

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

**TUESDAY, 28 OCTOBER 2014
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

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

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

ALSO PRESENT

Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Lorna Katz Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association
Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker Partners
Dan Kayser, Cecil Baker Partners
Cecil Baker, Cecil Baker Partners
Justino E. Navarro, Spring Garden Civic Association
Kim Cassar, Horizon Signs
Kevin Balch, Horizon Signs
Carey Jackson Yonce, Canno Design
Yiwen Zhang, Canno Design
Matthew Mowrer, CVM
David Gest, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Jeffrey Pustizzi, Esq.
Gabrielle Canno, Canno Design
Donna H. Mueller
John Loonstyn
Yao-Chang Huang, YCH Architects
Hui Yan Zhen, 360 M LLC

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Gutterman, Pentz, and Stein and Messrs. Cluver, D'Alessandro, and McCoubrey joined her.

ADDRESS: 500-06 WALNUT ST

Project: Construct 26-story residential tower

Review Requested: Review and Comment

Owner: 500 Walnut Partners, L.P.

Applicant: Rod Werner, Scannapieco Development Corporation

History: vacant lot

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a 26-story, multi-family residential tower on a currently vacant lot. The inventory lists the property as non-contributing, but with archaeological potential. The site was undeveloped at the time of designation and, therefore, the Commission's jurisdiction is review-and-comment. Several structures on the site were demolished in 1992. The proposed new building setbacks have been determined in conjunction with the National Park Service and other interested parties to protect views of Independence Hall from the Liberty Bell. The project has received zoning approval.

The new tower would include 40 residential units and various amenities, a ground-floor commercial unit along 5th and Walnut Streets, and below-ground, automated parking, with curb cuts along both 5th and St. James Streets. The proposed building materials are glass and metal curtain walls, with areas of stone cladding at the base. The upper floors include a mix of metal-frame windows and multi-story window walls.

STAFF COMMENT: The staff comments that the proposed building will be differentiated from yet compatible with its context within the Society Hill District.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Cecil Baker and Eric Leighton, and developer Rod Werner represented the application.

Ms. DiPasquale distributed letters from the National Park Service as well as attorney Robert D. Greenbaum, counsel for the Washington Square East Condominium No. 1.

Mr. Baker noted that the project has a long history, and that they have employed a punched-opening architecture around three-quarters of the building, and then, at the request of the National Park Service, chamfered the building to preserve the views from the Liberty Bell to blue sky behind the Independence Hall tower. The upper portions of the building would be curtain wall construction. The proposed building, Mr. Baker continued, sits on a four-story podium, and the front of the building relates to the scale and proportions of the neighboring Egyptian Revival remnant at the Penn Mutual building. He described the programming of the building, noting that the multi-million-dollar residential units will be marketed to a very small segment of the population.

Mr. Cluver commented that one thing that struck him was the change from the punched openings to the glass at the second and third-floor levels. He commented that the residents will want more privacy than the glass will provide. Mr. Baker replied that privacy is less of an issue, and that the market at this price range demands floor to ceiling windows with spectacular views. Mr. Cluver opined that more punched openings would be more appropriate within a historic

district. Ms. Hawkins suggested that Mr. Cluver read the letter from the National Park Service before commenting on the materials selection. Mr. Baker noted that it is the corner of the base of the building that is glass, as it is in keeping with the chamfered portion of the building. Ms. Hawkins asked that the Committee and applicants take a moment to read the 14-page document received from the National Park Service. Ms. Hawkins stated that the materials in question were depicted in Exhibit C of the National Park Service document. Ms. Gutterman noted that Exhibit C does not state where the materials are to be used. Mr. Baker described the locations of the various materials on the proposed façade. He noted that the colors for the metal panels have not yet been selected, but that they are meeting with the Society Hill Civic Association on November 12. The glass, he noted, is almost clear with a slight tint, the closest example of which is the Nano Center at the University of Pennsylvania.

Ms. Hawkins commented that the solidity of the building as it turns the corner is in question. Mr. Baker responded that the glazed portion of the base at the corner is part of the language of the upper floors. Mr. Cluver replied that he did not read it that way, and that, at the street level, the connection between the base and the curtain-walled upper floors will not be noticeable. Mr. Cluver continued that a solid, more punched opening mass turning the corner, consistent with what is proposed at the rear along 5th Street, would be more compatible with the historic district.

Mr. Cluver and Ms. Stein expressed confusion over differences between the drawings and the renderings, noting that the drawings indicate balconies that are not depicted on the renderings. Mr. Baker confirmed that there would be balconies.

Mr. McCoubrey commented that the metal panels depicted looked very light in color, but Mr. Baker confirmed that that was not the desired color. Mr. McCoubrey also suggested that more of the punched-opening vocabulary should be incorporated along Walnut Street, and Mr. Baker noted that they would explore that option. Ms. Hawkins agreed with Mr. McCoubrey, noting that if the base was to be a true plinth for the tower, there needs to be a sense of solidity. She also commented that, walking along Walnut Street, a pedestrian will not necessarily read the tower as part of the base.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if the stone being proposed is limestone, and Mr. Baker confirmed that it is. Ms. Hawkins asked where the limestone would be used, and Mr. Baker responded that it would be used for the pilasters, but not the horizontal bands. Ms. Gutterman asked if the horizontal bands would be metal panels, and Mr. Baker confirmed that they would. Ms. Stein asked if the limestone and metal panels would be flush, and Mr. Baker confirmed that they would. Mr. Baker noted that stone would also be used along the base of the building below the windows.

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor to public comment. Lorna Katz Lawson of the Society Hill Civic Association asked for clarification on several matters. First, she asked about the entrance along St. James, noting that the plans differed from the renderings. Secondly, she claimed that the balconies behind the glass railings could end up looking very messy. She suggested that the residents would store things on their balconies like bicycles, grills, lawn furniture, and trash, which would look bad from the street, giving the building a dingy, run-down appearance. She asked the Committee to require solid balcony railings to hide the detritus that would inevitably collect on these balconies. Mr. Baker responded that the target clientele would likely keep their balconies tidy.

Mr. Cluver commented that the applicant might want to explore creating a cornice line at the top of the third floor to establish a top to the base or plinth.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee commented that the façade along Walnut and 5th Streets should have more punched openings and a more solid, masonry-like character consistent with the historic district and the rear half of the proposed building, and that the applicant should further address the materials as they relate to the National Park Service agreement.

ADDRESS: 1417 LOCUST ST, AKA 215 S 15TH ST

Project: Install signage and awnings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Fellheimer & Elchen LLP

Applicant: Kim Cassar, Horizon Signs LLC

History: 1870; 5th Police District, Bookbinder's, Applebee's; Charles D. Supplee & Son, architect; alterations, 1898

Individual Designation: 4/18/1990

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a set of LED illuminated channel letters on a raceway along the west elevation, to reface an existing projecting blade sign, and to replace awnings with new non-illuminated Sunbrella awnings with metal graphics.

The proposed illuminated sign is 4'5" high at its tallest point, by 9'8" wide, with the individual Applebee's letters each measuring approximately 2' in height. The proposed sign would require numerous attachments to the masonry, as well as a conduit through the facade. The sides of the letters would be metal, while the faces would be plastic. The sign would replace an illegally installed banner that has been in place since 2011.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the awnings and refacing of the existing blade sign; denial of the illuminated channel letter sign, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. DiPasquale presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Kim Cassar and Kevin Balch of Horizon Signs, LLC represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the principal focus of the discussion would be the channel-letter sign.

Ms. Cassar provided the Committee members with additional information regarding the installation method for the sign. The engineer, she noted, suggested four fasteners at the top of the raceway and four at the bottom, with three on the apple. Ms. Hawkins asked the size of the mortar joints, and Mr. Balch responded that mortar joints are typically one-half inch in width. The Committee members disagreed, noting that mortar joints are never that wide. Ms. Hawkins asked if the applicant actually measured the size of the mortar joint; the applicant indicated that they had not. The drill bit, Mr. Balch noted, would be one-half inch in diameter.

Ms. Stein commented that the awning and refacing of the existing projecting sign seem to be improvements, but asked why the new signage could not be incorporated into the awnings or

inside of the building. Ms. Cassar noted that Applebee's has been rebranding all of its stores, and that its typical signage package includes the channel sign and awnings. Ms. Stein responded that the location of this restaurant in an urban environment differs from the usual location of Applebee's restaurants, and that there is already an enormous sign for the property which serves the purpose for anyone walking or driving down the street.

Ms. Gutterman noted that the Applebee's logo could be moved onto the face of the awning in the center and still serve the purpose of the head-on view of the sign from 15th Street. Ms. Gutterman opined that the building is not very large, and already has enough signage. Ms. Cassar asked whether the Bookbinders flat wall sign, which was removed when the building was renovated, provided any past precedent, and Mr. Cluver responded that that sign was not appropriate for the building, and that its removal benefited the building. Ms. Cassar noted that, from many angles, the existing projecting sign is not visible to passersby. Ms. Hawkins noted that the applicant was also free to explore signage on the interior of the building behind the glazing as a way to capture the attention of drivers. Ms. Gutterman reiterated that if the logo were incorporated into the awning, it would be equally visible. Ms. Cassar asked whether the placement of the logo on the awning would need to be re-reviewed by the Committee and Commission, and Ms. Hawkins responded that they could make a recommendation that the staff consider that option.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the term "metal graphic," and Ms. Cassar responded that the apple graphic on the awning is flat aluminum so that the graphics do not peel.

Mr. Cluver noted that in the revised application, there was an additional awning added along the side of the building. Ms. Cassar confirmed this, noting that it would replace an existing awning. Ms. Hawkins asked whether the frame would also be replaced, and Mr. Balch confirmed that it would be replaced. Ms. Hawkins asked whether the new awning frames could be installed in the same place, using the same anchor holes as the existing awnings, and Mr. Balch confirmed that the anchor holes could and would be used.

Ms. Hawkins asked why the existing armature could not be used, and Mr. Balch responded that it depends on how the awning material was fastened to the armature, and that sometimes it is easier to make a new identically sized frame. Ms. Cassar noted that the existing frames are roughly ten years old and that it is recommended to update the hardware for longevity. Ms. Hawkins asked whether the proposed new awning matched the existing front awning in every way, and Mr. Balch confirmed that it does.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the awnings and re-facing of the blade sign, provided that the existing anchor holes be reused for the installation of the new awnings, with a recommendation that an Applebee's graphic be incorporated onto the face of the awning along 15th Street, and denial of the channel sign, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

ADDRESS: 2322-32 GREEN ST

Project: Demolish non-contributing building; construct 10 single-family dwellings

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: How Properties

Applicant: Carey Jackson Yonce, CANNO Design

History: 1948; St. Francis Xavier Convent

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the demolition of a non-contributing building and the construction of ten townhouses. Seven of the townhouses will face Green Street and three will face Pennsylvania Avenue. Parking will be accessed through a common driveway on Pennsylvania Avenue. Because of grade changes, the houses on Green Street will be three stories tall at their front facades and four stories at the rear. The houses will be faced with brick; the ground floors of the houses on Pennsylvania Avenue will be clad in stone. The houses on Green Street will have terraced front yards and two-story front bays with large metal windows. The houses on Pennsylvania Avenue are set closer to the street. The houses will have rooftop decks with stair houses. The site is located at the southwest corner of the historic district, on the boundary of the district. Most of the buildings of the 2300-block of Pennsylvania Avenue are listed as non-contributing to the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the individual townhouses are demarcated as suggested, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Carey Jackson Yonce, developer Gary Jonas, and attorney Jeffrey Pustizzi represented the application.

Mr. Yonce presented revised architectural drawings with articulations at the cornice line showing the divisions between the townhouses on Green Street, but not on Pennsylvania Avenue. Ms. Gutterman opined that the articulation should be added to the cornice on Pennsylvania Avenue as well. Mr. Yonce replied that the façade design for Pennsylvania Avenue is not like that for Green Street. The cornice design differs and cannot simply be updated like it was on Green Street. Mr. Yonce noted that the window spacing on Pennsylvania is also different and already creates the rhythm that the cornice revisions will create on Green. Ms. Gutterman asked if control joints will be included on the facades between the townhouse units. Mr. Yonce replied that control joints will articulate the facades at the breaks between units. Ms. Gutterman responded that the control joints could be developed to create the divisions between buildings and break up the planarity of the facades. Mr. Yonce stated that he could distinguish the units on Pennsylvania with the control joints instead of modifying the cornice, as Ms. Gutterman had first suggested.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the privacy fences separating the roof decks could taper in height as they approach the front facades. Mr. Yonce agreed to consider Ms. Hawkin's suggestion.

Mr. Cluver contended that the Historical Commission does not normally approve decks on the fronts of main roofs of historic row houses. He asked if the decks could be set back to the rears of the buildings. Mr. Yonce noted that these building will be new, not historic, and observed that,

owing to the locations, these buildings can be viewed from a variety of angles; the rears are not necessarily less visible to the public. Therefore, locating the decks at the rears will not necessarily mean that they will be hidden from view. He explained that the decks were located to take advantage of the best views of the skyline and parkway. Mr. Cluver again noted that decks are not appropriate on the fronts of historic buildings. Mr. Yonce responded that they did not seek to hide the decks because they are parts of new buildings. He noted that the railings and penthouses will be finely detailed and finished and will not detract from the appearance of the new buildings. He added that these buildings were designed to be seen from all sides and angles. The rears are as nicely finished as the fronts, owing to the configuration of the site. Ms. Stein expressed concern about the size of the penthouses and asked if they could be reduced in size by pairing them or reducing their program. Ms. Hawkins agreed. Mr. Yonce offered to study the matter, but noted that the structures house more than stairs. He conceded that the visibility of proposed rooftop structures was a significant issue for historic buildings, but questioned why the Committee was so concerned with the visibility of such structures on new construction. Mr. Yonce also explained that he has had extensive negotiations with the Spring Garden Civic Association, especially regarding the penthouses. He stated that the association specifically required him to break up the penthouses, not pair or group them. Ms. Stein stated that the penthouses look like metal sheds. Ms. Gutterman added that they are very large. Mr. Yonce countered that they will have attractive siding and fine detailing. He again asked how the penthouses would have an adverse effect on the historic district. He acknowledged that they might not be appropriate on historic buildings, but reminded the Committee that these will be new buildings.

Mr. Cluver objected to the use of the same corbelled detail on the cornice and the bay. Mr. Yonce replied that the corbels differ between the cornice and bay. Mr. Cluver asked about the window sizes and shapes. He stated that they should all be the same size and align. Ms. Gutterman suggested that the windows at the upper floors should vertically align. Mr. Yonce stated that the window configurations were established by interior requirements, but offered to study the matter. Ms. Hawkins noted that the window configurations vary from vertically oriented to horizontally oriented; she urged consistency. Mr. Yonce stated that the window details were carefully designed to relate to the various contexts, but he nonetheless offered to study the matter.

Mr. Cluver objected to cast stone trim around the windows on Pennsylvania, calling it “unduly busy for such a small façade.” Mr. Cluver suggesting using the brick window surrounds found elsewhere on the project. Mr. Yonce objected, contending that Pennsylvania has a very different scale than Green and the designs of the two facades were intended to be compatible with their different contexts. Mr. Yonce stated that Pennsylvania is very wide and opens onto the Parkway; there are no houses across the street. Therefore, the detailing on the Pennsylvania houses must be able to participate in that large-scale, open context.

Ms. Gutterman questioned the transoms over the front doors. She asked Mr. Yonce to “talk a little bit about what the door, sidelights, and transom are.” Mr. Yonce stated that the doorways will have glazed canopies, glazed transoms, and solid, metal-panel sidelights. Ms. Hawkins contended that the transoms should be limited to the widths of the doors and not extend over the solid panels flanking the doors; or the panels should be converted to glazed sidelights. She said that it was unusual to have glazed transoms above solid panels.

Ms. Hawkins opened the floor to the public. Justino Navarro of the Spring Garden Civic Association said that his organization supports this project. He observed that the designs that presented today have been vetted extensively by the association's zoning committee, advisory architects, and near neighbors. The designs are based on numerous discussions and agreements between the association and development team. He asked the Committee to recommend approval as proposed and suggested that the Commission's be authorized to review any revisions, so as not to slow the project.

Mr. Cluver asked about the locations for mechanical equipment on the roofs. Mr. Yonce stated that the condensers will be small in size and located near the penthouses. Ms. Hawkins stated that they cannot be visible from any public right-of-way. Mr. Yonce questioned the requirement, but assured the Committee members that they would not be visible.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9, provided the following conditions are satisfied:

1. the Green Street cornice is constructed as revised, with the demarcations between units;
2. the second- and third-floor fenestration on Pennsylvania Avenue is made more consistent;
3. the decks are moved back on the buildings and mechanical equipment is fully screened from view;
4. the units on Pennsylvania Avenue are demarcated with control joints or some other device;
5. the entry-door design is studied;
6. the railings are moved back from the front facades;
7. the privacy fences between the decks are tapered down near the front facades; and,
8. the reduction of the sizes of the penthouses is studied.

ADDRESS: 2135 WALNUT ST, VARIOUS UNITS

Project: Legalize window replacement and masonry painting, coating, and cleaning

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: various

Applicant: Matthew Mowrer, CVM Construction Managers

History: 1916; Walnut Street Apartments; Clinton & Russell, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the legalization of the installation of vinyl windows in the masonry openings of all floors of this multi-unit building. Over the years, the Historical Commission has reviewed applications from individual unit owners to replace windows in this building. The Commission denied an application for vinyl windows in November 2005 and has approved several applications for the appropriate wood windows. The staff met last year with a contractor representing the condominium owners as a group to discuss the replacement of windows. At that time, the staff explained the review process and provided a copy of a photograph showing the historic windows to the contractor. Despite the meeting, no application was submitted and the window replacement was undertaken without permits or approvals. In August 2014, the staff witnessed vinyl windows being installed and requested that the

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 28 OCTOBER 2014

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Department of Licenses & Inspections issue violations to every unit owner. In addition to the vinyl windows installed in the masonry openings, some unit owners installed vinyl windows in the bay windows. The new vinyl windows have sandwiched muntins and vary substantially from the appearance of the historic windows. The applicant's letter claims that a staff member verbally approved the windows; no approval, verbal or otherwise, was granted. Moreover, no permit was obtained; the Department of Licenses & Inspections requires permits for window replacement in multi-unit buildings. In addition to the window replacement, limestone on the building has been painted brown and some brick was cleaned and coated without permits or approvals.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 7.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Construction manager Matthew Mowrer represented the application.

Mr. Baron stated that the limestone was painted a cream color prior to the work in question. During the recent project, it was painted brown. He contended that, if the Commission had reviewed the project before the work was done, it would have required either the removal of the cream paint or its repainting with a color to replicate that of the limestone, but not brown. Ms. Hawkins asked if this application requested legalization of the windows only, or of the masonry work as well. Messrs. Baron and Mowrer agreed that the application proposed the legalization of the windows and masonry work. Mr. Baron stated that the application does not cover illegal window replacement in the bays, which was undertaken by individual condominium owners prior to the project in question.

Ms. Stein asked if the project in question involved removing historic windows or non-historic replacement windows. Mr. Mowrer replied that they removed and replaced non-historic windows. The historic windows had been removed years earlier. Mr. Baron noted that the Commission had approved and some owners installed appropriate windows prior to the current project.

Ms. Hawkins explained that the Commission never approves vinyl windows on main visible facades of buildings. She noted that there was no application for financial hardship. She said that the brown paint on the limestone was inappropriate and no information was provided on the cleaning or coating for review.

Mr. Mowrer said that the project was managed by a former coworker who no longer works at the firm. He said that the coworker contends that the staff of the Historical Commission approved the windows and paint color in question. He apologized that they did not obtain a permit to do the work. He said that the windows that were removed were not historic and in poor condition. He asserted that the new windows are appropriate. He provided photographs of masonry cleaning samples done during the project.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the windows and painting clearly do not satisfy the Standards. She stated that the cleaning and coating may or may not satisfy the Standards, but a decision on them cannot be reached until the cleaning and coating specifications are submitted. She suggested to the applicant that he submit the cleaning and coating specifications to the staff, who can determine whether they merit approval.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 7.

ADDRESS: 2311 PENNSYLVANIA AVE

Project: Demolish non-contributing building; construct 4-story single-family dwelling

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Loonstyn Properties JB, L.P.

Applicant: Tommy Tran, J T Ran Expediting

History: 1968

Individual Designation: None

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

Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a two-story non-contributing building in the Spring Garden Historic District and construct a four-story single-family dwelling in its place. The building would be clad in brick and would have metal false mansard roof. The false mansard would hide the proposed roof deck. Although an untraditional fenestration pattern is proposed, this building is compatible and would not have a negative impact on the district and in particular this block of non-contributing buildings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté resented the application to the Architectural Committee. The applicants were not present at the start of the review, but arrived while the review was underway.

Mr. Cluver disagreed with the staff recommendation and stated that he considered the design incompatible with the historic district. Ms. Gutterman questioned the materials, the color of the materials, the support and the visibility of the deck, and the location of the mechanical equipment. She stated that the drawings do not provide enough detail.

Ms. Pentz commented that the application proposes is the strangest mansard she has ever seen. Mr. Cluver stated that the window in the mansard does not seem proportional and that there is a discrepancy between the section drawing and the elevation drawing. He opined that it hard to tell what this building is going to look like, given the discrepancies and lack of details.

Ms. Cote asked if the Committee had suggestions for compatible materials. Ms. Hawkins stated that the reason why a lot of modern buildings in Society Hill work is because they are constructed of similar materials. She stated that she did not think that the brick has to be red but it should be of the palette of the neighboring buildings, which, in this case, includes tans and oranges. Ms. Gutterman agreed and stated that a white house on Pennsylvania Avenue is not appropriate. Ms. Hawkins stated that the mansard is a prominent design feature and the design of such a feature be carefully thought out. Ms. Gutterman stated that the color palette should be warm and not white or gray, but brown, yellow, or some similar color. She asked about the material of the door and the surrounds. Ms. Stein stated that she appreciated that a garage door is not proposed for the front façade. Mr. McCoubrey opined that the overhang above the door appears to be out of proportion.

John Loonstyn and Yao-Chang Huang, the owners and applicants, joined the meeting. Ms. Hawkins informed them that the general consensus is that the building should not be white and should be more in keeping with the surrounding buildings in terms of materials. Mr. Loonstyn stated that the block has no real historic value at all; almost all of the buildings on the block are classified as non-contributing and most have mansards. Ms. Hawkins stated that they have considered the application and agree that the proposed building should have a warm color palette, such as orange, yellow, or brown, but not white.

Mr. Huang stated that this lot sits between a residential and a commercial building. He stated that he designed the building with a mansard roof to be compatible with the nearby residential buildings, but also to be compatible with the commercial building. He claimed that the nearby buildings provide precedent for a white house on Pennsylvania Avenue. He stated that he chose white because the current building, which will be demolished, is clad in a light colored brick. He stated that the new roof will be clad in white standing-seam metal and the trim will be white Trespa.

Ms. Gutterman stated that she understood the bridging of the commercial and residential buildings, but contended that white is too glaring in this context and inappropriate in this historic district. Mr. D'Alessandro concurred. Mr. Huang countered that this block is on the boundary of the district and looks nothing like the Victorian area to the north and east. Ms. Gutterman informed the applicant that there are discrepancies in the drawings. Mr. Huang stated that he has worked out the drawings since the submission deadline and he brought the three-dimensional model for clarification. Mr. Gutterman suggested that the drawings should have been annotated with notes about the materials.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the front door. The applicants responded that the front door will be a solid metal door with a sidelight. Ms. Hawkins asked about the bands. Mr. Huang stated that those would be cast stone. Ms. Stein observed that there would be no Trespa at the ground level. Mr. Huang confirmed her statement. Ms. Pentz stated that model shows improvement in the design.

Ms. Gutterman suggested that the Committee recommend denial based on the color choice for the exterior. She again insisted that white house was not appropriate for Pennsylvania Avenue. Ms. Hawkins asked about the incompleteness and discrepancies in the drawings and between the drawings and the model. Ms. Gutterman agreed that the drawings are not consistent. Mr. Huang stated that they will submit revised drawings for the Commission meeting.

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

ADDRESS: 2000-02 SANSOM ST, 2004 SANSOM ST

Project: Install mural

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Midwood Investment & Development; John Coccone, Demcor II

Applicant: Kate Jacobi, Mural Arts Program

History: 2000-02 Sansom St, 1965; 2004 Sansom St, 1850

Individual Designation: None

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

2000-02 Sansom St, Non-contributing; 2004 Sansom St, Contributing

Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a mural on the party wall between 2000-02 and 2004 Sansom Street in Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District. The mural will not be placed directly on and will not obscure historic fabric. Its size and scale does not adversely affect the historic streetscape or the district. However, the staff suggests that the bargeboard on the party wall, which would be above the mural, is painted to match the cornice and other trim on 2004 Sansom Street to ensure that the shape of the roof at 2004 is discernable.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the bargeboard on the party wall is painted to match the cornice and other trim on 2004 Sansom Street, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Section 6.15.a of the Rules & Regulations.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Coté resented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney David Gest, and Jane Golden and Kate Jacobi of the Mural Arts Program represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the applicants were willing to paint the barge board. Ms. Golden stated that they would be happy to paint it. Ms. Hawkins asked if the owner of 2004 Sansom Street would be amenable to the painting. Ms. Golden affirmed that the painting would be acceptable to the owner. Ms. Jacobi stated that they would review colors with the owner to match the front trim on 2004 Sansom Street.

Mr. Cluver asked how the mural would be affixed to the wall. Ms. Golden stated it is adhered with an acrylic gel. She stated that this technique is used often throughout the City. Ms. Gutterman asked if this still allows the masonry wall to breathe. Ms. Golden responded that it does.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the bargeboard on the party wall is painted to match the cornice and other trim on 2004 Sansom Street, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Section 6.15.a of the Rules & Regulations.

ADDRESS: 954 S FRONT ST

Project: Construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 360 M LLC

Applicant: Hui Yan Zhen, 360 M LLC

History: 1840

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958, 5/31/1966

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck on the main block of a three-story building. The proposed deck is set back ten feet from the front of the building and five feet from the north side of the building. It is accessed via a spiral staircase from a small deck at the rear of the property. The staff reviewed a mockup onsite to determine visibility from the public right-of-way. While the railing would not be visible from directly in front of the building on S. Front Street, it would be visible at an angle when standing across the street to the north.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the deck is set back to be inconspicuous and the railing is simple and metal, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Broadbent presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property co-owner Hui Yan Zhen represented the application.

Ms. Broadbent directed the Committee's attention to photographs showing the roof deck mockup, and explained that she was standing across the street, on the grassy knoll beyond the sidewalk, in order to get a shot from the angle where the railing is most conspicuous.

Mr. Cluver asked about the pitch of the roof, and whether the proposed deck would flatten the slope of the roof or retain the current pitch. Ms. Zhen responded that they propose to retain the slope of the roof, but then asked if the drawings show that detail. She then explained that she is not the architect who created the drawings and therefore is not very familiar with the specifics of the project. Ms. Hawkins explained that the floor of the deck will not be flat if there is no structure built to flatten the pitch of the roof. Ms. Zhen responded that they will build a fiberglass structure. Mr. D'Alessandro responded that fiberglass will retain the slope of the roof. Ms. Hawkins asked whether the deck will have a structure on top of the roof, or if the floor of the deck is the actual roof. Ms. Zhen responded that there will be a structure on top of the roof to act as the floor, constructed possibly of fiberglass.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the material and attachment of the railing to the deck. Ms. Zhen responded that a vinyl railing is proposed. Ms. Gutterman stated that there is a detail in the drawings that shows the railings extending through the roof membrane.

Ms. Hawkins asked the Committee to focus on the aspects of this application that are visible to the public, which include only the railing. Mr. Cluver responded that he is concerned with the installation of the deck, as it has potential to damage the roof and create leaks. Ms. Gutterman agreed, and explained that anchoring through the roof structure and membrane increases the potential for water to travel around the anchoring point and damage anything below.

Ms. Gutterman commented that the Committee does not typically recommend approval of decks on the front halves of buildings, and she did not understand why this proposal would merit an exception. Ms. Broadbent responded that the staff did discuss that concern, but determined that the “no decks on main blocks of houses” rule was a preference of the past executive director and not a rule predicated on the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. Since that time, the staff has found historic photographs of houses that show very visible decks on main blocks. Therefore, the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and the Roofs Guidelines should provide the standards and guidelines for these types of projects. They call for the roof decks to be inconspicuous, and not damaging to the historic buildings or their character-defining features.

Ms. Hawkins commented that the proposed deck is very large. Ms. Gutterman asked why the deck cannot be set back farther from the front façade.

Ms. Gutterman made a motion of to recommend denial of the deck, stating that it would set a precedent that should be avoided. Ms. Hawkins seconded the motion and opened it up for further discussion.

Mr. Cluver stated that he would agree with pulling the deck farther back from the front of the building. He opined that he is more concerned with the lack of details regarding the attachment of the railings and construction of the walking surfaces, as there is a potential to do damage to the existing historic fabric. Ms. Zhen responded that her architect can provide additional information regarding the attachment details. Ms. Hawkins replied that the Committee is trying to protect the applicant as a homeowner; making holes in a roof can cause water to enter a building.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the railing should be metal rather than vinyl, and opined that the highway across the street creates a context in which the proposed deck on the main block is acceptable. Ms. Hawkins asked the Committee about the distance that the deck should be set back from the front of the building. Mr. D’Alessandro responded that he is in favor of the placement of the deck as currently proposed.

Ms. Hawkins reminded the Committee that there is a motion of denial on the table. The Committee then voted 4 to 3 in favor of denial of application. Messrs. D’Alessandro, McCoubrey and Ms. Stein dissented.

Ms. Hawkins then asked the Committee to provide suggestions to the applicant that could be incorporated into revised drawings for review by the Historical Commission.

Ms. Stein stated that she would approve of a deck, provided the railing is metal, and the deck is set back to the mid-point of the building, and extends party wall to party wall, i.e. the width of the building. Ms. Hawkins determined that Ms. Stein’s suggestion was a motion and seconded it. However, the motion failed by a vote of 3 to 4. Messrs. Cluver and McCoubrey, and Ms. Hawkins and Gutterman dissented, owing to the greater visibility of the railing, should the deck span the full width of the roof.

Ms. Hawkins made a new motion of approval of a deck, provided the railing is metal, the deck is set back to the mid-point of the building and a minimum of five feet off of the side elevation, and

the deck surface is not built up, with the staff to review details. Mr. D'Alessandro seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 6 to 1. Ms. Gutterman dissented.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the railing is metal, the deck is set back to the mid-point of the building and a minimum of five feet off of the side elevation, and the deck surface is not built up, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guidelines.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

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

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

Standard 8: Archaeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

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.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.

Rules and Regulations Section 6.15 Murals

6.15.a Policy

6.15.a.1 This policy applies to murals and other similar forms of outdoor visual art.

6.15.a.2 Murals shall not be placed directly upon historic fabric.

- 6.15.a.3 Murals shall not be placed in a manner that obscures historic fabric.
- 6.15.a.4 The Philadelphia Historical Commission, its committees, and staff shall not consider a mural's content as a part of its review of any application for a building permit, but may consider size, scale, and relationship to the historic context.