a single casting for each pilaster, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 6, with the following conditions:

- The staff reviews samples of the Jahn to ensure the best match possible; and
- The fabricator confirms the appropriateness of the reinforcing with the casting.

ITEM: 2213 GREEN ST					
MOTION: Approval, with comments					
MOVED BY: Cluver					
SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					x
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 314 S 10TH ST

Proposal: Remove rear addition; construct rear addition; replace dormer sash

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Drew A. Moyer and Jude A. Tuma

Applicant: Christina Carter, John Milner Architects

History: 1837

Individual Designation: 6/29/1971

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

This four-story brick building at 314 S. 10th Street was constructed in 1837. Archival images show that windows at the north façade were blocked in; this is also apparent due to the change in mortar color at these locations. A rear frame addition is shown on maps up until at least 1931; however, no documentation has been found that indicates when the existing two-story, brick and frame addition was constructed. From 1961 on, building permit applications show the existence of a brick and frame two-story rear addition.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Remove existing two-story rear addition.
- Construct new three-story rear addition.
- Replace dormer windows with 4/4 wood sashes; replace existing siding and moldings in kind and matching original profiles.
- Clean north façade; stain mortar at in-fill locations to better match existing.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *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.*
 - The new dormer windows will return to a 4/4 configuration and shall be wood, as seen in archival images.
 - The dormers' siding and moldings will be replaced in kind; non-original elements will be replaced with wood and will match original profiles.
- *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.*
 - The existing two-story rear addition is not original to the period of construction and its demolition will not destroy historic materials;
 - The proposed new three-story addition will be situated in the same location as the existing;
 - The new addition will be differentiated from historic fabric by being set back 2" from the original house and by maintaining a cornice height that is lower than the adjacent historic fabric;
 - The use of brick for the new addition is compatible with the historic house.
- *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.*
 - The proposed addition will be located adjacent to the rear of the historic house and will not alter or obstruct historic fabric or views from the public right of way.
- *Masonry Rehabilitation Guideline: Cleaning soiled masonry surfaces with the gentlest methods possible, such as using low-pressure water and detergent and natural bristle or other soft-bristle brushes. Duplicating historic mortar joints in strength, composition, color and texture when repointing is necessary.*
 - Low water pressure and, if necessary, an appropriate restoration cleaner are proposed to clean the north façade.
 - An appropriate mortar stain is to be applied at the areas of in-fill where the mortar color differs from the rest of the wall in order to create uniformity across the north façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, 10 and the Masonry Rehabilitation Guideline.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:17:24

RECUSAL:

- Mr. Detwiler recused because the architectural firm for which he works is the applicant.

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Christina Carter represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee asked about the proposed mortar stain and whether there was an issue with the infilled brick not matching the original brick in size and color.
 - The applicant responded that the pointing at the north façade was sound, and that the infilled brick at the locations where the windows were previously matched the original quite well. Ms. Carter explained that her clients simply wanted to tone down the contrast in mortar colors which is why they were proposing a mortar stain.
- The Committee commented that the shadows of where the windows had been previously were a part of the building's story.
 - The applicant responded that when the windows were removed in the 1990s, those doing the work tried to disguise the alteration by toothing in the new brick. Ms Carter explained that was a different approach than what her firm may have done had they been involved in the work at the time.
- The Committee asked the applicant to confirm that they were proposing to use a stain on the mortar, noting that it would likely fade over time.
 - The applicant confirmed that they were proposing to use a stain on the mortar, and agreed that, over time, with exposure to environmental soiling, the stained mortar would likely fade. She explained that she had already let her clients know that the sections of stained mortar would not likely result in a perfect match. However, they still wanted to try and tone down the current contrast in mortar colors.
- The Committee asked if the window replacement was just of the sashes or if the frames were also being replaced.
 - The applicant said that the sashes and frames were being replaced. She explained that, although the dormer windows at the east façade were currently six-over-six lights, there was documentation that they had previously been four-over-four lights; they are proposing to return them to that configuration. The applicant said that the dormer window at the west façade had always been six-over-six lights; therefore, the new window would be as well.
- The Committee noted that the proposed three-story addition appeared to be of wood frame construction with a brick veneer. The Committee asked the applicant if they had found a brick for the addition that would closely match the brick of the house.
 - The applicant replied that they had not yet started searching for brick samples.
- The Committee asked if there was a detail of the pent roof above the door.
 - The applicant responded that they did not yet have a detail of the pent roof, but that it was something they wanted to propose since the door was

currently unprotected. Ms. Carter said that they were considering the use of a metal standing seam roof.

- The Committee commented that it was interesting to learn that there was a one-story rear addition documented in 1875.
 - The applicant explained that an insurance survey dating from around the time of construction noted that there was a one-story wood-frame bath house at the back of the property, but by 1885, the footprint of the addition appeared in its current location, directly adjacent to the western wall of the house.
- The Committee asked the applicant if she could document the existing two-story addition prior to demolishing it so that there could be a record of what was there, including the shingle size.
 - The applicant responded that they would carefully dismantle and document the two-story rear addition, thereby creating a record of it.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- Documentation was provided that showed the dormer window at the east façade was previously a four-over-four configuration.
- The precise date of construction of the existing two-story addition could not be determined, but is not thought to be original to the construction of the main house.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposal satisfied Standards 6, 9, 10 and the Masonry Rehabilitation Guideline.
- The applicant should carefully dismantle and document the existing two-story rear addition.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided mahogany is used for window replacement and the two-story addition is carefully dismantled and documented, with the staff to review the details of the pent roof, mortar staining, and new brick, pursuant Standards 6, 9, 10 and the Masonry Rehabilitation Guideline.

ITEM: 314 S 10TH ST MOTION: Approval MOVED BY: D'Alessandro SECONDED BY: Gutterman					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					x
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler				x	
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	5			1	1

ADDRESS: 825 WALNUT ST

Proposal: Install marquee; replace entry door; replace entry brick

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Walnut Street Theatre

Applicant: Jonathan Broh, JKR Partners LLC

History: 1905; Walnut Street Theater Annex

Individual Designation: 5/3/1973

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

This six-story building was constructed for office use in 1905 and now serves as the entrance to the Walnut Street Theatre. The existing entry doors situated within the vestibule appear to have been approved by the Historical Commission in 2011. The existing illuminated “Walnut Street Theatre” sign appears to have been approved by the Historical Commission in 2013.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Install new LED marquee above “Walnut Street Theatre” sign.
- Replace doors at existing entrance.
- Replace brick at entrance.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*
 - Though staff is not opposed to the concept of an LED marquee on this building, the location as proposed would install the marquee directly over a band of decorative terra cotta. Such detailing is a character-defining feature of this building and destroying it or permanently obstructing it does not comply with the Standards.
- *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.*
 - Though staff is not opposed to the concept of an LED marquee on this building, the location as proposed would install the marquee directly over a band of decorative terra cotta. Such detailing is a character-defining feature of this building and destroying it or permanently obstructing it does not comply with the Standards.
 - The proposed entry doors are replacing non-historic doors. Therefore, their removal and replacement does not destroy historic fabric. The proposed doors appear to be compatible with the existing, already altered entrance.
 - Though the brick adjacent to the existing entry doors is not historic, the proposed grey color for the replacement brick does not appear compatible with the brick to remain at the side walls of the vestibule. In addition, the smooth texture of the brick face and mortar joints as proposed lend a mismatched appearance rather than a differentiated one.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the entry doors, and denial of the marquee and replacement brick, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:31:35

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects Jonathan Broh and Ramune Bartuskaite represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee asked if the applicants had any response to the staff's recommendation.
 - Mr. Broh responded that the decorative terra cotta had been covered up with banners advertising the Walnut Street Theatre's performances for the last 20 years.
- The Committee stated that the banner was a temporary banner that could be removed.
 - The applicant responded that it was a temporary banner but it was always hanging on the building over the decorative terra cotta. Mr. Broh asked if there was any way to install a permanent marquee that would not attach at the decorative terra cotta, but just cover it. He said that they were unable to find any images of the decorative terra cotta. However, he believed that it was still there.
- The Committee questioned if the purpose of the proposed marquee was to advertise the name of the shows, rather than the name of the theater.
 - The applicant confirmed that this was accurate.
- The Committee noted that the current banner was temporary in material and nature and was being installed and removed without permission. The Committee acknowledged that they did not have purview over the new building that is proposed for the surface parking lot to the east of the theater. However, they wondered why the applicant could not find a location for the marquee on the new building instead of adding it to one of the designated buildings.
 - The applicant responded that the current entrance will serve as the entrance to both the new arena stage and the existing auditorium, meaning that the proposed marquee would service both spaces.
- The Committee questioned whether the marquee would be illuminated and change messages.
 - Mr. Broh stated that he believed it would have that capability. However, he was not entirely sure of the precise details of how the marquee would be used.
- The Committee commented that the current temporary banner was covering up a character-defining detail on the building, and was essentially taking advantage of a loophole since it was temporary and therefore not being reviewed as part of a permit. The Committee said that even if the marquee was installed in a way that would not further damage the terra cotta, the problem was that it would then be permanently obstructing the view of the decorative detail.
 - The applicant responded that there was no scenario in which the decorative terra cotta would be exposed, and that it would either be covered with the new marquee or with the temporary banner.

- The Committee told the applicant that he should see this as an opportunity to expose this decorative feature.
 - The applicant responded that the terra cotta could not be exposed because having a marquee above the entrance of the theater was of paramount importance.
- The Committee asked the applicant why the existing “Walnut Street Theatre” sign above the entrance could not be used as the location for the marquee, noting that the theater’s name was already on the original theater building. The Committee also pointed out that there was a blank wall on the original theater building that would be visible from pedestrians and cars heading west on Walnut Street where they could also consider installing signage.
 - The applicant responded that they were already planning on installing a blade sign at the new building.
- The Committee noted that, if the LED marquee was installed at the location of the existing “Walnut Street Theatre” sign above the entrance, it could display both the name of the theater as well as the names of the productions.
- The Committee asked when the brick in the vestibule had been installed.
 - The applicant responded that, although the doors had been replaced in approximately 2011, the arched brick openings and vestibule brick appeared to date from earlier. Mr. Broh explained that the design choices for the new brick and flooring for the vestibule were intended to respond to the significant design changes that were also being proposed for the lobby.
- The Committee asked about the treatment for the flooring within the vestibule.
 - The applicant replied that stone pavers with a black brick inset to match the wall were proposed.
- The Committee noted that, in one rendering, the new storefront appeared silver and in another it appeared dark bronze, and requested clarification from the applicant.
 - The applicant responded that the dark bronze color was the accurate rendering.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The Committee did not think that continuing to cover the terra cotta detail was a good approach.
- The Committee found that it would be helpful to review a complete signage package, including the new building, in order to evaluate the signage being proposed for the site as a whole.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed installation of the LED marquee would permanently obstruct a view of the decorative terra cotta band, and therefore does not comply with Standards 5 and 9.
- The removal and replacement of the non-historic entry doors does not destroy historic fabric, therefore meeting Standard 9.
- Rather than differentiating itself from the previous campaign of brick within the vestibule, the proposed grey/black brick color does not appear compatible with the surrounding design intent, and therefore does not meet Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the doors and brick replacement, with the staff to review details; and denial of the marquee, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9.

ITEM: 825 WALNUT ST MOTION: Approval of doors and brick; denial of marquee MOVED BY: Gutterman SECONDED BY: Cluver					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					x
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 352 S 4TH ST

Proposal: Install skylight and vents

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Nancy and Shahir Kassam-Adams

Applicant: Frank Kakos, Frank Kakos Architects

History: 1792; Joseph Wetherill, builder; new ground floor façade, entrance relocated to Pine St, 1967

Individual Designation: 4/30/1957

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

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

BACKGROUND:

This application proposes to alter the rear slope of the existing gable roof (on the main block) through the addition of a skylight, roof vent, and relocated stack vent pipe. The proposed changes are related to an interior alternation to create a bedroom loft in the existing attic level. In addition to light and ventilation, the skylight will serve as an emergency escape and rescue opening as required by code for sleeping areas. The existing side windows are not large enough to serve this function. The new roof vent is needed to provide ventilation to the existing roof system which includes wood shingles and rafters beneath asphalt shingles. The 4" stack vent is being relocated as it currently sits in the middle of the existing attic space. The exterior section of the stack vent will match the appearance of an existing stack vent on the lower rear roof.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Install 38" x 64" skylight with a 5" profile above the roof surface.
- Install a 15" x 11" roof vent with a 5" profile above the roof surface.
- Relocate stack vent pipe to lower roof. The 4" diameter pipe will be relocated near another stack vent pipe and will match the existing one.

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 MAY 2019

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alternations of features, spaces, and special relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
352 S 4th Street is located at the corner of S 4th and Pine Streets. The property sits at the end of the row with its south and west elevations visible from the public-right-of-way. Alternations to the roof will be visible, especially the addition of a 38" x 64" skylight.
- *Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*
The installation of the skylight entails removing a portion of the historic roof and materials. The visible changes will be located directly across from the Old Pine Street Presbyterian Church and cemetery.

STAFF COMMENT: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9. The proposed alterations of the roof do not satisfy Standards 2 and 9. The proposed changes are not compatible with its environment.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 02:49:16

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architect Frank Kakos and property owner Shahir Kassam-Adams represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Pentz asked the applicant what the required size is for an emergency escape and rescue opening.
 - Mr. Kakos responded that the required size is 24 inches high by 20 inches wide and 5.7 square feet open area total.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired about the sizes of the two windows on the south wall.
 - Mr. Kakos replied that they are 23 inches high by 21 inches wide and approximately 4.8 square feet open area total.
 - Ms. Stein asked if this is sizing for a single sash only. Mr. Kakos confirmed it is sizing for one sash only of the double-hung window.
- Ms. Gutterman pointed out that, if the side windows were casement windows designed to look like double-hung, the openings would meet the emergency escape and rescue opening requirements.
 - Mr. Kakos responded that potentially it could. He added that they also want to the skylight for ventilation, light, views, and to make the room nicer.
 - Ms. Stein stated that the Committee focuses on what is appropriate on the outside of the building notwithstanding what is happening in the interior. She continued that the Committee is assessing the skylight and its visibility in this neighborhood is appropriate to the building itself.
- Mr. Kakos pointed out that the skylight proposed is a low skylight at 5 inches high and is brown to blend in with the shingle roof.

- Ms. Gutterman contended that the skylight will be very visible. She added that if the property were one house in, it would not be as visible, but because it is on a corner it will be visible.
- Mr. Detwiler asked how much of the roof framing would be removed.
 - Mr. Kakos responded two rafters would be removed. He also stated that a house a few houses down has a couple of skylights and a roof hatch. He noted that 352 S. 4th Street also used to have a roof hatch up at the ridge.
- Ms. Gutterman asked how the roof is currently vented.
 - Mr. Kakos replied that there is a vent up near the ridge, on the rear side, and on the 4th Street side there is one down low but there is none down low on the west side of the gable.
- Mr. Detwiler inquired where the proposed vent would be installed.
 - Mr. Kakos explained that it would go on the rear gable roof, on the right side, down below the proposed skylight.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro pointed out that the vent should be at the ridge of the roof.
 - Mr. Kakos replied that there is an existing one there already.
 - Ms. Gutterman inquired why an additional vent is needed.
 - Mr. Kakos explained that there was air needed down low for circulation. He explained an early cedar shake roof exists underneath the asphalt shingle on top, and the ventilation is needed to keep the cedar shakes in good condition.
- Ms. Pentz inquired if there would be insulation installed between the rafters.
 - Mr. Kakos replied that there would be in the sloped part of the ceiling and it would be about an inch thick to allow for air circulation rather than packing it full of fiberglass insulation.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro inquired if it is exposed construction presently.
 - Mr. Kakos responded that the rafters have old fiberglass insulation stapled to them with no drywall or plaster covering it. He explained that this project will include installing drywall to finish the space.
- Ms. Gutterman inquired, based on her reading of the section drawings, if the vent only goes into the duct space.
 - Mr. Kakos explained how the existing and new vents would circulate the air through the finished spaces in the roof area.
- Mr. D'Alessandro stated that there has been a precedent set by the Committee to not approve skylights at the end of a row where the roofs are highly visible.
 - Mr. Kakos pointed out that the exterior photographs provided were taken in the winter when the roof was very visible, but he noted that in the summer, the roof is largely obscured by the trees. He noted that during the summer, the roof is only visible when from Pine Street.
 - Ms. Pentz agreed that she would not like to see the skylight in this location and stated that she would prefer to see the windows modified to allow for their use as emergency escape and rescue opening.
- Mr. Kakos inquired about the suggested casement window rather than using the skylight. Mr. Detwiler explained that it is possible to make a casement window that has a faux front to it, where there is a meeting rail that gives a shadow line, but it operates as one unit.
 - Mr. Kakos inquired if this was preferable to the Committee.
 - Ms. Gutterman opined the casement window was preferable to a skylight.
 - Mr. Kassam-Adams asked how this was safer.
 - Mr. Detwiler explained that the entire window opens.

- Mr. Kassam-Adams expressed concern about exiting from a 4th floor window with a ledge versus existing through the skylight and sitting on the roof.
- Ms. Gutterman responded that a drop-down ladder could be used with the casement window to enable exit from the window.
- Mr. Kassam-Adams pointed out that this would not be good for an elderly person or even himself.
- Ms. Gutterman pointed out there are sprinklers and other options but that is outside their jurisdiction, and the Committee must rule on what the architect and owner presented in their application.
- Mr. Kassam-Adams asked the Committee if a dormer window would be better.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that it would not because it would entail removing historic fabric and creating something new that would not be authentic to the building. She added that their charge is to protect the historic fabric of the neighborhood.
 - Mr. Kassam-Adams pointed out that other buildings have changes like what they are proposing.
 - Ms. Gutterman responded that these alternations may have been in place originally or prior to the historic district's designation. She explained that they must review and make decisions on a case-by-case basis, and they have to review what is being presented to the Committee in their application.
- Mr. Kassam-Adams asked the Committee if the skylight is the biggest issue.
 - Mr. D'Alessandro opined that the whole application was problematic. Mr. Kakos asked whether moving the skylight to the north would make a difference.
 - Ms. Gutterman replied that, for her, the issue is that the skylight is on the main roof.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The building at 352 S. 4th Street is individually designated as historic.
- The building at 352 S. 4th Street is classified as Significant in the Society Hill Historic District.
- The rear roof proposed for alteration is located directly across from the Old Pine Street Presbyterian Church and cemetery.
- The property sits at the end of the row, on the corner of Pine Street and S. 4th Street, with its south and west elevations visible from the public-right-of-way.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The proposed changes will be visible from the public right-of-way, especially the addition of a 38 inch x 64 inch skylight, and do not seem appropriate to the historic context and environment, and therefore does not satisfy Standard 2.
- The installation of the skylight entails removing a portion of the historic roof and materials, and therefore does not satisfy Standard 9.
- The changes proposed in the application are not appropriate when considering the property's historic context and environment.
- A revised application should be submitted without the skylight, with a casement window that looks like a double-hung window to allow for sleeping quarters on the

third level, and reconsideration of the ventilation system so it is not visible from the street.

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

ITEM: 352 S 4TH ST					
MOTION: Denial					
MOVED BY: Stein					
SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					x
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	6				1

ADDRESS: 219-29 S 18TH ST, UNIT 201

Proposal: Cut new window openings and inset balcony

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Karen Buchholz

Applicant: John Toates, John Toates Architecture and Design, LLC

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

Individual Designation: None

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

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

BACKGROUND: This application proposes to cut three new window openings and reopen one blind opening at the second floor of the Parc Rittenhouse building at 18th and Locust Streets. The second floor, which was most recently used as office space, is being converted to residential space. All floors above the second floor are already used as residential space.

The building was constructed as the Penn Athletic Club in 1925. The building underwent major renovations in 1957, which were unsympathetic, when it was converted for office space for the U.S. government. At that time, window openings were significantly altered, new window openings and windows were added, and ornamental features were removed. The new window openings were cut based on internal needs, resulting in an irregular window pattern on the exterior. The building was converted to residential use at floors three and above in 2006. The Historical Commission approved many changes for the project, in concept in 2004 and final approval in 2006. A large addition was constructed at the roof and lost ornament was recreated. At that time, the irregular window patterns were regularized and completed at floors three and above. The regularized window pattern was not extended to the second floor in 2006 because it remained office space. The Historical Commission noted that alterations and additions proposed in 2006, including the regularizing of the window openings, would not have been appropriate on

many historic buildings, but were appropriate for this building because they overcame the adverse effects of the 1957 renovation.

The second floor is now being rehabilitated as residential space, completing the conversion of the building. The owner of the unit at the corner of 18th and Locust Streets would like to continue the window pattern approved in 2004 and 2006 for floors three and above at the second floor. Two windows would be added on 18th Street and one on Locust Street. The windows would match the historic windows on the second floor, with the exception that they would have brick sills and jambs, not the terra cotta sills, spandrels, and jambs of the historic openings. The new owner would also like to reopen a blind opening on Locust Street for a terrace. Information in the form of a historic photograph as well as photographs of scars on the building demonstrate that the blind opening was a true opening at one time. A replica of metal railings found at the building would be installed in the new opening for the terrace. The Historical Commission reviewed and denied two applications to remove the brick in the blind opening previously, but neither application demonstrated that the opening had been a true opening in the past. Moreover, the denied applications proposed a glass railing and provided no details for the work. The current application offers a justification for reopening the blind opening as well as full details for the alteration.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Cut three new window openings and add windows to match existing windows.
- Remove brick infill in opening and install metal railing to create terrace

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *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.*
 - The new window openings and windows will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The cutting and installation of the new windows will complete the incomplete window pattern started in 1957 and continued in 2006.
 - The re-opening of the blind opening will recreate a historic if not original condition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Historical Commission's approvals in 2004 and 2006.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:03:32

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Architects John Toates and Mark Hoffman and property owner Karen Buchholz represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Gutterman asked about the blind opening and when and to what extent it had been opened. Mr. Toates displayed a large format photograph of the building with the infill removed from the opening. He then showed additional photographs taken from within the building showing where the opening had been infilled. Ms. Gutterman agreed that the blind opening had been truly open at one time, but she questioned whether the entirety of the opening had been free of infill. Mr. Toates agreed that the open area did not include the entirety of the current blind opening.
- Mr. Toates presented diagrams that showed what windows and other parts of the building had been changed in 1957 and 2006. He explained that the earlier changes altered the building from its historic condition and established new window patterns for the building. He stated that he is seeking to comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards by proposing a project that is both compatible with and differentiated from the historic while completing the new window pattern.
- Mr. Toates stated that he is proposing to reopen the blind opening, but not to the width of the recessed brick. He stated that he would like to open it to the width of the openings above because the earliest descriptions of the building in 19227 refer to the "vertical slit that runs through the building." He explained that he is seeking to restore that slit by opening the blind opening to the width of the openings above. He stated that the original intent of the building has been lost with the many changes. His proposal would return the building back closer to its original intent. He noted that all brick would be salvaged for used to rebuild the jambs and side and rear walls of the open area.
- Mr. Toates stated that the new window openings would be detailed like the historic windows but would not include the historic terra cotta jambs and sills. The new jambs and sills would be brick. The new windows would match the nearby replacement windows exactly and would be set into the façade 10 inches like the historic windows.
- Mr. Toates explained that the area in the unit in question behind the blind opening used to be part of the fire stair but the door to the stair was removed and infilled at some point. The area behind the blind opening is now a strange unused space.
- Ms. Gutterman stated that she did not object to the reopening of the blind opening but did object to the placement of furniture on the new terrace. She stated that any approval of the terrace should be conditioned to prohibit the placement of umbrellas, grills, and other such furniture on it. She stated that the Architectural Committee objected to the earlier proposals because of the desire to prevent views of deck furniture. Mr. Toates responded that he is not proposing any visible light fixtures. He stated that he understands that this space should be perceived as a dark void. He noted that he is proposing a n opening that is 3'-6" wide; the area will be too small for "Mardi Gras-type revelry."
- Mr. Detwiler asked why the proposed windows are sized like the other windows on the second floor and not like the windows above. Mr. Toates responded that they experimented with several window sizes including the sizes of the windows above and found that the narrower windows looked very awkward. He stated that their design intent is to complete the new window pattern that was started in the 1950s and added to in the 2000s. He stated that the second floor is the piano nobile and the new windows want to be sized like the other second floor windows. Because the second-floor windows are much taller than the windows above, the new second-floor need to be as wide as the other second-floor windows or their proportions become very awkward. Mr. Detwiler stated that the building was very solid, but it has been

turned it into “Swiss cheese” with the new window openings. Mr. Toates agreed but added that the window pattern was set with the earlier changes. At this point, the windows look unfinished at the second floor. This project is intended to complete the window pattern that was extended to every floor but the second. The second floor escaped the earlier changes only because it was office space, not residential space like the rest of the building. Mr. Detwiler stated that the new windows should be as narrow as the windows above. Mr. Toates disagreed and stated that they would then have strange proportions. They would be very tall and narrow if taking the height from the second floor and width from the third floor.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The non-historic window pattern was established with the changes in 1957 as well as the changes in 2006, which the Historical Commission approved.
- The blind opening, which is currently infilled, was previously open.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The new window openings and windows will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The cutting and installation of the new windows will complete the incomplete window pattern started in 1957 and continued in 2006, satisfying Standard 9.
- The re-opening of the blind opening will recreate a historic if not original condition, satisfying Standard 9.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the new window openings with windows and the re-opening of the blind opening to the width of the current recess, provided the area has no exterior lighting, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ITEM: 219-29 S. 18th Street, Unit 201					
MOTION: Approve windows					
MOVED BY: Stein					
SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					x
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler		x			
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	5	1			1

ITEM: 219-29 S. 18th Street, Unit 201 MOTION: Approve opening blind opening to width of recess MOVED BY: Stein SECONDED BY: Detwiler					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					x
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman		x			
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	5	1			1

ADDRESS: 322-40 RACE ST

Proposal: Relocate building; remove rear ell; construct mixed-use building

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Old First Reformed United Church of Christ

Applicant: David La Fontaine, Community Ventures

History: 1837; First German Reformed Church; altered 1882 and 1968; includes houses at 151 and 153 N 4th St

Individual Designation: 1/25/1966

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

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

BACKGROUND: This application proposes to construct a mixed-use building on the site of the Old First Reformed United Church of Christ at the southeast corner of 4th and Race Streets in the Old City Historic District. The building would include residential and service facilities for homeless men, commercial spaces, and offices for the church.

The site of the new building, along 4th Street to the west of the church building, currently includes an eighteenth-century house classified as significant, a pseudo-colonial house classified as non-contributing, a surface parking lot, and open space. To clear the site for the new building, the non-contributing building would be demolished and the main block of the eighteenth-century house would be relocated to the south against the party wall of the adjacent building and incorporated into the new building. The rear ell of the eighteenth-century house would be removed. The new building would include a two-story section for church offices adjacent to the relocated house and a five-story section at the corner with commercial space on the ground floor and residential units with support spaces on the upper floors. The new building would be beveled to maintain views of the church from Race Street. The new building would be designed to meet passive house standards and would be clad with brick, cast stone or similar material, EIFS, and metal panels. The church-office section of the building would be clad in cast stone and have the appearance of a separate building. The mass of the new building would be broken down with shifts in height, changes in materials, and the inclusion of bay-like elements. The upper floors would stand on pilotis at the northeast side of the building. It is important to note that, although the land at the corner of 4th and Race is now open, it was historically built up with structures about the size of the proposed building. The clearing of that land post-dates the period of significance of the historic district by many decades.

The eighteenth-century house was rehabilitated in the 1970s. A c. 1900 storefront was removed and the first-floor front façade was restored with a door with marble stoop, window, and bulkhead. Unfortunately, the brick used to rebuild the first floor was not a good match for the brick above. To cover the scar in the brick where a beam was inserted above the storefront, a pent eave was added. The pent eave as well as the cornice were returned onto the south party wall; such returns would have been impossible historically owing to the adjacent building. Chimneys were added at the main block and rear ell.

To move the eighteenth-century house, the rear ell and non-historic chimneys would be demolished. The main block would be shifted to the south, onto the surface parking lot. The front façade would be restored, albeit without the bulkhead. As an alternate, the reconstruction of the c. 1900 storefront is proposed, which would provide an accessible entrance to the building.

SCOPE OF WORK

- Remove rear ell and non-historic chimneys of the eighteenth-century house and move main block south to party wall
- Demolish non-contributing house
- Construct mixed-use building

STANDARDS FOR REVIEW:

Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance prohibits the demolition of a historic resources unless the Historical Commission finds that the demolition is “necessary in the public interest, or unless the Historical Commission finds that the building ... cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.”

- The Historical Commission must decide whether the removal of the rear ell and relocation of the main block would constitute a demolition. If they do constitute a demolition, the Historical Commission is prohibited from approving the project without first finding that the demolition is necessary in the public interest or the building cannot be used for any purpose for which it is or may be reasonably adapted.

Section 14-203(88) of the historic preservation ordinance defines “Demolition or Demolish” as:

- The razing or destruction, whether entirely or in significant part, of a building, structure, site, or object. Demolition includes the removal of a building, structure, site, or object from its site or the removal or destruction of the façade or surface.
 - The project does not propose the razing or destruction of the building in its entirety.
 - The project does propose the razing or destruction of the rear ell. The Historical Commission must decide whether the removal of the rear ell is a razing or destruction in significant part.
 - The project does propose the relocation of the main block. The Historical Commission must decide whether the relocation of the main block is a removal of a building from its site.

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines include:

- *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.*

- The Historical Commission must decide whether the new construction will destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property.
- The Historical Commission must decide whether the new construction will 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 shall 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.*
 - The Historical Commission must decide whether the 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.
- *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.*
 - The application proposes to incorporate the main block of the eighteenth-century house into the new building. The front façade would be restored, excepting the cellar bulkhead. As an alternate, a c. 1900 storefront that was removed in the 1970s would be reconstructed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends approval of the removal of the rear ell and relocation of the main block; and approval in concept of the new building. The staff contends that:

- The removal of the rear ell is not a demolition because it is not a razing or destruction in significant part. The rear ell does not characterize the property and is not part of the essential form and integrity of the historic property because it was not historically visible from the public right-of-way. The removal of the rear ell can be treated as an alteration and does not trigger the demolition prohibition in Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance. The removal satisfies Standards 9 and 10.
- The relocation of the main block is not a demolition because the building will not be removed from its site; it will be relocated on the same site. Moreover, placing the building up against a party wall will restore the historic relationship between this building and an adjacent neighbor. The relocation of the main block can be treated as an alteration and does not trigger the demolition prohibition in Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance. The relocation satisfies Standards 9 and 10.
- The restoration of the main block satisfies Standards 2 and 5, provided the eighteenth-century appearance of the first-floor front is retained (in lieu of the reconstructed storefront), including the reconstruction of the cellar bulkhead.
- The overall location, size, and massing of the new building satisfies Standard 9, but aspects of the materials, features, scales, and proportions do not.
 - The relationships between the brick, stucco, and metal panels seem unresolved. Choices of where to place brick and metal panels seem arbitrary.
 - The sizes, scales, proportions, and rhythms of the windows are unrelated to those of the surrounding historic buildings.
 - The use of the metal panels to create bay-window-like elements seems appropriate, but the designs of the bays at the corners seems unresolved.
 - The pilotis at the northeast façade seem incompatible with the historic church.

- The Race Street façade seems unresolved, especially where the windows at the ends of the corridors create a void at the center of what might be considered the main façade.
- Overall, the design of the new building should be better related to design elements found in the Old City Historic District. Additional detailing of the new construction should be provided for final approval. While full construction drawings are not necessary, the application should provide some information about details like storefront systems, window and door frames, etc.

START TIME OF DISCUSSION IN AUDIO RECORDING: 03:26:40

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee.
- Attorney David Gest, preservation consultant Cindy Hamilton, architect Morris Zimmerman, developer David La Fontaine, and Pastor Michael Caine represented the application.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Gest stated that their goal with this review is to determine whether they can remove the rear ell and move the eighteenth-century building and construct a building to the north of the moved building. He acknowledged that they need to continue to develop the architecture of the new building. He stated that they have applied for final approval but understand that the new construction may require another round of review. The goal today is to determine whether the overall plan is feasible from the Historical Commission's perspective. He stated that, in his opinion, the moving of the building and removal of its rear ell does not constitute a demolition in the legal sense and therefore does not require a finding of public interest or hardship for approval. He noted that the rear ell was not visible from the street historically. He noted that the moved building would be relocated on the same site, not moved to a new site. He asserted that the massing of the proposed building is appropriate, even if some of the details have not yet been developed.
- Pastor Caine explained that the church had been historically located at this site but moved to West Philadelphia in the mid nineteenth century. In 1967, the church moved back to its original location and renovated its historic church to be part of the renewal of Old City. He stated that at that time the church began to focus on the people who are often overlooked in society, especially the homeless and urban poor. He stated that the practice of the congregation's religion includes ministering to the homeless. He reported that the congregation opened a homeless shelter in the church in 1986 and has operated it ever since. He noted that there was a rise in homeless in the mid 1980s and, at the request of the Mayor, the church opened its doors to those in need. Currently, homeless persons live in the social hall of the church but the conditions are not ideal. To fulfill the mission, the church is seeking to construct an adequate facility for the homeless that it serves.
- Mr. La Fontaine explained that his company, Community Ventures, is a non-profit housing developer and is partnering with the church to construct the facility. The mission of the company is to provide affordable housing. This facility will have 34 units for men and women.
- Mr. Zimmerman showed numerous images of massing studies for the versions of the new building with the historic building to explain how they arrived at the decision to move the historic building. He stated that they could not develop an efficient building

- with the historic building in place. Therefore, they explored moving the building and found that moving it offered the possibility to construct an efficient building. Mr. Zimmerman noted that they still need to “fine tune” the new construction.
- Ms. Hamilton explained that moving the historic building and constructing the new building will restore the streetscape and context of the historic building. It currently stands in isolation adjacent to surface parking lots and a non-historic building but was historically part of a row. She noted that the rear ell was not visible from the street historically and has been altered.
 - Ms. Gutterman asked if the historic building can safely be moved. Ms. Hamilton responded that they have been working with Wolfe House & Building Movers, which has concluded that the building can be easily and safely moved. Mr. D’Alessandro, the contractor on the Architectural Committee, agreed that the building can be easily and safely moved. Mr. Zimmerman stated that Wolfe can move the building.
 - Ms. Gutterman stated that the massing of the proposed building is appropriate, but the materials and features like windows need to be developed further. She objected to the use of EIFS. Mr. Zimmerman stated that EIFS technology has been approved and is an appropriate material. He stated that the building is being designed to meet passive house standards and EIFS is one of few materials that has been tested and proven to meet those standards.
 - Ms. Stein stated that the new building should integrate better with the historic neighborhood. In its current form, it is out of character with the historic district.
 - The Committee members commented that the building is large for the area. Mr. Zimmerman disagreed. He explained that the proposed building would be the shortest of the buildings at the corner of 4th and Race Streets. The nineteenth-century building at the northeast corner is taller. The new construction at the northwest corner is the same height or taller. The U.S. Mint at the southwest corner is taller and presents a blank façade for the entire block. He added that the building to the east of the church, across Orianna, is the tallest in the area and taller than their proposed building. Ms. Gutterman countered that the height itself is not problematic; the corner of the proposed building should be redesigned. Mr. Gest pointed out that the area at the corner of 4th and Race, which is now a surface parking lot, was historically occupied by large buildings. The current openness of the corner is a non-historic condition. Ms. Gutterman stated that the height and massing are fine; the problem is the colors and materials. She stated that the proposed building is too “hodge-podge.” She added that “it does not come across as being a uniform building.” “This is too busy.”
 - Mr. Zimmerman showed several massing diagrams and explained that the lower section to the south is intended to allow light and air to the side of the church, where the windows are located.
 - Mr. La Fontaine stated that they would like an answer on the massing. Pastor Caine stated that the congregation has reviewed and approved the massing of the new building. The congregation appreciates the fact that it will frame the historic church. Ms. Gutterman responded that she approves of the height and massing of the building, but not its detailing. The colors, materials, and articulations need revision.
 - Mr. La Fontaine asked the Committee members if they would be willing to support an approval in concept. Ms. Gutterman stated that they would.
 - Ms. Stein asked Mr. Zimmerman asked the applicants to discuss the floor-to-floor heights. Mr. Zimmerman replied that the second floor of the new building is designed to correspond to the third floor of the historic building. He noted that the site drops about three feet from north to south along 4th Street. He acknowledged that the floor-

- to-floor height is rather tall in the two-story section, but it needs to be to accommodate numerous conditions at the site and historic building.
- Mr. Gest concluded that his clients would like some feedback on the moving of the historic building and the massing and location of the new building, even if it is only a recommendation of approval in concept.
 - Mr. Detwiler stated that he is not opposed to the moving of the building, but opined that the benefits of moving it probably do not offset the costs.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Cynthia Ballock, the neighbor to the south, stated that she did not oppose the project. She asked about moving the historic building up against her building. Mr. Zimmerman explained that the former party wall at the south of the church's property survives. The party wall stands about 1'-6" off the property line. Therefore, the moved building will stand about two feet north of the property line. Ms. Ballock stated that the new building should blend in with the neighborhood.
- Patrick Grossi of the Preservation Alliance stated that the applicants presented the project to his organization. He stated that the Preservation Alliance does not object to the moving of the house or the removal of the rear ell. He added that he is ambivalent on the reconstruction of the storefront that was replaced in the 1970s. He suggested that the applicants should continue to work on the design of the new building. He concluded that the end use of the new building is laudable.
- Elizabeth Walker, a member of the church, stated that the building design was intended to break down the mass of the large building to look like multiple smaller buildings.
- Kate McGlinchey of the Old City District noted that an official RCO meeting has not yet been held on this project yet, but the applicants did meet with the board members of the Old City District.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Architectural Committee found that:

- The building at 151 N. 4th Street is classified as Significant in the Old City Historic District.
- The building at 153 N. 4th Street is classified as Non-contributing in the Old City Historic District.
- Buildings once stood on the east side of N. 4th Street to the corner at Race Street.
- The building at 151 N. 4th Street had a c. 1900 storefront at the first floor until the rehabilitation in the 1970s.
- The building at 151 N. 4th Street can be safely moved.

The Architectural Committee concluded that:

- The removal of the rear ell is not a demolition because it is not a razing or destruction in significant part. The rear ell does not characterize the property and is not part of the essential form and integrity of the historic property because it was not historically visible from the public right-of-way. The removal of the rear ell can be treated as an alteration and does not trigger the demolition prohibition in Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance. The removal satisfies Standards 9 and 10.
- The relocation of the main block is not a demolition because the building will not be removed from its site; it will be relocated on the same site. Moreover, placing the building up against a party wall will restore the historic relationship between this

building and an adjacent neighbor. The relocation of the main block can be treated as an alteration and does not trigger the demolition prohibition in Section 14-1005(6)(d) of the historic preservation ordinance. The relocation satisfies Standards 9 and 10.

- The restoration of the main block satisfies Standards 2 and 5, provided the eighteenth-century appearance of the first-floor front is retained (in lieu of the reconstructed storefront), including the reconstruction of the cellar bulkhead.
- The overall location, size, and massing of the new building satisfies Standard 9, but aspects of the materials, colors, features, scales, and proportions do not and should be revised.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of the moving of the historic building, removal of the rear ell, and massing and location of the new building, with the understanding that the design of the new building will be revised before final approval.

ITEM: 322-40 Race St MOTION: Approval in concept MOVED BY: Stein SECONDED BY: D'Alessandro					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Dan McCoubrey					x
John Cluver	x				
Rudy D'Alessandro	x				
Justin Detwiler	x				
Nan Gutterman	x				
Suzanne Pentz	x				
Amy Stein	x				
Total	6				1

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 1:02 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

- Minutes of the Architectural Committee are presented in action format. Additional information is available in the audio recording for this meeting. The start time for each agenda item in the recording is noted.
- Application materials and staff overviews are available on the Historical Commission's website, www.phila.gov/historical, under "Current Applications."